
Emergent L2 Grammars in and for Social Interaction: Introduction to the Special Issue

SIMONA PEKAREK DOEHLER¹ AND SØREN W. ESKILDSEN²

¹*University of Neuchâtel, Institute of Language Sciences, Pierre-à-Mazel 7, Neuchâtel, 2000, Switzerland*

Email: simona.pekarek@unine.ch

²*University of Southern Denmark, Department of Design and Communication, Sønderborg, 6400, Denmark* *Email: swe@sdu.dk*

Setting the stage for the central themes and the articles in this special issue, this introduction delineates the epistemological confluences, complementarities, and differences among conversation analysis (CA), on the one hand, and 2 strands of usage-based linguistics, on the other—namely, usage-based second-language acquisition (SLA) and interactional linguistics. This implies depicting how an increased interest in actual usage within the field of linguistics, including usage-based SLA, has converged with the basic assumptions in CA and interactional linguistics: (a) Language use is primordially and primarily situated in social interaction, and (b) language emerges out of social interaction. We scrutinize the grounds for combining the 3 frameworks for investigating second language development, illustrate such combination through the discussion of some of the rare existing studies that integrate these frameworks, and argue for the need to develop the methodological combinations further in order to move toward an ecologically more valid understanding of how language develops out of language use. On that basis, and additionally drawing on the individual contributions to the special issue, we then outline some implications for L2 education.

Keywords: usage-based SLA; conversation analysis; interactional linguistics; interactional competence; exemplar-based learning

“The forms of natural languages are created, governed, constrained, acquired and used in the service of communicative functions.” (MacWhinney et al., 1984, p. 128)

“A language is composed of conventional symbols shaped by their social-communicative functions.” (Tomasello, 1992, p. 67)

“That language is social in nature stems from the fact that it is used for social action within a context of language use (...)” (Larsen-Freeman, 2006, p. 593)

“Language acquisition emerges through interaction with other human beings within a social context.” (de Bot et al., 2007, p. 11)

“The realization of the primacy of language usage to language acquisition necessitates a commitment to (...) the study of contextualized functional discourse.” (Ellis & Cadierno, 2009, p. 112)

“Aspects of language structure are designed for conversational use.” (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 22)

“Grammar’s integrity and efficacy are bound up with its place in larger schemes of organization of human conduct, and with social interaction in particular.” (Ochs et al., 1996, p. 2)

“Grammar is a central resource in social members’ interactional competence—a set of practices

The Modern Language Journal, 106, S1, (2022)

DOI: 10.1111/modl.12759

0026-7902/22/3–22 \$1.50/0

© 2022 The Authors. *The Modern Language Journal* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, Inc.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

deployed in practical activities.” (Kasper & Wagner, 2011, p. 120)

“Linguistic forms (...) can be thought of as recurrent and sedimented ways of accomplishing specific social actions in talk-in-interaction.” (Couper-Kuhlen, 2014, p. 624)

“Meaning is (...) not a feature that lives in the linguistic form but rather the experience of what action a certain way of talking usually does.” (Wagner, 2015, p. 88)

THROUGHOUT THE PAST DECADES, THE field of linguistics has seen a sea change in its understanding of language and language learning. Based on an increased focus on naturally occurring language use, researchers have provided growing empirical evidence suggesting that both the nature and the development of language are grounded in human social interaction and human perception of the world. This has given rise to usage-based models of language that build theory on the observation that grammatical structures are deployed in contextualized, locally contingent ways and are therefore ever changing and evolving (Bybee, 2010; Fillmore et al., 1988; Goldberg, 1995; Hopper, 1987; Langacker, 1987). Linguistic structures emerge from use and grow out of repeated co-occurrences in use, and they do so primordially in and through social interaction as the primary habitat of language, both phylogenetically and ontogenetically (Deacon, 1997; Lee et al., 2009; Levinson, 2006; MacWhinney, 2008). This basic understanding has been supported and refined by evidence from various fields of investigation, including first (L1) and second language (L2) learning (Bates & MacWhinney, 1988; Ellis, 2002; Robinson & Ellis, 2008; Tomasello, 2003), corpus linguistics (Sinclair, 1991), the study of grammaticalization (Hopper & Traugott, 2003), and interactional linguistics (IL; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2018; Ochs et al., 1996; Pekarek Doehler, 2021b).

Despite these important developments, the field of second language acquisition (SLA) is yet to take systematic interest in investigating how L2 structures are put to work interactionally and how they emerge from such specific interactional use. Research is needed that addresses both the local and the long-term emergence of patterns of language use in social interaction and sheds light on the precise role of linguistic structures in shaping L2 speakers' ability to interact (interactional competence) and on the precise role of the nature of L2 speakers' interactional environments and experiences in shaping their L2 grammars. This is exactly what this special issue ties into. We argue

that social interaction is the primordial scene for the learning of L2 linguistic structures. With Firth & Wagner (2007), we share a view of language use-in-interaction and learning as inextricably intertwined and, consequently, we stress the need to understand social interaction on its own terms in order to understand learning. We propose how this can be done by combining the methodological and conceptual instruments from usage-based approaches to the emergence of linguistic structures and conversation analysis (CA). Specifically, we explore how usage-based SLA, interactional linguistics (IL), and conversation-analytic SLA (CA-SLA) can be combined, and what can be gained from such a combination. It is our hope that this introduction and the contributions to this special issue can offer a modest step toward an integrative perspective in SLA that has continuously been called for during the last decade but that has mostly remained confined to programmatic statements (Atkinson, 2011; Beckner et al., 2009; Douglas Fir Group, 2016; Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007; Hulstijn et al., 2014).

Recent calls for a new SLA stress the need to take “the social–local worlds of L2 learners” (Douglas Fir Group, 2016, p. 20)—and specifically their social acting in this world (see already Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007)—as a starting point for investigating L2 development:

Language learning begins at the micro level of social activity [emphasis added] (...) through L2 learners' repeated experience in regularly occurring and recurring contexts of use, often characterized by interpersonal (oral, signed, or written) interaction with other social actors.” (Douglas Fir Group, 2016, p. 27)

Locating learning in the social–local worlds (or, the life-world; Schutz & Luckmann, 1973) of L2 speakers centrally involves seeking to understand how such learning emerges from and at the same time feeds into speakers' social—that is, interactional—practices within those worlds. These social–local worlds are themselves historically shaped and inhabited by people whose practices (including their use of language) are the cumulative effects of their past experiences in and with the world: While microprocesses of emergence may be configured locally, in the course of a single interaction, speakers are dealing with and drawing on linguistic resources that have filtered down to them through repeated and recalibrated use across months, years, or even decades, from the very first functional use or negotiation of a given format.

While language emergence must be acknowledged to happen across timescales (MacWhinney,

2015), we consider, specifically for L2 learning, social interaction to be both a central driving force and aim of L2 learning. Accordingly, we set out in this special issue to contribute to a better understanding of how patterns of language use emerge out of social interaction and how they develop and routinize as resources for social action, that is, as part of the systematic procedures that participants use for coordinating and jointly organizing their interactions and establishing mutual understanding. To be clear, our point here is not that language is only about interpersonal relations—it is also about navigating in, being part of, drawing on, and making sense of changing (material) surroundings, typically in close collaboration with others (see Hellermann & Thorne, 2022, this issue). Our point is, however, that language and language development are inextricably bound to social–interactional practices and contexts, that they are shaped by these and at the same time contribute to shaping them.

We hence address two interrelated SLA issues: The first (a) pertains to social interaction as the driving force of L2 development, and the second (b) to the development of L2 patterns of language use as resources for accomplishing social interaction. While (a) is about retracing the interactional grounding of the development of linguistic patterns from exemplar-based construction toward increased productivity and, possibly, schematization, (b) is concerned with evidencing trajectories of both expansion and routinization in the functional use of language patterns for carrying out actions (e.g., requesting, accounting, promising, reporting) and accomplishing interaction-organizational purposes, such as managing floor-holding and speaker transition (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) or alerting co-participants to incipient next actions. In other words, (b) specifically addresses the development of an L2 grammar-for-interaction (Pekarek Doehler, 2018). In a nutshell, as we see it, L2 development is about expanding a linguistic inventory and accomplishing an increasingly wider array of social actions but it is also about routinizing, and possibly grammaticizing, linguistic patterns as interaction-organizational devices.

We argue that addressing the issues outlined so far is not only key to understanding the relation between L2 use and L2 development but also highlights a core concern in SLA as it speaks to the very foundational fabric of the local–social world of L2 speakers. Our argument is rooted in a view of social interaction as the bedrock of human linguistic functioning—and hence of the development of language. That is, we view the

achievement of social interaction and the learning of linguistic resources as inextricably bound to each other. While such a view is basically shared across usage-based and conversation analytic research (as evidenced in the quotes cited in the opening of this introduction), only a few investigations in the field of SLA take it as the starting point for the empirical study of language learning.

The epistemological question we ask, then, is this: Given the current state of research, how can we investigate SLA as it “emerges through interaction with other human beings within a social context” (de Bot et al., 2007, p. 11)? And how can we study the developmental trajectories of L2 resources that, over time, become functionally “used for social action” (Larsen–Freeman, 2006, p. 593) and become “recurrent and sedimented ways of accomplishing specific social actions in talk-in-interaction” (Couper–Kuhlen, 2014, p. 624)? Combining CA and usage-based frameworks provides ideal grounds for scrutinizing how linguistic resources sediment experientially, in and through social interaction, to form emergent L2 grammars for social action. Such a combination advances our understanding of L2 speakers’ engagement with others in social interaction, of how L2 learning is situated within the local ecology of social interaction, of how L2 speakers put language to work collaboratively with co-participants, and of how they “soft-assemble” (Larsen–Freeman, 2010) their L2 grammars for social action through iterative use. Moreover, the microanalytic lens of CA lets us examine L2 multimodality and the role of artifacts in the material environments of L2 interaction. The special issue is designed to address these issues and to outline consequences that ensue for both SLA research and L2 education through a range of empirical studies complemented by two discussion pieces.

