



## The audio-recorder as a resource for L2 learning in study abroad

Janice McGregor, University of Arizona 

Victoria Surtees, University of the Fraser Valley

### Abstract

*Research on second language (L2) learning in study abroad (SA) often includes close analyses of audio or video recordings of interactions among speakers in the host country (Diao, 2022; Mitchell, 2023). These recordings are increasingly being collected by SA students themselves using handheld and/or mobile devices. Given that participants are aware and often in control of the recording process, some researchers (e.g., Gordon, 2013; Speer & Hutchby, 2003) have suggested that scholars should attend to how participants orient to the recorder as a resource for doing things (i.e., interactive and relational work) in talk. We take up these researchers' call by examining participant-collected recordings of peer talk from two SA case studies: American learners of German in Germany and Japanese learners of English in Canada. Analyses reveal that the audio-recorder afforded participants additional opportunities to collaboratively do research, build informal relationships, and practice language while abroad. Our results highlight how integrating recording devices in SA can support those seeking more informal ways to practice the L2 with peers in context.*

**Keywords:** *study abroad, second language learning, audio-recorder, participant-collected recordings, qualitative research*

**APA Citation:** McGregor, J., & Surtees, V. (2023). The audio-recorder as a resource for L2 learning in study abroad. *Second Language Research & Practice*, 4(1), 48–66. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/69878>

### Introduction

In applied linguistics, scholars drawing on theories of language socialization, sociolinguistic approaches, and conversation analysis for second language (L2) acquisition have long used audio or video recordings to capture and analyze the ephemeral nature of everyday talk. This emphasis on examining interactions embedded in social context has raised many methodological discussions around what Labov (1972) called the observer's paradox, or the conundrum that results from the desire to gain access to naturalistic settings and talk even via an *intrusion* (e.g., via the use of an audio-recorder or other device or the involvement of research personnel). A common solution to this paradox has been to curtail researcher interference as much as possible. Accordingly, some study abroad (SA) researchers have asked participants to make their own recordings, using discreet mobile devices (e.g., handheld recorders, mobile phones) (for an overview of methods for collecting interaction data in SA, see Mitchell, 2023). This form of data generation has allowed researchers access to interactions that they may otherwise not have acquired (e.g., informal talk in private residences).

Discourse analysts from various fields (e.g., Diao, 2022; Gordon, 2013; Speer & Hutchby, 2003; Wertheim, 2006) have challenged this pursuit of naturalness, arguing that the desire to reduce researcher impact is steeped in two problematic beliefs: one, that some natural way of talking exists, and that researchers should try to capture it; and two, that one should (and indeed, can) manage the effects of researcher intrusion to do so (Gordon, 2013). They note that every context is situated and natural in and of itself and have opposed

the common methodological practice of excusing, explaining, or omitting the role of the recorder (and the researcher) from analyses. They propose that participants' observable orientations to recorders should be examined.

In the current study, we extend these arguments by assembling and analyzing data from two SA projects. The original goal of these individual projects was to generate naturalistic data from SA learners to examine how they used language and actively participated in L2 learning outside the classroom. We soon noticed, however, that many aspects of participants' conversations referenced the recorder or study explicitly, challenging our initial conception of what natural conversations might look like in SA. Rather than discard these stretches of talk as unsuitable for analysis, we decided to approach them as data that provide unique insights into the many challenges that L2 learners face when they simultaneously attempt to do language learning and informal conversation in talk abroad. We thus report here on an analysis of the interactional data generated by SA participants in our projects in segments where they oriented to the recorder. In doing so, we aim to show how they negotiated *doing being natural* while using the recorder to do certain kinds of things in talk, including collaboratively doing research, building informal relationships, and practicing language abroad.

### ***Orienting to the Recorder's Presence***

Not all scholars have argued for focusing on the presence of the recorder. Some have found, for example, that behavioral modifications may not always be consequential in recorded interactions (e.g., Drew, 1989; Schegloff, 1998), perhaps because conversations require the interactants' complete attention and they forget about the device (e.g., Malone, 1997). However, other empirical studies have shown that "tape-affected speech" (Speer & Hutchby, 2003, p. 320) is present in many recorded interactions, since participants are aware of the recorder and must co-negotiate its presence. In this way, recorded orientations merit analytic scrutiny as they can help us to better understand participants' orientations to the recorder and how they may serve as resources for co-constructing social actions and identities, as well as reveal local norms for interaction.

Speer and Hutchby (2003) showed that participants' orientations to the recorder provided insight into the "ways in which research ethics and the morality of recording are played out as participants' concerns" (p. 321). Using data from focus groups, domestic telephone calls, and counseling sessions, the authors analyze segments in which participants explicitly topicalize what constitutes tape-appropriate and tape-inappropriate speech. They reveal how references to the recorder or recording process allow participants to co-construct shared notions of what is and is not appropriate for the task of "research," often through a humorous frame (e.g., jokes about not discussing sex or "anything nasty" [p. 320] or keeping state secrets). The authors' findings demonstrate that recorders are not always treated as intimidating, nor do they always promote participants' self-censure. Rather they can be used for all manner of interactional work, including the joint construction of positive affect through humor.

Building on Speer and Hutchby's work, Gordon (2013) drew on Goffman's (1981) notions of frame and footing to analyze the discourse of three American families, focusing on how they orient to the recorder as a resource for identity negotiation in informal conversations at home. In analyzing her participants' self-recorded data, Gordon found that mentions of the recorder served in the construction of identities as good people and cooperative research participants, often through non-literal, joking tones (e.g., one participant topicalized their children's TV watching and how that might make the researcher think they were bad parents). Gordon also analyzed participants' more subtle orientations to the recorder (e.g., changes in volume and pitch that occur when participants speak directly into the audio-recorder), and showed how one participant, Steve, treated the recorder as an audience to be entertained (e.g., speaking directly to the device: "well transcriber, it's been fun, eh?" [p. 311]). Gordon notes that Steve was in a theater troupe and his use of the recorder as a resource for humor appeared to align with his performer identity. Gordon's study demonstrates how participants' orientations to the recorder serve to construct both research-related and non-research-related identities that participants value.

These studies show that when demonstrable orientations to the recorder exist, we gain insight by attending to them. To date, excepting Diao (2022), SA research in applied linguistics has not examined how participants draw on the recorder in talk, or their “tape-affected speech” (Speer & Hutchby, 2003, p. 320). Results from studies involving participant-led data collection suggest, however, that SA learners likely do use the recorder to do interactive work that may be related to L2 learning. In McGregor (2021) on L2 peer interactions in SA, participants discussed which language should be used in their practice recorded conversations. Additionally, in Shively (2011), participants were asked to approach clerks and engage in service encounter speech acts, suggesting that the task of recording partially provided the frame for having the encounter to begin with. Similarly, in Zimmerman (2020), students of Japanese were encouraged to ask friends, acquaintances, and host families if they would engage in Japanese conversation to generate ethnographic data for analysis as part of their coursework and to provide opportunities for L2 conversations across multiple encounters. These insights indicate that the recorder may serve additional purposes within the context of L2 learning, and lead us to the following research questions:

1. What social activities are accomplished via L2 learners’ orientations to the audio-recorder when recording informal conversations for SA research projects?
2. How do L2 learners co-construct these activities in talk?

