The Faculty of Humanities

SDU

Master Thesis

Front page for examination assignment

Examination period (*please indicate*)	Summer ____	Winter __X___
Teacher: Dennis Day		

Title of assignment: The role of linguistic competence in a Danish university setting: A conversation analytic study of repair, word-search, and code-switch in student group work	
Min./Max. number of characters: 60-80 pages, excl. title page, abstract, table of contents, appendix etc. (1 norm page = 2400 characters incl. blanc spaces)	**Number of characters in assignment[1]:** **191.504**
Please notice in case your assignment does not meet the minimum/maximum requirements stipulated in the curriculum your assignment will be dismissed and you will have used up one examination attempt.	
(*Please mark)* __X__	**Yes, my assignment may in anonymous form be publicized on BlackBoard for future students in this course**

Solemn declaration
I hereby declare that I have drawn up the assignment single-handed and independently. All quotes are marked as such and duly referenced. The full assignment or parts thereof have not been handed in as full or partial fulfilment of examination requirements in any other courses. Read more here: http://www.sdu.dk/en/Information_til/Studerende_ved_SDU/Eksamen.aspx
Handed in by *(write only name and date of birth):* Marie Malmborg Henriques, 03.08.1991

[1] Characters are counted from first character in the introduction until and including the last character in the conclusion. Footnotes are included. Charts are counted with theirs characters. The following is excluded from the total count: abstract, table of contents, bibliography, list of references, appendix. For more information, see the examination regulations of the course in the curriculum

THE ROLE OF LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE IN A DANISH UNIVERSITY SETTING: A CONVERSATION ANALYTIC STUDY OF REPAIR, WORD-SEARCH, AND CODE-SWITCH IN STUDENT GROUP WORK

MARIE MALMBORG HENRIQUES
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN DENMARK
JANUARY 2019

With special thanks to my supervisor, Dennis Day, for his feedback and guidance; to Marie-Elisabeth Holm for her assistance in the initial stages of the process; to Leif Schwartz Holbek for his immense help with contact to students; and finally, thanks to all the students who participated anonymously in the study, without whom this paper would not have been written.

Contents

Resumé

This paper examines the role of linguistic competence in English-medium group work in Danish higher education. Danish universities and colleges widely offer English-language programmes, English being established as the international language of academia, with varying positions on this topic posed by the public, the government, and the world of academia. The study then speaks into a larger debate, although it focuses on linguistic competence in group work from students' perspective, examining implications as they are actually occurring, rather than relying on speculations. The study is then comprised of theoretical work, examining and discussing existing research on linguistic competence and English as a lingua franca, and of an analysis of collected data, examining actual language use and the embedded orientations towards linguistic competence. Drawing on existing research, it is established that the students can be said to use English as a lingua franca. Considering several perspectives on this topic, it is found that English as a lingua franca should not be treated as a separate language in its own right, and therefore, one cannot possess linguistic competence *in* English as a lingua franca. However, interactions in English are found to include a high degree of awareness towards establishing mutual understanding; in existing research as well as in the present analysis, speakers are found to employ various pragmatic strategies for creating and negotiating meaning in interaction. These strategies can take various forms, and furthermore vary depending on group constellations and participants' interrelations. As such, interactional competence is a vital part of linguistic competence in the students' English as a lingua franca-interactions.

The study is conducted using a conversation analytic methodology. Rooted in ethnomethodology, this approach entails using recordings of authentically occurring data, examining participants' orientations and activities as locally managed, not relying on external sociological categorisations. Rather, in the analysis there is a great attention to participants' interactions, and excerpts included in the paper are transcribed in detail. Analysing the data, the focus is on instances of repair operations, word-search sequences, and code-switches, conceding that these three aspects of English as a lingua franca-interaction reveal a great deal about participants' orientations towards linguistic competence, enabling a characterisation of the role this plays in the interactions. The analysis finds the ability of the students to readily engage in these operations that deal with troubles in interaction, that being already occurred or not-yet occurred instances of trouble, to be crucial for communication. Further, code-switches are found to be richly used, especially in the context of

switching to the local language, Danish. As such, competence in the local language as well as English is beneficial, whereas students lacking competence in the local language suffer a short-term exclusion as a consequence of the code-switch.

The findings from the analysis are compared to existing research in a discussion of the interplay between English as a lingua franca, intelligibility, native languages, and competence. It is noted that contradictory to some research-strands in the field, interactions in English as a lingua franca should not be regarded as inherently flawed or prone to misunderstandings. Rather, the focus in these interactions are largely on securing understanding and intersubjectivity, with a heightened sense of consensus achieved through pragmatic strategies. It is also established how the findings in the analysis of the participants' continuously reaching shared meaning, avoiding interactional breakdown and securing progressivity, may be influenced by the setting as being institutional. That is, participants' mutual educational goal may be a factor in motivating consensus, for which reason this cannot be ascribed to linguistic competence alone. Further, participants' interrelations also appear to influence the interactions, and while social categories are not inherently part of the conversational analytic study, in some cases they do make themselves evident through employed or avoided practices. As such, this approach to examining the subject results in insights and orientations on this topic, which continues to make itself relevant as language choice and competence remains an on-going subject for debate, in public media outlets as well as in academic research.

1. OPENING REMARKS

1.1 Introduction

The English language has undisputedly gained status as a global language, influencing institutions, popular culture and people's daily lives across the globe. Through multi-national companies, globally oriented institutions of education, international travel, movies, music, and internet usage, many non-native speakers are being exposed to the English language on a frequent basis, making it part of their day-to-day lives. Over the past 20 years, the English language has gained significant influence in European universities, where it constitutes a supplement to, or even a replacement of, the local language (Hazel & Mortensen, 2013: 3). In Denmark, it is currently under debate whether the many international – in practice meaning English-medium – programmes should continue to exist, but for now, many programmes are being taught in English rather than the local language Danish, although various counter-arguments has recently led to a 25 per cent decrease in admissions on English-taught programmes (Rasmussen, 2018; Denmark cuts students on English-language programmes, 2017).

Nationally oriented politicians are criticising how Danish universities provide a free education for international students with no benefit to the Danish state, while more linguistically based arguments for closing down the programmes claim that they pose a threat to the Danish language (Rasmussen, 2018; Ejsing, 2008). Further, articles from Danish media disclose how Danish-speaking students are struggling with the additional challenge posed by studying in a non-native language, and the issue of whether the quality of English-taught programmes are suffering under the language policy has been raised (Hansen, 2012; Andersen, 2010). The latter can be found in a feature article by a Danish university professor, who states that the foreign language use causes a decrease in learning, understanding, reflection and interaction for the students, who then receive a poorer education on the basis of the language used. As such, there are different perspective on the debate about whether the use of the English language in Danish-based educational institutes should be endorsed.

These public considerations provided some of the background for and initial interest in conducting the present study. Being exposed to these speculations, along with personal reports from acquaintances about their experiences with using English throughout their studies, sparked an interest in examining to what extent language use, and in particular language competence, influence student interactions in English-taught education programmes in Denmark. The focus point of the

study will then be specifically on student interactions; arguably, real-life experiences and practices are essential to examining this topic. Further, it is to be considered that academic research has in recent years paid much attention to the subject of English use in academia, with varying focus points and results (Björkman, 2017: 113). While on the one hand, political arguments rooted in economical advantages concede to decrease the number of English-taught programmes in higher education, it has also been documented through research how English language-learning in higher education is not only beneficial, but necessary for students to ensure competitiveness after graduating (Hellekjær & Fairway, 2015: 1048). The academic research on this topic presents various perspectives and is a relatively recent development, but with a growing body of work, which the present study will then add to.

1.2 Research question and aim of the study

With the above considerations in mind, this thesis aims to provide an answer to the following research question: *Which role does linguistic competence have for students engaging in English-medium group work in Denmark?* Adhering to an approach that investigates the real-life use of English language in practice, the question will be answered through an examination of actual language use and orientations to such in group work of students in Denmark, who conduct their meetings using English as a non-native language. The analysis will be carried out using a conversation analytical approach of recorded data; a method that will allow me to gain insights to language orientations and practices. This analysis is based on a theoretical examination of the implicated phenomena, namely *linguistic competence* and *English as a non-native language*. Further, the outcome of the analysis will be compared to current research on the topic, which will provide additional perspectives on my findings. My study then aims to provide new material that analyses the role of linguistic competence from groups of students' point of view, which through comparison to existing research in the field will shed light on the impact that linguistic competence has for students engaging in group work in Denmark.

1.3 Structure of the report

To present my findings, I have structured my written report into 7 chapters, divided into sections which will address different aspects or areas of each chapter. Following this chapter 1 with opening remarks, chapter 2 provides the theoretical background for my study, with separate sections focusing on the topics of linguistic competence, English as a non-native language, and talk in institutional settings. Hereafter, the methodological framework will be presented in chapter 3, elaborating on conversation analysis and the school of thought it stems from, ethnomethodology. Chapter 4 provides a description of how I practically approached this study in utilising the theoretical and methodological considerations and conducting my analysis, and further provides an overview of my analysed data. Following, chapter 5 constitutes the analysis itself, with the three main sections repair, word-search, and code-switch, and subsequently, I discuss the results of my analysis by drawing on similar contemporary research and related findings in chapter 6. The closing chapter 7 contains the conclusion of the study, finally followed by a list of references.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

This chapter contains the theoretical background for my study, presenting considerations on the topics of language and competence, English as a non-native language, and the relevance of setting for language use. These considerations will provide the foundation of my analysis, as the conceptualisations of the included notions, particularly on competence and the English language, are important in determining the role of linguistic competence in a setting which uses English as a non-local or non-native language.

2.1 Language and competence

Defining language, as with all broad and constituting aspects of human life, is near impossible. However, in understanding linguistic competence, attention should be paid to what language, and thus linguistic competence, enables us to do. As described by Bloomfield, "[t]he division of labor, and, with it, the whole working of the human society, is due to language" (Bloomfield, 1984: 24). In other words, the ability to verbally communicate with one another and thus divide labour separates us from all other species on Earth, and consequently provides a basis for our entire existence, making the ability to use language one of the most essential skills for a person to inhabit. Bloomfield's book on language was written almost an entire century ago, but as stated on its cover, it remains one of the most influential works on the subject, exploring many of the basic concepts of language that will be presented in the following.

Basically, "[l]anguage is regarded as a set of rules enabling speakers to translate information from the outside world into sound", and through shared knowledge of a language, communicative constraints, and certain social norms, speakers can be defined as members of the same speech community (Gumperz & Hymes, 1986: 14, 16). The speech-community is not necessarily fixed geographically nor in terms of members; a speech-community can span across several countries, just like there can be several speech-communities within one country, and further, speech-communities are able to gain new members through foreign language acquisition, or even losing former members (Bloomfield, 1984: 43). The latter can occur through acquisition of a new language, leaving one's native language unused and thus forgetting it (Bloomfield, 1984: 55). This phenomenon is described as possible, albeit not that common; a more common outcome of second language acquisition is bilingualism, which can be described as native-like control of two

languages, frequently occurring in the case of second-generation immigrants (Bloomfield, 1984: 55-6). However, adults too acquire new languages, resulting in a wide range of proficiency, and, regardless of ability, the learner is ranked as a foreign speaker of the language (ibid.). Bloomfield stresses that acquiring foreign languages is by no means a new phenomenon, why it cannot be stated that recent years' increased globalisation is the cause for the acquisition of foreign languages or the existence of bilingualism (Bloomfield 1984: 54). However, the number of these cases have increased with globalisation, and definitions of when a speaker has gained command of a language have since changed due to further scientific interest in the field. This topic of non-native speech will be elaborated on in section 2.2 and 2.3.

A person may be labelled proficient or competent in a language if they match a certain standard of language ability, that being defined through conventions set by authorities, dictionaries, or otherwise described linguistic rules (Bloomfield, 1984: 3). Aside from objective ways of measuring language ability, there is an on-going everyday assessment of speech between persons, wherein some ways of speaking are labelled 'good' and others 'bad' (Bloomfield, 1984: 22). The habits of their own speech community are acquired by children early in their lives (Bloomfield, 1984: 29). These habits are specific to local environments, which means that people who are competent in the same language may speak entirely differently, however, in some local communities "the habits of speech are far more uniform than the needs of communication would demand" (Bloomfield, 1984: 45). As such, matching speech to a particular, pre-set standard is not a requirement for intelligibility. Speech may differ in such a way that communication remains unproblematic, apart from locally used idioms or slang, whether the difference is due to speakers having different native languages, or a shared native language with local dialects (Bloomfield, 1984: 45, 52). A speech-community consisting of native speakers, then, is not necessarily homogenous in terms of language.

The assertions that there is not such a thing as identical ability to speak a language, or that foreign languages are continuously acquired by speakers to a varying degree of proficiency, raise the question of what it means to be proficient or possess linguistic competence in a given language. In the beginning half of the 20th century, definitions of linguistic competence were narrow, focusing on the grammatical knowledge of idealised, perfect (and hereby non-existent) speakers (Scarcella et al., 1990: xi). Chomsky's 1965 definition suggests that linguistic competence is characterised by a speaker's ability to produce all potential, grammatical sentences in a given language, measuring competence beside a person's knowledge of systemic potential (Saville-Troike, 2003: 18). He

operates with the binary notions of competence (what a person knows) and performance (what a person does), which he associates with Saussure's *la langue* and *la parole* (Hymes, 1972: 56). However, Chomsky favours his own conceptions over Saussure's, since they consider not only systematic inventory, but also the underlying processes (ibid.).

Hymes concedes that Chomsky's conceptions are more concrete and superior to Saussure's, however, he finds that the binary conceptualisation of competence and performance as two opposing entities is lacking in depth and nuance, which he then provides through an extension of the notions of competence and performance (Hymes, 1972: 56). Initially, he offers a critique of the idealised speaker used in concurrent theory on competence and performance, stating that performance will never be a direct reflection on competence in actual persons, whose speech will always contain false starts, changes, and deviations from rules (Hymes, 1972: 55). Further, the original notions of competence and performance did not take into account sociocultural factors, leaving competence restricted to a perfect, homogenous speech community (ibid.). Hymes then extends this definition of linguistic competence by adding the aspects of appropriateness, occurrence, and feasibility (Hymes, 1972: 63). Rather than having knowledge of all formal possibilities of a grammatical system, competence can be said to be possessed when a speaker has capability of all four aspects. That is, while Chomsky equates competence with grammatical prevails, leaving performance as the only remaining aspect, Hymes extends the notion of competence to contain several properties (Hymes, 1972: 67). It should not only be considered whether an utterance is formally possible, but also whether it is feasible in terms of the means of implementation available, and whether it is appropriate in the context in which it is used (Hymes, 1972: 66). These two aspects of competence then intersect with what was originally labelled *performance*, as they relate to language as it is used and are not restricted to formal possibility. Lastly, the aspect of whether an utterance occurs is brought in, that is, considering that utterances may be possible, feasible, and appropriate without ever occurring, and contrastingly, that utterances which do not employ all of these aspects may still occur and should still be treated as valid (Hymes, 1972: 67).

In sum, the aspects of possibility, feasibility, and appropriateness connected make up competence, in terms of being able to produce and interpret occurring utterances (ibid.). As Cazden puts it, Hymes' definition of competence is not restricted to knowledge of language forms, but extended to a form-function relationship, which is learned through language use in social life (Cazden, 2011:

366-367). Cazden further extends the relationship of competence and performance by characterising performance as two co-existing entities, A and B (Cazden, 1967: 136). Accepting the notion of competence as knowledge of what is formally possible, performance A and B respectively refer to what people *can* comprehend and perform, and what they habitually *do* comprehend and perform (ibid.). These aspects of performance contain similarities to Hymes' aspects of competence; both add the socially acquired knowledge of whether utterances are acceptable or appropriate, creating a nuanced view of the competence-performance binary, as both Cazden and Hymes suggest that their respective revised categorisations form an overlap between the two. That is, while Hymes' feasibility and appropriateness within competence is described to contain "a portion of what is lumped together in linguistic theory under the heading of performance", Cazden states that competence, performance A, and performance B can be described as "placed on a continuum as phenomena of increasing complexity" (Hymes, 1972: 66; Cazden, 1967: 137).

What is to be taken from this is that competence and performance, however described, interrelates with each other and cannot be regarded two separate entities. As we have seen, while performance may function as an *indicator* of competence, a speaker may possess competence to produce utterances that are never produced, and similarly, utterances that deviate from rules and norms are not necessarily an indicator of a lack in competence, as most daily speech will contain such deviations. Following, in the case of this study, the interrelatedness of competence and performance will be kept in mind, noting the aspects of acceptability and appropriateness of utterances. While holding on to the term linguistic competence, it is to be taken into account that in order to make use of one's linguistic competence, the parameters of what is feasible and appropriate must be part of the equation when competence is put into performance, and further, that there may be a distinction between what a speaker *is able to* perform and what they actually *do* perform. As such, proficiency requires social competence rather than just formal knowledge of a language in terms of systemic possibility. Even for someone born into a homogenous speech community, then, the question of competence is complex, and following, for someone acquiring a language later in life, defining competence increases in complexity.

2.2 The case of English

The aspects of communicative competence described by Hymes were held against the norm of a native-speaker community (Seidlhofer, 2011: 90). However, as Seidlhofer argues, they could also be related to other kinds of communities that are beyond native speaker/non-native speaker (hereafter, NS/NNS) distinctions, and applicable to communities of NNSs of English (Seidlhofer, 2011: 91). Following, with the above considerations about linguistic competence in mind, the subject of English as a non-native language must be considered in order to determine how to characterise the use of English as a non-native language, and further, how to define linguistic competence within such a setting. This section 2.2 will focus on the former, while the latter will be addressed in the subsequent section 2.3.

The current status of the English language has been described by Seidlhofer as not just *an* international language, but *the* international language (Seidlhofer, 2011: 2). As mentioned, globalisation and the consequent need to communicate across speech-communities is by no means a new phenomenon, although the term *globalisation* and scholarly attention towards the subject have only recently emerged (Hazel & Svennevig, 2018: 2). Further, the role of the English language in this phenomenon of globalisation is inherently unique; as Haberland states, the fact that people of different first languages freely, or by necessity, choose English as their medium of communication makes the English language relevant globally, to a degree unprecedented by any other language (Haberland, 2013: 195). He states that to talk about English in this global context, the term *lingua franca* must be employed (ibid.). Lingua franca in the traditional sense was a trade language, whereas English as a lingua franca serves multiple purposes (Mortensen, 2013: 27). For this reason English as a lingua franca will be treated as a notion separate from that of lingua franca in general: although some implications regarding English as a lingua franca see parallels in the original lingua franca, the unique global status of English means that comparisons to other languages, global or not, are difficult (Mortensen, 2013: 26). For my research question, I have used the term *English as a non-native language* to describe how English is used in the context of my study. However, it may be more precise to describe the students as using *English as a lingua franca* (hereafter, ELF), for various reasons which will be elaborated on in the following.

The usage of English in settings with no NSs is not the only defining aspect that gives it a different status to other languages. While increased mobility and globalisation in higher education and business make way for ELF usage, it has also influenced global popular culture. According to Prcic,

the wide-spread audio-visual distribution of the language, the consequent non-institutional exposition the language, and finally, the great influence the language has on international as well as individual language communities makes English an unparalleled language in terms of spread and usage (Prcic, 2014: 144). His study examines how English words and phrases are used by Serbians when speaking their native language, a phenomenon also found amongst Danish youth in a study by Preisler (Haberland, 2013: 197). Seidlhofer states that this "(…) is a linguistic development without precedence, and one, therefore, that calls for reconsideration of established concepts and assumptions, especially those that relate to variety, community, and competence" (Seidlhofer, 2011: 91). Categorising the different statutes and usages of the English language across the world, Kachru formulated a model of circles: The Inner Circle, in which English is the first language, the Outer Circle, where it functions as an additional language, and the Expanding Circle, which has English as a foreign language (Seidlhofer, 2011: 2). The use within the Expanding Circle is particularly interesting, as the terminology describing the status of English here has been, and continues to be, controversial. The terms *global English* and *English as an international language* have been deemed problematic in the sense that they are vague, they seem to employ a new variety of the English language, and additionally, they suggest that everyone in the world are able to speak English; considering a 2006 estimate that 25% of the world's population are able to useably communicate in English, this is not the case (Jenkins, 2007: 4; Seidlhofer, 2011: 2). Further, applying the label 'non-native' to the language causes issues; contrasting native and non-native English leads to a tendency of conformity towards NS norms, without proof that NS norms as opposed to non-native speech should improve communication (Seidlhofer, 2011: 39). Finally, an issue with the definition of English as a non-native language is that it evidently excludes NSs of English from that same interaction, contrasting and separating the two groups; this is problematic since NSs may very well be part of the interaction (Jenkins, 2007: 2). The term *ELF* may then be more applicable, although this term in itself has been subject to much debate, as the study of ELF as a field of research in its own right has only emerged in recent years (Mortensen, 2013: 26).

