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Abstract

When adult newcomers arrive in a new society, the new language encroaches immediately into their everyday lives. As a minimum, newcomers are *overhearers* of and *eavesdroppers* to spoken and written encounters in public life, education, at workplaces, or in the media. In daily life, there are ample daily opportunities for engaging with the language of the society which has a paramount presence in the daily life of newcomers even before they have acquired the nuts and bolts for using it actively. Language encounters ‘in the wild’ happen in an sometimes chaotic, sometimes repetitive environment, in fully embodied ways, in familiar and unfamiliar settings - all of which the newcomers constantly need to make sense of.

Compared to these experiences in their lifeworld, newcomers experience radically different opportunities for participation when seated in language classrooms, since the conditions for interacting are rather different. Classroom activities are usually well ordered, based on written material, and performed sitting at tables.

This chapter discusses theories to understand and practices to support the use of second languages outside of classrooms and to bring the experiences back into the classroom to study and learn from them. Are these ‘wild’ language contacts useful in the light of learning theories? And if they are - how can they be practically supported to become the ‘food chain’ for language acquisition? The paper will discuss models for (second language) learning that underpin a call for change in the division of labor between the classroom and everyday second language life.

In the last part of the paper I will point at practical possibilities for changes and report about cooperation between second language practitioners, researchers and interactive designers from Sweden, Denmark and Iceland. The project explores ways of building support structures in the everyday life environment of the newcomers and intends to make the their explorations into the ‘wild’ available for teaching practices in the classroom.

---

2 The immediately sensually accessible world around us, the everyday world for human actions and activities, the sensemaking ecology of human action (Husserl, Schutz).
1. Introduction

The social turn (Block 2003) has over the last twenty years spread through Second Language Acquisition research (SLA) and generated a number of studies which demonstrate how language learning is embedded in everyday life interactions (Brower, 2003; Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Kurhilla, 2006; Lilja, submitted; Theodorsdottir, 2011). In this chapter I will argue that the social turn has equally radical consequences for the teaching of second languages. Rethinking second language teaching and learning as a social and not as a linguistic endeavor opens new valuable resources that second language education has ignored for far too long. The chapter will therefore extend the argument about SLA, brought forward by Firth & Wagner (1997, 2007) to second language teaching.

Second language acquisition theory (SLA) is rooted in a (psycho)linguistic framework. In terms of psychology, SLA has for many years drawn on a cognitive paradigm where information processing in the individual brain has been central and issues of socially distributed cognition has been ignored. The growing understanding of the ways in which children acquire language has evidenced emergentist and constructionist models for language that promote the embodied, socially dependent understanding of cognition (MacWhinney 2008; Tomassello, 2003).

Classical linguistics has developed many of its central insights from engaging with the learning of (second) languages and a number of prominent methods for language teaching are based on linguistic thinking. Classical linguistic theory, especially the heritage of Bloomfield and de Saussure and their understanding of the linguistic sign, shines through exercises in each and every modern language textbook where language is taken as a system of forms and meanings (words) and combinatory rules (grammar in the sense of morphology and syntax). The 'pragmatic turn' in language philosophy and linguistics (Bernstein, 2010; Allan & Jaszczolt, 2012) has moved linguistics from a description of the structural properties of language towards discovering the use of language as providing possibilities to 'act'. It has expanded the scope of language teaching by formulating competence goals in terms of 'being able to do' (e.g. van Ek, 1977).

Recently, usage based linguistics (Ellis & Larsen-Freeman, 2009; Eskildsen, 2011, 2012) has demonstrated that language (first and second) emerges from use in particular contexts. Learning can be empirically unpacked as the change from multi-word-expressions as used in particular environments to schematic representation (c.f. Cadierno & Eskildsen, this volume). For a proper
understanding of the intricacies of language in use, a usage based approach needs to have a clear understanding how language use fleshes out in real interactions, what language accomplishes in its ecology of use, and how it is related to learning.

Based on the discoveries of Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis over the last 50 years I will take the position that action is not a property of language but that language is one resource through which action is done and that the understanding of actions and activities in their ecologies – and the use of language herein - can inform the teaching of languages in new radical ways. This means to redefine the learning of a second language in terms of sociology (as the range of social possibilities the new language will open), and not primarily in terms of linguistics (the range of forms and their grammar) or psychology (cognitive models of different kinds). The target of second language learning is not just 'to speak another language,' but to become part of the social and cultural environment in which this language happens. This entails fully embodied participation in the second language lifeworlds into which a newcomer bricolages his or her way.