## Theoretical Framework

Inspired by Gordon (2013)’s approach, we aim to examine our SA participants’ orientations to the audio-recorder in informal peer conversations using the concepts of footing and frame (Goffman, 1981; Tannen & Wallat, 1987), audience design (Bell, 1984; 2009), and identity (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005).

### ***Footing and Frame***

*Footing*, proposed by Goffman (1981), describes a speaker’s alignments toward others and themselves while managing the production and reception of talk. Footing is signaled by speakers’ use of linguistic or prosodic cues or other multimodal resources like gesture or gaze. Shifts in footing often signal a change in orientation to different audience members, something that is salient for this study since we aim to identify segments of talk in which the recorder is treated as an audience member. They also often signal a shift in what Goffman (1981) called the *frame*, or the mutual understanding that participants have of joint activities. Participants’ ability to co-construct frames relies on their ability to recognize the activity in which they are engaged and contribute appropriately. Tannen and Wallat (1987) argued that to understand what shifts in footing mean in interaction, it is necessary to explore participants’ knowledge schemas, or pre-existing “expectations about people, objects, events and settings in the world” (p. 207) and account for those in analyses. This study examines how participants’ utterances and orientations to the recorder work to construct particular frames and where relevant, draw on the researchers’ experiences with participants in interviews and other interactions to interpret the knowledge schema that support utterances being interpreted as constructing a particular frame.

### ***Audience Design and Identity***

This study is premised on the notion that speakers consider their audience when making communicative choices, or audience design (Bell, 1984). Audience design is an approach speakers take to “respond to different kinds of audiences” (Bell, 2009, p. 145) by utilizing the linguistic resources available to them. Bell theorized *audience* as anyone who may hear the speakers’ utterances—ratified in the conversation or not. Of particular interest is the role Bell called *auditor*, which refers to participants who are ratified and known to the speaker but not addressed directly. Bell explained that speakers use all manner of linguistic—and we add paralinguistic—resources to signal their orientation to and relationship with audience members, including the use of different phonological variants (Bell’s main interest), politeness strategies, codes, pragmatic conventions, gaze, pitch, marked vocabulary, and topic/activity selection.

Gordon (2013) applied Goffmanian frame and footing to understand the moments where research participants orient to audio-recorders. In addition, she drew on Bucholtz and Hall (2005) to theorize identity as co-constructed in talk through participants' moment-to-moment alignments with not only the addressee but all members of the audience. We adopt these interactional positions here, which understand identity as neither fixed nor pre-assigned (e.g., SA student). Instead, from an analyst's perspective, participants draw on shared knowledge of the complex social meanings of various stances, styles, and activities to co-construct identities in interaction. Thus, in investigating participants' language use in moments where they demonstrably orient to the recorder, we also examine how those orientations contribute to the discursive construction of particular identities.

## Study and Method

This study brings together two projects that examined undergraduate students' experiences with L2 learning in peer interactions during SA: Victoria's project involved Japanese SA students in Canada and Janice's project involved American SA students in Germany. We assembled our studies to link the individual findings to broader discussions about incorporating participant-led recordings in SA research.

### Context and Participants

Victoria's project was conducted in 2015-2016 with four undergraduate Japanese students participating in a 9-month SA program at a large English-medium university in Canada. The broader research project investigated the role of peer conversations for English language learning in SA and so asked participants to record weekly informal conversations with similarly aged peers. This study focuses on a subset of that data: the conversation data generated by one focal participant, Ami, and her cohort-mate, Emma (pseudonyms, see Table 1). These two were selected because their conversations presented the greatest number of orientations to the recording process. Data from interviews in which participants described the purpose of a particular conversation (e.g., practicing English) are also used to inform our understanding of the knowledge schemas (Tannen & Wallat, 1987) participants drew on to accomplish their interactive work.

Table 1. *Victoria's Participants.*

Characteristics	Ami (focal)	Emma
Self-identified Gender	Female	Female
Major	Political Science	International Communication
L1	Japanese	Japanese
L2	English	English
L3	Spanish (beginner)	French (beginner)

Janice's project was conducted in 2009-2010 with seven undergraduate US-American students who were participating in a year-long SA program at a German-medium university in Germany. The research investigated the role of peer conversations for German language learning in SA and so asked participants to record regular informal conversations with peers. This study focuses on focal participant Katie and peer interlocutors Lisa and Stefan (pseudonyms, see Table 2) because several of their informal conversations appeared to include language choices that reflected their orientation to the recorder.

Table 2. Janice's Participants.

Characteristics	Katie (focal)	Lisa	Stefan
Self-identified Gender	Female	Female	Male
Major	German	Religious Studies	Teacher Education: German as L2
L1	English	German	German
L2	German	English	English

### Data Generation

Victoria collected interview and peer conversation data, supplemented with program documents, TOEFL iTP scores, and field notes. Focal participants were recruited first. These focal participants then invited multiple peers to join the study and recorded 15–30-minute weekly conversations in English with them for 10 weeks. The guidelines provided to participants indicated that this could be any kind of conversation, with the suggestion that they start the recorder while playing a game, cooking, or doing homework. Participants were asked to record a conversation they would normally have and that involved daily life conversations. Although Victoria intended for participants to capture interactions that would have occurred whether or not they were recording, participants admitted that they approached peers to whom they spoke infrequently (e.g., roommates), and used participation in the research project to request extended conversations. This was also the case for Ami and Emma's interactions: Ami and Emma had enjoyed speaking English in classes during the previous semester and so Ami used the project to request continued contact and English use with Emma (they only used English when recording and otherwise spoke Japanese). Focal students also participated in three semi-structured interviews, and peer participants, like Emma, participated in two semi-structured interviews. In interviews, they were asked to reflect on their conversations with their peers.

Janice collected language background questionnaires, proficiency evaluations, semi-structured interviews, reflections from participants, and towards the final months of the project, asked her participants to collect informal peer conversations. She asked them to record with peers with whom they used some German, and that it was okay if they used English and German. Participants were instructed to request the peer's consent before recording and to give them time to first review the consent form. Janice assigned no length requirement but told participants that longer conversations were welcome as they might allow for deeper discussions. Finally, she urged participants to make a concerted effort not to change the way they spoke in these interactions, in hopes of acquiring conversations that would have occurred with or without the recorder. Katie recorded her interactions with German friend Stefan, whom she met during the international student orientation. Katie also recorded informal interactions with Lisa, her language exchange partner.

### Data Analysis

We brought both studies' recorded peer conversations together and re-examined them through our research questions. Victoria's dataset comprised five conversations totaling 95 minutes of audio. Janice's dataset comprised four conversations totaling 51 minutes of audio.

Each researcher listened to the recordings multiple times and transcribed them verbatim, flagging sections with a demonstrable orientation to the recorder (e.g., via linguistic or paralinguistic cues). The flagged segments were then listened to and transcribed in further detail using conversation-analytic style conventions (see [Appendix](#)). Each identified section was then analyzed using the tools described in Gordon (2013): the Goffmanian concepts of frame and footing, and Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) notion of identity.