Adhering to a 'pure' interpretation a lingua franca, Firth described English as a lingua franca as a 'contact language' for people with different native languages and cultures, naming English the chosen foreign language of communication (Jenkins, 2007: 2). This definition has been disputed, as two issues make themselves particularly clear. Firstly, it implies through the word *foreign* that English as a lingua franca-speakers are outsiders that can claim no ownership of the language, and secondly, the phrasing suggests that no NSs can be part of the lingua franca interaction (Jenkins,

2007: 2; Seidlhofer, 2011: 7). A more contemporary, accurate definition may be Seidlhofer's description of English as a lingua franca "as any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option" (Seidlhofer, 2011: 7). This definition is in part supported by Mortensen, who adheres to the description of ELF as "the use of English in a lingua franca scenario" (Mortensen, 2013: 36). The greatest difference between on the one side Firth's, and on the other Seidlhofer's and Mortensen's definitions, is the distinction between definition ELF as a *language* and a *use of English*. Mortensen describes how the latter is a more accurate way of thinking of the term, posing a critique of Seidlhofer's reification of ELF; although she defines ELF as a *use* of English, she still does not hesitate to describe the term as *an* English on other occasions (Mortensen, 2013: 37). This is arguably a problematic line of thought, for reasons which will be elaborated in the following section. For now, it should be stated that the perception of ELF in this study is rooted in Mortensen's definition, as the use of English in a lingua franca scenario. Notably, the scenario is thought to be a setting in which there is no or only partial overlap between the speakers' first languages, but total overlap on the language they choose to use as a lingua franca; in the case of ELF, the chosen language is English (Mortensen, 2013: 36).

2.3 ELF & linguistic competence

The relationship between ELF and linguistic competence will in part be determined by whether ELF is regarded a variety of English in its own right or not; this question remains a discussion point within ELF research with varying perspectives. Haberland states that the current outlook on ELF is too narrow and that both English and other languages are being affected by the current ELF usage, naming Asian varieties that may have roots in ELF as an example (Haberland, 2013: 197). Providing a different perspective, Gnutzman et al. propose that ELF as a distinct variety from English as a language could constitute a source of identity for young European ELF-users (Gnutzman et al., 2014: 438). This idea, however, is rejected by participants in the study, who are more prone to adhere to NS standards, not deeming a distinct ELF a relevant marker of European identity (Gnutzman et al., 2014: 455). This adherence towards NS standards is itself a point of discussion for researchers; a study by Hodgson has found how an aspiration towards NS norms has a negative impact on the NNSs' linguistic self-confidence, causing them to feel inadequate (Hodgson, 2014: 129). He then suggests that the term *standard English speaker* should be applied

to ELF users, rather than the distancing term NNS (Hodgson, 2014: 130). An issue in second language acquisition, the question of linguistic competence in the context of ELF is relevant outside the field of language teaching and learning as well, posing the question of what it means to be a competent user of ELF.

As presented by Björkman, ELF-interactions can be characterised by a usage of various communication strategies, applied by the speakers in the pursuit of pre-empting and resolving misunderstandings, although explicit misunderstandings appear to be rare (Björkman, 2017: 115). Pioneering these ideas, Firth has published an analysis of strategies for communication used in ELF-interactions, which he found to differ from NS interactions in certain ways (Firth, 1996: 239). Examining ELF-interactions that included abnormalities and deviations from NS English in terms of lexicon, syntax, morphology, and phonology, he describes how participants adopt the default position that their speech is understandable and 'normal', by way of negotiating meaning they are able to make sense of eventual abnormalities in situ (Firth, 1996: 239, 256). In these ELF-interactions, then, conversational competence is a highly relevant and useful supplement to linguistic knowledge in terms of grammatically correct, possible utterances. Björkman and Firth's studies both find that the communicative strategies employed by ELF-speakers are characterised by a limited focus on the form of others' talk, finding few linguistic corrections or comments on others' language use (Björkman, 2017: 130; Firth, 1996: 256). Rather, they are more inclined to let abnormalities go unnoticed, by 'letting it pass', or 'making it normal' (Firth, 1996: 243, 245). This again corresponds with the ELF speakers treating their utterances as ordinary, regardless of whether they include nonstandardness, in interactions where "communicative purpose and appropriateness "override" correctness" (Björkman, 2017: 130). Comparing these statements to Hymes' notion of communicative competence, they confirm that knowledge of linguistic systems is inadequate without and understanding of feasibility and appropriateness as well.

However, characterising ELF usage in this way can be problematic; it risks oversimplifying a term that is in fact very complex and may contain varying meanings. One problematic element is the a priori assumption of ELF as deviating from standard English use, as this is an unnecessary and not exclusively true (Tsuchiya & Handford, 2014: 126). Further, drawing on the initial explanation of language by Bloomfield, it seems clear that nonstandardness is not a specific marker of ELF usage, rather, different NS varieties across or within national borders, meaning that whether an American and a Yorkshireman understand each other depends on a variety of factors, including their

individual intelligence, experience, and external contextual factors (Bloomfield, 1984: 52-53). Granted, this does not take away from the importance of communicative competence in ELF-interaction, but it must be noted that the ability to interact fluently despite linguistic deviations is not exclusive to ELF-interactions. This point is implemented by Mortensen, posing a critique of a frequent treatment of ELF as a variety of English in its own right (Mortensen, 2013: 30). Along with the 'letting it pass'-procedure, he describes how previous attempts to define characteristics of ELF as a language suggest that ELF users frequently omit the –s in 3rd person singular for verbs in the present tense (Mortensen, 2013: 31-32). While nonstandardness is common in ELF-interactions, using these as specific characteristics of ELF is problematic in that they are not found in all ELF encounters, nor are they exclusive to ELF usage (Mortensen, 2013: 34). Rather, drawing on Garfinkel, the act of accommodating to nonstandardness should be seen as a method of interpretation used by speakers to create common-sense knowledge of their reality, a practice also used in ELF-interactions (Mortensen, 2013: 35).

Following, while focusing on communicative purpose over correctness, reluctance to draw attention to linguistic form, 'letting it pass', and using certain nonstandard features may be found in some ELF-interactions, they are not necessarily present in all. Similarly, one or all of these features being present in an interaction does not make it an ELF-interaction, as these phenomena just as well may occur in settings with just NSs present. Adhering to Mortensen's arguments, the present study employs the view that ELF cannot be treated a language or a variety in its own right, due to the grand complexity of variety of its usages. Therefore, defining proficiency or competence *in* ELF is not possible. Rather than regarding it a language one can possess competence in, ELF is here taken to mean a *use* of English within a particular setting, for what reason the speakers may be said to possess the degree of competence in ELF which is disclosed through the interaction in question.

2.4 Setting of interaction

The multilingual character of the setting has a significant influence on the interaction, which may also be shaped and defined by a number of other aspects related to the setting. Since this study deals with interaction in institutions of education, the role of this setting should be considered. While the boundaries between the two are not clearly defined, there are differences between interactions in institutional settings, and casual or ordinary conversation (Heritage, 2013: 4). Institutional settings

will often mean that there is a specific goal or purpose to the interaction, and the setting will involve certain constraints in terms of what will be deemed acceptable, and will be associated with procedures that are particular to that institutional context (Heritage, 2013: 3-4). The word setting could be equated with the word context, and interactions should, as presented by Heritage, 1984, be seen as doubly contextual (Drew & Heritage, 1992: 18). That is, while utterances are formed by the context of the interaction, they also contribute to shaping the context for the following, produced utterances (ibid.). The physical spaces alone are then not enough to determine whether a setting is institutional (Heritage, 2013: 4). Further, a setting being institutional is not a definite; while some extreme cases, such as ceremonies, will follow a predictable, predetermined set of rules, a lot of institutional interaction contain similarities to ordinary interaction, as it is locally produced and managed (Heritage, 2013: 5). Additionally, the roles of the people involved may also shape the interaction, and in instances where there are differences in roles of authority, or asymmetries related to knowledge, this may constitute a determining factor for the interaction (Heritage, 2013: 3, 16).

For the present study, asymmetries in linguistic knowledge may be more relevant than asymmetries in terms of roles, although asymmetries in linguistic knowledge is generally downplayed rather than highlighted (Lilja, 2014: 99). Since the interactions focused on in this study are student group meetings, most of the participants will have similar formal statuses, and further, the interactions are loosely structured and do not follow a predetermined set of steps, as has been examined in other institutional interactions, for instance calls to the emergency services, classrooms, or medical consultations (Heritage, 2013: 3). Drew and Heritage's concept of institutional talk as contrasting with ordinary conversation has been critiqued by Hester and Francis, who claim that their terminology is too generalising (Hester & Francis, 2001: 210). While Drew and Heritage state that the institutional element of a setting is not determined by the setting itself, but rather, by participants' institutional identities being made relevant within the interaction, the assumption that there are generic properties that distinguish institutional talk from ordinary conversation can be seen as problematic, as this is not always the case (Drew & Heritage, 1992: 3-4; Hester & Francis, 2001: 207). This critique may be disregarded when it comes to well-established institutional interactions with very specific goals, which are subjected to a lot of repetition for at least one of the parties involved; it seems odd to deny that calls to emergency services or medical consultations will take on patterns and characteristics on behalf of them being institutional, in the asymmetries in status and knowledge of the people involved, and the specific goal of the interaction.

The interactions examined in the present study do not have such an institutional character; the institutional element is mainly made up of the setting in an institution of education, and by the students having a task they need to perform, however, the interaction in question does not always have one specific goal as it would be the case for a call to the emergency services. Therefore, without directly rejecting the idea that talk can in fact be institutional, the interaction in this thesis will not automatically be treated as institutional interaction due to its setting, but rather, it will be regarded as institutional insofar as the participants' roles as students are relevant for the interaction (Drew & Heritage, 1992: 3-4). Thus, the educational setting will be considered in the analysis of the data. Further, it may be considered important that the setting is in Denmark, this may mean that native Danish speakers have an advantage as opposed to speakers to are less, or not at all, proficient in Danish (Tsuchiya & Handford, 2014: 118).

2.5 Summary: Linguistic competence in an ELF setting

This chapter has then established several aspects of language use and competence. Even within a language, great variety is found and thus, nonstandard language use cannot be equated with non-proficiency. In addition, ELF cannot be deemed a variety of the English language, but rather, a use of English in a lingua franca setting. Therefore, it is not possible to obtain linguistic competence *in* ELF as such, but linguistic competence is nonetheless a relevant factor in ELF-interactions. Linguistic competence is here to be understood not as only knowledge of a grammatical system, but also of appropriateness of utterances, and further, the ability to successfully communicate in spite of deviations from standard grammar or language usage may also constitute a factor in ELF-interaction. As such, linguistic competence here means being a competent user of language, rather than possessing knowledge of a language. Further, the interaction may be shaped not only by availability of linguistic resources between participants, but also by the context or the setting they take place in. Certain factors, such as asymmetry in status and knowledge between participants may prove relevant, as can the institutional factor of the interaction, which may also have an influence on whether parts of the interaction can be considered appropriate.

3. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter provides an overview of my utilised method, conversation analysis, and further provides an introduction to the school of thought that it belongs to, ethnomethodology. These terms then provide the foundation for my study, in terms of how I have approached the examination of students' orientations towards linguistic competence in practice, as well as providing insights into the perspective that an ethnomethodological approach provides throughout the study.

3.1 About conversation analysis

Conversation analysis (hereafter, CA) is simply put the study of conversation, or talk-in-interaction (Drew & Heritage, 2006: xxviii). According to ten Have, the method comes in two different forms, depending on its focus: *pure* CA can be described as scrutinising the infrastructure of interaction itself, while *applied* CA examines the management of social institutions in interaction (ten Have, 2007: 7). In other words, pure CA studies conversation as an entity in its own right, while applied CA focuses on how social institutions are managed through conversation. As such, the present study fits into the category of applied CA, since the focus is how the social institution of study groups manage their interaction using ELF. Importantly, CA as an approach "aims to describe, analyse and understand talk", and basically entails a close observation of the world and the spoken language (Sidnell, 2010: 1, 17).

In CA, the focus is how people's everyday actions are realised through conversation, and the approach is not directly about larger societal issues (Antaki, 2014: 2). CA does not ask questions of *why* something is or happens, but rather, is aims to examine *how* something is carried out (ibid.). This does not only mean that the method distinguishes itself from other more correlation-seeking approaches, it also establishes CA's role as a discovering science (Drew & Heritage, 2006: xxvii). That is, by asking *how*, no prior presuppositions about the way an interaction is carried out are necessary, and there is room for new discoveries to be made. Further, CA provides a contrast to previous normative approaches to conversation, in which the focus was how people *should* be speaking instead of how they actually *do* speak (ten Have, 2007: 2). Language then plays a huge work in CA work, even though it is not related to linguistics as such. Arguably, the overall question for the present study is rooted in linguistics or sociolinguistics, the focus being the use of English as it has developed into a globally used language for education (Cook, 2003: 4, 9). While stemming

from different backgrounds, CA and linguistics share an interest in language, and the disciplines have cross-influenced each other in various ways, such as implementing a shift from a static view of linguistic form to a dynamic view of linguistic patterns as practices (Fox et al., 2013: 739, 729). As such, various aspects from CA have become part of research in linguistics, while linguistics are also an essential influence for CA (Fox et al., 2013: 730, 732). In this present paper dealing with a linguistics issue, that of ELF and linguistic competence, CA is thus a valid approach, namely because through CA's focus on the *how*, the role of linguistic competence in interaction can be disclosed.

Adhering to examine practices of language use, CA is further applicable in that it essentially works with authentic rather than hypothetical data, and that this data is captured with a recording device; audio-visual recordings are preferred, although audio recordings can also be used (Sidnell, 2010: 20). This feature is also in line with CA being a discovering science, in which no hypothesis is assumed beforehand, because the data used for analysis are not examples of things that could happen, but captions what actually does happen (Sidnell, 2010: 28). The approach aims to capture and describe actual, naturalistic practices, and is as such qualitative rather than quantitative. As Antaki puts it, the use of quantification in CA is controversial, while it can be useful in some cases to examine how often a practice happens (Antaki, 2014: 12). But whether or not the quantity of certain phenomena is included, an examination that uses a CA approach is and must remain focused on details rather than summaries, adhering to its nature as a "microscopic way of thinking about social exchange" (ten Have, 2007: 9; Antaki, 2014: 2).

Described by ten Have as "one of the most mundane of all topics", conversation has been available for centuries, but only from the 1960s and onwards has it been a topic of scientific study (ten Have, 2007: 2). CA's founders were Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, who collaborated in establishing the approach (Sidnell, 2010: 6). Sacks could be said to be CA's main founder, as his initial *Lectures on Conversation*, as well as his work with tape recordings of emergency phone calls can be said to have laid the very foundation for what came to be known as CA (Sidnell, 2010: 11; ten Have, 2007: 5). Schegloff and Jefferson were nonetheless just as important contributors to CA's existence, in collaboration with Sacks carrying out important, foundational research that led to the emergence of CA. For instance, the three examined turn-taking in conversation and developed a model describing this, following their work "directed to extracting, characterizing, and describing the various types of sequential organization operative in conversation (Sacks et al., 1974: 698). Further, Jefferson

developed the transcription conventions commonly used within the CA approach (ten Have, 2007: 6).

Apart from being based on current tendencies and new research in the sociological field, CA's emergence throughout the 1960s was also a product of the decade's technological advances. As mentioned, an essential element of the approach is that an analysis must be conducted using real rather than imagined instances of interaction, as was initially stated in Sacks' *Notes on Methodology* (Sidnell, 2010: 20). CA requires great attention to detail, as well as patience while doing thorough transcriptions, thus the approach cannot be applied to mere observations in place of recordings (ten Have, 2007: 10). The availability of audio recording devices was then a basic condition for CA's existence when Sacks first carried out research on emergency phone calls (ten Have, 2007: 7). In these phone calls, of course, audio recordings were all that were available and necessary, since interaction through phone calls consists only of audible conversation. CA has since become enriched through the later spread and availability of video recording, in which not only audible talk, but also visible features such as gesture and gaze have become available for the analyst (Sidnell, 2010: 22). However, as ten Have puts it, the emergence of video recording as an alternative to audio recording has not had a revolutionary impact on CA as such, as CA's focus has remained on verbal interaction with features like gesture and gaze merely complementing the analysis of talk in interaction, providing additional aspects for the established method of analysis rather than a new approach to CA altogether (ten Have, 2007: 7).

As previously mentioned, CA has expanded vastly from its beginning, reaching way beyond what can be deemed 'pure' CA into many different varieties with different usages. As will later be elaborated on, core phenomena of CA have been established, and the approach does have feature elements that cannot be ignored when applying it to a set of data (ten Have, 2007: 11). However, new varieties of these phenomena in different settings and conditions are available for innovative analyses that have not yet been produced (ibid.). In some ways, CA has remained quite consistent throughout its existence in the past six decades, but as ten Have puts it: "[w]hile the CA paradigm is quite firmly established, CA is not 'finished'" (ten Have, 2007: 11). This means that any new member of the CA community can in principle produce new discoveries and create new additions to CA.

3.2 CA: an ethnomethodological perspective

From its origin, CA has been the study of language as it is used in naturally occurring interaction, and with language as a central phenomenon, a belonging to linguistics or communication studies is arguably implied. Certainly, CA studies are published in journals within various fields research, among which are linguistics and communication, but also others, such as anthropology (ten Have, 2007: 8). However, when CA was first developed, it was meant as "a kind of sociology", building on the works of sociologists Goffman and Garfinkel, from which Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson found inspiration for the topic of social interaction, and for the study of practical reasoning, respectively (ibid.; Sidnell, 2010: 9). With this in mind, labelling CA a product of a sociological paradigm seems obvious, though the method is more complex than that. Aspects of CA are more commonly seen in the natural sciences than in sociology, such as the eagerness to share collected data with readers, and the refrain from basing research upon hypotheses (Sidnell, 2010: 22, 28). CA's subject matter talk-in-interaction seems closely linked to other language-oriented fields, but the method used to study the interaction has a closer relation to the methods used in natural science (ibid.; ten Have, 2007: 8). As such, deeming the approach a kind of sociology would be to disregard the complexity of the approach, its origins, and uniqueness.

Rather, CA can be seen as emerging from the ideas of Goffman and Garfinkel (Sidnell, 2010: 9). Goffman had been a pioneer in research that paid attention to everyday situations and the ordinary way people interact with one another, and he discovered various interesting aspects of this, such as interaction requiring a kind of unselfconsciousness (Sidnell, 2010: 6-7). He was particularly concerned with the notion of 'face', examining face-to-face interaction as an institution in its own right, which in turn laid the foundation for everything else in society (ibid.). Published in 1955, Goffman's talks in terms of 'face' and the usage of everyday action as an object of research then contributed to the way of thinking that paved way for the emergence of CA, although far from all of Goffman's ideas became embraced by CA (Sidnell, 2010: 15). In a similar, although not directly affiliated movement, Garfinkel developed a style of social analysis, ethnomethodology, which would provide a foundational inspiration for CA (Sidnell, 2010: 8; ten Have, 2007: 5). His focus was on people's practical and common-sense reasoning in everyday activities, reconceiving the problem of social order as a practical one (ten Have, 2007: 5). Garfinkel's thoughts developed into the paradigm of ethnomethodology, which CA emerged from and can still be said to belong to.

Ethnomethodology is, however, not synonymous with CA, and the present study focuses more on CA as a practical approach than on its theoretical roots in ethnomethodology.

In terms of CA's methodology, then, Garfinkel should be noted the main influencer with his studies on ethnomethodology, which "analyse everyday activities as members' methods for making those same activities visibly-rational-and-reportable-for-all-practical-purposes" (Garfinkel, 1967: vii). That is, Garfinkel paved way for a form of research that gave special attention to commonplace, mundane activities rather than extraordinary ones, and by this means, previously unknown social phenomena could be exposed (Garfinkel, 1967: 1). The concern is not to formulate correctives or advocate certain kinds of behaviour, rather, the outcome should be an understanding of everyday practical action as an on-going, practical accomplishment (Garfinkel, 1967: ix, 2). This then corresponds to CA's aim to examine and understand how participants do talk-in-interaction, with no directives or "solutions" in mind. Accordingly, while CA by way of its history, influences, central topic, and methodology can readily be described as 'a kind of sociology' which relates to aspects of anthropology, linguistics, communication studies, philosophy, and natural sciences, it could easily and more precisely be described as belonging to the field of ethnomethodology, although these influences and similarities to other types of research are interesting to bear in mind.