This chapter distinguishes metaphorically between two spheres of the lifeworld by referring to 'the wild' as the focus of the argument. Hutchins (1995) popularized the notion of the ‘wild’ when he analyzed cognition outside the lab by describing the ways in which cognition becomes visible in practices related to material objects. In the field of HCI, Human Computer Interaction, the metaphor has caught on (Randall et al, 2012) to describe everyday life's variety of environments in contrast to structured (institutional) environments as e.g. labs or classrooms. Bringing software out of labs into the wild (the ‘living’ lab) gives high field validity to tests and experiments. Bringing the concept of cognition into the wild allows to study it in highly complex environments and to understand the relation between cognition and tool production. Bringing second language learning into the wild allows tapping into the myriads of interactions newcomers engage in a second language environment and explore their potential for language use/learning.

I am aware that early research on migrants has proven that the second language lifeworld in itself is not sufficient for language learning. A similar argument has been made in relation to study abroad programs (DuFon & Churchill, 2006; Collentine & Freed, 2004; Freed, 2008). This seems to be partly dependent on the forms of participation that are available for newcomers. In other words is the L2 social and linguistic environment not just ‘there’ for students in study abroad programs. It can be difficult for newcomers to get access to Second Language communities. Investigations of

---

3 For an overview of the field, often referred to as CA for SLA, see e.g. Kasper & Wagner, 2011, 2014.
study abroad programs have rarely looked at the interactions in detail but frequently used self-report data and correlated the measured linguistic advancement with the amount of interactions with locals (Dewey, Belnap & Hillstrom, 2013, for exceptions see Wilkinson, 2002; Cook, 2006). Pochon & Pekarek-Doehler (this volume) have studied the interactional development of an au pair girl over the course of 9 months and document manifest growth in the development of interactional practices as e.g. story-telling and request formation.

Teaching and classrooms are unavoidable to nurture second language use into learning. This chapter argues for a reflective relation between classrooms and the ‘wild’. Not only can the activities in the classroom initiated, form and support language practice and learning outside of it, but activities in the wild can be harvested and reflected in order to strengthen language learning and to develop resources that become available for the newcomer.

This chapter will discuss the consequences of a microsociology of learning for the old craft of language learning and language teaching. What are the consequences for pedagogical practices if language learning is an outcome of language use (UBL) and in situ sense making (EM/CA) and not (only) of language instruction and formal exercises? How do we envision language learning as a social endeavor?

I will in section 2 I discuss an example of an encounter collected in everyday life to show how participants make sense of each other and that this sense goes much deeper than ‘semantic understanding’ of what has been said. It involves a richer understanding of the issues which are at stake (learning, competence, knowledge, identity). Section 3 will discuss how an ethnomethodological understanding of action and sense making can inform the concept of learning further, in the light of the growing evidence created by CA for SLA. Section 4 will introduce the consequences for language teaching in the light of an interactional agenda. It will give an outline of a pedagogical model and shortly discuss the challenges found in this emerging practice.

2. The complexity of language use in its local ecology

Adults moving into another society and another country can do this out of very different reasons: Certainly, one major group are refugees, another the moving workforce - moving country for the better job, for education or for reasons of love (but all of them will eventually become part of the workforce). These groups are very heterogeneous in age, education, linguistics background and country of origin. The only thing they have in common is that they are adults and that they have
moved to a society with a different main language. Usually – at least in the Nordic countries - newcomers will receive language training but the language class is only a small part of their life and not their primary identity.

In this chapter I will refer to these groups of adults as *newcomers* instead of the traditional term *learners*. They certainly learn the ways of the new society, including knowledge of the spatial environment, cultural codes and language needed to do whatever they need to do, but it is more central that they have recently arrived. Their counterparts are the *locals*, who also might have their origin in another society or language, but are knowledgeable in the ways of the world and the language of the community. Obviously these categories of *newcomer* and *local* are not sharp. *Newcomers* will eventually become *locals*. And, depending on the situation, locals can be perceived as newcomers by other, more experienced *locals*. Since I see these identities as floating, ascribed and taken-on and not as fixed, inherent and essential, I will avoid terms as *language learners* and *native speakers* (c.f. the discussion in Firth & Wagner, 1997).