Like Gordon (2013), the analysis relied on participants' talk and responses (i.e., how respondents treated each other's talk) and one researcher also drew to some extent on knowledge gained in previous interactions with participants (e.g., interviews). Recurring social activities (i.e., frames) that involved an orientation to the recorder were then identified. Once the analyses were complete, the researchers compared findings and co-analyzed excerpts for each result for additional reliability. The findings published here are the result of that joint analysis.

## Findings

The analyses reveal that the participants, like in Gordon's (2013) study, treated the audio-recorder as both a data gathering device and auditor (a known, ratified listener who is not addressed directly). We turn now to recorder orientations that contributed to the construction of three recurring and oft-overlapping social activities, or frames (Gordon, 2013): doing research, building informal relationships, and practicing language.

### **Frame 1: Doing Research**

Since participants were tasked with generating conversation data, they chose when to record, who to include, and what to submit, and were thus relied upon to make decisions typically associated with researcher roles. Accordingly, participants often spoke directly to the device or explicitly about the research process. [Examples 1](#) and [2](#) demonstrate how speakers constructed a research frame while negotiating what is and is not appropriate for project recordings.

#### **"We Have to Record a Conversation in German"**

Katie and language exchange partner, Lisa, start the recorder outside of the university cafeteria. Katie updates Lisa on the number of remaining recordings for Janice's study (01-09).

#### **Example 1**

*Katie and Lisa on campus*

01 KAT: >ja ich hab gestern mit	22 ((laughing))
02 Janice gesprochen und sie	23 ((for her study))
03 hat< (.) OH JA (.) uh: ihr	24 ALM: ich bin ganz leise ((I'll be
04 braucht (.) fünf verschiedene	25 very quiet
05 (.) >aufnahme< (.) ((yeah I	26 LIS: [((laughing))
06 spoke with Janice yesterday	27 KAT: [((laughing)) ne(h) es ist
07 and she said oh yeah uh you	28 ega(hhh)l ((no that doesn't
08 guys need five different	29 matter))
09 recordings))	30 LIS: nur dass du dich nicht
10 (.) hallo! ((hello))	31 wunderst ((just so you don't
11 ((ALM & GRANDSON enter))	32 wonder))
12 LIS: und du darfst dich nur nicht	33 ALM: =ja ((yeah))
13 wundern das ist meine	34 LIS: =((laughing))
14 tandempartnerin und wir müssen	35 KAT: = <sup>o</sup> ja! <sup>o</sup> ((yeah))
15 jetzt ein gespräch auf deutsch	36 ALM: wenn ihr [keine geheimnisse
16 aufnehmen ((and just so you	37 habt ((if you have no
17 aren't surprised this is my	38 secrets))
18 tandem partner and we have to	39 KAT: [fhallo! ((hello))
19 record a conversation in	40 LIS: ne ((no))
20 German))	41 KAT: hallo! (.) ((hello))
21 (.) für ihre studie	

At line 10, Katie shifts footing from study talk to greeting (“*hallo!*”), signaling a momentary frame change from doing research to acknowledging new participants’ arrival. Katie’s shift draws Lisa’s attention to those approaching: her classmate Almi and young grandson. Instead of greeting Almi, Lisa extends the previous research frame, immediately informing Almi of the recording and study and designating her as an addressee (12-20). Thus, as Almi approaches, she moves from being an unknown, unratified, and unaddressed eavesdropper (Bell, 1984) to a known, ratified, and addressed participant within the same utterance. Interestingly, Lisa also never acknowledges Katie’s utterances regarding the remaining recordings in the study. She simply extends the research talk by informing Almi of the live recorder and project (12-23), which Almi responds to playfully (“I’ll be very quiet,” 24-25 and “if you have no secrets,” 36-38). Almi’s response is akin to the joking recorder orientations noted previously (e.g., Gordon, 2013; Speer & Hutchby, 2003). Although the recorder or researcher are never directly addressed, the influence of the device becomes clearer when Katie shifts frame and footing at line 39, uttering a joyful “hello” to Almi’s grandson, suggesting that any obligatory research matters are now finished, and that they should now continue with informal conversation.

During this time, Lisa and Katie knew that Janice was a doctoral student conducting dissertation research and the data’s lone analyst. As an asynchronous auditor of the recording, Janice was thus known to Lisa and Katie (but unknown to Almi). Although Lisa designates neither Katie nor Janice as addressees at lines 12-23, in extending Katie’s research talk, she constructs her utterance for Almi (addressee), Katie (present auditor), and Janice (asynchronous auditor/end listener). Lisa’s shift in footing lets Almi know that the conversation is being recorded and communicates to Katie (present auditor) and Janice (end listener) that informed consent protocols are being followed. Katie is designated as a known and ratified participant (auditor, not addressee), something that she co-achieves by not responding to Lisa’s utterance. Almi, by contrast, recognizes that she is being addressed, and co-constructs this knowledge in her playful response (24-25). Lisa and Katie recognize that Almi’s shift to a humorous frame is for both of them: Katie laughs and says, “no it doesn’t matter” (27-29) and Lisa states, “just so you don’t wonder” (30-32). Lisa’s research talk across lines 12-23 also directly communicates to all that any subsequent conversation should be in German. Study directions, however, ask participants to record using some German, yet English was always explicitly allowed. Katie does not respond to Lisa’s utterance here, though, possibly signaling that she does not believe she is being addressed.

Lisa’s claim about recording in German highlights an ideological belief about L2 learning as an endeavor best done monolingually. It also indexes a common belief that US-Americans like Katie may wish to use English (as purportedly English-only monolinguals, see McGregor, 2016). The presence of the audio-recorder and ideologies about L2 learning/use are repeatedly co-navigated, sometimes via the establishment of a language practice frame, which we return to in Frame 3: Practicing language.

### **“We are in Emma’s Room”**

Ami’s final recording with Emma is made a few days before their return to Japan. The example begins as Ami starts the recorder and states the location of the recording: Emma’s room (01). By providing the context, information that is obvious to the present interlocutors, and using Emma’s name (rather than the pronoun you), Ami addresses the recorder directly and treats the device (or perhaps the end listener) as a ratified participant. After a few long pauses (2-4), Ami shifts footing (03) to address Emma and begins asking questions that resemble the questions that Victoria had asked Ami the previous day in their final research interview, establishing a research interview frame.