The background in ethnomethodology then expands on our understanding of CA. While deriving from sociology, ethnomethodology differs in that it focuses on the actor's practical experience, whereas sociology typically ignore them, and further, ethnomethodology opposes traditional sociology's perception of the actor as an irrational being (Coulon, 1995: 16). Rather, ethnomethodological studies centre on process, "through which the perceivably stable features of socially organized environments are continually created and sustained" (Pollner, 1974: 27, in: Coulon, 1995: 16). As such, whereas sociologists may concern themselves with larger societal systems, ethnomethodology deals more closely with experience, which consequently changed the methods used for examining phenomena (ibid.). Coulon states that ethnomethodology removes itself from Parson's normative paradigm to an interpretive paradigm, in which the relation between the situation and the actor is changeable and produced by processes of interpretation (Coulon, 1995: 4). Zimmerman describes the ethnomethodological agenda as aiming to "treat members' accounts of the social world as situated accomplishments, not as informants' inside view of what is "really happening"." (Zimmerman, 1976: 10, in: Coulon, 1995: 25). The ethnomethodological paradigm is then an essential foundation for the development of CA, as well as the method of membership

categorization analysis, both operating from the viewpoint of the participants engaged in social settings, by way of explicating member's practices in situ (Hazel & Svennevig, 2018: 4). As such, CA operates from an emic, i.e. participant-based perspective (ibid.).

CA is then suitable for a detailed examination of the mechanisms that are present in people's conversations. It can expose phenomena that occur in particular cases, but these phenomena could potentially be limited to the interaction in question rather than be the foundation of a generalization. The approach is highly qualitative rather than quantitative; although quantification can be used to measure the frequency of certain phenomena, the use of quantification in CA is quite controversial (Antaki, 2014: 12). However, as explained by Gobo, while not necessarily *generalizable*, findings from one interaction may be *transferable* to others; that is, if two contexts are reasonably similar, the hypothesis formulated on the basis of the sending context may be applicable to the receiving context (Gobo, 2008: 195-196). What should also be noted is that in qualitative case studies, the focus is on the relation between a set of variables in a context, rather than quantification of them within a finite population (Gobo, 2008: 195). The purpose of a case study is detailed description and analysis of a phenomenon, where the case provides an example, and Gobo then advocates the possibility to generalise from qualitative studies with narrow data sets, stating that a few cases may be sufficient in order to generalise (Gobo, 2008: 196-197, 202). As seen in the beginning, canonical work of CA, some descriptions of talk-in-interaction are found in most cases of talk; thus, while CA findings are most likely not applicable to *all* instances of human interaction, it is highly probably that phenomena found in one context will occur in other, similar contexts (Gobo, 2008: 199). Applying CA is then a useful method for detailed examination of how certain aspects of interaction are carried out in practice.

3.3 Applying CA

The focus of the present study is *orientations* towards linguistic competence, and not actual *measurements* of competence, thus, in line with ethnomethodology's emic perspective, the topic is here examined as a members' concern. That is, linguistic competence is to be treated as an ordinary lay person's concern in terms of orientations to and assessment of their own and others' produced utterances in interaction (Day & Kristiansen, 2018: 91). This assertion offered by Garfinkel, 1967, is in line with ethnomethodological conventions, relying on the notion that members have their own

ways of measurement in their situated daily lives (ibid.). The members' actions and reactions then provide indications of what they believe to be an indicator for competence in a language. Here, the interrelatedness of competence and performance will become evident; through utterances and actions, members can perform as competent to varying degrees, assess the competence of others, and reveal attitudes towards the knowledge, appropriateness, and acceptability that characterise their own and others' produced utterances in interaction. Orientations towards linguistic competence can be expressed through demonstrations or claims of competence, as examined by Day and Kristiansen, in a study where demonstrations were found to be preferable to claims (Day & Kristiansen, 2018: 92). This is examined through the notion of assessments, which can be explicit or implicit; the act of choosing a language to speak in can in itself be deemed an implicit assessment of others' competence in a language, while it is also a demonstration of one's own ability to speak the language (Day & Kristiansen, 2018: 93). This will be kept in mind throughout the analysis of the present study, although assessments will not be a focus point; how orientations towards competence are examined here will be elaborated in the following.

As this text has briefly provided insight to, CA can be used in a multitude of ways to examine details of various aspects of human interaction. In the context of the present study, where orientations towards linguistic competence in an ELF context is in focus, some elements of CA are more beneficial to include than others, and these more specific terms should be introduced. Early on, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson devised "a quite comprehensive picture of the conversational organization of turn-taking; overlapping talk; repair; topic initiation and closing; greetings, questions, invitations, requests and so forth, and their associated sequences (adjacency pairs); agreement and disagreement; story telling; and of the integration of speech with non-vocal activities" (Drew and Heritage, 2006: xxiii). This list gives a brief overview of some of CA's key features, the meaning of which are in most cases somewhat straightforward. Many of the terms, such as turn-taking, requests, and adjacency pairs are particularly interesting in terms of pure CA, in which the focus is conversation as an institution in its own right. These terms can be used to examine and establish what goes on in a conversation between two or more people, with the focus being on what each of these actions *do* in a conversation, rather than what they mean (Sidnell, 2010: 16). However, an analysis cannot explicitly include on all these concepts at a time; a selection must be made as to how the analysis is focused. The analysis will then focus on sequences which include language alternation, word-searches, and repair.

In situations of language contact, a preference for employing the use of only one language is often displayed; in ELF-interactions this then means using English, as this is the common resource available to the participants (Moore et al., 2013: 57). However, in multilingual settings where at least two languages are available as resources to one or often more of the speakers, language alternation will often occur by bringing in multiple language resources (ibid.). Moore et al. found that this often happens in the openings of conversations; this is also displayed in a study by Hazel & Mortensen, where a shift in the participants present in the interaction would open up for negotiations about language choice (Moore et al., 2013: 57; Hazel & Mortensen, 2013: 4). Even in settings that has decided on English being *the* language used, the language(s) used are locally determined by participants' on-going assessments of their own and others' competence (Moore et al., 2013: 80). To describe the character of language alternation in a conversation the term *code-switch* can be employed, where a change to an additional language occurs without any indication a return to the original language, or the term *transfer* may be used, where the additional language is only briefly included, with a definite return to the original language (Auer, 1984: 26). In instances where a single word or a short phrase from a different language is included in an utterance, the term transfer will then be used rather than code-switch.

A transfer may be used for various reasons, one may be that a word is missing from the speaker's English vocabulary. A way of handling this issue is through word-searches, that is, verbal or embodied signalling that a speaker is searching for a word, possibly requesting help from other speakers in finding a word; this has been examined in CA contexts by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, among others (Radford, 2009: 599). A word-search may be realised by asking a direct question, such as *what is it*?, directed at oneself, to gain time for self-repair, or as a request for others to join in in a collaborative effort to find the missing word (ibid.). While not synonymous, word-searches can be said to belong to the domain of repair; that is, instances of correction of perceived errors in speech (Sacks et al., 1977: 363). Word-searching can constitute a way of dealing with this, as can replacements; however, an error does not need to be present for a repair sequence to occur, and similarly, 'incorrect' speech in a conversation can go unrepaired (ibid.). A repair sequence may or may not be successful, but the successful repairs can occur in the form of self-repair or other-repair, which refers to the outcome of a repair sequence. Regardless of whether the repair is a self-repair or other-repair, it may be self-initiated or other-initiated (Sacks et al., 1977: 363-364).

Applying these three notions from CA may display to what degree students orient to linguistic competence in ELF group work. Code-switches are grounded in an assessment of one's own or others' ability to produce or understand a given language, word-searches are a display of a deficiency in one's vocabulary, just as successful completion of word-searches may display the competence of other involved participants, and repair sequences display orientations through corrections of oneself or others. This of course is a rough introduction; how these elements can be seen as orientations towards linguistic competence will be elaborated on in the analysis. The analysis aims to describe which role linguistic competence plays; as such, as in all CA studies, the participants' actions and orientations are central (Heritage, 2013: 10). This same conviction applies to the question of the interaction as institutional, which in line with the ethnomethodological perspective will only be regarded as relevant insofar as it is talked into being by the participants in question (Hazel & Svennevig, 2018: 3).

3.4 Summary: a CA perspective on linguistic competence in an ELF setting

CA is a relatively new method, allowing researchers to study a hugely important aspect of human life in great detail. The method is qualitative, and focuses on how something is carried out, rather than why. It belongs to an ethnomethodological paradigm, which means that CA understands practices as a member's concern. Seen from this emic perspective, aspects of the interaction may be considered relevant insofar as members orient to it as relevant. Therefore, the institutional aspect of the interaction may be considered relevant, depending on whether the students orient to themselves as such, and further, the setting may be central in the interaction through the participants' orientation to the task at hand, or whether or not utterances are deemed appropriate within the institutional setting. Similarly, linguistic competence, understood as being a competent language user in the ELF context, should be considered from this emic perspective, in terms of how the students orient to the notion. Focusing on sequences which include language alternation, word-searches, and repair, the role that linguistic competence plays in the students' group work can then be examined through the way this topic is oriented to in interaction. Asymmetries in knowledge or competence may be made relevant through these sequences, or nonstandard language use may not complicate the interaction in the slightest; the focus is the members' concern towards the topic and how they make use of their linguistic resources in practice.

4. APPROACH AND DATA

This chapter describes the way the study has been conducted, with a main focus on the practical aspects of how data were collected and analysed in accordance with CA principles. Subsequently, an overview of the collected data will be presented.

4.1 Data collection

Gaining access to and successfully capturing naturally occurring interaction is an essential requirement for studies that use a CA approach. My focus, student group work, is a frequently occurring form of interaction which takes place in spaces more or less available to the public, it is often scheduled in advance, and its content is mainly institutional. For this reason, acquiring this form of data seems relatively straightforward, since it requires minimal effort and involvement on the participants' part, however, there are other aspects that should be considered. The required insight into participants' actual, authentic lives constitutes an aspect of intimacy which may seem less prevalent in organised experiments or survey studies, and further, the interaction must be video recorded rather than merely observed or audio recorded, a procedure which not everyone are comfortable with. For these reasons, many of the students I contacted rejected participation in the study, and it may be noted that some participants have possibly altered their behaviour slightly due to attention to the camera; this nonetheless is not my impression when looking at the recorded data. This being said, through persistent searching and contacting various students groups, I was able to find several student groups who were interested in participating.

Following, the practical aspects of data collection had to be considered. The students' planning of their group meetings was irregular and often spontaneous, which required flexibility on my part. I met the students in their university or college, in the space where they would normally conduct their meeting to avoid any sense of artificiality in the setting. Additionally, the recordings required access to and knowledge of how to use the video equipment. Most of the data were recorded by one video camera, but not always the same one, supplemented by audio recording on a phone. The quality of the recordings then vary based on which camera I used, how ideal the setting was for all participants to be visible in the image frame, and the background noise of the space. Many students do not have access to private meeting rooms, and the student lounges the meetings were held in occasionally have background noise that interferes slightly with the audio. This could have been

avoided by inviting the students to a different location, but since the focus was keeping the interaction authentic, this was not considered an option.

4.2 Data analysis

Following data collection, the data was analysed in detail using a CA approach. The focus being linguistic competence, instances of linguistically oriented repair, word-search, and code-switch were singled out by thoroughly watching the recordings, and selected excerpts were transcribed. As such, selecting excerpts and transcribing them constituted a large part of the analytical work, which was then continued by contrasting and comparing the excerpts in each of the three categories, which again required close attention to detail in the interaction. Repair, word-searches, and code-switches were the main focus points, but these could only be observed due to foundational CA knowledge of the organisation of turns and sequentially of interaction. The recorded meetings varied in length, the shortest being 37m45s, and the longest 145m30s, the overall data set being just over 9h. Based on this, 73 excerpts were transcribed; they were all considered in the analysis, where about half on them are presented. The transcriptions were conducted using the transcription programme CLAN, following the transcript conventions presented in table 1. These were inspired by Mortensen (2014) but are mainly a representation of which details were considered important to include in this present study.

Symbol	**Meaning**
(0.3)	pause, measured in seconds (pause less than 0.2 second not marked)
((text))	action or gesture
/text/	word or phrase in different language or accent than surrounding speech
text–	word or part of word abruptly cut off
[text]	name of person, company, or place changed for anonymity
text	speech translated to English
?text?	transcriber uncertainty
xxx	unintelligible word or phrase

[text]	overlapping speech, first speaker
[text]	overlapping speech, second speaker

Table 1. Transcription conventions

4.3 Characterisation of data

The analysis is based on collected data of seven different student groups, as presented in table 2 below. The student groups are all from institutions of higher education, and they consist of between three and nine members. Their meetings are characterised by dynamic conversation between several or all group members, and principally, their focus is their work on a collaborative project, mainly discussing feedback on a report and/or preparing a presentation on their project. Group 1 are bachelor students of natural science at Aalborg University, Copenhagen, and Groups 2-7 are bachelor of business students at KEA, Copenhagen School of Design and Technology. In group 1, students from another group are present in part of the meeting, in group 2, an outside collaboration partner is present and central for the meeting, and in group 6, the group's advisor is present for part of the meeting; these external participants are marked with an asterisk in the table. As such, there is a variety in the form of the interactions, but nonetheless they all share similarities other than being categorised student group meetings. Searching for data fitting this rather broad term, some recorded data had to be left out of the final data set because their structure and content differed too much from the remaining data; they were highly monological and centred around the work of one student, whereas the included data is interactionally dynamic, with students collaborating in reaching a common educational goal.

The participants were all given pseudonyms for anonymity, and corresponding initials that appear in the transcribed excerpts. Group 2 is collaborating with a company, which is given a pseudonym stated below the group number.

group	name	initials	L1	Danish
Group 1	Julia	JUL	Danish	Yes
	Khalil	KHA	Arabic	Yes
	Elizabet*	ELI	Latvian	Yes
	Oscar*	OSC	French	No
	Malou	MAL	Danish	Yes
	Anders	AND	Danish	Yes

Group 2 TrackAttack	Gabriel	GAB	Romanian	Limited
	Søren	SØR	Danish	Yes
	Kostas	KOS	Greek	Limited
	Emil	EMI	Danish	Yes
	Sofus	SOF	Danish	Yes
	Jakobs	JAK	Latvian	Limited
	Aaron	AAR	Danish	Yes
	Helge	HEL	Danish	Yes
	Lars*	LAR	Danish	Yes
Group 3	Jóhanna	JOH	Icelandic	Yes
	Magnus	MAG	Danish	Yes
	Sebastian	SEB	Danish/English	Yes
	Blake	BLA	English	Very limited!
Group 4	Joel	JOE	Tagalog	Yes
	Tilak	TIL	Nepalese	No
	Roland	ROL	Hungarian	Yes
	Tamás	TAM	Hungarian	Yes
	Patrik	PAT	Hungarian	No
	Katalin	KAT	Hungarian	No
Group 5	Mihai	MIH	Romanian	No
	Oliver	OLI	Danish	Yes
	Dovydas	DOV	Lithuanian	No
	Florin	FLO	Romanian	No
	Stefan	STE	Russian/Lithuanian	No
Group 6	Kieran	KIE	English	Limited
	Marta	MAR	Ukrainian/Russian	Limited
	Francisca	FRA	Romanian	Very limited
	Viktor	VIK	Czech	Limited
	Gauthier*	GAU	French	Yes
	Elena	ELE	Portuguese	Limited
Group 7	Jorge	JOR	Spanish	No
	Alvaro	ALV	Spanish	No
	Moritz	MOR	German	No

Table 2. Participant information

No two groups meetings are completely similar. The formalness and institutional character of the conversation vary between the groups; interactions with more authoritative figures present seemingly stay focused on educational talk, while the conversational topics are more casual in some, albeit not all, of the groups that have only students present. Further, the linguistic background of the groups vary from groups with a majority of Danish speakers (1, 2), groups with no Danish speakers, but where a different native language is shared by a majority (4, 7), groups with NSs of English present (3, 6), and groups where each participant have different native languages (5, 6), although they are all linguistically diverse.

To protect participants and ensure voluntary participation, a consent form was signed by myself and all participants in the study. On a separate form, participants were asked state their native language

and to self-assess their knowledge of Danish; the form they were given requested a yes/no response, although some answers fall in between (limited, very limited). This information on linguistic backgrounds mainly provide an overview of which participants share a native language, in the interest of examining code-switches, how many participants consider themselves competent in the local language, again for the sake of code-switches, and finally, which participants are NSs of English, to unveil whether native competence is oriented to in a different way than NNSs. It is, however, not these statements about linguistic ability, but rather their linguistic abilities as displayed in the collected data that are considered interesting and relevant in the analysis. Therefore, the written information will only be used insofar as it seems relevant in the analysis based on the video-recorded data.

5. ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter contains an analysis of my data set with focus on the role of linguistic competence in student group work meetings. The analysis builds on the introduced theory, namely with regard to understandings of ELF and implications for linguistic competence. Investigating this topic through a conversation analytic perspective, I have examined sequences that I find display an orientation towards linguistic competence, that being one's own others'. With this is mind, I have focused on sequences of repair, word-searches, and code-switches, and as such, the chapter is divided into three sections, one for each respective topic, followed by a summarising section that combines and ties together all three aspects.

Throughout, the focus is on repair operations or word-searches which seem to display some orientation towards linguistic competence, that being through bringing attention to troubles with grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary, or displaying a void in one's own competence. Repairs and word-searches are, respectively, retrospect and proactive strategies employed in conversation to negotiate meaning and prevent misunderstandings (Björkman, 2011: 952-953). By this means of accommodation, speakers are able to prevent overt disturbance in the interaction (ibid.). Whether or not such a negotiation causes disturbance for the interaction is a focus in this analysis as well, on the basis that overt disturbance, or failing to successfully communicate and continue the interaction, is to be considered a marker of the role linguistic competence plays in the interaction. That is, if instances that occur based in linguistic (in)competence disturbs the interaction, resulting in unsuccessful communication, that is arguably defining for the role of linguistic competence, for which reason it will receive some attention. Further, the focus point of the analysis remains how sequences of repair, word-searches, and code-switches are carried out in interaction, and what they reveal about the role that linguistic competence plays for the students through their orienting towards it.

5.1. Analysis of repair operations

Repair operations are common occurrences in the organisation of conversation, and there are different ways repairs can be organised; they can be either self-initiated or other-initiated, and, depending of who produces the solution, they can be categorised into self-repair or other-repair (Kitzinger, 2013: 229-230, 249). Generally speaking, there is a preference for self-repair, and self-

initiated self-repair within the same turn construction unit is overall the most common form of repair in conversation (Kitzinger, 2013: 232). This is reflected throughout the data set, although less common variations are also found, resulting in interesting observations. Repair sequences occur in many different types of interactions, and are thus not a marker of lingua franca interactions per se. However, in this analysis of repair sequences, I have focused on including instances where the repair seems to be rooted in linguistically oriented complications, such as speakers either producing or displaying trouble to understand nonstandard varieties of grammar, pronunciation, and lexicon. These three aspects then provide, respectively, the title for each subsection of the analysis of repair sequences.

5.1.1 Grammar troubles

As previously described, ELF-interaction can be characterised by a high degree of nonstandardness, including non-standard grammar; throughout the data set, nonstandard grammar is used by a majority, if not all, of the participants. These deviations, for example using the wrong form of the verb *to be*, are common and do not appear to cause any troubles in the interaction and are mainly left unnoticed. In line with Firth, 1996, the participants employ the strategy of letting it pass, seemingly focused on the fact that the content and meaning of utterances are not comprised on account of grammatical nonstandardness. The data shows no examples of other-initiated or other-repair that orient to purely grammatical issues, however, a few cases of self-initiated self-repair with grammatical issues as the trouble-source do occur, as in excerpt 7a (Kitzinger, 2013: 230):

```
1 *MOR:    for my task I need the information of the infor- interview
2 *ALV:    ah okay
3 *MOR:    so I
4 *ALV:    yeah (1.6) well I think everybody of us- eh everyone of us is going
5          to use interviews
6 *MOR:    yeah
7 *ALV:    because it's the only resource that we have
```

excerpt 7a, everyone of us

In line 4, Alvaro performs a self-initiated self-repair within the same turn, and the repair of the word *everybody* in place of *everyone* occurs almost immediately with a few words in between. The repair is initiated with a hesitation marker *eh* but no pause, and it does not create any actual disruption to Alvaro's speech. It appears to serve the purpose of making sure the correct meaning comes across; considering that this is the only instance when Alvaro performs a self-repair operation, although

instances of him using nonstandard grammar are numerous. In another example, a grammatical self-initiated self-repair does slightly delay the speaker's utterance:

```
1 ∗SEB:    [Magnus] did a thousand ibids [why didn't I why didn't] I pick up on
2          that
3          I read that through
4                                    [((BLA and JOH laugh))]
5 ∗MAG:    I did that I did that as a a response to every time you've been like
6          you you're referencing this guy too much so it's just like
7 ∗JOH:    mm
8 ∗MAG:    my effort to [please you guys]
9 ∗SEB:                 [even even] [Klaus] is like
10         ((JOH laughs))
11 ∗SEB:   for fuck's sake
12         ((JOH and SEB laugh))
13 ∗MAG:   I could have written ?Sloper? instead but like
14 ∗SEB:   like you could have just done it all in the end (0.4) ?Sloper? for
15         everything
16 ∗MAG:   no cause there are other places he criticises us for less- for   too
17         less- little referencing where I [was doing that exactly]
18 ∗JOH:                                    [oh I see it though] it's after
19         every sentence ((laughs))
```

excerpt 3a, too less

Here, the repair operation in lines 16-17 is also self-initiated self-repair, but the completion of it is slightly more problematic than in excerpt 7a. Magnus initially repairs his utterance *less* to *too less*, until finally reaching the solution *little*, in combination making up the phrase *too little*. Settling on this as correct, he continues his turn. Jóhanna continues the interaction without drawing attention to the repair, lines 18-19; in fact, she interrupts his speech, showing that she had no trouble understanding his utterance and continuing the conversation in the next turn. It may be noted here that Magnus is attempting to explain his motives for doing something the rest of the group disagree with and laugh about; this could possibly increase his urge for making himself understood, not just on a grammatical level, but also in terms of why he wrote the references in that particular way, heightening his orientation to his own linguistic competence. As such, grammatical issues as the trouble-source do infrequently cause self-initiated self-repair, but in no instances does it cause overt disturbance for the interaction. These minimal repair operations could imply an orientation towards correct grammar, displaying a desire to perform as competent and correct English speakers. However, it may be more suitable to interpret these repair operations as a wanting to make sure the correct meaning comes across, as these kinds of repair operations occur far less frequently than the instances where nonstandard use of grammar go completely unnoticed.