To flesh out the phenomenon and to better describe the target group for studies on language learning in the wild, I will present three different prototypes of newcomers. Although they are prototypes, their descriptions are built on a number of migrants which have been studied in a project on *Language and Interaction* in Denmark 2005-2008 (Wagner 2006).

Arun is a refugee from Myanmar who has been one of the first refugees from his ethnic group arriving to Denmark. He lived on his own in a small Danish city and had a number of changing low paid jobs. For a while he was hired to hand out free newspapers at the Station in the morning and had another job at a supermarket chain where he supplied shelves with new commodities and worked in the stockroom. Arun followed language classes while he successfully juggled several jobs in a Danish environment. His encounters with the second language are primarily at his workplace and in the classroom, but certainly he navigated his daily chores in the Danish lifeworld.

Sandra is a highly qualified academic professional who has worked and lived in her home country Germany and in the US for several years. In her workplace she uses German and English but rarely Danish. She has followed language classes on and off and is managing her daily life in the trilingual environment of German, English and Danish. Sandra has few contacts to locals, mainly through her workplace, and here English is her language of interaction. Her other contacts are mainly in the public sphere and have to do with living in
Denmark and the things needing to be done in Danish (shopping, going to yoga classes, negotiating with builders, picking up books at the library, buying tickets, …)

Mulenga came from Africa to Denmark and lives with a Danish man and his daughter. She does not work but receives language training. She speaks Danish when her step-daughter is around.

As part of the project, Arun, Sandra and Mulenga audio-recorded themselves in their daily life. Most of Arun’s recordings were done when he worked at the supermarket. Mulenga taped her conversations at home and Sandra taped typically several types of service encounters (shops, restaurants). Obviously the activities done through the second language differed considerably. Sandra's service encounters are short and on target. Mulenga's recordings contain dinner conversations in which tellings play a major role and Arun informs customers about placement and character of the commodities for sale and participates in the coffee break conversations with some provoking young workmates.

When reflecting the language situation of those three people, many different language learning arenas (Clark et al 2011a, b) open up. Apart from the Danish classes, Mulenga has a home environment that speaks Danish. Arun and Sandra live alone and they meet Danish in the public sphere. Arun however has frequent contacts with his Danish co-workers on the job and in the breaks. Sandra has occasional encounters outside her job and home and Mulenga has no contacts apart from her family and her class. In terms of social infrastructure, Sandra still has to build it, while Arun and to a lesser degree Mulenga have easy access to Danish speaking environments.

In section 4 I will come back to the question how the social infrastructure of people as Arun, Mulenga or Sandra can be expanded and made useful for language learning but before I will discuss an example to unfold the richness of activities and agendas which are made relevant in face to face encounters 'in the wild'. In the remaining part of this section I will analyze a short interaction at Arun’s workplace, the supermarket, to give an example for issues I will discuss later. The extract is taken from one of Arun's longer audio-recordings where he taped nearly a full day of activities in the supermarket, filling shelves and enjoying breaks with his co-workers.

At the beginning of Extract 1a, Arun is filling up shelves and is approached by a customer who requests the location of a specific item, 'bay leaves' (line 232). Short encounters as this happen regularly during the recording. Arun indicates not having understood the incoming turn by initiating a repair (l. 234). Repairs of these kinds are usually treated as indications of non-hearing
and responded to by a full repeat of the problematic turn (Schegloff et al 1977, Drew 1997). Arun could as well have indicated a specific part of the customer’s turn as being the problem, e.g. by specifying the repairable as in ‘Do we have what?’. After this repair initiation, he would probably receive the repeat of the specified word. In Extract 1a, the interaction runs off in a different way:

Extract 1a Bay leaves, ARUN513a3

232 CUS: har I laur- laurbærblade et sted her i nærheden
    have you laurel leaves a place here in nearby
    Do you have bay- bay leaves somewhere nearby
233 (.)

234 ARU: hva- hva siger du
    what- what say you
    What do you say?
235 (.)

236 CUS: $lau:r (.) bær (.) bl:ade$→
    laurel         leaves
    bay leaves
237 (0.4)

238 ARU: lau:r (.) bærblade

239 CUS: °hhehhehhehhe°
240 (0.3)

241 ARU: a (.) det godt £spørgsm(h)ål£ hehehuhahahahah
    ah      it good     question
    ah that is a good question
242 (0.5)

As we see in line 236, the customer repeats only the key item, i.e. responds as if Arun had asked ‘Do we have what?’ The repeat is done in slowly produced chunks. The syllables are stretched and pronounced distinctly.