In this introduction, we set the stage for the rest of the special issue. We first delineate the epistemological confluences, complementarities, and divergences among CA-SLA, usage-based SLA, and IL. We then exemplify, through a critical discussion of two empirical studies, what can be gained by bringing together the conceptual and methodological apparatus of CA and usage-based linguistics (UBL) in investigating two L2 developmental issues: (a) the emergence of constructions in and through social interaction, and (b) the routinization and functional expansion of constructions for socio-interactional purposes. We finally offer an overview of the empirical articles in the special issue before concluding and outlining implications for L2 education.

USAGE-BASED SLA, CONVERSATION ANALYSIS, AND INTERACTIONAL LINGUISTICS

The epistemological impetus behind merging the interests from usage-based SLA, CA-SLA, and IL is that each of the three strands has advanced our understanding of overlapping and, we argue, mutually constitutive aspects of the role of usage in language development, but none of them alone can account for how linguistic constructions are shaped by use and learned in and through use as speakers deploy them to accomplish social actions in sequentially sensitive ways. Usage-based SLA (e.g., Ellis & Ferreira-Junior, 2009; Eskildsen, 2012) provides an apparatus for tracing patterns of language use across time from their exemplar-based origins. However, as pointed out in Eskildsen & Cadierno (2015), usage-based SLA research has typically abstracted use from its primary habitat—social interaction—thus leaving unattended the situated, interactional dynamics and discourse-functional roots of exemplar-based learning. CA-SLA in turn offers methodological tools for scrutinizing such situated specifics of L2 learning (e.g., Brouwer, 2003) through its interest in the minute sequential organization of actions and mutual adaptations among participants. Longitudinal CA-SLA in particular, going back to Brouwer and Wagner's (2004) pioneering observations, has evidenced the development of L2 interactional competence as L2 speakers' adaptive ability to accomplish social actions, for example repair, story-telling, and conversational openings and closings (Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018; 2019; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011, 2015).¹ Such work, however, has remained largely agnostic as to the role of linguistic resources in that development, thus leaving the ground fertile for postanalytic applications of usage-based SLA. Last, IL (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2018; Maschler et al., 2020; Ochs et al., 1996; Pekarek Doehler et al., 2015) provides methodological and conceptual tools for understanding the social anchoring of linguistic patterning and the relationship between linguistic items and the social actions they can accomplish but has so far not been applied to longitudinal case studies of language development, be it L1 or L2.

In sum, usage-based SLA provides a method for tracing linguistic patterns in action over time, CA-SLA provides a method for capturing the local-social specifics and the dimension of action accomplishment in L2 learning, and IL offers a toolbox for understanding grammar as “routinized ways to implement actions” (Thompson &

Couper-Kuhlen, 2005, p. 808). The three strands of research find common ground in the fundamentally experiential observability, noticeability, and learnability of language (Eskildsen & Kasper, 2019), and their combination translates into a robust epistemological apparatus for understanding and explaining L2 development in terms of an embodied grammar for accomplishing social action. We will briefly outline the three strands in the following sections.

Usage-Based SLA

UBL has come to be a cover-term for a range of linguistic theories that, in brief terms, abolish the syntax–lexis distinction and do away with the sharp competence–performance distinction, instead putting language use at the center of language emergence and learning. UBL views language as an inventory of cognitive schemas variably referred to as form–meaning pairings, symbolic units, or constructions. They are described along a continuum of specificity (from fixed formulas to abstract schematic templates, which in turn sanction the single instantiations) and complexity (from morphemes to full utterances). This implies a “maximalistic language model in which abstract grammatical patterns and the lexical instantiations of those patterns are jointly included and which may consist of many different levels of schematic abstraction” (Tummers et al., 2005, pp. 228–229). Learning a language is seen as an exemplar-based process of extracting regularities among linguistic patterns in a slow and piecemeal fashion along a trajectory of increasing schematicity from formulas to abstract representations (Ellis, 2002; Tomasello, 2003).

The idea of a usage-based approach to linguistic phenomena has epistemological forerunners in anthropological linguistics and sociolinguistics of the 1960s, particularly Hymes (1962, 1972). His notion of communicative competence builds on the idea that language is communicative action and that people learn it as such through experience. Similarly, UBL takes a bottom-up perspective on language emergence and argues that language is fundamentally shaped by function in discourse (Bates & MacWhinney, 1988; Tomasello, 1992). Concrete exemplars of form–meaning pairings constitute the beginnings of language users' cognitive processes of extracting schematic generalities that result in generic templates that in turn sanction the comprehension and use of new exemplars. In other words, any and all of a language user's extracted generalities stem from specific occasions of use (Tomasello, 2000). This

has been supported repeatedly in child language studies that have pioneered usage-based models of language through providing compelling empirical evidence (Ambridge & Lieven, 2015; Brandt et al., 2011; MacWhinney, 1975; Tomasello, 2003).

Since Ellis's (2002) seminal focus article in a special issue of *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, UBL has been gaining attention in SLA research. Experimental work in psycholinguistics has confirmed the ontological reality of constructions as form–meaning pairings (e.g., Ellis, 2002; Ellis et al., 2014; Gries & Wulff, 2005, 2009). A growing body of nonexperimental research, including case studies and corpus-based investigations, is documenting and discussing L2 learning over time in terms of an exemplar-based and frequency-biased process in which L2 users are developing a repertoire of interrelated constructions on the basis of recurring exemplars (e.g., Ellis & Ferreira-Junior, 2009; Eskildsen, 2012, 2015, 2020, *inter alia*; Horbowicz & Nordanger, 2021; Lesonen et al., 2020; Roehr–Brackin, 2014; Römer & Berger, 2019; Tode & Sakai, 2016).

One finding that is consistently emerging from recent research is that the exemplar-based trajectory is not necessarily a path from ‘one to many’ but can also be from ‘a few to more’ in a process where both recurring multiword expressions and constructions that are partially specific and partially schematic (for example, “are you *ADJECTIVE*?” in L2 English question formation) play an essential role across phases in development (Eskildsen, 2015, 2017, 2020; Horbowicz & Nordanger, 2021; Lesonen et al., 2018, 2020). The fact that the exemplar-based learning trajectory *per se* is flexible in this way is in alignment with the competition model's notion of multidimensional processes of competition at various levels of human behavior and cognition (MacWhinney, 2015) and with the notion of soft assembly as found in complexity theory (Larsen–Freeman, 2010): The L2 inventory as it is being built through use is permeable and open to change at any point as speakers coadapt in interaction. This means for SLA that the learning trajectory is highly susceptible to interactional needs, linguistic awareness, and cross-linguistic influence (e.g., MacWhinney, 2015; Lesonen et al., 2020; Roehr–Brackin, 2014).

While usage-based approaches to SLA have shown the importance of frequency effects and prototypicality of meaning in construction learning and have mapped out exemplar-based emergence of L2 constructions, evidence for how L2 structures are put to work interactionally and how they develop from such specifically interactional use is scarce (Pekarek Doehler, 2018). This may

be because the necessary data can be difficult to obtain, but it may also be because longitudinal microanalysis of L2 sociointeractional practices of the type that could tackle such issues poses a range of tricky methodological challenges when it comes to warranting comparability, over time, of speakers' social practices—and hence of the social-interactional and contextual grounding of language use (for a recent discussion, see Deppermann & Pekarek Doehler, 2021). Attempting to understand the social-interactional roots of emergent L2 grammars, however, is in full alignment with the usage-based epistemology—as evidenced in the introductory quotes—but it necessitates the complementation of usage-based approaches with a theory of social action—namely, CA (Eskildsen, 2018a, 2018b; Eskildsen & Kasper, 2019; Pekarek Doehler, 2018; Pekarek Doehler & Balamán, 2021; see also Larsen–Freeman, 2010, on the importance of understanding the microlevel of interaction for the purposes of understanding long-term L2 learning).

CA-SLA

For the past two decades, CA-SLA has mapped out L2 learning as situated activities that are socially accomplished through certain displayed behaviors (e.g., Brouwer, 2003; Eskildsen, 2019; Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017; Firth & Wagner, 2007; Greer, 2019; Lilja, 2014; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Svennevig, 2018). These behaviors include systematic practices for accomplishing repair and doing noticing, focusing on form, preempting trouble, reindexing recently learned items, and orienting to new (material) objects and their lexical specifications. Such research highlights the fundamentally usage-based roots of L2 learning as it reveals the interactional specifics and sequential unfolding of first instances of use—where, it is agreed, usage-based learning begins.