5.1.2 Pronunciation troubles

Self-initiated self-repairs within the same turn construction unit are also found in troubles relating to the pronunciation of words:

```
1 *OLI:    they they don't want to hear about what Adkar is and they don't
2          wanna hear about who ?Machoc? is and what's his life story they want
3          to hear like how can they use it and what's the like advantages of
4          using this and then have a plan of attack for this
5 *STE:    yeah so we can just eh okay so as as we we're getting the feedback
6          they mention that like eh ?Machoc? metha- metaphors are like as [DOV]
7          said eh a frame and then to that frame we put in Adkar
8 *OLI:    m hm
9 *STE:    and maybe we mention about resistance to change
10 *OLI:   m hm
```

excerpt 5a, metaphor

In line 6, Stefan performs a minimal self-initiated self-repair operation, correcting his pronunciation of the word *metaphor*. This repair occurs immediately, initiated by cutting off the word directly after the trouble part, which is the use of a *th*-sound in place of the *t* in *metaphor*, and providing the repair in form of the correct pronunciation of the full word. This repair is entirely self-initiated, as there is no indication that the word *metaphor* would be incomprehensible for the other participants had it been pronounced *methaphor*, and as such, it relates to Stefan's orientation towards his own pronunciation of the word and making sure the meaning comes across to the other participants. This form of repair operation, which is almost unnoticeable and causes no disruption for the flow of the interaction, can be observed numerous times throughout the data set. Arguably, is not necessarily connected to a lower degree of linguistic competence, but is perhaps an expression of orienting towards it. A similar repair operation is found in excerpt 6a:

```
1 *KIE:    colour coding is- yeah they were really suggesting colour coding
2 *ELE:    okay
3 *KIE:    and not eh narrative kind of stuff he was saying like eh [Gauthier]
4          was very very much saying be pregmatic- pragmatic about this you
5          don't need to do all the theories that social science has come up
6          with for analysing interviews just pick something that works for you
```

excerpt 6a, pragmatic

In line 4, a self-initiated self-repair operation is performed by Kieran, correcting the pronunciation of the word *pragmatic*. The repair occurs immediately after the trouble-source, the mispronunciation *pregmatic* using an *e*-sound in place of an *a*, and is performed through repeating the word, but this time using the correct pronunciation, *pragmatic*. Kieran is, unlike Stefan in excerpt 5a, a NS of English. As such, it appears that the perceived mispronunciation of words is not

a NNS trait, but rather a commonplace occurrence in interaction. It may also be worth noticing that this self-initiated repair occurs only a few turns after another participant initiates a repair due to troubles to understand Kieran:

```
1 *KIE:    so [Gauthier] was saying we take the components of the knowledge
2          management value chain and we use those as themes (0.8)
3 *ELE:    as what
4 *KIE:    themes
5 *ELE:    yeah
6 *KIE:    and we colour code when we find a chunk
7 *ELE:    uh huh
8 *KIE:    to one of those ideas one of [those] things right
9 *ELE:                                 [okay]              okay
```

excerpt 6b, themes

In lines 2-5, a repair operation is performed on the trouble-source word *themes*, with Elena providing the category-specific repair initiator *as what*, line 3 (Kitzinger, 2013: 249). By this means, she clearly displays which word she failed to hear or understand; the word following *as*. The repair is then instantly performed by Kieran, line 4, with the repetition of *themes*, and Elena accepts this repair in line 5, *yeah*, showing that this time she heard or understood the utterance. Now, following Kieran's turns in line 6 and 8, Elena produces utterances of acceptance, *uh huh* and *okay okay*, accompanied by nodding her head. This is in contrast to her remaining quiet in the interaction prior to her repair initiator in line 3; now she is displaying a higher degree of awareness towards Kieran's utterances and her understanding them. This could be a factor in Kieran's self-initiated self-repair in excerpt 6a; that the other-initiated repair of the trouble-source *themes* elicited a higher degree of orientation towards his own pronunciation, wanting to make sure that the other participants, and in particular Elena, understand his utterances. In all these three instances of pronunciation troubles, whether self- or other-initiated, the repair is immediately performed by repeating the trouble-source word, not causing any noticeable disruption for the interaction.

In excerpt 6b, the repair initiator is category-specific, and the repair operation is promptly completed. Instances of open-class repair initiators can also lead to quick repairs of the trouble-source, as in the following example (Kitzinger, 2013: 249):

```
1 *MOR:    eh I've yeah I did eh (0.7) write something about my eh (0.6) eh
2          part and I read all the interv- or just one is left but I read the
3          interviews and wrote on some in⌈for⌉mation
4 *ALV:                                   ⌊yeah⌋
5          (1.0)
6 *MOR:    ⌈ehh⌉
7 *ALV:    ⌊yeah⌋ they're really long
```

```
8          (0.9)
9 *MOR:    what
10 *ALV:   they are really long
11 *MOR:   yeah yeah it took it the whole day yesterday to read
```
excerpt 7b, they are really long

The trouble-source is Alvaro's utterance, line 7, *yeah they're really long*, and the repair is initiated by Moritz' initial pause and subsequent open-class initiator, *what*, line 9. In line 10, Alvaro then repeats the entire trouble-source turn, *they are really long*, this time with a distinctively more articulated and slow pronunciation. Moritz accepts this repair solution through the utterance *yeah yeah it took the whole day yesterday to read*; through the first *yeah* he shows that he has now heard and understood what Alvaro said, a display of understanding which he then accentuates by adding in his own experience of the interviews as being *really long*. Sometimes, however, repetition alone is not treated as a sufficient repair, and is followed by additional words to explain the meaning, as in this excerpt, where Julia and Oscar are talking about the weather:

```
1 *JUL:    like look here it's gonna rise from today and then it's gonna rise
2          and rise and rise and rise and rise
3 *OSC:    and then go down ((laughs))
4 *JUL:    it's not even gonna go down tonight it's just gonna keep on going up
5 *OSC:    well I hope so
6 *JUL:    but I think it's some there's some wind coming from the south
7 *OSC:    /the south/
8 *JUL:    /the south/
9 *OSC:    oh so [Paulina] is bringing some wind with her
10 *JUL:   some what
11 *OSC:   some wind with her some hot weather from the south
12 *JUL:   yes
```
excerpt 1a, some wind

The repair operation here in lines 9-12 is initiated by Julia's category-specific *some what*, line 10, clearly stating which part of the utterance caused trouble: the word following *some*. Unlike the previous examples, the repair solution performed in line 11 is not just a repetition of the trouble-source phrase, rather, the phrase is followed by a further explanation, *some hot weather from the south*. This may suggest that Oscar treats Julia's repair initiator as orienting to a problem of understanding the meaning of his utterance. However, as seen in line 6, Julia already made use of the word *wind* in describing the hot weather, which then suggests that she would understand Oscar's use of the same word, but perhaps she misheard it the first time. Whether a question of mishearing or misunderstanding, the repair solution is promptly accepted in line 12, by the utterance *yes*, and the interaction continues.

It is not always the case that the repair is initiated immediately after the trouble-source. In excerpt 2a, there are several turns between the trouble-source and the initiation of the repair:

```
1 *HEL:    would it be an idea that we connect the eh (0.3) the container eh
2          session with eh with that would that be in our creation or do you
3          think it should be eh an independent event
4 *LAR:    yeah
5 *HEL:    an e-sport thing
6 *LAR:    yeah I think it is something- something should be in the ?pit? area
7 *HEL:    yeah
8 *LAR:    the whole day
9 *HEL:    yeah
10 *LAR:   yeah [because-]
11 *SOF:         [what]
12 *LAR:   in the pit area
13 *SOF:   ((nods))
14 *LAR:   is there where the whole is going on
```

excerpt 2a, the pit area

The interaction in this part of the meeting is mainly between Lars and Helge, with the remaining group members listening in. The trouble-source in Lars' turn in line 6, an unclear pronunciation of the phrase *pit area*, evidently does not pose any problems for Helge, who utters the agreement *yeah*, line 7, and continues to agree with Lars' following utterance, line 9, again by the word *yeah*. In line 11, Sofus, who is the one taking notes for the meeting, interrupts Lars' utterance with *what*, a repair initiator that prompts the candidate repair *in the pit area*. This is deemed an acceptable repair solution by Sofus, who nods in response, still not taking part in Lars' and Helge's conversation, but now being able to follow the interaction. The repair initiator *what* is sufficient here; during Lars' turn in line 6, Sofus coughed at the time the word *pit* was uttered, and Lars knew which part of the utterance caused the trouble, and was able to offer the correct repair solution, which was then immediately accepted. Unlike in the previous excerpt 1a the problem is treated as one of hearing, not understanding, and the repair operation is successful.

The six examples above present troubles in hearing or understanding which are relatively easily solved through simple repair operations. However, repair operations can be more extensive and disruptive for the flow of interaction, for instance in the following example:

```
1 *VIK:    but he mentioned colour code it just so we can split it in two
2          different sections
3 *KIE:    eh I found an article the other day about this concept
4 *VIK:    but we just need to know where to put things so we can just match
5          the question with the answer
6 *KIE:    yeah
7 *ELE:    I don't know what you're talking about colour ?coded? or
8 *VIK:    because I I think what [Gauthier] was talking about is
```

```
9          deconstructing the interviews
10 *ELE:   m hm
11 *VIK:   and when you ask these specific- every question every question will
12         go to a specific topic
13 *ELE:   m hm yeah
14 *VIK:   so you for example mark it blue for I don't know eh processes
15 *ELE:   okay
16 *VIK:   mark it yellow for knowledge sharing (0.9) eh or something and then
17         you just take these things and always put it in the respective
18            [column (0.5)]
19 *ELE:   [and what's the name of it]
20 *VIK:   so you can (0.4) colour code it
21 *ELE:   col- ah colour coded ah okay okay okay
```

excerpt 6c, colour code it

This repair operation through lines 1-21 is long and quite complex. The trouble-source in line 1, *but he mentioned colour code it*, is not oriented to as such until line 7, when Elena produces the repair initiator *I don't know what you're talking about colour ?coded? or*, with the final part of the turn being uttered in an unsure and indistinguishable pronunciation. In the exchange that follows, Viktor, evidently treating the trouble as being due to a lack of understanding on Elena's part, explains the procedure for colour coding and argues for why they should use it, in lines 8-9, 11-12, 14, 16-17. In between these lines, Elena responds with utterances of agreement, *m hm*, *m hm yeah*, *okay*, in lines 10, 13, 15. However, her tone of voice during these turns is hesitant, and her hand gesture, with one hand thoughtfully placed around the mouth and chin, remains unchanged throughout the turns 8-18. It is unclear whether Viktor hears her final and very specific repair initiator in line 19, *and what's the name of it*, as it is almost inaudible and coincides with his own utterance *column*. Nonetheless, this shows that Elena's original repair initiator has not been sufficiently dealt with, in that she still has questions directed at the initial trouble-source. In line 20, Viktor provides the repair through a continuation of his previous explanation of the process, *so you can (0.4) colour code it*; this does not seem to be a response to Elena's turn in line 19, but arguably has the same effect as if it were: in line 21, through a repetition of the term, *col- colour coded*, and the additional *ah okay okay okay*, Elena accepts this repair solution, whether or not it was Viktor's intention to provide it. Her speech is accompanied by a gesture that displays her acceptance of the repair; she removes the hand from her face, and nods multiple times while producing her utterance.

Treating a problem of understanding as one of hearing can also complicate a repair operation, as in this excerpt:

```
1 *OLI:    so we make the presentation now or
2 *STE:    yeah we should make it like a plan how we make and just make a
3          presentation
```

```
4          (0.8)
5 *OLI:    or we can eh yeah
6          (0.7)
7 *STE:    like what which parts eh like eh what did it take what what did we
8          take for it then how we sell it
9 *OLI:    hm (0.5) ((tilts head))
10 *STE:   [and how we sell it]
11 *OLI:   [can you explain] eh can you explain what you mean
12 *STE:   eh ah I mean how we present it like so
13 *OLI:   yeah okay
14 *STE:   as it's more of a sales pitch to the xxx team when we present it
15 *OLI:   hm ((questioning facial expression))
16         (2.2)
17 *STE:   so maybe we did a shit report but we can still make the
18         presentation work well and make us look good
19 *FLO:   otherwise I'm going to poison you
20         ((laughter))
```

excerpt 5b, what we take for it

The trouble-source is Stefan's utterance in lines 7-8, and Oliver initiates the repair with *hm*, line 9, a marker which is accompanied by a tilting of the head and an affectedly questioning facial expression. A pause follows and Stefan and Oliver, lines 10 and 11, speak at the same time; Stefan, allegedly treating the repair initiator as orienting to a problem of hearing, repeats the final part of his utterance as a candidate repair. This not accepted as simultaneously, Oliver seems to treat the pause following his repair initiator as an indicator that Stefan is struggling to perform the repair, and explicitly states that he failed to not hear, but to understand the trouble-source, *can you explain what you mean*. Now, the repair can be performed, and in line 12 Stefan, after brief hesitation *eh*, and expressing understanding *ah*, begins repairing the trouble-source by providing a different way of phrasing what he meant, *I mean how we present it like so*. This is then approved by Oliver, line 13, by *yeah okay*, although Stefan continues to extend the repair by the arguments *as it's more of a sales pitch*, line 14, and *so maybe we did a shit report but we can still make the presentation work well*, lines 17-18. Upon this final argument, Florin offers agreement with Stefan's utterances through the phrase *otherwise I'm going to poison you*, line 19, supposedly taken to mean that *mak[ing] the presentation work well* is something he strongly agrees should happen. His utterance is met with general laughter from the group, and the repair operation is completely finalised, allowing the interaction to continue.

All the above are examples of self-repair, that being self- or other-initiated. While relatively uncommon, instances of other-repair are also found in the data set, as in the following example:

```
1 *KIE:    why the hell are we doing this it depends whether we should create
2          xxx their knowlegde management system increase the market in the
```

```
3          majorities and the not effective uh competences and excetera excetera
4 *VIK:    etcetera
5 *KIE:    etcetera
6 *VIK:    so we're gonna go over what we wrote here or
```
excerpt 6d, etcetera

The repair operation in lines 3-5 is other-initiated other-repair. Following the trouble-source, Kieran's nonstandard pronunciation of the word twice in line 3, *excetera excetera*, Viktor produces a candidate repair in line 4 by uttering the word *etcetera* using the correct pronunciation, initiating and providing the repair in the same turn. The candidate repair is accepted by Kieran in line 5, by him repeating the word produced by Viktor in the previous turn, and the interaction continues. This example is not just one of other-repair, which overall is very uncommon throughout the data set, it is also one of a NNS, Viktor, correcting a nonstandard pronunciation of a word produced by a NS, Kieran. As such, the production of nonstandard utterances is not a NNS trait alone, just as the corrections of nonstandard utterances is not a right reserved for NSs. Interesting in terms of the perceived NS-NNS distinction, this repair operation is minimal, but another more complex repair operation is also found in the same group's interaction:

```
1 *KIE:    do you want us to repeat it or
2 *MAR:    I don't know [Elena] is not here
3 *FRA:                 [Viktor] do you have a charter
4 *VIK:    what's that
5 *FRA:    do you have your charter
6 *VIK:    charter (0.9) no what charter
7 *KIE:    for the MacBook
8 *VIK:    eh sorry
9 *FRA:    for the MacBook
10         (0.9)
11 *VIK:   charger oh my god I understood charter I thought it was the project
12         charter that you used xxx I was like what no no
13 *FRA:   ((laughs)) okay
```
excerpt 6e, charter

The repair operation in lines 3-13 is a complex kind of other-initiated other-repair which happens due to Viktor's trouble in understanding Francisca's pronunciation of the word *charger*, ultimately correcting her pronunciation of the word in line 11. The trouble-source utterance in line 3, *Viktor do you have a charter*, is uttered in a low voice; Francisca is speaking directly to Viktor, on a topic that is not part of the overall interaction between Kieran and Marta. Viktor's open-class repair initiator in line 4, *what's that*, is then interpreted by Francisca as orienting to a problem of hearing, and she responds with a near identical utterance as the previous one, *do you have your charter*, in line 5. It becomes evident that Viktor's trouble is one of understanding, not hearing, when in line 6 he

repeats the trouble-source word, *charter*, followed by a pause and a then a category-specific repair initiator, *what charter*. In line 7 Kieran, a third party who has neither produced the trouble-source nor initiated the repair offers a solution, *for the MacBook*, implicitly extending the single word *charter* to the more explanatory phrase *charter for the MacBook*. Offering this candidate repair shows that he has, unlike Viktor, understood Francisca's pronunciation of the word, and by not correcting it to *charger*, he employs the strategy of making it normal (Firth, 1996: 245). However, this does not help Viktor's understanding, and his third attempt of a repair initiator, *eh sorry*, is followed by Francisca repeating Kieran's candidate repair in line 9, *for the MacBook*, approving this as a suitable repair solution. A pause follows, until in line 11 Viktor arrives at an understanding, and by uttering the word *charger* in a more standard way, he ultimately provides the repair solution, opposing the two pronunciations *charger* and *charter* in the utterance *charger oh my god I understood charter*, thereby not following Kieran's making it normal. In line 13, Francisca then accepts this repair solution through laughter and the utterance *okay*. Arguably, it is through this agreement to Viktor's pronunciation of the word that his utterance in line 11 serves as a repair solution, since it is followed by her acceptance of that candidate repair.