What might be the reason for picking out the key word and produce it in this careful pronunciation? The choice of the repair turn indicates the customers understanding of the situation. Arun looks Asian and the word laurbærblade [lawoæblæd] itself might appear complicated and phonetically difficult, so the repair is designed specifically for somebody who might not know the word or its
reference. Following Arun’s repeat of the word in line 238, the chuckle we hear from the customer may indicate an appreciation of Arun’s performance.

But Arun seems to be on a different track. His receipt in line 238 can as well be heard as the repeat of an item which as been requested, but where the answer is not straightforward. In this second hearing, Arun is ‘doing thinking,’ i.e. he shows understanding and wins time for thinking about the request. Arun's following turn in line 241 ‘that is a good question’ indicates that this latter understanding is warranted: Arun produces a response but not an answer to the request and its form indicates that an answer might be forthcoming.

The manner in which the turns are delivered in Extract 1a indicates that this is not just treated as a request for information, but that other issues become relevant in the interaction as well. The customer treats the clerk at the supermarket (Arun) as not knowing the item/word for what she is asking for. She isolates the word and pronounces it slowly and carefully. Arun picks up the pronunciation but what at first glance looks as a spontaneous pronunciation exercise (repeat after me!) indicates on its occurrence that Arun is mulling over the request (241) and buys time to find the answer. So Arun is responding in a way that transpires that he knows but not immediately can find the correct answer to the request. His problem is not the understanding of the word, his problem is to remember exactly where bay leaves are stacked. In other words does Arun not accept the treatment as an unknowing foreigner – this is what the customer hints at in her repair - but as a knowing and competent clerk at the supermarket who will be able to deliver the answer. The innocent request in line 232 brings up issues of identity, belonging (local or newcomer) and competence.

Following up on Arun’s non-answer (l.241), the customer delivers a description of the searched-for item (Extract 1b, l.243). This casts again Arun as lacking competence, i.e as not knowing how the searched-for item looks like, which the description remedies – and not as a professional clerk who might need time before giving an answer.

**Extract 1b  Bay leaves, ARUN513a3**

\[
\begin{align*}
243 & \text{ CUS: sådn tørrede grønne bla:de } \checkmark \\
\text{ such dried green leaves} \\
244 & \text{ ARU: } \text{hm} \\
245 & (0.3)
\end{align*}
\]
In other attempt to solve the issue, the customer reports that she is looking for it and cannot see it. Arun and the customer probably scan the shelves to identify the searched-for item. Since we do not have a video recording, we need to guess what is going on in the physical space. The talk indicates visual orientation (l. 243 a description, l. 250 'see'). Both participants' slow production of the item
(l. 252 and 254) may point as well to an ongoing visual search activity. Equally, Arun's request for the spelling of the word (l. 258) might indicate physical search. Interestingly, he delivers himself a syllabic gloss of the spelling in overlap with the customer spelling the letters and responds to Arun's spelling by an ingressive -hja which in third position indicates that what was said in the preceding trun already was known, i.e. is opposite to a change-of-state-token⁴.

In Extract 1c, line 265, Arun presents the searched-for item and the customer responds with a high pitched 'yes'. Line 265 delivers a delayed response to the request in line 232 and the encounter could be closed down now with an exchange of gratitude. But it does not as we will see

**Extract 1c Bay leaves, ARUN513a3**

265 ARU: dem der her

> these ones here

266 (0.5)

267 CUS: ↑↑ja

268 (0.4)

269 ARU: hva er det→

> what is It

> what is this

270 (.)

271 ARU: ↑↑huha hha [hhe hh-]

272 CUS: [laur]bærblade= 

273 ARU: =ja

> yeah

274 (0.2)

275 ARU: jeg havde lige fyldt de(hh) t hhe

> I had just filled it

> I had just filled it up

276 (1.0)

277 ARU: NÅ→

> Well

278 (2.0)

279 ARU: d' ar det

---

⁴ Tine Larsen, personal communication. (Larsen & Steensig, forthcoming).
(it was it)
(that’s it)

. .

CUS: tak for det—
thanks for it
thank you

. .