## Example 2

### *Ami interviews Emma about homesickness*

1	AMI:	we are in the Emma's room.	27	EMM:	um I had my birthday
2		(.)	28	AMI:	yeah
3	AMI:	ah::	29	EMM:	and also after the um
4		(2.5)	30		(2.7)
5	AMI:	(.pt) it's seven months?	31	EMM:	I wanted to um join
6		it's already seven months	32		coming of s- coming
7		have passed?	33		[of age ceremony]
8	EMM:	yep	34	AMI:	[ah ((inaudible but in
9	AMI:	how do you feel. what did	35		Japanese))] ]
10		you changed?	36	EMM:	in Japan. so:
11	EMM:	oh:. (2.0)	37	AMI:	[ah:: yeah ]
12	AMI:	hh. yeah.	38	EMM:	[at that time] I felt
13	EMM:	eh:=	39		little bit but =
14	AMI:	=did you feel like (.)	40	AMI:	=mm[: ]
15		homesick.	41	EMM:	[just little bit] so
16	EMM:	oh: actually I didn't(0.7)	42		not much. (1.0)
17		feel (.) much homesick.	43	AMI:	I see.
18		like um	44	EMM:	yea:h.
19		(2.8)	45	AMI:	in my case?
20	EMM:	I: felt a little bit	46		actually I didn't
21		homesick (1.0) um (2.2)	47		remember whether I felt
22		during (.) like winter	48		homesick but in the
23		vacation.	49		during the term one I
24	AMI:	win- really?	50		really wanted to go back
25	EMM:	yeah a little bit. because	51		to Japan.
26		um (1.5)			

Ami's questioning begins with a contextualizing statement in which she explains that seven months have already passed since they arrived in Canada (05-07). Ami's initial statement provides context for the discussion they are about to have, much like a radio interviewer providing background for an audience. Emma treats Ami's rising intonation as a signal for her to respond (i.e., she recognizes that she has been designated as the ratified addressee) and aligns, saying "yep" (08). Ami then pursues her turn by asking "how do you feel" and "what did you changed?" and finally, after Emma displays difficulty responding, she reformulates the question to address homesickness. In response, Emma claims that she did not experience much homesickness, except in winter break when she could not attend the coming-of-age ceremony that is usually held for people turning 20 in Japan. Throughout Emma's explanation, Ami produces a number of supportive tokens, such as "really?" (18) and "yeah" (21). She does not take the floor but instead aligns with Emma's story and waits until it is concluded. Upon completion, Ami says "I see" with falling intonation (32), before sharing her own experience of homesickness in term one.

The format of this conversation—from topic to turntaking patterns—bears a striking resemblance to the participants' research interviews with Victoria. As explained above, knowledge schemas, including those related to participation in research, are acquired and reproduced through experiences within the community (Tannen & Wallat, 1987). Ami had participated in two interviews where Victoria had asked forms of the questions "how do you feel?" and "what changed?" It appears that Ami, and to a lesser extent Emma, draws on schemas acquired through research participation: Both the announcement of the location (01) and the contextualization of the questions (05-07) contribute to establishing a frame in which Emma is expected to share experiences related to the research project—namely, stories of cultural and linguistic adjustment. Turntaking and questioning patterns also mirror typical interview practices. Like an interviewer or researcher, Ami (the focal participant controlling the recorder) retains control of the floor and of topic

selection. She also encourages and aligns with Emma's responses, much like a researcher encouraging a participant. Together, this evidence suggests that Ami draws on experience related to interviews and on her and Emma's mutual awareness of the recorder to accomplish the interactive activity of interviewing. In Ami's final interview completed a few days later, Ami also reported Emma's experience of homesickness (i.e., the details of this conversation), as if, having collected data relevant to the research project, she should report her findings. By providing data of interest to Victoria, Ami is also building an identity as a good research participant.

### **Frame 2: Building Informal Relationships**

The second frame involved a curious desire on the participants' part to use recordings to engage in a play frame (Bateson, 1972), and involved joking around both with and about the researcher. Both researchers were young women who interacted with the participants in many capacities, including informal discussions about everyday life and culture. Their relationship with participants was warm and relaxed. The participants continued to build these relationships while recording by treating the recorder as a proxy for them and talking directly to them or about them.

### **"She Really Looks so Young"**

In [Example 3](#), Ami chooses to report personal information she learned about Victoria (her age) the night before, collaboratively constructing a gossip frame with Emma. The interaction took place following a group outing where Ami had asked Victoria about her and her brother's age. In the lines preceding this excerpt, Emma guessed that Victoria was 22 years old. The excerpt starts as Ami announces Victoria's actual age at the time: 32 years old.

### **Example 3**

*Emma and Ami gossip about the researcher*

01	AMI:	thirty-two.	22	EMM:	difficult to um (.)
02		(0.8)	23		um guess how old is
03		I I I can't believe it.	24	AMI:	yeah
04		((both laugh))	25	EMM:	in here because we- the
05		(.)	26		appearance is really
06	EMM:	mm? (1.0) her (0.8) younger	27	AMI:	mm.
07		brother <u>is</u> thirty-two.=	28	EMM:	di[fferent ] from Asians so
08	AMI:	no [no no ]	29	AMI:	[different]
09	EMM:	[Victoria] is thirty-two and=	30	EMM:	hh. hh. hh.
10	AMI:	=Victoria is thirty-two and=	31	AMI:	hh. hh. hh.
11	EMM:	=oh:	32	EMM:	\$oh my god w:ow\$.
12	AMI:	younger brother is three years	33		(1.0)
13		(.) younger than(.)	34	EMM:	°I didn't know that°
14		Victoria [so:]	35		(6.0)
15	EMM:	[oh.]	36	EMM:	she looks so young.=
16	AMI:	twenty-nine?	37	AMI:	=yeah
17		(1.2)	38		and I I told to her like she
18	EMM:	r-hh. hh. hh. ↑hh. ↑hh. eh::?	39		really looks so young.
19	AMI:	hh. hh.	40	EMM:	yeah.
20	EMM:	really surprised.(.)	41	AMI:	\$she looks really happy.\$
21		because it is always	42		((both burst out laughing))

Following Ami's announcement, there is a pause before Ami comments on how unbelievable Victoria's age is. Ami's comment is followed by laughter (04) and another short pause before Emma clarifies that it was indeed Victoria who was 32 and not her brother. At line 18, Ami and Emma resume making laughter sounds and Emma produces a stretched "eh::?" (18) with rising intonation which, in Japanese, marks uptake, interest, and surprise. Emma thus registers Ami's announcement as news, aligns with Ami's evaluation of the news as unbelievable, and works to collaboratively establish a gossip frame. As with [Example 2](#), here, Ami has chosen to redo parts of a conversation that she had previously with Victoria. This

was commonly observed in Ami's data; she would often retell stories or information from her informal interactions or interviews with Victoria. The purpose of these retellings is unclear. They could be part of Ami's strategy to practice language (see analysis of [Example 5](#)) or a strategy for involving Victoria in the recording process. Whatever her intent, Ami's reporting of these conversations is not random; she is selecting content specifically for recording.

Until line 19, it is difficult to detect an overt orientation to the recorder apart from participants' use of English rather than Japanese. Awkward pauses at places where a response would be expected (e.g., 02) and the giggling (04 and 18–19) may also signal the participants' sensitivity to the potential inappropriateness of gossiping about the end listener of the recording. Following Emma's alignment with Ami (18), it becomes more obvious that Ami and Emma are orienting to the recorder as a proxy for Victoria specifically (who is, however, never directly addressed) as both offer accounts for why they are so surprised at Victoria's age. In lines 20–28, Emma explains that it was difficult to guess Victoria's age because "in here" (presumably Canada), "the appearance is really different from Asians." Emma initially uses the pronoun *we* ("because we-") at line 25, which appears to reference the two participants' belonging in the racial category of Asians. The use of "we" and of the explicit category mention (Asian) evoke a contrast with Victoria's racial category (White) and provide an account to members of that category (i.e., Victoria, as an auditor) for the shared surprise. Ami aligns with Emma, echoing Emma by saying "different" (29). Both then produce short giggles, followed by Emma's stronger evaluation of the news as surprising (i.e., "oh my god wo:w" using a smiling voice, and then more quietly, "I didn't know that," 32–34). Ami offers an additional account for why they could not guess Victoria's age: Victoria looks young. At line 37, Emma immediately aligns, producing a latched "yeah" at which point Ami adds to her account saying, "I told her like she looks really so young" (indeed, Ami had said those words to Victoria the previous night). Finally, Ami further elaborates on her assessment, saying in smile voice that Victoria "looks really happy" and both participants burst out in fits of laughter before moving on to a new topic. The explanations offered by Ami (i.e., it is difficult to tell her age, she looks young, she looks happy) appear to constitute not only an account for her difficulties in guessing Victoria's age but also a compliment designed to flatter Victoria. The final laughter signals that the participants are playing with the notion that Victoria is listening and enjoying it. Thus, it appears that participants are not only "doing gossip" but also accomplishing flattery and humor by playing with the notion that Victoria is listening. Through this play, they build on their affect for each other and with the researcher.