5.1.3 Lexical troubles

Finally, lexical items can serve as the trouble source in repair operations, that being self- or other-initiated repairs:

```
1 ∗JOE:    can you not can you not wait until the holidays are finished
2          to drink
3 ∗PAT:    no tonight is CBS ⌈party⌉
4 ∗ROL:                     ⌊don't drink⌋ Tamás
5 ∗TAM:    no tomorrow
6 ∗PAT:    ((laughs)) tonight
7 ∗TAM:    huh (0.2) oh CBS party yeah yeah but I don't like that I don't wanna-
8          tomorrow we have the presentation I don't wanna be get fucked up
9          ((TAM and PAT laugh))
10 ∗PAT:   yeah but it's only ten thirty
11 ∗TAM:   yeah but I still have to wake up at eight that's quite early
12 ∗PAT:   no
13 ∗TAM:   yesterday I woke up at one am- one pm ((laughs))
```

excerpt 4a, CBS party

This excerpt shows Tamás engaging in other-repair and self-repair, both due to troubles that are solved by replacing lexical items for similar, but far from synonymous ones. In lines 3-7, the word *tonight* is initially by Tamás repaired to *tomorrow*, but Patrik dismisses this solution through

laughter and repetition of the word *tonight*, line 6, to which Tamás responds *oh CBS party yeah yeah*, agreeing that his correcting *tonight* to *tomorrow* was in fact incorrect. Here, the trouble source appears to not exactly be a wrongful use of the word, or a temporary void in either participant's vocabulary, arguably they are just talking about two different events, the party and the presentation the day after the party. Further, in line 13 in a self-initiated self-repair operation, Tamás wrongly utters the phrase *one a.m.*, immediately repairing it to *one p.m.*. This latter lexical repair appears almost as a grammatical repair, and could have presumably gone unnoticed by employing the letting it pass strategy, however, it is repaired, presumably due to awareness on Tamás' part, wanting to be understood. Other examples are also found of lexical troubles being instantly repaired by the same speaker:

```
1 *JOR:    yeah and find a way ((snaps fingers)) (1.2) that ((taps table)) (1.4)
2          the eh the the the the eh employers can upload the information in a
3          very easy way I don't know why (1.0) I I don't know how
4 *MOR:    yeah yeah
5 *JOR:    yeah (0.9) but it gonna be the best way to upload very easy
```

excerpt 7c, I don't know how

Jorge performs a self-initiated lexical repair in line 3, changing the word *why* to *how*. This repair solution includes a repetition of the utterance prior to the trouble-source word *why*, a word which has quite a different meaning than *how*. This repair then addresses a distinction which, unlike the one between *a.m.* and *p.m.*, is potentially disruptive to understanding Jorge's utterance. Lexical repair then occurs as self-repair, but also in the form of other-repair:

```
1 *MAL:    then write like eelgrass eh waste product on public swimming beaches
2          (4.4) what does the eutrophication mean
3 *AND:    like (2.0) it's ruining everything else
4 *MAL:    ((laughs quietly))
5 *AND:    ((laughs)) (1.7) it's taking over the (1.6) ecosystem in that
6          specific area
7 *MAL:    okay yeah write that
8 *JUL:    what ((laughs))
9 *MAL:    ((laughs)) eh the last sentence
10 *JUL:   euutroo ((writes on computer))
```

excerpt 1b, eutrophication

Here, Malou arguably initiates a repair on Anders' utterance through laughter, line 4. Her question, *what does the eutrophication mean*, line 2, is responded to by Anders, *it's ruining everything else*, a response Malou treats as a trouble-source through quietly laughing at it rather than for example producing an utterance of approval, understanding, or agreement. At least, Anders treats the laughter as a repair-initiator, after joining in on Malou's laughter and thereby agreeing to position

his turn in line 3 as a repairable, he provides a candidate repair for it, *it's taking over the (1.6) ecosystem in that specific area*. This is approved by Malou, *okay yeah write that*, line 7, and the repair operation is completed. Initiating a repair through laughing at a person's utterance is a potentially face-threatening manoeuvre, and through performing this kind of repair operation with no disruption in the interaction, Malou and Anders' interaction appears more casual than formal. That is, although the setting is institutional and their interactional goal is working on a project, their relationship as friends rather than just co-workers is implied, making laughing at someone's phrasing an utterance in a silly way non-damaging. The trouble in line 3 is emphasized as wrong, and a solution is found. Sometimes through, trouble-source words are more implicitly repaired, not drawing explicit attention to its wrongness:

```
1 *MIH:    does anyone know how to substract the feedback
2          (0.7)
3 *STE:    substract
4          (0.4)
5 *MIH:    how do you download
6 *OLI:    eh you have to reconvert ((gets up and looks at MIH's computer))
7 *MIH:    where
8 *OLI:    go to the download folder
```

excerpt 5c, substract

In this excerpt, the trouble source word *substract* appears to be a made-up hybrid word combining *subtract* and *extract* to form a new word. Regardless, Mihail's using the word in line 1, *does anyone know to substract the feedback*, is followed by a pause, and then a repair initiator produced by Stefan, line 3, by simply repeating the trouble-source word *substract*. This is treated as a problem of understanding by Mihail, who, after a brief pause, asks the same question substituting a synonym of the word, *how do you download*. Oliver promptly answers, displaying that *download* was a satisfactory substitute for *substract*. Here, the nonstandardness on Mihail's part is not allowed to go unnoticed, but his talk being faulty is not accentuated in the same way as in the previous excerpt 1b. Rather, the repair is quickly and easily performed, not drawing attention to the trouble-source's nonstandard character, but focusing on the function of the word rather than its form.

5.1.4 Summary of repair

Throughout the data set, repair operations are numerous. In accordance with Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's original observations on the topic, there is a clear preference for self-repair in the

student group meetings (Sacks et al., 1977: 362). Of course, their examinations were based on native speakers rather than ELF-scenarios, thus, the ELF-scenarios in this study follow standards on NS-interaction with regards to preference for self-repair, whether self- or other-initiated, although other-repair does occur a few times in the data. Commonly, repair operations are quick and successful; self-initiated self-repair often occurs within the same turn-construction unit, and other-initiated repairs are often completed directly following the repair initiation. This is often managed through explicit repair markers, bringing attention to particular trouble sources, with the focus being function over form in most cases.

The analysis found that grammar is rarely treated as a trouble source, and only self-repair operations were performed on issues of grammar. Lexicon is nearly as rarely treated as a trouble source, and lexical issues are mainly solved by self-initiated self-repair, although a few instances of other-initiated self-repair were found, such as 5c, substract. Generally, for grammar and lexicon, troubles did not result in overt disturbances of the interaction, and repair operations were quick an successful. There can be said to be a focus on meaning over form, and the students display a high degree of orientation towards their own speech production. On the aspect of pronunciation, however, other-initiation and even other-repair operations were far more prevalent. This suggests that nonstandard pronunciation is treated as less comprehensible than for example non-standard grammar, although not necessarily for all speakers involved, as in 6e, charter.

Based on the above analysis, the following characteristics can then be identified for linguistic repair operations throughout the data set:

(i) low orientation towards formal structure, high orientation towards meaning
(ii) pronunciation issues as a prevalent trouble source
(iii) preference for self-repair, but other-repair does occur
(iv) repair operations mostly result in low degree of disturbance
(v) troubles are usually addressed immediately, that being by oneself or others

5.2 Analysis of word-search sequences

Word-searches are essentially a specific form of repair operation commonly found in interaction. Whereas the previous section 5.1 dealt with backward-oriented repair operations, focused on repairing already produced troubles in conversation, word-searches are forward-oriented, dealing

with troubles that have yet to be produced (Reichert & Liebscher, 2012: 600). As such, they display a trouble of speaking rather than hearing or understanding, as they are solely connected to the act of producing utterances. While it is accepted that word-searches do not equate less linguistic ability, since they are also found in NSs utterances, initiating a word-search does display a void in lexical knowledge at that very moment, arguably meaning that the speaker is momentarily performing as less competent (Greer, 2013: 101; Reichert & Liebscher, 2012: 601). In turn, another speaker can display their competence in understanding and speaking by offering a candidate solution to the search which then becomes a collaborate word-search, an act which may or may not cause the initial speaker to explicitly accept that candidate solution. The speaker may also, however, produce the solution themselves with no involvement from others, in a solitary word-search. It may through different means, such as a shift of gaze towards or away from fellow participants, be evident whether the speaker initiating the search wishes for others to join in.

A word-search can be initiated in different ways, for example by way of pauses, hesitation markers, shift of gaze or other embodied actions, or even through explicit markers such as *what is it?* (Greer, 2013: 100; Reichert & Liebscher, 2012: 600). Generally, it is characterised by causing a delay in one's turn, contrary to backward-oriented repair, which often uses cut-offs to address the trouble as quickly as possible. In the present study, word-searches were found in all group meetings, although they were managed in a variety of ways. The analysis is divided into the subsections *solitary word-searches* and *collaborative word-searches*, both categories displaying quick and successful as well as more problematic and disturbing examples of word-searches among the interactions.

5.2.1 Solitary word-searches

Much like backward-oriented self-repair, solitary word-searches completed within the same turn construction unit are common in conversation. The speaker delays their utterance, displaying that the delay is due to a word-search, that being through embodied actions or verbal markers:

```
1 *SOF:    we know you have some co-operations what kind of (0.2) do you have
2          any kind of binding contracts with like shopping malls sponsors
3          generally I know you have some sponsors for the entire race right
4 *LAR:    yeah yeah
5 *SOF:    (0.8) h- h- how much do they like (1.0) ((looks at SRE)) how do you
6          explain how much do they affect ((hand gesture)) your eh marketing
7          and that kind of stuff are they both mostly passively just putting
8          [money in]
```

```
9 *LAR:    [yeah yeah] and then some (1.0) yeah s- some eh names on the cars
10 *SOF:   ah ((nods))
11 *LAR:   and and on the tracks but but it is not eh but (1.2) again it's
12         something I think we should work with
```
excerpt 2b, eh marketing

In this interaction between Lars and Sofus, Sofus initiates and completes a solitary word-search in lines 5-8. The word-search is first initiated by a delay in his speech; following, his shift of gaze towards Søren could be interpreted as an invitation for him to offer a candidate solution for the missing word, but Sofus then shifts his gaze and utters the word-search marker *how do you explain*, followed by a candidate solution. His solution includes a repetition of the phrase uttered right before the trouble in speech occurred, *how much do they*, and the candidate solution *affect your eh marketing and that kind of stuff* is accompanied by a hand gesture, and a further specifying explanation, *are they both mostly passively just putting money in*. This candidate solution is approved by Lars, through him replying to Sofus' question in line 9; although not explicitly orienting to the word-search, it is completed in that the interaction continues and that the trouble in speaking is repaired. Sometimes though, word-search solutions are more explicitly approved by another participant, as in this excerpt:

```
1 *LAR:    yeah if you're asking I think that it's too hardcore ((laughs))
2 *GAB:    ah it's just usually festivals have like a lot of different [vi]bes
3 *LAR:                                                               [yeah]
4 *GAB:    around the ?camp? where you place the
5 *LAR:    yeah ehh
6 *GAB:    that's why from previous experience I thought ah it's not a problem
7          if they allow us to have like a small (0.3) ehm (0.2) booth what is
8          it eh
9 *SOF:    ((looks up))
10 *GAB:   a tent
11 *SOF:   ((nods))
12 *LAR:   that's that's because this festival you got there there's eh there's
13         for the young people yes that's right
14 *GAB:   yeah
15 *LAR:   but but not a lot of family
```
excerpt 2c, booth what is it

In this interaction between Lars and Gabriel, Gabriel initiates and completes a search for the word *tent* in lines 7-10. It is initiated through pauses and a hesitation marker *ehm*, line 7, followed by the candidate insertion *booth*. However, without a pause Gabriel dismisses his own candidate word, uttering the search marker *what is it eh*. Sofus shifts his gaze in Gabriel's direction, and Gabriel produces another candidate solution, *a tent*, line 10. This time, he does not dismiss his own candidate word, and further, Sofus approves of this solution through nodding, line 11, and Lars

continues the conversation in line 12, further signalling that the word-search sequence is satisfactorily completed. In other examples, verbal approval of a candidate solution is produced:

```
1 *SEB:    okay see I see something here that we should maybe eh (1.9) look at
2          because [Klaus] says in his first comment on s on the first part
3          of the economics
4 *JOH:    m hm
5 *SEB:    something about outsourcing with ?sizing? with what we've done in
6          eh (1.3) what was it called ((snaps fingers)) organisation
7 *BLA:    yeah
8 *JOH:    yeah
9 *SEB:    so perhaps next time we should see if there are try and link it in
10         in ⌈more ways⌉
11 *BLA:     ⌊together yeah⌋
```

excerpt 3b, organisation

In line 6, Sebastian actually produces four different word-search initiators before reaching his candidate word: a hesitation marker *eh*, a pause, an explicit marker *what was it called*, and a hand gesture, snapping his fingers, implying him searching for a word. The other participants do not take part in his search, but as soon as the candidate word *organisation* is produced, both Blake and Jóhanna approves of this word, *yeah*, *yeah*, lines 7 and 8. Likely, the use of four different search initiators make them aware that a word-search is in process and following, that an approval of the candidate word will help Sebastian to continue his utterance.

It is a possibility that the missing word is not found, but the word-search still appears to have a satisfactory outcome, as in this excerpt:

```
1 *JUL:    but the nice thing in [my workplace] they have this eh th- thing like
2          if there's a (0.2) eh a specific eh cocktail you can't remember or
3          something then you can take it out and then you can like see ((hand
4          gesture)) and then they're like ok take this kind of glass put in ice
5 *OSC:    oh yeah that's ⌈fine⌉
6 *JUL:                   ⌊put⌋ in this put in ⌈this⌉
7 *ELI:                                       ⌊okay⌋ yeah that's good
8 *OSC:    that's good yeah
9 *JUL:    so like if you're all fucked you can always take that ⌈one⌉
10 *OSC:                                                        ⌊okay⌋ yeah I
11         think they have that everywhere
```

excerpt 1c, they have that everywhere

In lines 1-4, Julia is searching for, and then settling for explaining, a word reminiscent of *recipe*, *menu*, or the like. However, after initiating a word-search through hesitation markers *eh* and a pause, she resorts to the solution *this eh t-thing*, line 1, followed by an extensive explanation of its function accompanied by a hand gesture, holding up both palms as if reading a book. During this, both Oscar and Elizabet display that they have understood this explanation, not just through

approval, but offering statements about the *thing* at Julia's workplace, *oh yeah that's fine*, *okay yeah that's good*, lines 5 and 7. Finally, in lines 10-11, Oscar's *okay yeah I think they have that everywhere* displays that he definitely knows what Julia is talking about, although this use of a pronoun, *that*, displays that he does not know which word to use either. As such, without actually finding the correct word, this word-search is successfully completed in that mutual understanding is created between all three participants of the interaction. Sometimes there can be several word-searches within one turn, as in this example:

```
1 *FRA:    ohh you went there how was it
2          (1.1)
3 *MAR:    [Kieran] how was it can you can you tell
4 *KIE:    ehh it was fine it was just really fast
5 *ELE:    what does [eh]
6 *MAR:              [yeah] at first I couldn't connect my uh ((extends hand
7          (0.8) snaps fingers)) pc on this ((looks at Kieran)) edduruom
8 *KIE:    eduroam did [you] did you figure that out or
9 *MAR:                [yeah] eh [Ted] gave me his account
```

excerpt 6f, eduroam

Marta's first word-search in lines 6-7 is initiated by her extending her hand towards the object she is trying to name, then a pause and a snapping of her fingers, followed by the candidate word *pc*. She requires no approval that this is the correct word to continue her turn, implying that she is sure her candidate word *pc* is the correct one. The next word-search, line 7, is different; Marta looks at Kieran before uttering the phrase *edduruom* in an usual and hesitant pronunciation. Kieran, having engaged in eye contact with Marta, immediately provides the correct pronunciation, *eduroam*, displaying that he understood her candidate word, completing her search. Marta's shift of gaze is thus treated as an invitation to not so much collaborate in the word-search, as the word she produced is not entirely wrong, but perhaps to convey that she is aware of her struggle to produce the correct pronunciation of the word.

Word-searches can cause a rather long delay in a conversation while remaining solitary word-search:

```
1 *JOR:    so an idea maybe would it be like to use eh ((taps table)) only one
2          system
3 *ALV:    yeah
4 *JOR:    I think only one system for all the department
5 *MOR:    yeah
6 *ALV:    yeah I think through the whole organisation
7 *JOR:    yeah
8 *ALV:    just to
9 *JOR:    yeah and find a way ((snaps fingers)) (1.2) that ((taps table))
```

```
10          (1.4) the eh the the the the eh employers can upload the information
11          in a very easy way I don't know why (1.0) I- I don't know how
12 *MOR:    yeah yeah
13 *JOR:    yeah (0.9) but it gonna be the best way to upload very easy
14          information
```
excerpt 7d, employers

Jorge's word-search initiators include snapping his fingers, pausing, tapping the table, pausing again, using a hesitation marker *eh*, and repeating the article *the* multiple times before finally finding and settling for the word *employers* through lines 9-10. The various markers all display that he is engaged in a word-search; Jorge is in different ways delaying the utterance while keeping his turn to speak, and the other two participants refrain from collaborating in this word-search despite its extensive length, and since Jorge arrives at a solution, is does not become necessary for others to partake.

5.2.2 Collaborative word-searches

Word-searches are collaborative when more than one speaker participates in finding a missing word or phrase, co-constructing the utterance, as in this example:

```
1 *JAK:    as we understood (0.4) we're interested on on boarding more like
2          family members the kids (0.4) eh female eh (0.7) participants not
3          participants but like eh spectators (0.3) of the whole thing so
4          (0.5) we were just trying to select the most ehm (0.9) yeah
5 *HEL:    suitable
6 *JAK:    suitable places to ranch one month tournaments to ranch just like a
7          showcase scenes
```
excerpt 2d, suitable

Jakobs' turn in lines 1-4 is has many hesitation markers and pauses of 0.3-0.7 seconds, in between which he continues his utterance. Finally, after a hesitation marker *ehm* and a pause, line 4, he continues with *yeah*, thereby signalling that he does not know which word to continue with. It is evident that he is looking for a word to complete the phrase, as the prior *we were just trying to select the most ehm* is not a phrase that can stand on its own. Helge treats this as an invitation by offering the candidate word *suitable* in line 5. Jakobs approves of this candidate solution by repeating the word and continuing his utterance, as if no disruption had occurred. This type of collaborative word-search occurs several times throughout the data set; one speaker displays a void in vocabulary through engaging in a word-search, and another speaker immediately provides the missing word, allowing the interaction to go on. Rather than serving as a pointing out the first

speaker's lack of ability to produce the correct word, these kinds of word-searches can be seen as displaying that the meaning is coming through in spite of the missing word; the second speaker providing the missing word displays understanding, and co-constructs the turn, allowing the interaction to continue. 2d is one of many examples of a word-search being initiated by one speaker and completed by another, the initial speaker approving the candidate solution by repetition. However, a word-search can even be completed by several other speakers, as in this excerpt:

```
1 *ELI:    and then he basically rejected like all nineteen of us ((laughs)) I
2          was like what the hell ((laughs)) I mean come on like I don't know
3 *OSC:    where was that
4 *ELI:    it was at eh the flamingo place
5 *JUL:     ⌈oh the drunken flamingo⌉
6 *OSC:    ⌊ohh the drunken flamingo⌋ who can they refuse
7 *ELI:    I know right ⌈that's what I was thinking⌉
8 *JUL:                 ⌊the drunken flamingo⌋ is just like this cheap place
9 *OSC:    it's ⌈like the⌉
10 *ELI:         ⌊exactly⌋
11 *OSC:   cheapest place in all of Copenhagen
12 *ELI:   yeah I know and that's why I was also like what the fuck dude like
13         who do you think you are man
14 *OSC:   oh my god the drunken flamingo ⌈seriously⌉
15 *ELI:                                  ⌊yeah⌋
16 *JUL:   of all places oh my god
```

excerpt 1d, the flamingo place

In line 4, rather than initiating a word-search by pausing or delaying her utterance, Elizabet substitutes the phrase *eh the flamingo place*. It is not a search as such, although the insertion of the general term *place*, in combination with the hesitation marker *eh*, suggests that she cannot find the exact word she is looking for. Arguably, this is treated as a search; in lines 5 and 6, Julia and Oscar simultaneously produce the candidate solution *the drunken flamingo*. Evidently this needs no further approval, and Elizabet continues the interaction by responding to Oscar's *who can they refuse* with *I know right that's what I was thinking*, line 7, supported by Julia's *the drunken flamingo is just like this cheap place*, line 8. This way, Elizabeth, Julia, and Oscar all display a shared knowledge of the place rather than just guessing the missing words from Elizabet's initial trouble turn; by demonstrating their understanding her phrase rather than merely claiming understanding, the word-search is successfully completed and the candidate solution approved (Mondada, 2011: 543). Sometimes though, the approval of a candidate solution in collaborate searches is more explicit:

```
1 *MAG:    oh has it happened to you though that Klaus he was like (0.4) he was
2          ehm (0.7) he was positive and surprised that we (0.3) did this
3          without ((hand gesture in BLA's direction))(0.4)
```

```
4 *BLA:    guidance
5 *MAG:    without a gui[dance yeah without asking him] for advice
6 *JOH:                 [yeah without a guidance]
7          (1.3)
```
excerpt 3c, without a guidance

In this example, Magnus is specifically inviting Blake to join the word-search, by initiating it with a hand gesture and shift of gaze in Blake's direction at the end of his unfinished turn, line 3. Blake responds to this by immediately offering a candidate solution, *guidance*. Magnus then partly accepts this solution in line 5, through repeating the final part of his trouble phrase using the candidate word, *without a guidance yeah*, but additionally to the approving *yeah* he adds another way of phrasing what he meant, *without asking him for advice*. At the same time though, Jóhanna expresses approval of the initial candidate solution produced by Blake, *yeah without a guidance*, using the article *a* in the same non-standard way as Magnus did in his using the presented candidate word *guidance,* making it normal. This way, a third party who neither initiated the word-search or offered a candidate solution becomes part of completing the word-search, by confirming that the solution *without a guidance* is the correct one to use in this context. Aside from allocating the next speaker, hand gestures can be used in word-searches more specifically to show which word is missing:

```
1 *MIH:    what's environment did we have anything about it
2 *STE:    it's environment
3 *OLI:    eh I don I the I think eh
4 *MIH:    we were supposed to have it
5 *OLI:    no no no no no I think eh he's using some sort of ((holds up hands))
6          eh
7 *MIH:    yeah yeah template
8 *OLI:    template
```
excerpt 5d, template

Oliver's word-search in lines 5-7 is initiated by use of a hand gesture, which, rather than merely announcing the beginning of a word-search actually displays which word he is searching for. Oliver holds up both palms with the thumbs extended to form two opposing L-shapes, positioned so they make a square. There is no pause in his utterance, only a brief hesitation marker *eh* earlier in line 6, and Mihail's response *yeah yeah*, line 7, shows that he understands this gesture, further producing the candidate solution *template*. This is immediately approved by Oliver in line 8, *template*, and the interaction continues. Other examples display more complex and extended word-search sequences:

```
1 *JUL:    and then eh after that it's ple- pl- plr-
2 *MAL:    pre[liminary results]
3 *JUL:       [prelim- ((laughs))]
4 *AND:    prelimmiminnarry results
```

```
5          (1.5)
6 *JUL:    who wants that one (2.4) it's very short ((laughs))
7 *MAL:    funny
8 *AND:    no I can do it I can do it
9 *JUL:    okay but there is like [five things]
10 *MAL:                          [but what did] you did you take something
11 *AND:   prellimminary yes I took the ((points to JUL))
12 *JUL:   flowchart right ((laughs))
13 *AND:   flowchart
14 *MAL:   okay
15 *JUL:   oh (0.4) should I take the prelam- ((laughs))
16 *MAL:   ja
17         ((JUL and AND laughs))
18 *MAL:   ja ja take that
19 *JUL:   preliminary results
```

excerpt 1e, preliminary

This word-search is, similarly to Marta's in excerpt 6f, a search for the correct pronunciation of a word. Unlike the previous example which was immediately solved in the next turn, this one stretches over lines 1-19. Julia initiates the search, line 1, by producing the beginning of the word *preliminary* three times, in three slightly different variations. This prompts Malou to produce the candidate solution in line 2, *preliminary results*, to which Julia attempts to repeat the phrase, seemingly in a way of approving it, but again struggles and bursts out in laughter. Then in line 5, Anders contributes a pronunciation of *preliminary* with a smile and overcomplicated articulation, seemingly offering agreement that the word is quite complicated to pronounce, partaking in Julia's amusement about it. In Julia's next turn, she refrains from pronouncing the word, settling for *that one*, line 6. In turn, in line 11, Anders once again produces the word *preliminary* in a funny, complicated and elongated version, keeping up the discourse that the word is difficult and the situation is humorous. This is supported in line 15, where once again Julia struggles with it, only producing *prelam* before laughing again. Finally, in line 19, she tries once again, producing and thus approving the solution to her word-search that Malou provided in line 2, *preliminary results*.