Longitudinal CA-SLA, in turn, has conceptualized L2 learning as development of interactional competence (Hall, 1993, 1995; Hall et al., 2011; He & Young, 1998; Pekarek Doehler, 2018; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon–Berger, 2015). Interactional competence is understood in terms of members' methods (i.e., systematic procedures in the ethnomethodological sense of the term; Garfinkel, 1967) for organizing social interaction. Along these lines, CA-SLA has investigated L2 speakers' methods for accomplishing particular actions and how these methods change and are recalibrated over time. This research has documented

learning trajectories for L2 speakers' methods for managing turn-taking, task openings and disengagements, storytelling and responding to storytelling, repair, requesting, disagreeing, topic management, sequence organization, and word searches (e.g., Hellermann, 2008, 2011; Kim, 2016; König, 2020; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Nguyen, 2011, 2018, 2019; Pekarek Doehler, 2018; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018, 2019; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015; Shively, 2015; Skogmyr Marian, 2022). The quoted studies focus on a distinct action or course of action (e.g., initiating repair, disagreeing with others, opening a storytelling, complaining) and investigate how speakers' procedures and resources (both verbal and embodied) for accomplishing that type of action or course of action change over time. The research converges on a key finding: The process of L2 interactional development implies the diversification of procedures for action. Beginner L2 speakers may employ only basic methods for turn-taking, story opening, or disagreeing but then complement these with more refined procedures (more precision-timed turn-taking, the use of dispreferred turn formats for dispreferred actions such as disagreement, the use of story prefaces, etc.) in the process of becoming efficient L2 speakers.² Such empirical observations clearly indicate the need for investigating the precise role of emergent linguistic resources in the accomplishment of social action. However, to date, only a few studies have done so.

The first systematic developmental studies concerned with the use of specific grammatical resources for coordinating L2 interaction are Kim (2009) and Ishida (2009). Kim (2009) traced change in the interactional use of two Korean connectives—*nuntey* and *kuntey*—by comparing four L2 speakers of Korean whose proficiency levels ranged from mid-novice to mid-advanced. The study provides evidence for the emergence, with the more advanced speakers, of interaction-organizational uses of the connectives, such as the use of *kuntey* as a back-linking (see Schegloff, 1996) device. In a longitudinal case study, Ishida (2009) investigated the changes that occurred over a period of 9 months in the use of the particle *ne* (compared to the English tag “isn't it” or to utterance-final “you know”) with an L2 speaker of Japanese (see also Masuda, 2011) in a study-abroad context. She documented the emergence, over time, of specifically interaction-organizational uses of *ne* for pursuing co-participants' alignment or agreement.

Eskildsen (2011), drawing on usage-based SLA and CA, showed how an ESL learner used the mul-

tiword expression “what do you say” initially exclusively as a request for help in word-search sequences (in the sense of “how do you say X”), and then increasingly as a repetition request (in the sense of “what did you just say”) or for soliciting a recipient's opinion (in the sense of “what do YOU say / think”). He further showed how the recurrent “what do you say” format constituted the frequency-gated foundations of the emergence of a more varied “(WH) do PRO VERB” construction, distributed across communicative contexts and functions.

Pekarek Doehler & Berger (2019) and Pekarek Doehler (2018) analyzed the French multiword expressions *comment on dit* [how do you say] and *je sais pas* [I don't know], respectively, produced by L2 speakers when interacting with their au pair families in a French-speaking environment. Their findings indicate that both target constructions evolve over time from being used first literally (i.e., as a request for a word or as an epistemic disclaimer, respectively, often with a complement) toward more diversified and specifically interaction-organizational uses, without a complement, for instance for floor-holding or floor-yielding purposes.

Drawing on video recordings of service encounters involving a Korean-speaking shop owner in Hawai'i with limited proficiency in L2 English, Kim (2019) described how an idiosyncratic multiword expression (“we limit ten under 20 cent charge”) is routinized as a resource for accomplishing a particular social action—namely, informing customers about payment policy. The accomplishment of the informing is shown to rely on participants' previous knowledge and features of the environment, including a sign next to the cash register that stipulates the store's policy (“10\$ limit for card transaction. 20¢ will be charged for under 10\$”). The routinization of the idiosyncratic multiword expression is shown to be the result of co-constructed, embodied, repeated achievements of understanding in each informing sequence.

The studies cited in this section concurringly show that development of L2 interactional competence pertains not only to the acquisition of new linguistic form–meaning pairings—nor does it only concern the accomplishment of social actions in situ. Rather, participation in usage environments that differ slightly from previous experiences, the accomplishment of environmentally adapted (embodied) social actions, and the gradual and ongoing understanding and recalibration-through-use of linguistic patterns all conspire to form the backbone of developing interactional competence—also when that

involves the routinization of an idiosyncratic expression. The precise relationship between usage environment, social action, and the deployment of specific linguistic resources is the core interest in IL, to which we turn next.

Interactional Linguistics

IL is concerned with exploring “the structure and organization of language as used in social interaction” (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2018, p. 3). It originates in a confluence of the microsociological paradigm of CA and earlier discourse-functional and usage-based approaches to linguistic structure (e.g., Chafe, 1988; Hopper & Thompson, 1980, 1984; for a recent discussion see Mushin & Pekarek Doehler, 2021). Just like these approaches, IL understands linguistic structures—be they syntactic, phonological, morphological, or lexical—as being shaped by the functions they serve in their actual use, and views language as contingent, temporal, and ever-adaptive (see also Bybee, 2010; Hopper, 1998, 2011). Differently from its foundational inspirations in the field of linguistics, however, IL stresses the fact that language use is prototypically interactional in nature—that is, that social interaction is the primary habitat of language, both phylogenetically and ontogenetically (see also Levinson, 2006; MacWhinney, 2008; Tomasello, 2003). Understanding use in terms of social interaction means acknowledging that social interaction is prior to language—is what language grows out of—and therefore to some extent structures language, yet it is also structured through the resources provided by language (Ochs et al., 1996). Based on this understanding, studies in IL have prominently documented how linguistic constructions are employed to manage social interaction across a number of languages (see the articles in Auer & Pfänder, 2011; Deppermann & Günthner, 2015; Lindström et al., 2016; Maschler et al., 2020; Sorjonen et al., 2017), that is, how they serve as resources for turn-taking, managing disagreement, projecting incipient turns and actions, and accomplishing mutually recognizable actions. IL hence investigates linguistic constructions as part of speakers’ “routinized ways to implement actions” (Thompson & Couper-Kuhlen, 2005, p. 482).

Studies analyzing multiword expressions have, for instance, documented the use of complement-taking predicate constructions involving mental verbs—such as “I (don’t) know,” “I mean,” or “you know”—as marker-like, highly routinized interaction-organizational devices (e.g., Helmer

et al., 2016; Imo, 2007; Kärkkäinen, 2003; Keevalik, 2011). We know from earlier work that these grammaticize as epistemic or phatic markers or parentheticals (e.g., Bybee, 2010; Jucker & Smith, 1998; Östman, 1981; Thompson & Mulac, 1991) and that such grammaticization reaches far back in history (see Brinton, 1996, for Middle English; Greimas & Keane, 2001, for Middle French). Against this background, the distinctive trait of studies in IL lies in the fact that they specifically explore the interaction-organizational workings of such constructions. For instance, equivalents of “I don’t understand” in German and Hebrew have been documented to not only function as epistemic hedges, but also to index interactional disaffiliation (Deppermann, 2011; Polak-Yitzhaki & Maschler, 2016). Recent cross-linguistic evidence shows that equivalents of English “I don’t know” in languages as different as Czech, French, Hebrew, Mandarin, and Romanian work as pragmatic interactional markers that serve to preface dispreferred actions (Pekarek Doehler et al., 2021), such as disagreeing with an assessment or the non-granting of a request. Given such findings, a relevant question for SLA research is how L2 speakers use such constructions and how that use evolves over time.

With respect to more abstract grammatical constructions, a number of recent studies have been concerned with various types of cleft structures. There is a wealth of discourse-functional research that has evidenced the role of clefts in the structuring of information, that is, the marking of new and old information (Jespersen, 1949; Lambrecht, 1994; Prince, 1978). Recent work in IL adds to this understanding by showing that pieces of complex clause-combining patterns may autonomize (i.e., work as a syntactically independent fragments) and routinize as interaction-organizational devices. For instance, the initial pieces of pseudoclefts have been shown to sediment as interactional projector constructions (see Hopper, 2004; Hopper & Thompson, 2008, for English; Günthner, 2006; Günthner & Hopper, 2010, for German; Maschler & Fishman, 2020, for Hebrew; Müller Blaser, 2007; Pekarek Doehler, 2011, for French). Illustrations are provided in the following excerpts.

EXCERPT 1

(H) Then what I’ll do ... is,
 ... when –
 ... you can –
 ... I’ll call you and find out.

(Hopper & Thompson, 2008, p. 104)

EXCERPT 2

ce qu'on-eu::h on: on a fait
 what we we we AUX do-PP
 'what we did'

maintenant j'ai une classe que je suis
 now I have a class that I teach

pour la deuxième année, ((turn continued))
 for the second year

(Pekarek Doehler, 2011, p. 124)

In both excerpts, the *wh*-piece (in bold) projects more to come, but the subsequent stretch of talk is not syntactically tied to it. The *wh*-piece functions as a projector construction framing upcoming talk in terms of the action it is about to accomplish (e.g., it projects a paraphrase of a preceding action, as in Excerpt 1, or a specification of a future doing, as in Excerpt 2). These pieces hence work as (routinized) resources for dealing with a central exigency of interaction—namely, the need to anticipate (project; Auer, 2005) what comes next.

Finally, there is some work on the interactional workings of so-called insubordinate clauses, that is, “the conventionalized main-clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses” (Evans, 2007, p. 367), such as free-standing “if” or “because” clauses. Following Evans’s seminal work, much existing research associates insubordination with intersubjective alignment between speaker and hearer, related to the delivery of requests, commands, hints, and warnings but also with epistemic and evidential meanings. The recently intensifying interactional perspective specifically adds to this by revealing the interaction-organizational role of insubordinate clauses (see Couper-Kuhlen, 1996; Lindström et al., 2019; from a different perspective, see Hilpert, 2015, on “collaborative insubordinations”). For instance, Ford (1994) and Ford & Mori (1994) documented that free-standing “because” clauses serve the purpose of fishing for recipient response or affiliation in conversation. Such clauses often occur as a turn-extension after the speaker’s preceding turn has come to a completion point “in contexts where recipient uptake is relevant but either missing, hesitant, or less than affiliative” (Ford, 1994, p. 537).