ARU: selv tak
self thanks
you’re welcome

Before the customer expresses her thanks, Arun launches a new sequence in line 269 asking the customer about the article they had been searching for (‘what is this’). His subsequent laughter marks the joking character of the question. The customer gives the correct response, laurbærblade ‘bay leaves’ and Arun acknowledges the answer. The sequence looks now very much as the IRE (Initiative-Response-Evaluation) structure, well described for classroom interaction (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975; Ehlich & Rehbein 1986; van Lier 1988; Zemel & Koschman 2011). IRE sequences are different from question-answer sequences. In IRE the questioner does not receive new information but initiates a display of knowledge, a paramount activity in instructional environments. When Arun initiates what becomes an IRE sequence, he prompts the customer to display her knowledge, while Arun is taking the role of an instructor. In the light of the preceding activities Arun displays here that he did know what bay leaves are and proves in line 275 further his familiarity with the object.

In this short sequence, Arun and his customer do more than finding a searched-for item in a shelf. In the way the customer responds to Arun's repair initiation in Extract 1a, she treats Arun as somebody who has not understood the word laurbærblade, has no basic knowledge of the item and needs phonetic instruction to make his sense of the term (Day 1998). The reason might be that Arun looks foreign and Arun is treated not only as foreign, not-knowing Danish but equally as not competent in his job. We see Arun struggling continuously during the talk against this ascribed identity. In the afterplay of the request sequence in Extract 1c he clearly makes his point, hinting playfully at a the IRE sequence but with himself in the teacher’s role (in contrast to the phonetic instruction in Extract 1a, l.236 and demonstrating his familiarity with the item 'I had just filled it up' (l. 275)
For a number of years, scholars with a background in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis (CA) have investigated the complexity and richness of activities, resources and methods by which newcomers navigate the second language environment (c.f. Kurhilla, 2006 and contributions to Gardner & Wagner, 2004; Nguyen & Kasper, 2009; Richards & Seedhouse 2005; Pallotti & Wagner, 2011; Hall, Pekarek-Doehler & Hellerman, 2011).

This research has challenged SLA profoundly, since it questions the general epistemological frame in which SLA has been firmly rooted. Instead of a psycholinguistic model of the individual, i.e. of the Cartesian model of cognition, the social turn has connected SLA to a strong sociological (and pedagogical) thinking which does not focus on issues of cognitive processing but on a model of cognition firmly grounded in social interaction. In the following section I will outline the roots of the social paradigm in SLA and point to its pedagogical implications.

3. Social infrastructures for learning: Ethnomethodology and CA for SLA

This section will give a short historical background of the social paradigm and introduce some central concepts from Conversation Analysis and Ethnomethodology about sense making, understanding and learning.

3.1. The roots of the social paradigm

In the beginning of the 20th century, the American Pragmatists (Charles Sanders Peirce, John Dewey, and George Herbert Mead) founded an intellectual tradition that described the formative role of the social for human action and, eventually, human thinking. G. H. Mead described the emergence of the human mind out of sequentially organized ‘gestures’. “The term ‘gesture’ may be identified with these beginnings of social acts which are stimuli for the response of other form” (Mead, 1934, p. 43). By ‘other form’ Mead refers to another entity that participates in the social act. In the animal kingdom, gestures are ‘mindless’ initiatives and responses. Mind appears according to Mead when gestures become significant and attain meaning. Mind therefore requires the internal representation of ‘the other.’ In Mead’s thinking, the human mind is created in ad by the social action. Mind is an outcome of interaction, not its precondition.

Mead places reflexivity, intersubjectivity and social practice as the ways in which mind organizes itself in and through sequentially structured interactions. Mind emerges from the complexity of
social interaction and is not an innate human endowment *per se*. This line of thought is not dualistic. Mind and intellectual properties arise from embodied social praxis and interaction. Epistemologically, social action, embodiment and mind are dependent on each other. The emergence of human capabilities is a historical process and not an unfolding of innate structures.

In sociology, the pragmatic heritage has been reformulated by Goffman in his work on the social construction of self in everyday life interaction. Goffman (1959) studied the *interaction order* as it can be observed in any social encounter even when people - even unknown to each other - inhabit shared spaces. Even before *participation frameworks* - another of Goffman's significant concepts - are established, people respond to the possible gaze of the other and either proceed in systematic ways into joint participation or avoid participation (e.g. involvement shields which discourage others to approach and may even hide an activity. However, they will never make invisible, regardless how hard they might try.