In the above examples, word-searches are successfully other-completed, in that participants other than the word-search initiator offer a candidate solution to the search, which is then accepted as correct. Arguably, this means a limited amount of disturbance for the interaction. However, complete acceptance of the candidate solution does not always occur, as in the following example:

```
1 *STE:    we can start by eh
2 *OLI:    I don't think we should explain as much that's what they said
3          [that they] don't want too much eh
4 *MIH:       [yeah]
5 *OLI:    (0.5) eh
6 *FLO:    information
```

```
7 *OLI:    they want information but they want information about them they
8          don't want information [about eh the theory]
9 *MIH:                          [how are we going to do that]
10 *FLO:   yeah
11 *STE:   about who specifically information about who
12 *OLI:   they they don't want to hear about what adkar is and they don't
13         wanna hear about who ?Machoc? is and what's his life story they want
14         to hear like how can they use it and what's the like advantages of
15         using this and then have a plan of attack for this
```

excerpt 5e, information

Here, Oliver is initiating a word-search through pauses and hesitation markers inserted at an uncompleted turn, lines 3 and 5. In line 6, Florin then offers the candidate word *information* as a completion of Oliver's phrase *they don't want too much*. This is immediately responded to by Oliver, who does not definitively accept or reject the word-search solution, rather, his turn in lines 7-8 explains that the word *information* is to some extent suitable, in that there are specific types of information they don't want. This response then results in a category-specific repair initiator from Stefan in line 11; arguably neither the candidate solution *information*, as offered by Florin, nor the subsequent modification of this solution by Oliver in lines 7-8 is satisfactory for making the meaning of Oliver's original turn evident to all speakers. This repair initiator then causes Oliver to produce an even longer turn in lines 12-15, further adding explanation onto the candidate solution *information*. The candidate word itself, *information*, is not included in this explanation, and conclusively, the candidate solution *information* is rejected, in that is it not included in the final completion of the word-search. The word-search to some extent is left uncompleted, in that no actual solution was found for the missing word in Oliver's vocabulary, and further, the offered candidate word is not explicitly accepted or rejected. However, rather than completing the word-search operation, the participants do settle for reaching shared understanding, rather than finding the exact word or phrase to fit the initial trouble source.

A candidate solution offered by another speaker can also more explicitly be rejected by the word-search initiator:

```
1 *LAR:    if we can do something for the females we can probably do a
2          cooperation to the Matas and to the females (0.7) I got without DTC
3          I got some of the younger (0.4) ehh motorsports drivers is women
4          (1.3) eh so so is there any way we can make a (1.2) toss just for
5          the female
6 *SOF:    mm
7 *LAR:    would give us a lot of ((hand gesture)) (0.7) what do you say eh
8          (0.7)
9 *HEL:    credibility
10 *LAR:   yeah credibiliehhh (0.6) eh easy points
```

```
11 *HEL:   mm mm
12 *LAR:   eh in the family
13 *HEL:   yeah yeah
```
excerpt 2e, easy points

Lars initiates a word-search in lines 7-8, by use of embodied actions, pauses, and the explicit marker *what do you say eh*. Helge takes up this invitation to join in the word-search, offering the candidate word *credibility*, line 9. In line 10, Lars initially seems to approve this candidate solution, *yeah*, but in repeating the word he stumbles mid-word, exchanging the latter part of the word for an elongated hesitation marker, negating his acceptance of this as a solution to the word-search. Following a brief pause, he offers the solution *eh easy points*, *eh in the family*, lines 10 and 12 respectively, with Helge agreeing to this in lines 11 and 13, *mm mm*, *yeah yeah*. Contrasting to the example above, a specific term was then found in place of the rejected candidate solution. Similarly though, several speakers were involved in negotiating meaning, and though a brief disturbance occurs for the interaction, the collaborative word-search does conclusively succeed and understanding is established.

5.2.3 Summary of word-search sequences

Word-search sequences are commonly observed in the data, both in the form of solitary and collaborative searches. Different search markers such as gaze, pauses, hesitation markers, and explicit markers are all used in data, exhibiting that a word-search is taking place and by this means, the speaker keeps their turn, possibly inviting others to participate in the search. This way, complete silence or breakdown of the interaction is avoided, and the disturbance in the interaction is minimised. Especially hand gestures function as important markers; these can mimic the missing word, invite others to join the search, for example through an extension of the hand, or contrastingly, hand gestures can lead to treating the word-search as solitary, for example by tapping the table. Through others' approving of solutions in solitary word-searches, or through collaborative word-searches, meaning is negotiated through co-operation. A word-search can even result in success without the missing word being found, an even in the case of a candidate solution being rejected, the meaning is always agreed upon, resulting in a low degree of disturbance of the interaction on account of word-searches.

As such, the following characteristics can be formulated:

(i) solitary word-searches are commonplace in the interaction
(ii) collaborative word-searches, or co-constructions of meaning, are frequent
(iii) embodied gestures are consistently employed in word-searches
(iv) the trouble source word does not need to be found for the operation to be successful

5.3 Analysis of code-switch

As examined in the above sections 6.1 and 6.2, repair operations are dealt with in a variety of ways, whether they are backward-oriented or forward-oriented. In both of these types of repair operations, instances of code-switch can be found, either as transfers of single words or phrases, or as code-switches that, fully or partially, alters the medium of interaction for several turns. These switches, most commonly from English to Danish, can either function as a trouble source in conversation, needing to be repaired, or they can occur as a product of a trouble in either producing or understanding an utterance. Generally, code-switches are to be considered a product of participants' on-going assessment of their own and others' competence (Moore et al., 2013: 80). Therefore, in an examination of orientations towards linguistic competence, it is relevant to analyse how code-switching is employed as a means in conversation, in terms of how it reveals orientations towards competence for the person speaking and for recipients. This section is dedicated to the aspect of code-switching, divided into three subsections: change in participant constellation, word-searches, and repair operations. All of the groups in the data set are part of English-taught programmes, and as described in section 4.3 they all include at least two different native languages. Transfer words occur in groups 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7, but only groups 1, 2, and 7 have entire turns in a different medium than English, for which reason this section will mainly focus on these three groups.

5.3.1 Code-switch and shift of participants

Code-switches can be observed in various scenarios, one of which is when there is a shift in the participants present, as observed in previous studies (Hazel & Mortensen, 2013: 4). Here, the participants design their turn in accordance with the participants present, displaying a belief about their fellow participants' linguistic ability, as in this example:

```
1 *AND:    har vi fået nogen resultater siden ethanol extraction
```

```
           had we gotten any results since ethanol extraction
2 *MAL:    mm ja ((looks away)) ja
           mm yes ((looks away)) yes
3 *AND:    ja altså sådan færdige resultater
           yeah well like finished results
4 *MAL:    ehh
5 *AND:    helt fra start til slut (1.0) ((looks at KHA who just arrived))
           from beginning to end
6          morning (0.3) ((looks at MAL)) it's still ?really is fine?
7 *JUL:    ja
           yes
8 *AND:    (1.3) you have been warned
9 *MAL:    altså øh
           well uh
10         ((KHA leaves))
11         (11.9)
12 *MAL:   tænke tænke tænke (1.6) neej det tror jeg ikke (4.3) ikke medmindre
           think think think (1.6) no I don't think so (4.3) not unless
13         hvad har du tjekket din mail om hende der
           have you checked your email if that woman
14 *AND:   hende der
           that woman
15 *MAL:   Gitte
           Gitte
```

excerpt 1f, morning

In lines 1-5 and 9-15, the interaction between Anders and Malou is exclusively in Danish. However, throughout lines 6-9, Khalil, who is not from Denmark, is present. It should be noted that Khalil answered yes to being competent in Danish, however, throughout the meeting he does not respond to Danish utterances at all, and is solely addressed in English. During lines 6-9, he does not produce any utterances, but Anders changes his language from Danish to English in the time when Khalil is present. In line 6, he produces the utterance *morning*, in combination with a gaze in Khalil's direction, presumably displaying that this part of the utterance is directed towards him. The code-switch is a display of recipient design; Anders knows that Khalil does not speak Danish, and therefore directs this utterance towards him in English. Subsequently, he returns to speaking to Malou, also evident through his shift in gaze, and this time he speaks English. His utterance is a continuation of their previous conversation, and is almost inaudible, but nonetheless it is produced in a code, English, that all participants present are able to understand. Julia replies in line 7 with the Danish *ja* (*yes*), not participating in this shift of code to English. This does not divert Anders from his initial code-switch, when in line 8 he produces the utterance *you have been warned*. Like Julia, Malou replies to this in Danish, *altså øh* (*well uh*). Khalil then leaves, and the conversation continues in Danish. This can then be seen as an attempt at code-switching the conversation on

Anders' part, an initiative which is not supported by any of the other participants in the group. This is contrasting to another group in which a majority shares a language:

```
1          ((ALV and JOR talk in Spanish))
2 *ALV:    okay okay (0.6) so let's do this (2.7)
3 *JOR:    okay draft
4          (2.2)
5 *ALV:    so have you (0.8) have you included new material
6          to the draft document
7 *MOR:    eh I've yeah I did eh (0.7) write something about my eh (0.6) eh
8          part and I read all the interv- or just one is left but I read the
9          interviews and wrote on some in⌈for⌉mation
10 *ALV:                                  ⌊yeah⌋
```

excerpt 7e, let's do this

Upon arrival, Moritz, who is a native speaker of German, was greeted with a good morning by Alvaro and Jorge, who are both native speakers of Spanish. Following this greeting, they both returned to speaking Spanish to each other, and Moritz remained quiet while unpacking his computer and setting it up for the meeting. When he finishes, Alvaro performs a code-switch in line 2, initiating the meeting with *okay okay (0.6) so let's do this*. After a brief pause, Jorge joins in with the agreeing *okay draft*, line 3. Following, Alvaro's next utterance in line 5-6 is directed at Moritz, who replies, and the conversation continues in English from there. Similarly to the situation in excerpt 1f, morning, the immediate arrival of a participant who does not share the currently employed language does not result in a lasting code-switch to a language that everyone in competent in. However, when Alvaro in line 2 initiates this code-switch, it is supported by all other members, and the interaction remains exclusively in English throughout their entire meeting. While I am not able to understand or translate Alvaro and Jorge's interaction in Spanish, it appears that their interaction is separate from the project they are working on; throughout their Spanish conversation, they are looking outside the window, gesturing and pointing at a building on the opposite side of the road. Arguably, this can be taken to mean that their interaction which by choice of language excluded Moritz was private and casual and did not involve him as a member of the project group, whereas all the project work they conduct during the actual meeting is in English; Spanish does not at all occur again after this pre-meeting talk. This sets their using another language than English apart from group 1, wherein Danish and English are used interchangeably, also on matters of the project they are working on:

```
1 *MAL:    gad vide om det jeg stillede fra om det var for to gange HPLC eller
           I wonder if what I set aside was for twice HPLC or
2          om det var for en gang (0.8) det kan jeg ikke huske
           if it was for one (0.8) I can't remember
```

```
3 *AND:    hva
           what
4 *MAL:    vi skal jo have lavet to gange
           because we have to do it twice
5 *AND:    ja jeg ved ikke om KHA har lavet det stilt det andet fra
           yes I don't know if KHA has done it put aside the other one
6          (5.5)
7 *MAL:    hvad mener du
           what do you mean
8          ((KHA arrives))
9 *AND:    der [er i hvert fald]
           anyway there is
10 *MAL:         [der skulle] vel der skulle vel laves to gange ikk
                 it was supposed it was supposed to be done twice right
11 *AND:   ja to gange
           yes twice
12         (4.2)
13 *MAL:   ehm did we
14         ((KHA looks at MAL))
15         (1.4)
16 *MAL:   I can't remember how much I prepared for the HPLC you did it
17 *KHA:   yeah
18 *MAL:   last week right like preparing it
19 *KHA:   and it's in the freezer
20 *MAL:   yeah [but]
21 *AND:        [yeah]
22 *MAL:   was that for a like two samples that was for double right
23 *KHA:   yes
24 *MAL:   okay (2.3) jamen så er det klar
           okay (2.3) well then that's ready
25         (1.5)
26 *AND:   alright
27 *MAL:   altså vi skal lave HPLC skal vi ikke
           like we have to do HPLC don't we
28 *AND:   jo
           yes
29 *MAL:   der i weekenden
           on the weekend
```

excerpt 1g, that was for double right

In the beginning of this excerpt, Khalil is not present, and Malou and Anders are talking about their project in Danish. Contrary to the interaction in excerpt 1f, morning, Khalil's arrival, line 8, does not cause either of the participants to perform a switch to English, even though their exchange in Danish had involved Khalil directly, line 5. Only when Malou directs a question at Khalil does she perform a switch to English, and during the lines 13-23, the interaction between Malou and Khalil is performed in English. However, after having had this interaction with Khalil, Malou switches back to Danish, evidently resuming the conversation as before the switch to English was performed. The lines 24-29, then, are all in Danish; although the words *okay*, line 24, and *alright*, line 26, are transfer words from English, they are commonly used in Danish language, and cannot be deemed

markers of keeping or switching the conversation to English medium. In this excerpt, the language choice is then not determined by participants present, but in turn, the language choice does determine who participates in the conversation and when.

5.3.2 Code-switch in word-search sequences

Code-switches can occur as part of forward-oriented repair operations, where a lexical item appears to be missing from the speaker's English vocabulary:

```
1 *MAL:    jeg skal forsøge ikke at bruge alle mine penge på sådan noget
           I have to try and not spend all my money on that kind of
2          skønhedsfis
           beauty junk
3 *AND:    det lyder som en dårlig ide
           it sounds like a bad idea
4 *MAL:    ((laughs)) (2.1) ehm but do we need to make like any kind of eh
5          ((yawns)) (1.7) like ehm ((taps fingers)) åh hvad var det jeg ville
                                                    oh what was I going to
6          sige (1.1) tabeller øh like
           say (1.1) tables eh like
7 *AND:    table
8 *MAL:    nice tables or something in excel to put in the presentation
```

excerpt 1h, nice tables

In this example, Malou conducts a code-switch from Danish to English, then back to Danish, and then to English again. Lines 1-2, produced in Danish, are casual remarks about her personal life, which is replied to in line 3 by Anders, also in Danish. Following this exchange there is a brief pause and a hesitation marker before Malou speaks again, this time in English and with focus on the project, *(2.1) ehm but do we need to make like any kind of eh*, line 4. The distinction between the recipients these two turns produced by Malou is clear, the casual remarks do not involve everyone present at the meeting, while the talk about the project does; at least that is what is displayed through Malou's switch from one language to another. However, she struggles to keep her turn fully in English, as she engages in a word-search, lines 4-6, eh *((yawns)) (1.7) like ehm ((taps fingers)) åh hvad var det jeg ville sige (1.1) tabeller øh like (oh what was I going to say (1.1) tables eh like)*. A wide range of word-search markers are employed here (excluding the yawn, which might not have been deliberate): pausing, producing hesitation markers *like ehm*, turning to gestures by tapping her fingers down on the table, before finally producing an explicit marker in Danish, *åh hvad var det jeg ville sige* (*oh what was I going to say*). This is followed by another pause, perhaps now searching for the word in Danish, before producing it, *tabeller øh* (*tables eh*). Finally she adds

like, arguably diverting the interaction back to English, although her explicit word-search marker invited only the Danish-speakers present to participate in the word-search. At this point, Anders is able to provide a candidate solution, *table*, in line 7, which is immediately approved by Malou who continues her utterance from before it was obstructed by her word-search, *nice tables or something in excel to put in the presentation*, line 8. Not only is this word-search an example of a participant returning to their native language for the purpose of finding a word that is, perhaps momentarily, missing from their English vocabulary, but there is even a word-search within a word-search, in that Malou seems to have forgotten which word she is looking for during the initiation of the word-search. However, despite this quite complex operation, the obstruction is brief, and through their shared language, Danish, Malou and Anders quickly reach the solution *tables* through Malou's substitution of the word in Danish, *tabeller*. Later on, Malou and Anders have left, and Julia is now talking to Elizabet, who speaks some Danish, and Oscar, who reportedly does not, when she initiates a word-search in a similar way:

```
1 ∗JUL:    I remember one of the first times I– I was wasted I was at this ehm
2          conf– what is it called ((looks at ELI)) /konfirmation/
3 ∗ELI:    hmm
4 ∗OSC:    yeah con⌈firmation⌉
5 ∗JUL:    ⌊confirmation⌋
6 ∗ELI:    oh yeah confirmation
7 ∗JUL:    party thing
8 ∗ELI:    yeah
9 ∗OSC:    mh
10 ∗JUL:   and the guy had chosen wine that was like twelve thirteen per cent
```

excerpt 1i, confirmation

In lines 1-2, Julia engages in a word-search, initiating it by a hesitation marker *ehm*, followed by a partial candidate word *conf*, which she quickly deems wrong, cutting off the word to produce the explicit marker *what is it called*, looking at Elizabet and providing the Danish term, *konfirmation*. However, even though she is being directly invited to join the word-search, Elizabet replies only with a hesitation marker *hmm*, presumably displaying that she does not know the word in English, although not showing a lack of understanding of this Danish word. In the following line 4, Oscar then utters *yeah confirmation*, followed by Julia's repeating this candidate word, *confirmation*. To this, Elizabet also offers an approval, *oh yeah confirmation*, followed by Julia's further specifying *party thing*, line 7, which both Elizabet and Oscar approve of, *yeah* and *mh*. Arguably, Julia extended an invitation for Elizabet to join the word-search, knowing that she is competent in Danish, by shifting her gaze towards her while uttering the trouble source word in Danish. Again, the two words *konfirmation* in Danish and *confirmation* in English are very similar, and Julia

already produced part of the English word before expressing trouble with it, in line 2. Perhaps for these reasons Oscar, who does not consider himself competent in Danish, is able to produce a turn in which he offers a candidate word, while displaying that he understands Julia's transfer word from Danish. This transfer word is tricky, since *confirmation* in Denmark is a common ritual that does not necessarily translate to other countries and cultures, and after both Elizabet and Oscar display understanding and approval of the word *confirmation* in place of *konfirmation*, Julia adds the explanatory *party thing*, making sure the correct meaning comes across. Whether or not the word *confirmation* is actually correct or not is less important, since both Elizabet and Oscar display understanding of the word, it is deemed the right solution for the search.