### **"Love You so Much!"**

Similar relational work occurred between Katie, Stefan, and Linda while in a café. Unlike Ami and Emma's gossip about Victoria's age in [Example 3](#), in [Example 4a](#), Katie, Stefan, and Linda address Janice directly upon starting the recorder.

### Example 4a

*Katie and peers playfully address researcher*

01 KAT: ((microphone crackling))	29 class today))
02 ↓take one (.) hi Jan (.)	30 KAT: >oh i don't wanna talk< (.)
03 love you: (.) LOVE YOU SO:	31 okay (.) u:m zwei ((um two))
04 MU:::CH	32 STE: von zwei bis vier? ((from two
05 LIN: I love you too Ja:n	33 to four))
06 STE: I love you Ja:n (.) and	34 KAT: ja und [dann ((yeah and then))
07 würmchen loves you too: xx	35 STE: [und dann hast du
08 KAT: würmchen is here (.) boop	36 dann von vier bis sechs (.)
09 boop (.) okay jetzt aber	37 [okay ((and then you have from
10 ((okay but now))	38 four to six okay))
11 STE: okay	39 KAT: [und dann ich treff mit
12 KAT: [Nsou:] ((so))	40 meine andere (.) deutsche
13 STE: nicht sou:: ((laughing))	41 freundin ((and then I'm
14 ((not so))	42 meeting with my other German
15 KAT: wie g[eh::ts ((how are you))	43 friend))
16 STE: [also ((so))	44 STE: ACH so (.) und hiermit hört
17 KAT: (.) HEY	45 die aufnahme für mich auf
18 STE: [sou:]	46 [((laughing)) ((aha and with
19 KAT: [zo:]	47 that the recording ends for
20 STE: also? ((so))	48 me))
21 KAT: also (.) um ((so um))	49 KAT: [↑!OH:[:
22 STE: =was gibt's zu besprechen	50 STE: [nein ((laughing))
23 ((what's there to talk about))	51 ((no))
24 KAT: ((laughing)) nichts (.)	52 KAT: =hey
25 ((nothing))	53 STE: nu nur scherz (.) ich mache
26 um (.) wait	54 nur ein scherz ((just a joke
27 STE: wann hast du heute	55 I'm just making a joke))
28 unterrichtet ((when do you have	

Katie starts the recorder and speaks into the microphone at a lower volume (“take one”), orienting to the recorder like a director on a movie set. She then directly addresses the researcher with a greeting and nickname (“hi Jan”) and an affective declaration (“love you, love you so much”). This jocular performance is co-extended by Stefan and Linda, who also declare love for “Jan” (05–08). All three co-construct this play frame (Bateson, 1972) by adjusting their voices’ volume (03), using rising and falling pitch (02), and uttering elongated vowels (03–07). Stefan and Katie also refer to Katie’s stuffed toy, *Würmchen* (a stuffed worm clipped to her backpack) (07–08), which the researcher knew about due to close relationships that had emerged between her and all participants. This is not uncommon for researchers who are (graduate) students, reasonably close in age to participants, and abroad themselves.

The recorder’s presence affords Stefan and Katie opportunities to negotiate their relationship with Janice by uttering affective declarations and shared jokes and references. They repeat the same utterances while co-directing them to the device (i.e., the researcher), pointing to social closeness and the fact that they may communicate in similar ways off-recorder. The use of the recorder here clearly serves as a resource to further co-construct these relationships together and with the (physically absent) researcher.

### Frame 3: Practicing Language

In both studies, participants were expected to generate recordings at least partially in the L2 (see methods section). Thus, these projects constituted recording as both data collection for research purposes and as an opportunity for participants to use and practice language skills. During recordings, participants sometimes eagerly and actively constructed language learning frames, while other times, they resisted their obligation to practice the L2 with others.

## “Oh, I don’t Wanna Talk”

What Katie and peers begin in [Example 4a](#) continues into the latter half of the recording (see [Example 4b](#)). Here, we turn our focus to lines 09–55, where Katie shifts from the aforementioned play frame (01-09) to doing recording (“*okay jetzt aber*”).

### Example 4b

#### Stefan teaching Katie

<p>01 KAT: ((microphone crackling))  02  take one (.) hi Jan (.)  03 love you: (.) LOVE YOU SO:  04 MU:::CH  05 LIN: I love you too Ja:n  06 STE: I love you Ja:n (.) and  07 würmchen loves you too: xx  08 KAT: würmchen is here (.) boop  09 boop (.) okay jetzt aber  10 ((okay but now))  11 STE: okay  12 KAT: [ʃso:] ((so))  13 STE: nicht so:: ((laughing))  14 ((not so))  15 KAT: wie g[eh::ts ((how are you))  16 STE: [also ((so))  17 KAT: (.) HEY  18 STE: [so:]  19 KAT: [zo:]  20 STE: also? ((so))  21 KAT: also (.) um ((so um))  22 STE: =was gibt's zu besprechen  23 ((what's there to talk about))  24 KAT: ((laughing)) nichts/ (.)  25 ((nothing))  26 um (.) wait  27 STE: wann hast du heute  28 unterricht ((when do you have</p>	<p>29 class today))  30 KAT: &gt;oh i don't wanna talk&lt; (.)  31 okay (.) u:m zwei ((um two))  32 STE: von zwei bis vier? ((from two  33 to four))  34 KAT: ja und [dann ((yeah and then))  35 STE: [und dann hast du  36 dann von vier bis sechs (.)  37 [okay ((and then you have from  38 four to six okay))  39 KAT: [und dann ich treff mit  40 meine andere (.) deutsche  41 freundin ((and then I'm  42 meeting with my other German  43 friend))  44 STE: ACH so (.) und hiermit hört  45 die aufnahme für mich auf  46 [((laughing)) ((aha and with  47 that the recording ends for  48 me))  49 KAT: [↑OH[:  50 STE: [nein ((laughing))  51 ((no))  52 KAT: =hey  53 STE: nu nur scherz (.) ich mache  54 nur ein scherz ((just a joke  55 I'm just making a joke))</p>
--	---

In 09–10, Katie briefly pauses, switches into German, and starts using consistent intonation patterns. All of this signals that the play frame is over and the “real” task (an interaction in German) is about to begin. Stefan aligns with Katie’s shift in frame and footing, stating “okay” (11). Their shift is ratified by Linda, who was participating in the play frame but does not continue. Katie and Stefan ratify this because they leave her out of the subsequent interaction.