These are just a few examples illustrating how speakers use elements of grammar as resources not only for, for instance, focusing and linking elements in discourse, but also for prospectively alerting recipients to what they are doing next and

for retrospectively tying back to what precedes or dealing with preceding trouble. As Ford & Fox (1996) put it, “linguistic choices are made not only to fit into, but also to manage and to transform conversational activities” (p. 162). If this is so with “competent” speakers in their L1, we might expect that L2 speakers’ uses are equally akin to serve the management of conversational activities. Grammatical routines for dealing with fundamental interaction-organizational issues such as projection can be anticipated to be objects of learning as L2 speakers develop their interactional competence over time.

Furthermore, there is some—though so far only initial evidence—for how interaction-organizational needs actually drive the routinization of constructions, suggesting that grammatical routines may be motivated by social-interactional exigencies (Couper-Kuhlen, 2011) such as turn-taking (Detges & Waltereit, 2011) or, more generally, the sequencing of actions on a turn-by-turn basis (Pekarek Doehler, 2021b) and interactants’ negotiation of meaning (Hopper & Traugott, 2003). To date, however, studies in IL have exclusively focused on interactions between competent L1 speakers; developmental issues regarding L2 (or L1) use have remained unaddressed (but see Pekarek Doehler, 2018; Pekarek Doehler & Balaman, 2021).

INTEGRATING CA AND USAGE-BASED FRAMEWORKS: TWO ILLUSTRATIVE STUDIES

In this section, we provide illustrations, in the form of two case studies, of how CA can be combined with usage-based frameworks to tackle two distinct SLA issues: (a) the exemplar-based emergence of patterns of language use as rooted in local contextual interactional problems, and (b) the progressive routinization and functional diversification of such patterns in and for social interaction. Eskildsen (2012; Study A) reported on the developmental trajectory of negation constructions combining the method from usage-based child language research of tracking the natural history of linguistic patterns in use (Lieven et al., 2003) with detailed turn-by-turn CA analysis. Pekarek Doehler (2018; Study B), combining IL with CA, showcased the developmental trajectory of a lexically specific multiword expression (*je sais pas* [I don’t know]) and showed how it progressively diversifies in its functional use in response to local interactional needs, ultimately routinizing into an interaction-organizational device.

Study A: Tracing the Emergence of Exemplar-Based Patterns of Language Use Over Time

The study reported on here, Eskildsen (2012), was a longitudinal study that traced the negation constructions of two ESL learners, Carlos and Valerio, over the course of 2.5 years and 3 years, respectively. The data came from the Multimedia Adult English Learner Corpus at Portland State University, an audio–video database of ESL classroom interaction. The purpose of the study was to investigate the exemplar-based trajectory of negation learning and, using CA, to understand the interactional roots of negation development.

Using type–token frequencies, Eskildsen showed that the students’ overall learning trajectories supported a view of L2 learning as going from recurring expressions toward an increasingly productive inventory of linguistic resources. Carlos’s learning trajectory was characterized by

- (1) an initial high frequency of a recurring exemplar of the target construction (*I don’t know*); (2) a gradual increase in the use of other exemplars of the target-like pattern, *subject don’t verb*; and (3) a concomitant gradual waning of the non-target-like pattern, *subject no verb*. (Eskildsen, 2012, p. 342)

Valerio’s use, too, was initially dominated by a high frequency of the multiword expression “I don’t know.” Valerio, however, initially used the “*subject don’t verb*” pattern more often and more productively than Carlos, whereas his uses of “*subject no verb*” were initially relatively infrequent but increased over the first three recording periods before waning to the brink of disappearance from the data.

While the use of “no” as preverb negator by Spanish speakers of English has been regarded as a matter of transfer from L1 at least since

Cancino et al. (1978), the high degree of fluctuation in the waxing and waning of the “*subject no verb*” patterns in Valerio’s data could, to a large extent, be explained by recourse to his participation in recurring interactional environments. Based on Eskildsen (2020), we will briefly describe the environmentally coupled emergence in Valerio’s data of a routinized pattern for social action, “you no *verb*.” This is to exemplify how usage and biographical encounters of specific expressions are crucial to the developmental overview as reflected in the type–token counts.

The most frequent purposes for which Valerio used the two varieties “you no *verb*” and “you don’t *verb*” constructions were to make assertions (Pomerantz, 1984) or ask confirmatory questions (Turk, 1999). However, the “you no *verb*” construction was also used to achieve a specific purpose for which Valerio used no other construction and for which he did not appear to possess more relevant L2 resources—namely, to instruct his fellow students on the task at hand. One activity on one day in class seemed especially pivotal to the development of this aspect of Valerio’s negation repertoire (Excerpt 3) where the students were doing free movement interactions, a common praxis in this classroom in which the students walk around and engage relatively briefly in cued serial dyadic interactions (Hellermann & Cole, 2009). In this exercise, the students had been instructed by the teacher to write down the names of the students who answered their “are you going to + *verb*” questions affirmatively.

In lines 1–3, a classmate asks Valerio a task question and Valerio answers. The student then starts writing, and Valerio instructs her not to write at this point, using “you no write” as the main resource to achieve this (4–8). Valerio ends his turn with “you no:,” accompanied by a vertical open

EXCERPT 3

February 13, 2004

- 01 Un: are you going to: buy a house↑
- 02 (1)
- 03 Va: no:
- 04 Un: ((writes))
- 05 -> Va: no::: you no write no:↓ you write na:mes↓
- 06 ((orienting to paper)) the the people say
- 07 yes I am↑ you say the name↓ (.) the people
- 08 say no↑ you no: ((vertical open palm
- 09 gesture))
- 10 Un: nothing↓
- 11 -> Va: you no write nothing.
- 12 Un: o:h ((pats Va on shoulder)) thank you

palm gesture (8–9). The gesture seemingly works as an embodied completion of the turn (Olsher, 2004), thus projecting a relevant point for speaker transition. In response, the co-participant delivers a “nothing” (10) which displays understanding and thus helps maintain intersubjectivity, and Valerio immediately incorporates the item into his next turn, a repetition of the instruction, “you no write nothing.” The sequence is finally closed down as Valerio’s partner, in line 12, thanks him following a change-of-state token “o:h” (Heritage, 1984), which works as a claim that she has now understood Valerio’s instruction.

On this day, Valerio uses the expression “you no write” eight times to instruct his classmates in this same way. Importantly, recipients’ responses on these occasions provide the interactional validation of the functionality of this otherwise nonstandard format. Valerio is not just producing language in these instances; he is engaged in collaborative sense-making procedures that ascribe actions to the expressions he uses (see Kim, 2019). The action of instructing somebody on how to do something is for Valerio strictly coupled with the “you no *verb*” construction. It seems to emerge, in Valerio’s experience, as a resource for accomplishing this specific action—it is, in other words, derived from interactional practices in which the act of instructing is relevant and recognized as such by others.

With the recurring interactional uses of “you no write,” the nonstandard negation, in the first instance probably arising from cross-linguistic influence, becomes a quantitative preference in Valerio’s linguistic repertoire, and its use in later interactions a matter of the frequency-biased construction of his linguistic inventory. It becomes an established, routinized resource with a clear relation between the expression and the action it is used to accomplish (Eskildsen & Kasper, 2019; Pekarek Doehler & Balamán, 2021). The deployment of this particular pattern at this particular time, then, is a matter of using available resources allowing Valerio to achieve his interactional goals. It is a “make-do” solution whose deployment in a recurring interactional environment leaves a profound mark on Valerio’s ongoing “soft assembly” of linguistic resources (Larsen–Freeman, 2010). Given the highly contextualized nature of “you no write,” it is likely that different interactional environments (e.g., different or differently structured language learning tasks in the classroom) would have yielded a different trajectory of emergence for this particular feature of Valerio’s negation repertoire. Referring to Eskildsen (2012) as an exemplary

study in her overview of complexity theory in SLA, Larsen–Freeman (2015) made the point that Valerio’s changing repertoire in response to situational changes is, indeed, what would be expected of changes in a dynamic system.

Study B: Tracing the Functional Diversification of a Pattern of Language Use Over Proficiency Levels

This ongoing study, preliminary findings of which were reported in Pekarek Doehler (2018), is concerned with how speakers, over time, develop an L2 grammar-for-interaction, and how such development may be driven by speakers’ repeated dealings with locally emergent social-interactional needs. Focusing on the negative epistemic expressions *je sais pas* [I know.1SG NEG] (henceforth JSP), and drawing on the methodological and conceptual apparatuses of CA-SLA and interactional linguistics, the study investigates the progressive routinization and functional diversification of JSP in L2 development: Do L2 speakers develop, over time, interaction-organizational uses of JSP? If so, what is the related developmental trajectory? Does that trajectory show parallels to what we know about grammaticization in language change?

Prior research has shown that complement-taking predicate constructions involving mental verbs, such as “I (don’t) know” or “you know,” grammaticize as epistemic or phatic markers in a wide range of languages (e.g., Bybee, 2010; Jucker & Smith, 1998; Östman, 1981; Thompson & Mulac, 1991; see previous discussion), and that some of these markers work as highly routinized interaction-organizational devices in L1 interactions (e.g., the articles in Lindström et al., 2016). The fundamental question this raises for SLA is whether parallel issues can be observed in L2 development.