Not always is the candidate solution accepted fully, although understanding seems established, as in this example:

```
1 *LAR:    another place could be eh- we got some eh the latest ehhh what do
2          you say (1.4) ehm (2.6) what do you call that eh
3 *HEL:    hvad hedder det på dansk
           what is it called in Danish
4          (0.4)
5 *LAR:    ehh livsstilsmesse life styles (0.9) eh
           ehh life style convention life styles (0.9) eh
6 *SOF:    convention
7 *LAR:    eh
8 *SRE:    yeah it's
9 *SOF:    convention
10 *HEL:   life style
11 *LAR:   yeah life styles
12 *HEL:   fair
13 *LAR:   the the the
14 *SOF:   ((nods))
15 *LAR:   the biggest place we're going to have with lifestyles in Denmark is
16         (0.7) something about eh Roskilde eh Ledreborg lifestyles place is a
17         place where about sixty thousand people is coming in three and four
18         days (0.9) eh also a (1.5) more different place to try something
19 *HEL:   Ledreborg
20 *LAR:   Ledreborg ja could also be something yeah
```

excerpt 2f, life styles

Lars is struggling to produce his utterance almost throughout lines 1-2, changing the course of his utterance, producing hesitation markers and pauses, as well as two explicit markers, *what do you say* and *what do you call that*. None of this make the other participants offer candidate solutions, possibly due a lack of understanding what Lars is trying to say. However, Helge still engages in the word-search through a code-switch to Danish, *hvad hedder det på dansk (what is it called in Danish)*, line 3. Similarly to excerpt 1h, nice tables, the Danish term for the missing word is

produced by the initial speaker, although not immediately, displaying a general uncertainty about the what he is trying to say, rather than specifically exposing a void in his English vocabulary. When after a brief hesitation marker *ehh*, Lars produces the Danish word *livsstilsmesse*, he immediately repeats the beginning part of the compound word translated to English, *life styles*, line 5. This is followed by a pause and a hesitation marker, seemingly not being able to find the latter part of the word. The candidate solution *convention*, which is offered by Sofus, line 6, receives neither explicit reject nor acceptance from Lars, although Søren approvingly joins in with *yeah it's*, followed by Sofus' second attempt at providing the candidate solution, *convention*. However, both Helge and Lars return to the beginning part of the trouble source word in lines 10 and 11, *life style*, *yeah life styles*, with Helge offering *fair* as the final part of the word. While Lars begins his next turn, stretching from lines 13-18, Sofus nods, as if accepting the word *fair* as correct, admitting the candidate solution *convention* as rejected. However, *fair* is not accepted by Lars either; perhaps due to uncertainty in what is considered correct, he opts for *place*, which he uses in lines 15, 16, and 18, in the context of *lifestyles place*. As such, the interaction continues even with no suitable word being agreed on, and although it would appear that mutual understanding is established, Lars' opinion and his interaction with Helge arguably carries more weight than Sofus and Søren's contributions to the search.

5.3.3 Code-switch and repair operations

Not only forward-oriented, but also backward-oriented repair operations employ the use of code-switch to repair troubles in interaction, as in this excerpt:

```
1 *MAL:    den er godt nok langsom til at loade det hva
           it sure is loading slowly huh
2          (2.9)
3 *JUL:    ja
           yes
4          (29.6)
5          ((AND arrives))
6 *AND:    what if we had like a ehm like a eh halfway faded background
7 *MAL:      [halfway faded]
8 *AND:    [of sustainable mari]na
9 *MAL:    so [on]
10 *AND:     [on the] flowchart
11         (1.7)
12 *MAL:   øh hvad
           eh what
13 *AND:   sådan lidt ((hand movement)) faded baggrund
```

```
           kind of like                faded background
14 *MAL:   nårh ja ja let's do that
           oh yeah sure
15 *AND:   ((laughs)) ja ja
                     yeah sure
```

excerpt 1j, faded background

The interaction in lines 1-2 is conducted in Danish, however, when Anders arrives, he talks to his group members in English; this medium is adapted by Malou as well, and she and Anders carry out an interaction in English in lines 6-10, where seemingly, Malou is struggling to understand what Anders means by *halfway faded background*. After a pause, line 11, rather than attempting to carry out a repair operation still in English, Malou switches back to Danish with the open class initiator *øh hvad (eh what)*. When Anders replies, also in Danish, his utterance *sådan lidt faded baggrund (kind of like faded background)* is accompanied by a hand movement and prompts Malou to accept this repair solution, *nårh ja ja let's do that (oh yeah sure let's do that)*. Through ending her turn in English, she arguably signals that the conversation may return to English, as it originally was when Anders returned, and the Danish was for repairing her trouble in understanding Anders in English. His reply, *ja ja*, appears to mimic Malou's speech and is then not an actual switch back to Danish, which remains, for now, a means for repairing trouble in an otherwise English-medium conversation.

In groups 1 and 2, there are several examples of native speakers of Danish inserting transfer words in Danish in their otherwise English-medium utterances. This action is often treated as a trouble and immediately repaired within the same turn:

```
1 *MAL:    ja so it's not loading øh you gotta do it yourself ((laughs))
2 *JUL:    i'm gonna try
3 *MAL:    it's [literally just stopped]
4 *JUL:         [wait because I found a] way to do this but [I cannot]
5 *MAL:                                                     [yeah but that's]
6          /dumt/ that's stupid
7 *JUL:    yeah that's [okay]
```

excerpt 1k, that's dumt

The interaction between Malou and Julia is in English, apart from one transfer word from Danish, *dumt*, produced by Malou in line 6. Malou immediately, with no initiation marker, performs a self-repair, repeating a translation of the final part of her utterance, correcting *that's dumt* to *that's stupid*. This small obstruction in her speech is not oriented to by Julia, and the interaction continues in English. A similarly constructed self-repair operation is found in group 2:

```
1 *LAR:    how how many can can you put out in on one time
2 *HEL:    six
3 *LAR:    six players
4 *HEL:    yeah
5 *LAR:    okay
6 *HEL:    so but like in a in a competition like the [competition] three
7          hundred and twenty four
8 *LAR:    yeah
9 *HEL:    participants in one ?grand race? (0.3) so with qualification ehh
10         three hundred and twenty four human players start up the tournament
11         and eh four of each in in in in each race of six person goes to the
12         next race so in eight finals you will have two hundred and sixteen
13         then three of them goes to the quarter/finale/ (0.5) quarterfinals
14         which is one hundred and eight and then two to the semi-finals thirty
15         six and then one to the final which is six people
16 *LAR:   okay
```

excerpt 2g, quarterfinale

Helge produces a rather long utterance in lines 9-15, in line 13 producing a Danish/English hybrid word, *quarterfinale*. The full Danish term for this would be *kvartfinale*, while the English term is *quarterfinals*. These words closely resemble one another, and perhaps it cannot be deemed a full transfer, since only the latter part of the word, finale, is transferred from Danish. However, Helge orients to this partial transfer as a trouble source, in pausing and producing the repair *quarterfinals*, line 13, before continuing his turn. This self-initiated self-repair is minimal and not responded to by the remaining participants, and the meaning is assumed to come across. The similarity of the two words *finale* and *finals* might make repairing the transfer seem redundant, however, Helge chooses to repair it, perhaps just on account of wanting to stay within the medium of English, or wanting everyone present to understand.

However, transfer words are not always repaired; further on in the meeting it is seen how an unrepaired transfer word from Danish causes obstruction to the interaction and a participant's understanding:

```
1 *SOF:    so that also means we can put more stuff in it
2 *LAR:    ja
3 *SOF:    we don't make it
4 *HEL:    yeah yeah and we can make this cowboy fa- facade
5 *AAR:    and we can paint it [trackattack]
6 *LAR:    ah not paint it we can decorate with eh /folie/ not ⌈paint it⌉
7 *AAR:                                                       ⌊okay folie⌋
8 *LAR:    that's too expensive we do it the same way when we do the race cars
9 *AAR:    it's nice ⌈knowing that we⌉
10 *HEL:                ⌊yeah folio⌋
11 *LAR:   we we don't paint it that costs a lot of ⌈money⌉
12 *AAR:                                          ⌊yeah I'm⌋ just asking what we
13 *LAR:   just put some folie on it instead
14 *SOF:   ⌈ja⌉
```

```
15 *JAK:   [may]be stickers in case we want to write [trackattack]
16         (0.8)
17 *LAR:   [what]
18 *HEL:   [folio]
19 *JAK:   stickers
20 *SOF:   no no fo[lie]
21 *LAR:          [we're] going to
22 *SOF:   we use it
23 *LAR:   we use [folie]
24 *HEL:           [like] like when you decorate a taxi
25 *LAR:   yeah
26 *JAK:   ah okay
27 *SOF:   ((nods))
28 *HEL:   that's folio
29 *SOF:   alright ehm
30 *HEL:   folio decoration of container
```

excerpt 2h, folie

In this interaction, Lars uses the Danish transfer word *folie* (which could be translated to *foil* in English) line 6, to explain how to decorate cars. This is seemingly understood by the Danish speaking participants; Aaron's okay *folie*, line 7, Helge's *yeah folio*, line 10, and Sofus' *ja*, line 14, reads as continuation markers, displaying them understanding what Lars is saying. However, this is seemingly not the case for all participants: in line 15, Jakobs' suggestion *maybe stickers in case we want to write [trackattack]* shows that he does not understand the meaning of the word *folie*. His utterance is evidently a product of his trouble to understand the previous turns, but it is treated as a lexical trouble source by the participants speaking in the following lines, Lars' *what*, Helge's *folio*, and Sofus' *no no folie* as a reply to Jakobs repeating the word *stickers*, show how in this interaction, *folie* or *folio* is agreed upon as the correct word, while *stickers* is dispreferred by a majority of participants and is treated as repairable. After listening to the others' explanation, Jakobs displays agreement that this initial word *folie* is more correct, line 26, *ah okay*. Transfer words can also, however, remain unrepaired with less consequences:

```
1 *SEB:    it's related but what is their [main goal]
2 *JOH:    [but is it] related to this case
3 *MAG:    yeah but it's one of the main goals
4 *BLA:    there's no one relevant
5 *MAG:    there's a lot of different goals
6 *BLA:    there's a lot of them
7 *SEB:    but what Klaus says is he wants us to comment it on employment rates
8          so on and so forth and I think sometimes instead of just looking at
9          the theory in a book and saying okay these two things relate
10         (0.4) /eller/ okay why would the government take this d- make this
11         decision these are all the reasons (0.8) if if I was working with
12         this project in the government would I be like we're gonna do this
13         to solve inflation or would we do this because of something else
```

excerpt 3d, eller

Sebastian's insertion of the transfer word *eller (or)*, line 10, is not explicitly oriented to by him or any other participants. Unlike the previous example *folie*, understanding the conjunction *eller* is not fatal for understanding Sebastian's utterance; perhaps for this reason, it not oriented to. Further, it has been suggested by Nyroos et al. that a code-switch in this context can be a means of signalling that the speaker is engaged in a solitary repair- or search-operation, not wanting other speakers to participate (Nyroos et al., 2017: 13). It is argued that the code-switched conjunction buys time for the speaker, while using the conjunction *or* in English would misleadingly display to other participants that the speaker is inviting them to join a word-search. As such, while not broadly observed in this data set, transfer words can be a part of a strategy to convey on-going processes rather than just the meaning of the words.

5.3.4 Summary of code-switch

The analysis of code-switch has shown this to be a method of reaching meaning, either turning to code-switching in order to repair a trouble, or employed as a means of searching for a word. Through the means of code-switching as a problem-solving strategy, breakdown of the interaction is avoided, however, it does come with consequences. That is, in some instances code-switches or even single transfer words result in speakers not sharing the switched-to language being excluded by not being able to understand the interaction, as in 2h, folie. Perhaps due to an orientation towards this, transfer words are often, albeit not always, treated as trouble sources and immediately repaired to English, although sometimes, there are full code-switches to Danish even with non-Danish speakers present, primarily in group 1. Groups 7 and 4 have a majority of group members sharing a language, Spanish and Hungarian respectively, but apart from one switch at the beginning of group 7's meeting, no transfer words or switches to these native languages were found. This is different in groups 1 and 2, where a majority of members are native speakers of Danish. Here, transfer words and code-switches are common, and often, but not always, treated as repairable. As such, the following characteristics make themselves clear on the aspect of code-switches:

(i) code-switch does not occur in all groups with speakers sharing native language
(ii) code-switch most often includes the local language, Danish
(iii) transfer words are often, but not always, treated as repairable
(iv) code-switching can be used as a means word-search operations

(v) change of participant constellation can result in change of code

5.4 Findings from analysis

Based on the above analysis of repair, word-searches, and code-switches, the following characteristics of the ELF-interactions have been found:

(i) low orientation towards formal structure, high orientation towards meaning
(ii) pronunciation issues as a prevalent trouble source
(iii) preference for self-repair, but other-repair does occur
(iv) repair operations mostly result in low degree of disturbance
(v) troubles are usually addressed immediately, that being by oneself or others
(vi) solitary word-searches are commonplace in the interaction
(vii) collaborative word-searches, or co-constructions of meaning, are frequent
(viii) embodied gestures are consistently employed in word-searches
(ix) the trouble source word does not need to be found for the operation to be successful
(x) code-switch does not occur in all groups with speakers sharing native language
(xi) code-switch most often includes the local language, Danish
(xii) transfer words are often, but not always, treated as repairable
(xiii) code-switching can be used in word-search operations
(xiv) change of participant constellation can result in change of code

Through these characteristics of the interaction, various notions on the role of linguistic competence in the interactions can be inferred. Self-repair and word-search strategies, which are richly employed, display a high orientation towards the students' own linguistic competence; that is, proactive and retrospect corrections of one's own speech display an orientation towards whether or not the speech is intelligible for its recipients, which is seemingly the main goal for the participants. Following, the participants' readiness to engage in word-searches, and by this means co-create meaning, further suggests a high orientation towards linguistic competence of not just oneself, but of other participants as well. Arguably, providing candidate solutions to a word-search shows that not only has the initial speaker managed to make clear that they are engaged in a word-search, they also have made the meaning of their phrase evident, even with the word itself not being readily available in their English vocabulary. Displaying a void in one's vocabulary does not result in

losing face for the participants, just like providing a rejected candidate word is not a fatal act for the success of the operation. Rather, such instances result in a negotiation of meaning, which is completed in collaboration by several participants; thus, intelligibility is not an individual responsibility, but a collective achievement.

Similarly, other-initiated or other-repair operations based on linguistic issues do not cause overt disturbance or breakdown of the conversation, nor are they treated as problematic. Contrastingly, these repair operations are quick, and often explicit markers are used, like *as what* (e.g. 6b, themes), or even with open class initiators such as *what* (e.g. 7b, they are really long), the trouble source is directly addressed. This again suggests a high degree of orientation towards intelligibility and mutual understanding, while not drawing explicit attention towards wrongly produced speech, focusing on solving the trouble rather than highlighting it as incorrect (e.g. 5c, substract). To this follows that grammar or lexicon are made less problematic aspects of communication, while pronunciation is more often subjected to negotiation before the meaning becomes evident; this is the case in both backward- and forward-oriented repair scenarios, sometimes with discrepancy with whether or not a nonstandard pronunciation should be treated as problematic or made normal (e.g. 6e, charter). Further, embodied actions such as hand gestures are an important resource for meaning-making, namely in word-search sequences, where the hand gesture can help visualise a missing word (e.g. 5d, template). With this in mind, it can be stated that there is a clear focus on meaning over form in the interaction; nonstandard use of grammar, which is less consequential for intelligibility is ignored through the letting it pass strategy, while troubles of hearing or understanding nonstandard pronunciation-speech are readily addressed, with gaining access to the meaning of the word(s) as the main goal. Certain scenarios may make a speaker more focused on form for the sake of making sure they are understood (e.g. 3a, too less), while occurrences of failing to be understood can also result in higher awareness towards own production of speech (e.g. 6a, pragmatic). Sometimes, candidate solutions are rejected, or candidate words are not found, resulting in longer explanations or settling on general terms as substitutes for the missing word, still with a satisfactory outcome of ensuring collective understanding (e.g. 1c, they have that everywhere). Regardless, the interaction does not continue before a sense of common understanding is established, which appears more important than reaching a satisfactory, correct word in English.

On the topic of switching between languages, this is done based on an assessment of others' competence, and thereby, linguistic competence plays an important role in choosing which

language to speak. However, in many cases, the local language Danish is used even in situations with non-Danish speakers present, so in some cases, this awareness towards competence is diminished. In cases of Danish transfer words in otherwise English-medium speech, they can be treated as repairables (e.g. 1k, that's dumt) and further, these do cause disturbance if not repaired (e.g. 2h, folie). Further, making use of Danish is often a means in resolving other troubles; in can be employed to complete word-searches, with speakers arguably assessing their own or others' competence in English to be less than sufficient for this specific forward-oriented repair operation to succeed, sometimes with the outcome that non-Danish speakers are also able to understand the utterance (e.g. 1i, confirmation). Further, they can function not a repairable but a signal towards other participants that a solitary word-search is taking place (e.g. 3d, eller). As such, the role of linguistic competence in the local language Danish is not insignificant, and the practices surrounding transfer words or switches vary widely. In English, though, the concept of NS competence seems to have little impact for the participants, with deviations from native-like language use being fully accepted, and NSs also being subjected to linguistic repair operations of for example pronunciation (e.g. 6d, etcetera). As such, while linguistic competence plays an important role in the interactions, native-like linguistic competence in English is not distinctively relevant, neither for the native-speakers themselves nor for the remaining participants. Rather, throughout the data set, linguistic competence in the sense of being able to readily co-construct and renegotiate meaning appears invaluable in the ELF-interactions.

6. DISCUSSION

This section contains a discussion of the above analysis results, drawing on additional research on ELF-interactions and linguistic competence as to reflect on and solidify my findings. With the above established findings of the present study in mind, these additional research perspectives will then be compared and considered, providing different perspectives in order to ultimately form a conclusion on the role of linguistic competence in ELF-group work.

6.1 ELF-interactions and the matter of (mis)understanding

The overall results from the above analysis, that not only linguistic competence, but also competence to readily co-construct and negotiate meaning in interaction is an invaluable asset in ELF-scenarios resonates well with previous research on ELF-interactions. As introduced in section 2.3, Björkman has found that communication strategies are employed to pre-empt and resolve misunderstandings; an observation which is undoubtedly supported by the analysis of this present study (Björkman, 2017: 115). Therefore, the observation that the proactive and retrospective work employed by speakers to prevent misunderstandings can be seen as a characteristic of ELF-usage holds true for the data in the present study as well as in various other studies referred to by Björkman (Björkman, 2011: 952, 951). She argues that this interactional behaviour suggests a preparedness for potential disturbance in the communication, which leads to a heightened awareness and mutual cooperativeness for the participants (Björkman, 2011: 952). This then contrasts previous, not to say dated, work on NS-NNS interactions, for example Varonis and Gass' rather dramatic perception that "NSs and NNSs are multiply handicapped in conversations with one another" (Varonis & Gass, 1985: 340). Here, the concept of NS-NNS interaction appears distinct from ELF-interaction, but in accordance with the conceptualisation used in the present paper, (that is, ELF as a use of English in a scenario where speakers have different native languages, using English as their chosen shared medium of communication), ELF-interactions include NS-NNS as well. It is therefore possible to conceive that while ELF-interactions are broadly characterised by a desire to pre-empt misunderstandings, they have also, at one point, been viewed as characterised by misunderstandings.

Pre-empting misunderstandings then remains a focus point in various studies, with active negotiation and use of strategies such as repetition and paraphrasing highlighted as means to avoid

breakdowns of the interaction (Kaur, 2009: 119). As such, formal correctness is found to be less important than functional effectiveness, with orientations towards form limited to instances in which the intelligibility may be comprised, again in line with the findings of this present study (Kaur, 2011: 2713). However, this *avoidance of misunderstandings/occurrence of misunderstandings* binary may be more nuanced than the mentioned studies concede. Arguably, it is relevant to consider not only what is *avoided* but rather, what is *pursued* in ELF-interactions, since the notion of pre-empting misunderstandings comprises the ideology of ELF-interactions as fundamentally prone to misunderstandings. To a certain extent this stands in contrast to Firth's notion that ELF-speakers adopt the position that their speech is normal, and as noted in the analysis, 'letting it pass' and 'making it normal' are strategies richly employed by the participants, thereby not assuming that their speech is abnormal or misunderstanding-prone as default (Firth, 1996: 256). Further, House takes on a perspective that finds ELF-interactants to employ the pragmatic strategy of reinterpreting discourse markers, through this means expressing intersubjectivity and connectivity (House, 2013: 65). Subjectivity, a speaker's ability to present themselves as a subject through language and expressing attitudes, beliefs, or assessments, is considered in close relationship with its recipient, that is, intersubjectivity (House, 2013: 57-58). This may be expressed in interaction through the use of certain lexical features; for example the interpersonal, other-oriented marker *you know* is found to be richly employed in ELF-interactions, where it also functions as a coherence-marker, and similarly, the discovered frequent use of *yes/yeah* markers serves as a sign of self-presentational display (House, 2013: 58; 59-60). These are examples of self-supporting strategies that display ELF-interactants' paying close attention to their utterances; through re-interpretation of discourse markers in interaction, interactants display pragmatic competence and achieve avoidance of breakdown in interaction (House, 2013: 60; 65). This stance then highlights the pursuit of established intersubjectivity in interaction as essentially pursued in interaction. Notably, the analysis in the present study ultimately does not concede that breakdowns or misunderstandings in interaction are constantly lurking, nor do the participants orient to that idea; however, it is noted how certain scenarios heightens participants' orientation towards expressing themselves and thus their own linguistic competence as it comes across (3a, too less; 6a, pragmatic).