Goffman's colleague Howard Garfinkel (1967) took the argument further and formed Ethnomethodology as a method to study the systematic ways in which members of a society create sense and meaning. Garfinkel, echoing arguments of the early phenomenologists (Merleau-Ponty, Husserl, Heidegger), as well as those of Wittgenstein, discovered the social order as something being produced in systematic ways in situ by the members of a sociality.

Goffman and Garfinkel had paramount influence on the sociological thinking of Harvey Sacks who is the commonly acknowledged main thinker of Conversation Analysis together with Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. CA is about the organization of talk that in Schegloff's terms is "the primordial site of sociality" (e.g. Schegloff, 1986: 112). Three issues are central for organizing the sociality: intersubjectivity sense making, and learning.

### 3.2. Intersubjectivity

In Extract 1, Arun is responding to the customer's request with a repair initiation. It is taken by the customer to indicate Arun not understanding the word or not knowing the herb. We deducted this from the way she formats her repair as a slow and precisely pronounced repeat of the key reference term of the request. What might be the reason for the customer not to respond to the repair initiation by repeating the request turn and thereby treating the trouble to be caused by non-hearing. Her
different response might reflect something she had noticed in Arun's repair initiation. So the way she formats her repair casts Arun as not being Danish. Her repair might be helpful for a not fully competent foreigner who might need a little bit of help. This again is perceived and contested by Arun in the way the interaction runs off. The sense that the next speaker gives to a previous action is documented in the speaker's response.

Participants show their understanding of a previous action by the way they are doing the next action. Has a next action been projected - for example projects a request something that can count as granting, delaying or refusing the request – this second action would be expected to be the core of the next action. In our example, line 241 a (. ) det godt spørgsmål would do the job and would demonstrate that both participants have understood that the previous action has been a request to which the response is pending.

Intersubjective sense making is a sequential endeavor. The customer makes sense of Arun's repair initiation by the way she crafts her response. In this way it becomes available and accountable for the participants for future action.

The analytic reconstruction of intersubjectivity can be done since it is not accidental what people do and say and how they format it. We do not have to look into their mind, but we need to know the practices and methods people us in interaction. Conversation Analysis and Etnomethodology describe in systematic ways how people go about their business of talk. Practices are stable and routinized so they can be recognized, but, obviously, they are as well flexible and depending on their local circumstances in situation and setting. For their practical sense making, all participants draw on all available cues.

This is rather consequential for a theory of meaning and sense making and it turns out radically different from the linguistic tradition. Interaction analysis shows that meaning and sense are not part of the word. Meaning becomes first accessable post festum by the next action. So, words when they have been spoken, are no longer the property of the speaker but through the response of the other participants the speaker has to figure out the sense which the co-participants is giving to them.

When meaning and sense are not in the word but in its actional consequences, it becomes obvious that language understanding is experiential - for first and second language speakers. Newcomers can figure out how the second language works by experiencing how the locals treat what others are saying and doing. They can study the consequences of their own action in their co-participants responses. They can experience how their own utterances are handled by other participants and the
sense that is given to them. Meaning is therefore not a feature that lives in the linguistic form but the experience of what action a certain way of talking usually does. So, when Arun initiates a repair of an incoming turn - remember that the customer opens the interaction with an unmitigated and unprimed request – his repair initiation is not taken as an innocent attempt to get a second chance to hear what the customer said. It is taken as documenting his lack of competence to understand the customers specific request.

For newcomers, activities in the new environment are difficult to plan ahead, since they have a tendency to run off in other ways than expected. But by engage in activities, newcomers can observe what they do and take that understanding with them into future actions. In their daily routines, newcomers living in the second language world have myriads of encounters and many of them in regular repeated ways as e.g. shopping, taking public transport or greeting colleagues at their workplaces. Out of the ways social situation run off accidentally, certain ways of doing them may emerge, even idiosyncratic versions and they may become part of the repertoire a participants uses in his or her life. But likewise, what might be expected to be a routine request might be responded to in a way that sows confusion in the ways the world works. Theodorsdottir & Wagner (forthcoming) discuss data recordings that students bring back to the classroom. Even ordinary activities (e.g. ordering a capuccino) may bring up unforeseen interaction details which challenge the newcomers’ ways to make sense of it.