Although it is Katie who initiates the line 09–10 shift, in the lines that follow, she displays resistance to Stefan’s expectations around what it means to chat informally in German. For example, at line 12, Katie extends her shift by emphatically uttering the word “so” (pronounced with a rising and falling tone, [ʃso:]). There are two ways to understand her use of this word: one, as the English word “so” (because she uttered it as [so]), or two, as the German false cognate “so” (uttered using the aforementioned U.S.-English pronunciation, and with the assumption that the German and English word mean the same thing). Stefan immediately assumes the latter and communicates noncooperation (both structurally and affectively) with Katie’s utterance, saying “not ‘so’” (13–14). With this utterance, Stefan constructs a language practice frame within the interaction—a sequence that is reminiscent of classroom discourse (Wilkinson, 2002). While Stefan questions and teases Katie for her word choice, she ignores his rejection of this utterance and tries to guide the conversation back to informal German conversation (“*wie geht's?*” / “how are you?”, 14). Stefan does not take this up and extends the corrective work by offering Katie a better-suited item for the English “so”: the German word “also” ([alzo]) (16). Katie protests this shift by switching into English and

raising her voice: “HEY” (16). Stefan responds with more teasing—he revoices her choice emphatically ([ʃsoo:], 18), intentionally performing a stereotypical U.S.-American English accent. Katie subsequently teases Stefan, playing emphatically with the phonological features associated with a stereotypical German accent, saying [zo:] (19). Stefan continues positioning himself as a language teacher and utters the desired German word “*also*” once more, but with rising intonation. This time, Katie accepts and re-produces “*also*” (21). The two thus achieve intersubjectivity and after a micropause, shift footing to continue informal conversation and facework management together. Stefan’s topic search in German is cooperative in this regard: “what’s there to talk about” (22-23) Katie’s response: “((laughing)) nothing” (24-25). The effects of the diversion into a language practice frame, however, may have affected Katie’s desire to continue in German as evidenced by both her switch into English at line 26 and her hurried “>oh I don’t want to talk< (.) ok” (30-31). Katie’s “ok” at line 31 is likely a self-directed reminder that she is recording and should continue speaking informally in German with Stefan. The two do continue chatting (primarily in German) for another five minutes.

### “Is it Correct?”

In Victoria’s study, all participants reported in interviews that they used the recordings as a pretext to engage in English language practice with peers. Ami and Emma presented an extreme case: Both reported that they only used English together when they were recording and then switched immediately to Japanese once the recorder was turned off. This contextual information allows us to interpret their language choice in [Example 5](#) as an orientation to the recorder and to understand what follows as constitutive of language practice. What stands out in this excerpt is how the norms around doing language practice are negotiated. The excerpt begins with Emma asking how often Ami goes to the gym.

### Example 5

#### *Emma and Ami engage in wordsearching*

01	EMM:	how often do you go to	19	AMI:	onc:e
02		gym	20	EMM:	[ah: ]
03	AMI:	mm:: (1.7) mm: (1.3)	21	AMI:	[once] once day is <i>ichinichi</i>
04		once a two days?	22		<i>ni ikkai?</i> ((once a day))
05	EMM:	oh:	23		once a day is > <i>ichinichi ni</i>
06		(2.0)	24		<i>ikkai</i> < ((once a day))
07	AMI:	once a two days.	25		once a <u>week</u> is
08		(1.8)	26	EMM:	yeah
09		is it correct?	27	AMI:	<i>isshukan ni ikkai</i> ((once a
10		(1.4)	28		week)=
11	EMM:	per week.	29	EMM:	=yeah
12	AMI:	no no.	30	AMI:	so once a two days?
13	EMM:	huh?	31		((both laugh))
14	AMI:	two days > <i>futsuka ni</i>	32	EMM:	oh:: ((inaudible))
15		<i>ikkai</i> < ((once in two	33	AMI:	it's difficult
16		days))	34	EMM:	is it=
17		((both laugh loudly))	35	AMI:	=mm
18		(1.8)			

While formulating a response to Emma’s question, Ami encounters a language problem: She is unsure how to say “once every two days.” Ami produces two stretched fillers (03) followed by long pauses, allowing her to keep the floor while doing thinking. She eventually produces a candidate phrase with rising intonation: “once a two days?” (04). Emma treats Ami’s answer as sufficient, saying “oh:” (05) followed by a long pause. However, Ami decides to pursue her wordsearching and after a two second pause, she repeats the initial candidate with falling intonation. Another long pause follows as Emma declines to

participate in Ami's wordsearching. Ami then explicitly invites Emma to participate by asking "is it correct?" (09). Another long pause follows before Emma proposes the candidate "per week" (11), but she appears to have misunderstood Ami's intended meaning and Ami immediately rejects her candidate ("no no," 12). Emma, clearly confused, responds with "huh?" (13) and Ami begins an extended sequence in which she breaks down the expression starting with "two days" and then provides a gloss in Japanese (14–16). The use of Japanese appears to cause both participants to laugh loudly, but it is an awkward laugh followed by more silence. Ami tries again, establishing phrases she already knows ("once a day" and "once a week") and providing the Japanese translation. Emma aligns with these candidates throughout. Through analogy with expressions like "once a day," Ami again proposes "once a two days" (30), which is again responded to with laughter from both participants and they are unable to resolve the wordsearch. Finally, after the laughter, Emma produces the stretched filler "oh:." and a soft unintelligible comment and Ami comments that "it's difficult" (33). The sequence is then closed as both align with this assessment of the wordsearching task.

Ami's wordsearching reflects how Ami conceptualized the benefits of recording with Emma. She explained in interviews: "I guess I didn't learn something new from her [Emma] but we make sure ah whether it works like can I say it like and she yes like this and so I just make sure how to use and then make confidence to use the words" (Interview 3). Ami's many attempts at producing the expression "once every two days" shows how Ami actively constructed hypothesis testing and confidence building in practice. The extended self-repair sequence (i.e., the part of the interaction in which Ami pursues, co-manages, and resolves the issue in the talk; see Schegloff et al., 1977) differs markedly from repair embedded in everyday conversations. Eskildsen and Theodórsdóttir (2017) found that repair practices in SA service encounters were more condensed than in the classroom, where sequences were extended and drew on previous discussions of language. The number of turns that Ami dedicates to this repair could thus indicate that the principal activity, or frame, of this stretch of talk is indeed language practice. We argue that her dedication to the repair sequence is also evidence of her orientation to the recorder—or at the very least to the shared activity of practicing English while recording.