The study design is pseudolongitudinal in nature, comparing four L2-French-speaking au pairs of different levels of proficiency, ranging from beginner to upper-intermediate-level speakers (they were ranked A1 through B2 on a school-administered test compatible with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages [CEFR]). The data consist of recordings of the au pairs’ naturally occurring interactions with their host families during lunch, coffee, or dinner; the parallels between the recorded situations in terms of types of participants, familiarity between them, type of setting (meals in the host family’s home), and speech exchange system (ordinary conversation) allowed for maximal comparability across these naturally occurring data. So

EXCERPT 4

Julie 100323

- 01 JUL: parce que ce mati:n (0.2)
because this morning
- 02 quand on a passé pour aller à l'école,
when we passed to go to school
- 03 (0.2) il y avait un qui sortait,
there was one (= a soldier) getting out
- 04 et il était- il devait avoir l'air être (.) fat(h)ig(h)ué
and he was he must have looked tired
- 05 et tout,
and all
- 06 (0.2) alors peut-être ils font la fête quand même ici.
so maybe they nevertheless party around here
- 07 (3.5)
- 08 JUL: >°j'sais pas.<
I don't know
- 09 MAR: mh.

(Pekarek Doehler, 2018, p. 14)

far, between 2.5 and 4 hours of recording have been transcribed and analyzed per participant; overall, the data comprise 73 tokens of JSP occurring without complement (occurrences with complement were excluded from the analysis).

Based on this data, the findings provide initial evidence for a possible developmental trajectory of L2 grammar-for-interaction: L2 speakers move from a limited range of literal uses of the multiword expression at hand (JSP as a claim of lack of knowledge) to a diversified range of marker-like uses. These include not only the use of JSP as an epistemic hedge (or epistemic parenthetical; Thompson & Mulac, 1991) but also interaction-organizational uses of JSP, for example, as a preface to a disagreement or as a turn-exit device. The marker-like uses emerging at upper-intermediate level in the data are characterized by semantic bleaching, morphophonological reduction, and prosodic downgrading, which are well known features of grammaticization (Hopper & Traugott, 2003). This suggests that the construction undergoes a progressive routinization as a marker-like interaction-organizational device.

The use of JSP as a turn-exit marker is illustrated in Excerpt 4, in which Julie and her host mother, Marie, are speculating whether the soldiers stationed in a nearby bunker are having parties or not.

Julie offers an eyewitness report that comes to a possible completion, in line 6, with the fi-

nal falling intonation (marked in the transcript by means of a full stop), indicating the end of her turn (a so-called complex transition relevance place; Ford & Fox, 1996). Yet her guess (6), although it makes recipient response relevant, is met with a lengthy 3.5-second silence (7). Julie then extends her turn with a low-voiced (indicated by means of the ° ° symbols), morphophonologically reduced “>°j'sais pas.<” (8) delivered with speedup of tempo (indicated by > <), thereby recompleting her turn. This token is clearly treated by Marie as a turn-exit device, as Marie immediately produces an acknowledging “mh.” (9)—whereas such a reaction was notably absent before. So, by means of the added-on “j'sais pas” in a turn extension, Julie redoes a turn ending (note that the lower volume here is clearly closing implicative), while at the same time providing a second sequential opportunity for recipient reaction: The “j'sais pas” works as an interaction-organizational device related to the organization of turn-taking. With Julie, an upper-intermediate level speaker (B2), such interaction-organizational uses of JSP make up roughly a third of the total JSPs occurring without a complement in the data; uses as an epistemic hedge make up another third and uses as a claim of no knowledge also roughly one third. This stands in sharp contrast to the lower level speakers, with whom JSP is observed to almost exclusively work in its literal sense as a claim of no knowledge.

The developmental trajectory from initial literal use of JSP to interaction-organizational marker brings L2 speakers' interactional practices close to what has been observed for L1 speakers (e.g., Pekarek Doehler et al., 2021). In other words, in the course of L2 learning, grammar develops as a resource for interaction. This converges with findings on other multiword constructions, such as *comment on dit* [how do you say], as reported in Pekarek Doehler & Skogmyr Marian (2022, this issue; see also Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2019).

The findings also suggest that such L2 grammar-for-interaction emerges out of language use in social interaction: The relatively late emergence of particle-like uses may be seen as indicating that these are routinized products of frequent combinations in interactional language use. This, in principle, confirms the basic tenet of usage-based approaches to SLA, but also expands the focus of attention to how grammar emerges from use—at least partly—as a specifically interactional grammar, that is, an L2 grammar-for-interaction.

Interim Conclusion

The two studies reviewed in this section set out to answer two different (sets of) questions: (a) exemplar-based constructional emergence, and (b) development of L2 grammar-for-interaction. Accordingly, they draw on different but overlapping methodologies: (a) usage-based models of language emergence and CA, and (b) CA and IL. They also trace different phenomena: (a) a syntagmatic construction, and (b) a fixed multiword expression. Yet, they reach the same empirically grounded conclusion: L2 development is fundamentally driven by interactional needs and concerns speakers' ways of using linguistic resources to accomplish and coordinate social actions. Their complementarity, however, also leaves questions open for more research: While Study A traced emergent productivity of a syntagmatic construction and reported on routinization more *en passant*, Study B traced the pathway from first instantiation to routinized, or even grammaticized pattern without paying attention to uses of the generic negation construction, of which JSP might be an instantiation.

This is where we are: We know that usage-based SLA, CA-SLA, and IL are basically mutually conciliable and complementary. Although there is need for reflecting on epistemological and methodological compatibilities in more detail in view of an integrated approach, we start to have ev-

idence that these frameworks can fruitfully be combined to further our understanding of the ways in which L2 grammar evolves in and for social interaction as part of people's L2 interactional competence. Our claim is not that such an integrated framework provides an all-encompassing picture of L2 learning, but we suggest that it represents a promising step toward enhancing our understanding of situated social-functional language use as a driving force for language learning. This special issue is devoted to advancing such endeavors further as it combines CA research on L2 interactional competence with usage-based understandings of linguistic structure and its emergence as fundamentally rooted in social interaction.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THIS ISSUE

The foci of the articles in this special issue span from micromoments of L2 understanding and use to year-long developmental perspectives. They investigate different L2s (English, French, Icelandic); analyze constructions of various degrees of schematicity, ranging from lexically fixed expressions (such as *comment on dit* [how do you say] or "it's good for") to more open, constructional patterns (e.g., "you can *X*" and *ég ætla að X* [I intend to *X*]); and discuss several aspects of multimodal conduct involved in participants' sense-making practice (e.g., ongoing turn visualizations and interbody alignment). Also, they encompass a variety of social situations (classrooms, service encounters, mundane conversation, place-based games) and action-contexts (e.g., word searches, requests, criticisms). Some articles have a direct bearing on teaching activities as they feed on data from classrooms or activities that are partially set up for learning outside of the classroom, whereas other articles have more indirect implications for L2 teaching, for instance, by arguing how features of interactional competence can profitably be incorporated into the CEFR. Finally, the articles address developmental issues on timescales ranging from microgenesis to year-long development.

Bringing together multimodal CA-SLA and interactional linguistics, Pekarek Doehler & Skogmyr Marian (2022, this issue) document how, over 15 months, a French L2 speaker's use of *comment on dit* [how do you say] diversifies in both function and form. The expression expands in the actions that it accomplishes (request a candidate lexical item; request a confirmation), and progressively routinizes as a marker-like element used for indexing cognitive search and floor-holding. The findings evidence the

longitudinal development of L2 grammar-for-interaction and showcase how linguistic and bodily resources may interface in L2 development.

Theodórsdóttir & Eskildsen (2022, this issue) investigate an L2 speaker's use and learning of the Icelandic auxiliary verb *ætla* (literally, "to intend") in the wild. The data show that the L2 speaker learns to use *ætla* to make requests in service encounters, but does not automatically transport her learning to other environments that call on the use of *ætla*. This suggests an intricate relationship between *ætla* and the social actions it is used to accomplish, in situ and over time, and the study illuminates (a) how this relationship between *ætla* expressions and the social actions they are used to accomplish develops over time, and (b) how increasingly diversified and productive varieties of *ætla* expressions coemerge with increasingly varied action accomplishment.

Based on a corpus of video-recorded paired discussion tests, Greer & Nanbu (2022, this issue) use multimodal CA to examine Japanese English-as-a-foreign-language learners' use of writing gestures as they talk. They suggest that learners' visualizing written grammar or words helps them to recall and/or produce linguistic items or structures and hence supports their social interaction with others. They argue further that even though such visualization might seem like a cognitive private process, the learners' well-timed use of gaze and gesture also display it as a social matter that is relevant for their co-participant.

Combining usage-based understandings of language learning, embodied approaches to communicative action, and CA, Hellebrand & Thorne (2022, this issue) analyze three English L2 learners' interaction as they are engaged together in an augmented reality game. The data reveal the learners' creative use and reuse of multiword expressions and their interbodily cooperative practices in the building of an oral report that they had to record as part of the game. Due to technical difficulties, the group had to repeat the report three times. Mapping out the learners' language use and tracking their interbodily practices over the course of the three takes, the authors highlight the collaboratively produced, embodied, and emergent nature of grammar for social action.

Hall (2022, this issue) examines the linguistic designs of information-seeking sequences in classroom interaction, drawing on the shared theoretical and methodological framework of CA and interactional linguistics. The study shows that the teacher's questions are mostly designed to elicit simple one- or multiword phrases; accordingly, the author argues for the need to enhance L2 teachers' understanding of the relation be-

tween L2 classroom input and learners' developing grammars and of the key role teachers play in configuring the linguistic input in classroom contexts.