3.3. Learning as a social activity

Describing sense making as a social and publicly inspectable activity and not as individual interpretations of linguistic messages has radical consequences for the understanding of learning. If interaction is the primordial site of sociality - primordial for sense making as a social accomplishment - this has radical consequences. Learning then is shaped by the ongoing sense making through which people navigate their lifeworlds. Learning is related to understanding (Koschman 2011, Koschmann et al 2011) and to noticing (the use of) resources for sense making. Learning is not just observation and information processes. It is consequential social practice, learning-in-action, and bound to the procedures of sense making as a social practice.

Learning in this sense is then ubiquitous in everyday life's interactions. Learning is out in the open. It is displayed and inspectable for others. It is observable in the everyday interactions in which people engage. Learning a language is not an isolated or specialized activity. It is the use of
language (as e.g. embodied behavior, Eskildsen & Wagner 2013, forthc.) which forges it’s learning. Learning is embedded in the mundane practical activities in which speakers engage. Speakers can take any activity as a learning environment. But what are their ecological challenges?

Newcomers learning a new language will overhear and observe the organization of activities and the local order created by the participants in the new culture. They will make sense of what they see and hear. They will participate, drawing on the semiotic resources they can muster, and they will develop ways of treating routine challenges in whatever way they do them. At any point in this activity, they will create sense. They will understand and they will learn how to participate.

However, their sense making may be skewed and lead to wrong generalizations that rather confirm their position as newcomer than helping them to become members in the community. They need help to de-brief their experiences in the life-world to better make sense of it all. Their participation will be seriously hampered by their lack of language so they need to reflect their needs and experiences and plan for the resources they might need to do the business they could not do or could do better another time. In other words, there is a need for analyzing and reflecting the practice in the lifeworld and with this starting point to build learnables for future actions (Majlesi & Broth 2012).

It is paramount to understand that becoming a second language speaker is not just mastery of a language, it is about building one's biography and the person which is seen by others in one's lifeworld. But how does this translate into a sensible proposal for an experiential L2 teaching method?

4. Building social infrastructures for second language learning

When moving around in their lifeworld, newcomers come across the second language in many different ways. There are writings on walls, spurs of talks around them. There are new ways of doing otherwise familiar things; in general, there are myriads of here-and-nows to make sense of. Newcomers experience constantly puzzles which need to be solved. If they are lucky, they get in contact with locals and interactions between newcomers and locals will have frequent instances where troubles of understanding need to be solved, often related to (new) words and their meaning. From an ethnomethodological point of view, all these encounters and experiences are environments for understanding and learning. Any puzzle solving activity may appear trivial, but on the long haul, the ways of the second language become familiar and settled. However, much knowledge is
related to specific places and things (you know where to leave the bus, you know what coffee you want and how to order it, you know your way home, the location of the local supermarket and how to navigate it), the repertoire needs to be expanded, to become portable into new situations. The newcomers need to gain flexibility in a variety of new situations to expand a growing localized second language competence, the established routines for surviving in the new world need to be constantly challenged.

The everyday life of the learner is unchartered territory for language teaching. The everyday life is not so much about linguistic issues but about its cultural organization and the navigation in it. The challenge for experiential language learning is to open experiences in the lifeworld for learning to open them for reflection and understanding in teaching.

In this section I will discuss the challenges and solutions for advancing language learning in the wild in connection with language teaching. Specifically, I will discuss the mapping and reflection of language arenas (Clark et al 2011), the planning and preparation of new experiences, tools and activities to promote experiential language learning and issues of de-briefing in the language classroom.

4.1. Mapping and planning language arenas

In section 2 of this chapter, I described three prototypical newcomers. Although all three live in Denmark, every one of them has a daily life that is different from the others. They go to different places, do different things, meet different people. Clarke & Lindemalm (2011:2) suggest to map out typical activities to make them available for reflection. Mapping language arenas can be done on a physical map of the town in which the newcomer is living. Mapping means to mark the locations to which a newcomer ventures, to add routine activities and encounters, and even to list the linguistic resources to be used. Mapping language arenas can also be done as a chart which documents the daily flow of activities.
Mapping language arenas helps to reflect where in one's daily life the second language is relevant and for what, and it allows reflections over which other, new, arenas can be added for what reason or benefit, and how this can be done. Mapping the language arena allows to reflect existing activities and plan for new ones. In this way it supports growth of language use and activities in new and in well-known environments in which the second language is used.

Mapping the language arena allows the migrant to colonize their environment and methodically to expand their circles: on the basis of the map, new challenges can be found which are principally available in the daily life of the newcomer. They might currently not be taken advantage of or are handled in another language than the second language. Reflection about the newcomer's status quo, the reflection of needs and the creation of new challenges needs to be cyclical and repetitive such that the expansion of the arena drives the dynamic of the learning process.