Although the recorder is not addressed directly, the shifts in tempo when Japanese is used (uttered significantly more quickly) signal brief microshifts in footing from a participant framework that includes the recorder as an auditor to a framework that excludes the recorder. Each use of Japanese is also followed by laughter (17 and 31), which treats its use as marked. Indeed, in interviews, Emma explained that during recordings, she avoided using Japanese, and in the data, she regularly treated Ami's use of Japanese as problematic. Accordingly, in this example, while Ami uses Japanese for wordsearching, Emma abstains and limits her contribution to confirming Ami's Japanese explanations, saying "yeah" (26 and 29). This treatment of Japanese as illicit reflects local constructions of appropriate and non-appropriate talk for recorded conversations, or what Speer and Hutchby (2003) call situated morality. In this case, there appears to be a local norm that recordings should be principally in English (which of course was what Victoria had requested). Throughout this extended self-repair sequence, Ami is also constructing an identity of *good language learner* by actively trying to resolve language problems and asking for language help (Surtees, 2019). Emma, however, resists doing overt language learning, participating minimally in Ami's activities. Thus, much like [Example 5](#), there seems to be a misalignment between participants around whether language practice in this context should include extensive repair work, explicit language learning talk, and L2 use, versus simply the use of the language to be learned.

## Discussion

The findings show that our participants, language learners in two SA contexts, oriented to the audio-recorder in the informal conversations they collected through identifiable shifts in footing. In some cases, participants spoke directly into the recorder (e.g., [Example 2](#)) or named the researcher directly (e.g., [Examples 3](#) and [4a/b](#)), designating the device as an (asynchronous) addressee. In other cases, the device was treated as an auditor—an unaddressed, ratified participant not expected to respond. Evidence of

orientations to the recorder as an auditor was more subtle and included L2 use (English or German), treatment of the L1 as inappropriate or marked (e.g., through laughter), and topic selection (i.e., homesickness, gossip). The audience design framework (Bell, 1984), which acknowledges the role of auditor, proved a useful tool for recognizing how the recorder and the act of recording shape talk and for understanding some of participants' interactive choices and practices. Although orientations to the recorder were often discernable in the interaction data alone, in Victoria's study, interview data provided important contextual information on participant-relevant schema that allowed the researchers to interpret how certain frames were constructed.

The analyses also show that participants accomplished three social activities. They treated the audio-recorder as a proxy for the researcher, much like in Gordon (2013), whose participants approached the recorder "as a conduit to the researcher" (p. 306). The participants also treated the recorder as a way to build informal relationships and to practice their L2. These activities sometimes overlapped, for example, when Ami and Emma gossiped about Victoria and were simultaneously engaged in practicing English, relationship building, and data generation.

Crucially, participants co-constructed these three social activities in ways that offer insight into how language learning is negotiated in informal talk and how the recorder and research participation can serve as resources to accomplish or resist that interactive work. The findings thus underscore the challenges that L2 learners in SA encounter when they try to do both learning and informal conversation simultaneously in talk. This was especially notable in interactions between multilingual speakers with different goals and proficiencies. Yet recording seems to have served as a tool to prioritize L2 learning and use in these socially complex situations. For example, in Janice's study, Katie navigated Stefan's teasing about her usage of the German false friend of the English word "so" via the use of overemphasized vowel sounds and play with both meanings.

Additionally, the humor frames established by participants when addressing the recorder or playing with the notion of being recorded worked to build affect between participants because it allowed them to create inside jokes associated with their shared recording experience. These opportunities for humor are the foundation of relationships and community. In Janice's study, participants playfully exclaimed "take one!," evoking the start of a movie scene where they would be cast as actors. Such ludic behavior becomes important for SA students attempting to make meaningful connections with L2 speakers abroad. Humor also emerged when participants played with the notion of what was (in)appropriate for the recording. For example, Janice's participants jokingly explained that it was okay for others to be recorded as long as they did not have secrets. In Victoria's study, Ami's gossip about Victoria's age caused giggling that can be attributed to the taboo nature of gossiping about someone who will listen to the recording. Similar moments emerged in other projects, where participants self-censored by way of asking the researcher to delete recordings or turn off the recorder (Diao, 2022), where they joked sarcastically about hiding state secrets (Gordon, 2013; Speer & Hutchby, 2003), and where they treated the recorder as an audience for theatrical behavior (Gordon, 2013). These examples show how participants acknowledge the act of recording and the role of the overhearer even as they attempt to establish the informal, friendly tenor that has been requested by the researchers (who sought conversations that would have taken place with or without the recorder).

Participants' orientations to the recorder were also part of the ongoing construction of their identities as good research participants, as observed by other scholars (e.g., Gordon, 2013), and provided opportunities to experiment with L2 use in academic genres (i.e., obtaining consent, interviewing). In Janice's study, a participant made a decision typically associated with researchers: She sought an approaching friend's verbal consent before continuing the conversation. In Victoria's study, participants engaged in typical interview behaviors (e.g., turntaking, questioning patterns). In these ways, participants oriented to the requirement to supply appropriate data for the researchers and to act ethically. They also appropriated new language they had encountered through project participation and incorporated it into their productive L2 repertoires.

This study differs from previous work on orientations to the recorder because the participants often treated recording sessions as opportunities for intentional L2 practice (rather than the recording of naturalistic

conversations they may have had without the recorder's presence). The act of recording gave participants a legitimate reason to initiate L2 talk with others. They also used the act of recording as a resource for imposing a language practice frame on these shared interactive spaces. In Janice's study, Stefan teases-nudges a resistant Katie to use German instead of English. In Victoria's study, Ami indulges in extended wordsearching and experimentation with English, despite minimal cooperation from her peer, Emma. In both studies, participants oriented to and negotiated norms around the relevance of active language learning (wordsearching in Ami's case and other-initiated repair in Stefan and Katie's case) and the appropriate amount of L1 versus L2 use. For Emma and Stefan, L1 use was treated as marked when operating in a learning frame, yet Ami treated L1 use as legitimate when in the service of learning. Katie, however, associated her L1 with friendly talk and relationship building whereas the L2 was treated as tiresome "work".

Importantly, not all recorded interactions contained easily identifiable orientations to the recorder, nor are the frames identified exclusive to recorded interactions. However, the act of recording does appear to have afforded participants additional opportunities for co-constructing these frames in original ways, for initiating L2 talk, for engaging in joint tasks with others (i.e., recording), and for participating in playful interaction.

## Conclusion

We have co-assembled two projects to show that the act of recording can serve as a resource for participants to engage in interactive and relational work during L2 practice and with L2 speakers—including the researchers, who at the time of data collection were relatively young and proficient speakers of the L2s. Although the initial aim of our projects was to gather naturalistic participant interactions, it was the act of assembling them under a new analytic lens that revealed how participants navigated our desire for naturalness. Their similar treatment of the recorder underscores that our findings may be relevant to a broader range of contexts (i.e., in language programs, study abroad) involving SA research and language learning.

Regarding implications for SA research, these findings support Diao's (2022) arguments that additional reflection on the relationship between the research and the researched is required as that relationship is consequential for the L2 conversations that participants are co-constructing. We would add that convergence or divergence between participants' SA and L2 learning goals (i.e., to meet L2 speakers and practice the L2) and the aims of the research project is also consequential. It is likely that participation in research projects like these might play a role in L2 learner identity and language development as well as provide regular access to opportunities to have sustained conversations with a speaker of the TL (e.g., the researcher) that participants would not have otherwise had. By exposing such entanglements, productive discussions emerge about the impact of research participation and the opportunities it affords for L2 practice and reflection (see also Diao, 2022).