Further, the preference for intersubjectivity is, along with the preference for progressivity, a fundamental principle in conversation (Mondada, 2011: 544). Mondada argues that these two principles are central to understanding, with a prevalence for securing intersubjectivity over

progressivity (ibid.). Understanding is not to be understood as a mental process, but as related to the next action achieved by an interactant, such as a display of understanding by way of either producing a continuer or initiating a repair, orienting to progressivity or intersubjectivity, respectively (Mondada, 2011: 543-544). Expressions of understanding may be linguistic or embodied, and through a variety of different strategies, understanding may be established as a collective achievement in interaction which is publicly available (Mondada, 2011: 545; 550). House and Mondada's arguments on the expressions of intersubjectivity and understanding in interaction may be relatable to the role of linguistic competence for the participants. That is, the employed pragmatic strategies that lead to the situated, locally-managed and collective *achievement of understanding*, which includes securing intersubjectivity and progressivity, can be considered a vital characteristic of successful ELF-interaction, as opposed to an *avoidance of misunderstanding*. This perspective correlates with the findings of the present study, in which participants continuously conduct interactional work that secures understanding, displaying a high degree of awareness of their own speech being intelligible, and furthermore, valuing intersubjectivity over progressivity.

Another point that could be added to Varoni and Gass' notion that misunderstanding is an overt feature is their argument that interactions are not only complicated by the linguistic aspect of the interaction, but also different cultural backgrounds and world-views (Varonis & Gass, 1985: 340-341). These external categories must arguably be excluded in a CA study, in that social categories such as culture must make themselves relevant in interaction in order to receive attention. No such observations have been made in the present study, and these can therefore not be considered obstructive for linguistic competence and intelligibility, with the argument that culture and language are not necessarily interconnected. However, as argued by Kappa, interactionally external features such as setting and power relations should be considered when claiming that ELF-interactions are generally characterised by solidarity and consensus (Kappa, 2016: 30). She contests this view based on the fact that a lack of divergence cannot be ascribed to linguistic ability alone, but also to the fact that an institutional setting with an explicit institutional goal for the interactants may motivate an avoidance of orientation to divergence, which may not be found in informal talk, as she explores in her article (ibid.). A similar position is explored by Heritage, stating that participants' roles and interrelations shape the interaction, while Vickers concedes that particular participants' contributions have more impact and shape the group's constructed reality more than others' (Heritage, 2013: 3; Vickers, 2010: 118-119). Considering this in the context of the present analysis,

it is notable that laughter is continuously employed as a means of reaching intersubjectivity in group 1 (e.g. 1e, preliminary; 1b, eutrophication), while in group 2, there is a tendency towards certain participants' perceptions and inputs carrying more weight than others' (e.g. 2f, life styles; 2h, folie). In group 1, the external factors of the participants having a closer personal relation becomes relevant for the interaction, while in group 2, it may be noted that Lars and Helge, who act as more influential than the rest of the participants are NS of Danish, are older than the remaining participants, and namely that Lars is a representative from the project group's business partner; these are categories that may play a role in their positioning themselves as more authoritative in the meeting. In the remaining groups 3-7, interrelational roles are not conceivable to the same degree, but it is clearly exemplified how roles and relations cannot be downplayed when it comes to characterising interactions and employed pragmatic strategies. As such, it is further conceivable that the institutional setting may interfere, resulting in a higher degree of consensus, as suggested by Kappa. Bearing this in mind, the participants may be said to have a heightened focus on establishing understanding due to their relations, a common institutional goal, and an awareness towards linguistic competence and securing intersubjectivity.

6.2 Native speakers, non-native speakers, and linguistic competence

Arguably, in the assumption that ELF-interactions are inherently complicated and full of misunderstandings lies the ideology that NSs of English are more competent. While such an assumption may not be misguided in terms of formal linguistic features, the idealisation of the native speaker can have a negative impact on speakers in ELF-scenarios. Hodgson highlights the idealised conception of NSs as damaging for NNSs' self-image, leading to linguistic insecurity (Hodgson, 2014: 116). However, it is stated how a greater exposure to interactions with non-native speakers result in a reluctance to claim NS norms as the definitive goal, and a banishment of the term 'native speaker' is suggested (Hodgson, 2014: 118; 130). That is, actually experiencing ELF-interactions increases positive attitudes towards NNS-English, and as observed in the data set a glorification of NS-competence is not present in the ELF-interactions. It is further debated whether the NS can be said to function as an expert versus the NNS as novice in NS-NNS interactions (or ELF-interactions including NS); Vickers explains how this view is challenged through actual examinations of such interactions (Vickers, 2010: 117). This is again supported in the present study, where the NS is not positioned as an expert in ELF-medium group work, in correspondence with

Vickers' conception that these categories are locally managed and not tied to native/non-native categories (ibid.). That is, while aspects of the analysis may find locally created expert/novice roles, these are not related to the participants' status as NSs or NNSs. The issue of expert-novice is then, as previously suggested, perhaps tied to competence in the local language rather than to the ideology of NS-competence in English as superior.

The question of expert-novice positioning echoes the question of an ownership ideology; as presented by Jenkins, NSs and NNSs alike share the perception that native speakers are owners of the English language (Jenkins, 2011; 933). This controversial perception is disputed not only in the analysis of data in the present study, where NSs are found to be subjected to other-initiations of repair and other-repair and do not function as experts, but also in reference to chapter 2 in this paper, where the validity of ELF-interactants' competence was established. However, in the context of ELF-interactions, Jenkins in fact suggests that there is a reversal of the expert-novice roles, in that NSs are allegedly less effective than NNSs in these scenarios (Jenkins, 2011: 934). For this reason, she argues, ELF essentially functions as an additional language for native speakers to learn; through this argument self-contradicting an earlier section of her article where it is stated that ELF cannot be reified and considered a variety of English (Jenkins, 2011: 934; 931). Again, considering ELF a *variety* of English is inherently problematic, and an incorrect way of viewing what should be characterised a complex language *use*. Therefore, Mauranen et al.'s notion that successful ELF use demands certain new *skills* for speakers, that being NSs or NNSs, is to be considered a more accurate definition (Mauranen et al., 2010: 189). That is, as examined in the present analysis and further supported in this chapter 6, the ability to employ pragmatic strategies in interaction, that being through embodied as well as different linguistic means, is essential in ELF-interactions. Certainly, this is a set of skills separate from understanding a language's systemic potential, and therefore something that NNSs as well as NSs of English must acquire. There is no observable difference in this ability between NSs and NNSs in the data; NSs are either equally as able as NNSs to employ these pragmatic strategies, or they acquired that ability through exposure to ELF-interactions on account of living and studying in Denmark, or both.

Another aspect of linguistic competence that must be considered is that of competence in the local language, Danish in the case of the present study. This has been examined in business contexts, for example by Angouri and Miglbauer, who find that even in companies with an established English language policy, language choice is constantly negotiated, leading to a reality characterised by an

interplay between lingua franca use and local languages, although English remains the main language in business activities (Angouri & Miglbauer, 2014: 165). Further, Lønsmann has found how competence in the corporate language as well as the local language is important, in that a lack of competence in either language can lead to processes of exclusion (Lønsmann, 2014: 112). As found in the present study, participants with little or no competence in Danish can be exposed to misunderstanding an utterance, or not being included or addressed to the same extent as the native Danish speakers of the group due to use of Danish. In this regard, not only linguistic competence in English, but also in the local language, makes itself interactionally relevant in ELF-scenarios. However, the use of additional languages in ELF-settings it not deemed exclusively problematic; Mortensen argues that there are benefits to integrating the local language into international education, rather than solely relying on English (Mortensen, 2014: 438). Contradictory to Lønsmann's conclusion, he finds that the exclusive use of English as opposed to the local language leads to a long-term exclusion, in that the local language is never acquired, and as such, engaging in local society is made difficult (Mortensen, 2014: 437). Much like some of the groups in the present study, Mortensen finds that student groups' linguistic practices often involve code-switches to the local language, which does not correspond with the English-only language policy (Mortensen, 2014: 438). Rather than supporting a theoretical language policy that is not carried out in practice, it is suggested that language choice should not be a matter of *either* the local language *or* English, but rather, that language policies are conducted from below and may even be person-dependent (Mortensen, 2014: 438). In the present study, it is briefly observed that Danish words may be understood by non-native speakers of Danish, and further, there is a broad tendency to perform code-switches to the local language, whereas groups with a majority of participants speaking Hungarian or Spanish do not employ that same practice. Arguably, this suggests that non-native speakers of Danish are able to understand some Danish, while simultaneously, the fact that participants are lacking local language competence does lead to momentary exclusion, as practices do not reflect the linguistic abilities of all participants present. Rather than forcing English-only policies, it may therefore be beneficial to model language strategies after the actually employed practices; that is, introducing the local language to non-speakers of Danish, aiming for long-term inclusion, as is implied in Mortensen's study (Mortensen, 2014: 438). Certainly, there is little reason to adopt the position that it is a question of either English *or* Danish, conceding that in transient multilingual communities, language choice will be under constant renegotiation, as argued by Mortensen (Mortensen, 2014: 438-439). It may even be said, as by Angouri and Miglbauer, that

the notion of multilingualism as the coexistence of self-contained linguistic systems that are to be switched between is reductive (Angouri & Miglbauer, 2014: 152). This is stated with reference to Auer, who further remarks how such a view "is of course part and parcel of the nation-state language ideology, which dominated (…) when linguistics established itself as a discipline" (Auer, 2007: 320 in Angouri & Miglbauer, 2014: 152). With these perceptions in mind, a traditional view on language, as was mentioned earlier in the context of speech-communities as entities with shared cultural and linguistic norms, can readily be deemed non-applicable to the current reality, which arguably calls for flexibility and fluidity rather than fixed definitions and policies.

7. CONLUDING REMARKS

The field of ELF-research currently contains many different perspectives, some of which have been disclosed in the present study. It has been established that ELF cannot be reified and treated as a separate language, but rather, the notion describes a use of the English language between speakers of different native languages. In institutions of higher education, in Denmark as well as in other countries, English-medium communication is common, and group work will therefore be conducted by ELF. As was concluded based on an examination of the term linguistic competence, section 2.1, being competent in a language includes social competence. Following, it has been found through the analysis that linguistic competence plays a significant role; however, linguistic competence in the sense of adhering to standard forms of grammar, pronunciation, and lexicon was not found to be essential. Rather, the ability to readily negotiate utterances, co-creating meaning in situ, is a vital competence for ELF-users. In the present study, participants were found to possess this ability, skilfully navigating self- and other-repair operations, displaying a high degree of awareness towards their own' and others' production of utterances. This observation does not only hold true for the present study, but is certainly supported by existing research, which has come to similar conclusions. Additionally, displaying a void in one's vocabulary through initiating word-searches is not treated as a problematic, rather, it works as a means to ensure progressivity and express meaning, that being by oneself or in co-operation with others. Here, it is further evident that participants display a high degree of awareness towards whether the speaker requires candidate solutions or approval in their search, which can be expressed through different means. The retrospective and proactive strategies of repair and word-searches are then found to display a high degree of awareness towards linguistic competence, with participants prioritising meaning over form. As such, linguistic means ranging from short hesitation markers, to longer explicit markers, and embodied actions such as hand gestures and gaze are all richly employed as part of the participants' pragmatic strategies for making meaning, which is oriented to as the ultimate goal, with reaching linguistic correctness as secondary.

The conducted method of investigation, CA, ensured close examination of actual practices as they are occurring in Danish-based, English-medium group work. This qualitative method has then provided insight into the role linguistic competence can play for students in this context. Corresponding to existing research, it is likely that the observations made in the study are transferable to other similar contexts, bearing in mind than even within the data set, there are

variations, in that each group makes up its own interactional unit, continuously constructing their own reality. That being said, through the analysis and consideration of additional research, it is conceived that pragmatic strategies for communication is a necessary skill for ELF-interactions. The pragmatic strategies employed and their outcome will vary based on the participant constellation and participants' interrelations; for instance, laughter may be an appropriate means to use in constellations characterised by familiarity, while other constellations will mean that some participants have more impact than others due to formal roles. The pragmatic strategies that ensure consensus in the interactions may be a product of the setting's institutional character, but nonetheless, consensus is overall reached through these pragmatic strategies which display a high degree of orientation towards linguistic competence.

Code-switching is further a strategy often used in the interactions, either addressing a shift in participant constellation, or as a means to repair a forward- or backward-oriented trouble in the interaction. This requires on-going assessment of the recipients' linguistic abilities, and does sometimes lead to exclusion of speakers who do not share the language. Notably, these switches are prone to occur in constellations where several speakers share the local language, and though there are exceptions, participants not being competent in the local language will then miss out on parts of the interaction. Following, participants who are competent in English as well as the local language are at an advantage, for which reason it may be beneficial to consider implementing the local language into non-Danish students' education, as to create a long-term inclusion in Danish society. Contrastingly, it is noted throughout the study that NSs of English are not positioned as more competent, and that NNSs are not considered less competent as default. Rather, the position of NNS-speech as normal is accepted, although there is a high focus on securing mutual understanding and intersubjectivity in the interactions. However, this achievement is not a product of the individual's flawless linguistic ability, but rather, the participants' interactional competence becomes an essential part of their linguistic competence. Through this, participants are able to collectively negotiate language use and reach shared meaning in situ, and as such, the role of linguistic competence in ELF-settings is undeniably significant. Echoing Seidlhofer's observation that ELF-usage calls for a reconceptualization of variety, community, and competence, ELF-linguistic competence is removed from the view of languages as separate entities (Seidlhofer, 2011: 91). Rather, it succeeds in creating a mode of interaction which is characterised by a high degree of flexibility and awareness towards securing collective understanding.

References

Andersen, H. L. (2010). Hvordan kan man undervise på engelsk på danske universiteter? *Information*. Retrieved from: https://www.information.dk/debat/2010/01/hvordan-kan-undervise-paa-engelsk-paa-danske-universiteter

Angouri, J. & Miglbauer, M. (2014). 'And then we summarise in English for the others': The lived experience of the multilingual workplace. *Multilingua*, 33 (1-2). Pp. 147-172.

Antaki, C. (2014). *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Auer, J. C. P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bloomfield, L. (1984). *Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Björkman, B. (2011). Pragmatic strategies in English as an academic lingua franca: Ways of achieving communicative effectiveness? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43. Pp. 950-964.

Björkman, B. (2017). PhD supervision meetings in an English as a lingua franca (ELF) setting: linguistic competence and content knowledge as neutralizers of institutional and academic power. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 6 (1). Pp. 111-139.

Cazden, C. B. (1967). On individual differences in language competence and performance. *Journal of Special Education*, 1 (2). Pp. 135-150.

Cazden, C. B. (2011). Dell Hymes' construct of "communicative competence". *Antropology & Education*, 42 (4). Pp. 364-369.

Cook, G. (2003). *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coulon, A. (1995). *Ethnomethodology*. London: Sage Publications.

Day, D. & Kristiansen, E. D. (2018). Demonstrating and claiming competence in a language: Doing being better or worse than others. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 126. Pp. 90-105.

Denmark cuts students on English-language programmes. (2017, November 7). Retrieved from: https://www.thelocal.dk/20171107/denmark-cuts-students-on-english-language-programmes

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In: Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (eds), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 3-65.

Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (eds.) (2006). *Conversation Analysis, Volume 1*. London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: SAGE.

Ejsing, J. (2008). Studier kan nu gennemføres kun på engelsk. *Berlingske*. Retrieved from: https://www.b.dk/viden/studier-kan-nu-gennemfoeres-paa-kun-engelsk

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26. Pp. 237-259.

Fox, B., Thompson, S. A., Ford, C. E. & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2013). Conversation Analysis and Linguistics. In: Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*.

Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Pp. 726-740.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gnutzmann, C., Jakisch, J., & Rabe, F. (2014). English as a lingua franca: A source of identity for young Europeans? *Multilingua*, 33 (3-4). Pp. 437-457.

Gobo, G. (2008). Re-conceptualizing generalization: old issues in a new frame. In: Alasuutari, P., Bickman, L., & Brannen, J. (eds): *The SAGE Handbook of Social Research Methods*. Pp. 193-213.

Greer, T. (2013). Word search sequences in bilingual interaction: Codeswitching and embodied orientation toward shifting participant constellations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 57. Pp. 100-117.

Gumperz, J. J. & Hymes, D. (1986). *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Inc. Pp. 1-25.

Haberland, H. (2013). ELF and the bigger picture. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2 (1). Pp. 195-198.

Hansen, J. H. (2012). Ernæring på engelsk er en stor mundfuld. *Uniavisen*. Retrieved from: https://uniavisen.dk/ernaering-paa-engelsk-er-en-stor-mundfuld/

Have, P. t. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis* (2nd ed.). London; Los Angeles: SAGE.

Hazel, S. & Mortensen, J. (2013). Kitchen talk – Exploring linguistic practices in liminal institutional interactions in a multilingual university setting. In: Haberland, H., Lønsmann, D. & Preisler, B. (eds.), *Language Alternation, Language Choice and Language Encounter in International Tertiary Education*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. Pp. 3-30.

Hazel, S., & Svennevig, J. (2018). Multilingual workplaces – Interactional dynamics of the contemporary international workforce. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 126. Pp. 1-9.

Hellekjær, G. O. & Fairway, T. (2015). The mismatch between the unmet need for and supply of occupational English skills: an investigation of higher educated government staff in Norway. *Higher Education*, 70 (6). Pp. 1033-1050.

Heritage, J. (2013). Language and social institutions: The conversation analytic view. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, 36 (4). Pp. 2-27.

Hester, S., & Francis, D. (2001). Is institutional talk a phenomenon? Reflections on ethnomethodology and applied conversation analysis. In: McHoul, A., & Rapley, M. (eds.), *How to analyse talk in institutional settings: A casebook of methods*. London: Continuum. Pp. 206-218.

Hodgson, K. M. (2014). Mismatch: globalization and native speaker models of linguistic competence. *RELC Journal*, 45 (2). Pp. 113-134.

House, J. (2013). Developing pragmatic competence in English as a lingua franca: Using discourse markers to express (inter)subjectivity and connectivity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 59. Pp. 57-67.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In: Holmes, J., & Pride, J. P. (eds). *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin. Pp. 53-73.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2011). Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43. Pp. 926-936.

Kappa, K. (2016). Exploring solidarity and consensus in English as lingua franca interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 95. Pp. 16-33.

Kaur, J. (2009). Pre-Empting Problems of Understanding in English as a Lingua Franca. In: Mauranen, A. & Ranta, E. (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Pp. 107-125.

Kaur, J. (2011). Raising explicitness through self-repair in English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43. Pp. 2704-2715.

Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In: Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Pp. 229-256.

Lilja, N. (2014). Partial repetitions as other-initiations of repair in second language talk: Re-establishing understanding and doing learning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 71. Pp. 98-116.

Lønsmann, D. (2014). Linguistic diversity in the international workplace: Language ideologies and processes of exclusion. *Multilingua*, 33 (1-2). Pp. 89-116.

Mauranen, A., Hynninen, N. & Ranta, E. (2010). English as an academic lingua franca: The ELFA project. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29. Pp. 183-190.

Mondada, L. (2011). Understanding as an embodied, situated and sequential achievement in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43. Pp. 542-552.

Moore, E., Borràs, E. & Nussbaum, L. (2013). Plurilingual resources in lingua franca talk: An interactionist perspective. In: Haberland, H., Lønsmann, D. & Preisler, B. (eds.), *Language Alternation, Language Choice and Language Encounter in International Tertiary Education*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. Pp. 53-84.

Mortensen, J. (2013). Notes on English used as a lingua franca as an object of study. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2 (1). Pp. 25-46.

Mortensen, J. (2014). Language policy from below: language choice in student project groups in a multilingual university setting. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35 (4). Pp. 425-442.

Nyroos, L., Sandlund, E. & Sundqvist, P. (2017). Code-switched repair initiation: The case of Swedish *eller* in L2 English test interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 120. Pp 1-16.

Prcic, T. (2014). Building contact linguistic competence related to English as *the* nativized foreign language. *System*, 42. Pp. 143-154.

Radford, J. (2009). Word searches: on the use of verbal and non-verbal resources during classroom talk. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 23 (8). Pp. 598-610.

Rasmussen, D. M. (2018). Regeringen vil skære engelsksprogede uddannelser med over 1.000

studiepladser. *Uniavisen*. Retrieved from: https://uniavisen.dk/regeringen-vil-skaere-engelsksprogede-uddannelser-med-over-1-000-studiepladser/

Reichert, T. & Liebscher, G. (2012). Positioning the expert: Word searches, expertise, and learning opportunities in peer interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 96 (4). Pp. 599-609.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50 (4). Pp. 696-735.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organisation of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53 (2). Pp. 361-382.

Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The Ethnography of Communication: an Introduction* (3rd ed.). Malten, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Scarcella, R. C., Andersen, E. S. & Krashen, S. D. (1990). Developing communicative competence in a second language. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis: an Introduction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Tsuchiya, K. & Handford, M. (2014). A corpus-driven analysis of repair in a professional ELF meeting: Not 'letting it pass'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 64. Pp. 117-131.

Varonis, E. M. & Gass, S. M. (1985). Miscommunication in Native/Nonnative Conversation. *Language in Society*, 14 (3). Pp. 327-343.

Vickers, C. H. (2010). Language competence and the construction of expert-novice in NS-NNS interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42. Pp. 116-138.