The special issue is concluded by two commentaries. Larsen-Freeman (2022, this issue) identifies cross-cutting themes resulting from combining the research frameworks represented in the five research articles and relates them to other SLA approaches, in particular complex dynamic systems theory. Piirainen-Marsh and Lilja (2022, this issue) put into perspective educational implications that result from the articles in this special issue and, in line with recent arguments toward rewinding L2 learning and L2 education, suggest that there is a need to reconceptualize grammar as an object of learning and reconfigure pedagogical practices and frameworks to support the learner's ability to act in the social world.

Implications for SLA

Across diverse situations, languages, timescales, and analytic objects, the five research articles concur to show that linguistic resources are learned as recognizable usage patterns that emerge from repeated in situ meaning-making processes in social interaction, and that repeated grammatical and embodied shaping of utterances for interactional purposes results in the routinization of such patterns of language use for interaction (i.e., a grammar-for-interaction). This leads to a view of the L2 speaker's emergent L2 grammar as an adaptive accumulation of resources for interaction that are continually (re-)configured in response to the local, interactional uses of language. Epistemologically, the findings and discussions presented in this special issue refine our understanding of usage-based L2 learning as essentially interactionally driven and bring us further in understanding the mutually constitutive nature of language learning and language use, and ultimately of cognition and action (e.g., Douglas Fir Group, 2016; Ellis & Larsen-Freeman, 2006; Firth & Wagner, 2007). And they provide a precedent for how usage-based models of language, CA, and IL can be combined to advance our knowledge of the emergence and workings of L2 in real-life social encounters and showcase consequences that ensue for L2 education. Ultimately, they reach beyond the field of SLA by offering empirical evidence in support of an understanding of grammatical constructions as "routinized ways to implement actions" (Thompson & Couper-Kuhlen, 2005, p. 808).

Implications for L2 Education

Based on their findings, each contribution outlines avenues for L2 education. Cumulatively, they lead to the following set of considerations: The studies give further empirical impetus to current discussions on interactionally oriented L2 assessment and testing research (Eskildsen & Cadierno, 2020; Roever & Kasper, 2018; Salaberry & Kunitz, 2019; Sandlund et al., 2016) that seeks to treat linguistic and interactional competences in an integrated way. The studies feed into current concerns with how the empirical findings of the type of research reported here can be brought to bear on the classroom, regarding, for instance, initiatives that seek to bring students' real-world experiences back into the classroom for reflection and teaching purposes (Lilja & Piirainen-Marsh, 2019). Finally, the theoretical implications raise critical issues regarding the epistemologies of language learning and teaching in L2 education (Hall, 2018; Huth, 2020; Pekarek Doehler, 2021a; Wagner, 2019): They call for a respecification of the reference frameworks for L2 teaching, centered on an integrated notion of L2 competence rather than on additive inclusion of formal and interactional perspectives into existing frameworks. While this is a particularly challenging endeavor, we argue that it represents an indispensable basis for designing pedagogies (see Tyler et al., 2018, on usage-inspired L2 instruction) that are in line with the empirical fact that linguistic constructions evolve through language use, that language learning is situated in social practice, and that becoming a competent L2 speaker means being able to engage in joint action in locally adaptive ways, as evidenced in the contributions to this special issue.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This article was in part written with the support of the Swiss National Science Foundation, grant nb.10001F_200539, as part of the project *Developing an L2 grammar-for-interaction: elaborations on interactional competence* (2021–2025). We are grateful to Brian MacWhinney for much inspiring comments on a prior version of this article.

Open access funding provided by Université de Neuchâtel.

NOTES

¹ For a recent overview of methodological issues in longitudinal CA, see Deppermann & Pekarek Doehler (2021).

² The notion of preference in CA refers to the organizational infrastructure of social interaction: preferred actions, such as granting a request or answering a question, tend to be delivered right away, while dispreferred actions, such as refusing a request, tend to be delayed and pushed further back in the turn by means of various turn-prefaces (Sacks, 1987).

REFERENCES

- Ambridge, B., & Lieven, E. V. M. (2015). A constructivist account of child language acquisition. In B. MacWhinney & W. O'Grady (Eds.), *Handbook of language emergence* (pp. 478–510). Wiley Blackwell.
- Atkinson, D. (Ed.). (2011). *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. Routledge.
- Auer, P. (2005). Projection in interaction and projection in grammar. *Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 25, 7–36. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2005.25.1.7>
- Auer, P., & Pfänder, S. (Eds.). (2011). *Constructions: Emerging and emergent*. Mouton De Gruyter.
- Bates, E., & MacWhinney, B. (1988). What is functionalism? *Papers and Reports on Child Language Development*, 27, 136–152.
- Beckner, C., Ellis, N. C., Blythe, R., Holland, J., Bybee, J., Ke, J., Christiansen, M. H., Larsen-Freeman, D., Croft, W., & Schoenemann, T. (2009). Language is a complex adaptive system: Position paper. *Language Learning*, 59(Suppl. 1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00533.x>
- Brandt, S., Verhagen, A., Lieven, E., & Tomasello, M. (2011). German children's productivity with simple transitive and complement-clause constructions: Testing the effects of frequency and variability. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 22, 325–357. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.2011.013>
- Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. De Gruyter.
- Brouwer, C. E. (2003). Word searches in NNS–NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *Modern Language Journal*, 87, 534–545.
- Brouwer, C. E., & Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 29–47. <https://doi.org/10.1558/japl.v1.i1.29>
- Bybee, J. (2010). *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cancino, H., Rosansky, E. J., & Schumann, J. H. (1978). The acquisition of English negatives and interrogatives by native Spanish speakers. In E. M. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings* (pp. 207–230). Newbury House.
- Chafe, W. (1988). Linking intonation units in spoken English. In J. Haiman & S. A. Thompson (Eds.). *Clause combining in grammar and discourse* (pp. 1–27). John Benjamins.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1996). Intonation and clause-combining in discourse: The case of *because*. *Pragmatics*, 6, 389–426.

- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2011). Grammaticization and Conversation. In H. Narrog & B. Heine (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization* (pp. 424–437). Oxford University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2014). What does grammar tell us about action? *Pragmatics*, 24, 623–647. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.24.3.08cou>
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (2018). *Interactional linguistics: Studying language in social interaction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Deacon, T. (1997). *The symbolic species*. Penguin.
- de Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A dynamic systems theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 10, 7–21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728906002732>
- Deppermann, A. (2011). Constructions vs. lexical items as sources of complex meanings. A comparative study of constructions with German *verstehen*. In P. Auer & S. Pfänder (Eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and emergent* (pp. 88–126). De Gruyter.
- Deppermann, A., & Günthner, S. (Eds.). (2015). *Temporality in interaction* (Vol. 27). John Benjamins.
- Deppermann, A., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2021). Longitudinal conversation analysis—Introduction to the special issue. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 54, 127–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2021.1899707>
- Detges, U., & Waltereit, R. (2011). Turn-taking as a trigger for language change. In S. Dessì, U. Detges, P. Gévaudan, W. Mihatsch, & R. Waltereit (Eds.), *Rahmen des Sprechens. Beiträge zu Valenztheorie, Varietätenlinguistik, Kreolistik, kognitiver und historischer Semantik* [Frames of Speaking. Contribution to valence theory, linguistic variation, creole studies, and cognitive and historical Semantics] (pp. 175–189). Narr.
- Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *Modern Language Journal*, 100(Supplement 2016), 19–47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12301>
- Ellis, N. C. (2002). Frequency effects in language processing: A review with implications for theories of implicit and explicit language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 143–188. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263102002024>
- Ellis, N. C., & Cadierno, T. (2009). Constructing a second language. Introduction to the special section. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 7, 111–139. <https://doi.org/10.1075/arcl.7.05ell>
- Ellis, N. C., & Ferreira-Junior, F. (2009). Construction learning as a function of frequency, frequency distribution, and function. *Modern Language Journal*, 98, 370–385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00896.x>
- Ellis, N. C., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). Language emergence: Implications for applied linguistics: Introduction to the special issue. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 558–589. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml028>
- Ellis, N. C., O'Donnell, M. B., & Römer, U. (2014). Second language verb-argument constructions are sensitive to form, function, frequency, contingency, and prototypicality. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 4, 405–431. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.4.4.01ell>
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2011). The L2 inventory in action: Conversation analysis and usage-based linguistics in SLA. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 337–373). National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2012). L2 negation constructions at work. *Language Learning*, 62, 335–372. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00698.x>
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2015). What counts as a developmental sequence? Exemplar-based L2 learning of English questions. *Language Learning*, 65, 33–62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12090>
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2017). The emergence of creativity in L2 English: A usage-based case-study. In N. Bell (Ed.), *Multiple perspectives on language play* (pp. 281–316). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2018a). Building a semiotic repertoire for social action: Interactional competence as biographical discovery. *Classroom Discourse*, 9, 68–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1437052>
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2018b). “We’re learning a lot of new words”: Encountering new L2 vocabulary outside of class. *Modern Language Journal*, 102(Supplement 2018), 46–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12451>
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2019). Learning behaviors in the wild: How people achieve L2 learning outside of class. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of second language interaction ‘in the wild.’* (pp. 105–129). Springer.
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2020). Creativity and routinisation in L2 English: Two usage-based case-studies. In W. Lowie, M. Michel, A. Rousse-Malpat, M. Keijzer, & R. Steinkrauss (Eds.), *Usage-based dynamics in second language development* (pp. 107–129). Multilingual Matters.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Cadierno, T. (2015). Advancing usage-based approaches to L2 studies. In T. Cadierno, & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 1–18). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Cadierno, T. (2020). Oral English performance in Danish primary school children: An interactional usage-based approach. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 10, 525–548. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2020.10.3.6>
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Kasper, G. (2019). Interactional usage-based L2 pragmatics: From form-meaning pairings to construction-action relations. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics* (pp. 176–191). Routledge.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Theodórsdóttir, G. (2017). Constructing L2 learning spaces: Ways to achieve