Regarding implications for L2 teaching and learning, the findings shed light on the agency that L2 learners have in generating spaces for informal language practice with local community members (e.g., peers) when they are granted the authority of data gatherer via the recorder. As Zimmerman (2020) has pointed out, SA language learners can struggle to build friendships in the L2 and face challenges in carving out spaces as legitimate L2 speakers. Our findings support the assertion that giving students a recording task linked to an important project (our research projects, or in Zimmerman's study, a homework assignment) empowered them with a legitimate and authoritative reason to request opportunities for language practice. Our detailed analysis adds to these findings by showing that the recorder is a resource for keeping the conversations focused on language practice and highlights the complexities of trying to navigate the oft-competing goals of practicing an L2 and participating in informal, friendship-building conversation. By involving students in the analysis of the interaction data they collect, they could be further empowered to take charge of their learning and examine their beliefs about language learning in SA (Zimmerman, 2020).

Our project suggests intriguing possibilities for preparing students to engage with community members prior to going abroad and for students looking for meaningful informal L2 interactions in their home institutions. For example, introducing and integrating educational technology (e.g., recording devices, smart phones) within and outside of an SA program may offer educators in language programs a way to provide more informal opportunities for students to build their skills and confidence in requesting, initiating, and managing L2 conversations outside the classroom. Educators in language programs who wish to incorporate this activity into their classroom would need to support L2 learners to continually think about the kinds of conversation partners they seek out and possibly challenge assumptions about who and where those speakers are and who the perceived best conversation partners might be. This approach may also give L2 learners reflective, embodied opportunities for developing a multilingual identity outside of assessment contexts in which their oral L2 production is rated. The act of having L2 learners record informal conversations is something that has already been implemented as a learning activity in SA to promote multilingual L2 use, analysis, and reflection (see Zimmerman, 2020), and intentional translanguaging work (i.e., encouraging students to draw on their entire linguistic repertoire with the aim of expanding it; see Trentman, 2018). Yet, importantly, not all L2 learners pursue SA (see Fernández, McGregor, & Yuldashev, 2021 for how L2 learners discursively enact their ways of deciding to study abroad or not). Although our findings provide initial insight into the potential benefits of such an approach, more research will certainly be needed to understand how recording practices may support L2 learners within or outside of SA programs in co-enacting legitimate multilingual participation.

## References

- Bateson, G. (1972). A theory of play and fantasy. In G. Bateson (Ed.), *Steps to an ecology of mind* (pp. 177–193). Chandler.
- Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society*, 13(2), 145–204. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4167516>
- Bell, A. (2009). Back in style: Reworking audience design. In P. Eckert & J. R. Rickford (Eds.), *Style and sociolinguistic variation* (pp. 139–169). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511613258.010>
- Bucholtz, M., & K. Hall. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4–5), 585–614. <https://doi-org.ezpl.lib.umn.edu/10.1177/1461445605054407>
- Diao, W. (2022). Are natural conversations *natural*? Critical reflections on using participants' self-recorded conversations, the positioning of researchers, and participant self-censorship. In J. McGregor & J. L. Plews (Eds.), *Designing second language study abroad research: Critical reflections on methods and data*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Drew, P. (1989). Recalling someone from the past. In D. Roger & P. Bull (Eds.). *Conversation: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 96–115). Multilingual Matters.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Theodórsdóttir, G. (2017). Constructing L2 learning spaces: Ways to achieve learning inside and outside the classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 38(2), 143–164. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv010>
- Fernández, J., McGregor, J., & Yuldashev, A. (2021). Discursive enactment of agency in study abroad interviews. *Modern Language Journal*, 105(4), 877–896. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12733>
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gordon, C. (2013). Beyond the observer's paradox: The audio-recorder as a resource for the display of identity. *Qualitative Research*, 13(3), 299–317. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794112442771>
- Labov, W. (1972). Some principles of linguistic methodology. *Language in Society* 1(1), 97–120.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500006576>

- Malone, M. (1997). *Worlds of talk: The presentation of self in everyday conversation*. Blackwell.
- McGregor, J. (2021). An investigation of L2 learning peer interactions in short-term study abroad. In W. Diao & E. Trentman (Eds.), *Language learning in study abroad: The multilingual turn* (pp. 72–96). Multilingual Matters.
- McGregor, J. (2016). “I thought that when I was in Germany, I would speak just German”: Language learning and desire in twenty-first century study abroad. *L2 Journal*, 8(2), 12–30. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L28228930>
- Mitchell, R. (2023). Documenting L2 input and interaction during study abroad: Approaches, instruments and challenges. *Second Language Research*, 39(1), 59–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02676583211030626>
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 2, 361–382. <https://doi.org/10.2307/413107>
- Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Reflections on studying prosody in talk-in-interaction. *Language and Speech*, 41, 235–263. <https://doi-org.ezpl.lib.umn.edu/10.1177/002383099804100402>
- Shively, R. L. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1818–1835. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.030>
- Speer, S. A., & Hutchby, I. (2003). From ethics to analytics: Aspects of participants’ orientations to the presence and relevance of recording devices. *Sociology* 37(2), 315–337. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038503037002006>
- Surtees, V. (2019). “As a friend, that’s the one thing I always am very conscious not to do”: Categorization practices in interviews with peers in the host community. *Study Abroad Research in Second Language Acquisition and International Education*, 4(1), 45–69. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sar.17018.sur>
- Tannen, D., & C. Wallat. (1987). Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: Examples from a medical examination/interview. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50(2), 205–216. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2307/2786752>
- Trentman, E. (2018, October 5). Ethnographic projects for study abroad [Blog post]. <https://www.emmatrentman.com/blog/2018/10/4/ethnographic-projects-for-study-abroad>
- Wertheim, S. (2006). Cleaning up for company: Using participant roles to understand fieldworker effect. *Language in Society* 35(5), 707–727. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506060337>
- Zimmerman, E. (2020). Code-switching in conversation-for-learning: Creating opportunities for learning while on study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 53(1), 149–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12440>

## Appendix. Transcript Conventions

(.)	brief pause
(0.5)	longer pause; measured in milliseconds
<i>italicized text</i>	German and Japanese utterances
((text))	details of the scene, including German and Japanese utterances glossed in English
[ ]	overlapping
=	latching

TEXT	uttered with a louder volume
>text<	uttered at a quicker pace
◦	whispering
:	elongation
?	rising intonation
.	falling intonation
!	uttered with an animated tone
↑	uttered with rising inflection
↓	uttered with falling inflection
↕	uttered with rising and falling inflection
<u>text</u>	uttered with emphasis
\$	smile voice
xx	inaudible

## About the Authors

**Janice McGregor** is a faculty member in the Department of German Studies and the SLAT program at the University of Arizona. Her research projects examine how those involved in language education pursue and talk about language learning and multilingualism in interactional and intercultural contexts.

**E-mail:** [jmcgregor@arizona.edu](mailto:jmcgregor@arizona.edu)

**Victoria Surtees** is a Teaching and Learning Specialist in Internationalization at the University of the Fraser Valley in Canada. Her work dismantles deficit narratives about international students and investigates ways to support multilingual learners in post-secondary education.

**E-mail:** [victoria.surtees@ufv.ca](mailto:victoria.surtees@ufv.ca)