In the Icelandic village, a project at the University of Iceland, Theodorsdottir and her colleagues have established a network of service places (cafés, bookstores, libraries, ...) where newcomers are welcome to exercise their Icelandic. The employees in these outfits have agreed not to shift into English or take the quick way out when newcomers attend and try their first formulations in Icelandic. In this way, the village creates a protected language arena for newly arrived foreign students who start their journey into the Icelandic lifeworld. Theodorsdottir 2011, Eskildsen & Theodorsdottir ???, Theodorsdottir & Wagner, forthcoming, describe service encounters between newcomers to Iceland and their local contacts.
4.2. Tools and activities

The Språkskap project in Sweden, The Icelandic Village in Reykjavik and the Languaging project in Denmark are cooperations between language acquisition researchers and Interaction / Experience Designers. Interaction Design, coming out of Human Computer Interaction has created a family of design models where the user perspective is central for the design process (Buur & Matthews, 2008). Experience Design is a new discipline whose goal it is to create specific experiences for users. Experience Design is interested not just to craft the technical hard- and software (e.g. smartphones and apps) but to reflect and design the experiences user can have through them. Experience Design can therefore become an ally for the language researcher to reflect, create, and evaluate the experiences that second language users can create to shape language learning in situ. Users are in this terminology as well language teachers and language students a.k.a. newcomers.

Re-focussing on the second language user has resulted in a number of tools to

- enhance the contacts between newcomers and locals,
- prepare the newcomers for the situations in which they engage,
- harvest these situations by recording the activities,
- share the recording, and to
- systematize knowledge and practice gained in an encounter.

The tools are forming a personal learning environment for newcomers which allows them to personalize the learning process and to preserve its upshot in video, sound and writing.

![Figure 2: Personal Learning Environments for newcomers](image)

Tools of the Personal Learning Environment are not just in the hands of the newcomer. They can be added to the environment to create easier access to the community. In the example of the Icelandic Village, one of the tables in a café can be marked as 'the Icelandic Village table.'
locals frequenting the place will then know that people sitting at this specific table are interested in a contact and talk to learn Icelandic.

4.3. De-briefing

Although making sense in interaction is easy, interactional sense making where both participants in sequential cooperation establish accountable intersubjectivity is often very difficult for newcomers since they may lack cultural and linguistic knowledge. Prowling the second language life-world is a constant challenge and newcomers will regularly run into situations where they cannot be sure that they have understood what has happened. It is therefore essential that teachers provide de-briefing to help reading the signals.

The really difficult issue here is to document what has happened. In all three projects mentioned earlier, newcomers have recorded and shared their interactions, but this doesn't really solve the problem. As Theodorsdottir & Wagner (forthcoming) argued, recordings taken in real life environments are not easily accessible. Usually, sound quality and lighting is pure and understanding what is said and what else is going on maybe very tricky indeed. De-briefing session in classrooms are time-consuming and need to be done on a 1:1 situation or at least in smaller groups.

5. Perspective

Experiential second language learning taps into the rich array of possible contact with the L2 lifeworld which the newcomers experience outside of the classroom. In this setting it becomes the role of the teaching to prepare, furnish and de-brief the activities outside of the classroom. It is essential that classrooms provide environments where experiences can be discussed and - at times - made post festum sense. In experiential language learning, the direction of tasks can go two ways:

1. From the outside into the classroom. Unplanned and possibly problematic interactions need to be picked up and newcomers need assistance to understand what might have been going on. Equally, situations may present themselves for which the newcomer lacks proper linguistic and cultural tools, so the classroom might provide knowledge to future repeats of the situation.
2. Certain task can be formulated on the basis of the newcomers’ experiences. Via the PLE, students can be equipped to take up challenges and report back to the class about what had happened. Often, this will motivate to redo the task in which the competence for a certain situation can be built.
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Transcription symbols

↗→↘ Rising, level and falling intonation contour

(.) (0.4) (5.0) Pauses

hva- Cut off (glottal stop)

wo:rd (Vowel) lengthening

°word° Low voice

§word§ Careful pronunciation

☺ word ☺ Smile voice

word Pitch

.h Inbreath

<word< Spoken faster than surroundings

xx Unclear talk

[word] Overlapping parts of speech