- learning inside and outside the classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 38, 143–164. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv010>
- Evans, N. (2007). Insubordination and its uses. In I. Nicolaeva (Ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations* (pp. 366–431). Oxford University Press.
- Fillmore, C. J., Kay, P., & O'Connor, M. C. (1988). Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions. *Language*, 64, 501–538. <https://doi.org/10.2307/414531>
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285–300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1997.tb05480.x>
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 800–819. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00670.x>
- Ford, C. E. (1994). Dialogic aspects of talk and writing: Because on the interactive-edited continuum. *Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 14, 531–554. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1994.14.4.531>
- Ford, C., & Fox, B. (1996). Interactional motivations for reference formulation. In B. Fox (Ed.), *Studies in anaphora* (pp. 145–168). John Benjamins.
- Ford, C. E., & Mori, J. (1994). Causal markers in Japanese and English conversations: A cross-linguistic study of interactional grammar. *Pragmatics*, 4, 31–61. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.4.1.03for>
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Polity Press.
- Goldberg, A. (1995). *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Greer, T. (2019). Noticing in the wild. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of second language interaction 'in the wild.'* (pp. 131–158). Springer.
- Greer, T., & Nanbu, Z. (2022). Visualizing emergent turn construction: Seeing writing while speaking. *Modern Language Journal*, 106 (Supplement 2022), 69–88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl12748>
- Greimas, A. J., & Keane, T. M. (2001). *Dictionnaire du moyen français* [Middle French Dictionary]. Larousse.
- Gries, S. Th., & Wulff, S. (2005). Do foreign language learners also have constructions? Evidence from priming, sorting, and corpora. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 3, 182–200. <https://doi.org/10.1075/arcl.3.10gri>
- Gries, S. Th., & Wulff, S. (2009). Psycholinguistic and corpus-linguistic evidence for L2 constructions. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 7, 163–186. <https://doi.org/10.1075/arcl.7.07gri>
- Günthner, S. (2006). “Was ihn trieb, war vor allem Wanderlust” (Hesse: Narziss und Goldmund): Pseudocleft-Konstruktionen im Deutschen [“What drove him was above all Wanderlust” (Hesse: Narziss and Goldmund): Pseudocleft-constructions in German]. In S. Günthner & W. Imo (Eds.), *Konstruktionen in der Interaktion* (pp. 59–90). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Günthner, S., & Hopper, P. J. (2010). Zeitlichkeit & sprachliche Strukturen: Pseudoclefts im Englischen und Deutschen [Temporality and linguistic structures: Pseudoclefts in English and German]. *Gesprächsforschung-Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*, 11, 1–28.
- Hall, J. K. (1993). The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The socio-cultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language. *Applied Linguistics*, 14, 145–166. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/14.2.145>
- Hall, J. K. (1995). (Re)creating our worlds with words: A sociohistorical perspective of face-to-face interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 206–232. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/16.2.206>
- Hall, J. K. (2018). *Essentials of SLA for L2 teachers*. Routledge.
- Hall, J. K. (2022). L2 classroom input and L2 positionally sensitive grammars: The role of information-seeking question sequences. *Modern Language Journal*, 106 (Supplement 2022), 113–131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl12751>
- Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.). (2011). *L2 interactional competence and development*. Multilingual Matters.
- He, A. W., & Young, R. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. In R. Young & A. W. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 1–24). John Benjamins.
- Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, J. (2011). Members’ methods, members’ competencies: Looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated repair. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 147–172). Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, J., & Cole, E. (2009). Practices for social interaction in the language learning classroom: Disengagements from dyadic task interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 30, 186–215. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn032>
- Hellermann, J., & Thorne, S. (2022). Collaborative mobilizations of interbodied communication for cooperative action. *Modern Language Journal*, 106 (Supplement 2022), 89–112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl12754>
- Helmer, H., Reineke, S., & Deppermann, A. (2016). A range of uses of negative epistemic constructions in German: ICH WEIß NICHT as a resource

- for dispreferred actions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 106, 97–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.06.002>
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge University Press.
- Hilpert, M. (2015). Kollaborative Insubordination in gesprochenem Englisch: Konstruktion oder Umgang mit Konstruktionen? [Collaborative insubordination in spoken English: Construction or handling of constructions?]. In A. Ziem & A. Lasch (Eds.), *Konstruktionsgrammatik IV. Konstruktionen als soziale Konventionen und kognitive Routinen* (pp. 25–40). Stauffenburg.
- Hopper, P. J. (1987). Emergent grammar. In J. Aske, N. Beery, L. Michaelis, & H. Filip (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* (pp. 139–157). Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Hopper, P. J. (1998). Emergent grammar. The new psychology of language. In M. Tomasello (Ed.), *The new psychology of language: Cognitive and functional approaches to language structure* (pp. 155–176). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hopper, P. J. (2004). The openness of grammatical constructions. In *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 40, 153–175.
- Hopper, P. J. (2011). Emergent grammar and temporality in interactional linguistics. In P. Auer & S. Pfänder, (Eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and emergent* (pp. 22–44). De Gruyter.
- Hopper, P. J., & Thompson, S. A. (1980). Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language*, 56, 251. <https://doi.org/10.2307/413757>
- Hopper, P. J., & Thompson, S. A. (1984). The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar. *Language*, 60, 703–752.
- Hopper, P. J., & Thompson, S. A. (2008). Projectability and clause combining in interaction. In R. Laury (Ed.), *Crosslinguistic studies of clause combining: The multifunctionality of conjunctions* (pp. 99–123). John Benjamins.
- Hopper, P. J., & Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Horbowicz, P., & Nordanger, M. (2021). Epistemic constructions in L2 Norwegian: A usage-based longitudinal study of formulaic and productive patterns. *Language and Cognition*, 13, 438–466. <https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2021.9>
- Hulstijn, J., Young, R., Ortega, L., Bigelo, M., De Kayser, R., Ellis, N., Lantolf, J., Mackey, A., & Talmy, S. (2014). Cognitive and social approaches to research in second language learning and teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 36, 361–421. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263114000035>
- Huth, T. (2020). *Interaction, language use, and second language teaching*. Routledge.
- Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. C. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and human behavior* (pp. 13–53). Anthropology Society of Washington. <https://doi.org/10.1111/an.1962.3.8.6.2>
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35–71). Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.
- Imo, W. (2007). *Construction Grammar und Gesprochene Sprache-Forschung: Konstruktionen mit zehn matrixsatzfähigen Verben im gesprochenen Deutsch* [Construction grammar and research on spoken language: Constructions with ten complement-taking predicates in spoken German]. Niemeyer.
- Ishida, M. (2009). Development of interactional competence: Changes in the use of *ne* in L2 Japanese during study abroad. In H. T. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 351–386). National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Jespersen, O. (1949). *A modern English grammar: On historical principles*. Munksgaard.
- Jucker, A. H., & Smith, S. (1998). “And people just you know like ‘wow.’” Discourse markers as negotiating strategies. In A. H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse markers: Theory and descriptions* (pp. 171–201). John Benjamins.
- Kärkkäinen, E. (2003). *Epistemic stance in English conversation: A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on I think*. John Benjamins.
- Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). A conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 117–142). Taylor & Francis.
- Keevallik, L. (2011). The terms of not knowing. In T. Süvers, L. Mondada, & J. Steensig (Eds.), *The morality of knowledge in conversation* (pp. 184–206). Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, S. (2019). We limit under twenty centu charge okay?: Routinization of an idiosyncratic multiword expression. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of second language interaction ‘in the wild.’* (pp. 25–49). Springer.
- Kim, Y. (2009). The Korean discourse markers –nuntey and kuntey in native-nonnative conversation: An acquisitional perspective. In H. T. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 317–350). National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Kim, Y. (2016). Development of L2 interactional competence: Being a story recipient in L2 English conversation. *Discourse and Cognition*, 23, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.15718/discog.2016.23.1.1>
- König, C. (2020). *A conversation analysis approach to French L2 learning: Introducing and closing topics in everyday interactions*. Routledge.
- Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information structure and sentence form. Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge University Press.

- Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Theoretical prerequisites* (Vol. 1). Stanford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in the oral and written production of five Chinese learners of English. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 590–619. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml029>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2010). Having and doing: Learning from a complexity theory perspective. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising 'learning' in applied linguistics* (pp. 52–68). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2015). Complexity theory. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 227–244). Routledge.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2022). Combinations and connections: Reaching across disciplinary boundaries. *Modern Language Journal*, 106 (Supplement 2022), 132–140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modll12753>
- Lesonen, S., Suni, M., Steinkrauss, R., & Verspoor, M. (2018). From conceptualization to construction in Finnish as an L2. *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 24, 212–262. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pc.17016.les>
- Lesonen, S., Steinkrauss, R., Suni, M., & Verspoor, M. (2020). Lexically specific vs. productive constructions in L2 Finnish. *Language and Cognition*, 12, 526–563. <https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2020.12>
- Lee, N., Mikesell, L., Joaquin, A. D. L., Mates, A. W., & Schumann, J. H. (2009). *The interactional instinct: The evolution and acquisition of language*. Oxford University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (2006). On the human “interaction engine.” In N. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and human interaction* (pp. 39–69). Berg.
- Lieven, E., Behrens, H. Speares, J., & Tomasello, M. (2003). Early syntactic creativity: A usage-based approach. *Journal of Child Language*, 30, 333–370. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000903005592>
- Lilja, N. (2014). Partial repetitions as other-initiations of repair in second language talk: Re-establishing understanding and doing learning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 71, 98–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.07.011>
- Lilja, N., & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2019). Connecting the language classroom and the wild: Re-enactments of language use and experiences. *Applied Linguistics*, 40, 594–623. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx045>
- Lindström, J., Maschler, Y., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2016). A cross-linguistic perspective on grammar and negative epistemics in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 106, 72–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.09.003>
- Lindström, J., Lairy, R., & Lindholm, C. (2019). Insubordination and the contextually sensitive emergence of *if* requests in Swedish and Finnish institutional talk-in-interaction. In K. Beijering, G. Kaltenböck, & M. S. Sansiñena (Eds.), *Insubordination: Theoretical and empirical issues* (pp. 55–78). Mouton De Gruyter.
- MacWhinney, B. (1975). Pragmatic patterns in child syntax. *Stanford Papers and Reports on Child Language Development*, 10, 153–165.
- MacWhinney, B. (2008). Cognitive precursors to language. In D. Kimbrough Oller & U. Griebel (Eds.), *Evolution of communicative flexibility: Complexity, creativity, and adaptability in human and animal communication* (pp. 193–213). The MIT Press.
- MacWhinney, B. (2015). Multidimensional SLA. In T. Cadierno & S. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 19–48). Mouton De Gruyter.
- MacWhinney, B., Bates, E., & Kliegl, R. (1984). Cue validity and sentence interpretation in English, German, and Italian. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 23, 127–150. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(84\)90093-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(84)90093-8)
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 491–500. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3588581>
- Maschler, Y., & Fishman, S. (2020). From multi-clausality to discourse markerhood: The Hebrew *ma she-what that* construction in pseudo-cleft-like structures. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 159, 73–97.
- Maschler, Y., Pekarek Doehler, S., Lindström, J., & Keevallik, L. (Eds.). (2020). *Emergent syntax for conversation: Clausal patterns and the organization of actions*. John Benjamins.
- Masuda, K. (2011). Acquiring interactional competence in a study abroad context: Japanese language learners' use of the interactional particle *ne*. *Modern Language Journal*, 95, 519–540. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01256.x>
- Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 501–518. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.61.4.461>
- Müller Blaser, G. (2007). La construction pseudo-clivée dans l'organisation d'activités complexes: Questions de portée [The pseudo-cleft construction in the organization of complex activities]. *Cahiers de Praxématique*, 48, 213–238. <https://doi.org/10.4000/praxematique.837>
- Mushin, I., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2021). Linguistic structures in social interaction Moving temporality to the forefront of a science of language. *Interactional Linguistics*, 1, 2–32. <https://doi.org/10.1075/il.21008.mus>
- Nguyen, H. T. (2011). *Developing interactional competence: A conversation-analytic study of patient consultations in pharmacy*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Nguyen, H. T. (2018). Interactional practices across settings: From classroom role-plays to workplace patient consultations. *Applied Linguistics*, 39, 213–235. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw007>

- Nguyen, H. T. (2019). Turn design as longitudinal achievement: Learning on the shop floor. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 Interaction 'in the wild'* (pp. 77–103). Springer.
- Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A., & Thompson, S. A. (Eds.). (1996). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge University Press.
- Olsher, D. (2004). Talk and gesture: The embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken interaction. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 221–245). Continuum.
- Östman, J.-O. (1981). "You know": A discourse functional view. John Benjamins.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). Clause-combining and the sequencing of actions: Projector constructions in French conversation. In R. Laury & R. Suzuki (Eds.), *Subordination in conversation: A crosslinguistic perspective* (pp. 103–148). John Benjamins.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Elaborations on L2 interactional competence: The development of L2 grammar-for-interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 9, 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1437759>
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2021a). L2 interactional competence and L2 education. In S. Kunitz, N. Markee, & O. Sert (Eds.), *Classroom-based conversation analytic research: Theoretical and applied perspectives on pedagogy* (pp. 417–424). Springer.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2021b). How grammar grows out of social interaction: From multi-unit to single unit question. *Open Linguistics*, 7, 1–28.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Balaman, U. (2021). The routinization of grammar as a social action format: A longitudinal study of video-mediated interactions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 54, 183–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2021.1899710>
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2018). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics*, 39, 555–578. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw021>
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2019). On the reflexive relation between developing L2 interactional competence and evolving social relationships: A longitudinal study of word-searches in the 'wild'. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction 'in the wild'* (pp. 51–75). Springer.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., De Stefani, E., & Horlacher, A.-S. (2015). *Time and emergence in grammar: Left-dislocation, right-dislocation, topicalization and hanging topic in French talk-in-interaction*. John Benjamins.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2011). Developing 'methods' for interaction: A cross-sectional study of disagreement sequences in French L2. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 206–243). Multilingual Matters.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–267). Mouton De Gruyter.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., Polak-Yitzhaki, S., Li, X., Stoenica, I. M., Havlík, M., & Keevallik, L. (2021). Multimodal assemblies for prefacing a dispreferred response: A cross-linguistic analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.689275>
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Skogmyr Marian, K. (2022). Functional diversification and progressive routinization of a multiword expression in and for social interaction: A longitudinal L2 study. *Modern Language Journal*, 106 (Supplement 2022), 23–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl12758>
- Piirainen-Marsh, A., & Lilja, N. (2022). Learning grammar for social action: Implications for research and language teaching. *Modern Language Journal*, 106 (Supplement 2022), 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl12757>
- Polak-Yitzhaki, H., & Maschler, Y. (2016). Disclaiming understanding? Hebrew 'ani lo mevin/a ('I don't understand m/f') in everyday conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 106, 163–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.06.013>
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge University Press.
- Prince, E. F. (1978). A comparison of *wh*-clefts and *it*-clefts in discourse. *Language*, 54, 883–906. <https://doi.org/10.2307/413238>
- Robinson, P., & Ellis, N. C. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition*. Routledge.
- Roehr-Brackin, K. (2014). Explicit knowledge and processes from a usage-based perspective: The developmental trajectory of an instructed L2 learner. *Language Learning*, 64, 771–808. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12081>
- Roeper, C., & Kasper, G. (2018). Speaking in turns and sequences: Interactional competence as a target construct in testing speaking. *Language Testing*, 35, 331–355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/%2F0265532218758128>
- Römer, U., & Berger, C. M. (2019). Observing the emergence of constructional knowledge: Verb patterns in German and Spanish learners of English at different proficiency levels. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 1089–1110. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263119000202>

- Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 54–69). Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-623550-0.50008-2>
- Salaberry, R., & Kunitz, S. (Eds.). (2019). *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Sandlund, E., Sundqvist, P., & Nyroos, L. (2016). Testing L2 talk: A review of empirical studies on second language oral proficiency testing. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 10, 14–29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12174>
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52–134). Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8, 289–327. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289>
- Schutz, A., & Luckmann, T. (1973). *The structures of the life-world*. Northwestern University Press.
- Shively, R. L. (2015). Developing interactional competence during study abroad: Listener responses in L2 Spanish. *System*, 48, 86–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.007>
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford University Press.
- Skogmyr Marian, K. (2022). *The development of L2 interactional competence: A multimodal study of complaining in French interactions*. Routledge.
- Sorjonen, M.-L., Raevaara, L., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (Eds.). (2017). *Imperative turns at talk: The design of directives in action*. John Benjamins.
- Svennevig, J. (2018). “What’s it called in Norwegian?” Acquiring L2 vocabulary items in the workplace. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 126, 68–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.10.017>
- Theodórsdóttir, G., & Eskildsen, S. W. (2022). Accumulating semiotic resources for social actions: A case study of L2 Icelandic in the wild. *Modern Language Journal*, 106 (Supplement 2022), 46–68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl12752>
- Thompson, S. A., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2005). The clause as a locus of grammar and interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 7, 481–505. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054403>
- Thompson, S. A., & Mulac, A. (1991). A quantitative perspective on the grammaticization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In E. C. Traugott & B. Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization* (Vol. 2; pp. 313–329). John Benjamins.
- Tode, T., & Sakai, H. (2016). Exemplar-based instructed second language development and classroom experience. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 167, 210–234. <https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.167.2.07tod>
- Tomasello, M. (1992). *First verbs: A case study of early grammatical development*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tomasello, M. (2000). First steps toward a usage-based theory of language acquisition. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 11, 61–82. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.2001.012>
- Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a language: A usage-based approach to child language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tummers, J., Heylen, K., & Geeraerts, D. (2005). Usage-based approaches in cognitive linguistics: A technical state of the art. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 1–2, 225–261. <https://doi.org/10.1515/clt.2005.1.2.225>
- Turk, M. J. (1999). Negatively formulated questions in interaction. In W. Klein & A. Barber (Eds.), *Crossroads of language, interaction and culture* (Vol. 2, pp. 39–48). The Center for Language, Interaction, and Culture.
- Tyler, A., Ortega, L., Uno, M., & Park, H. I. (2018). *Usage-inspired L2 instruction: Researched pedagogy*. John Benjamins.
- Wagner, J. (2015). Designing for language learning in the wild. Creating social infrastructures for second language learning. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 75–104). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wagner, J. (2019). Towards an epistemology of second language learning in the wild. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction ‘in the wild’* (pp. 251–271). Springer.