Routledge Advances in Second Language Studies

TEACHING AND TESTING L2 INTERACTIONAL COMPETENCE

BRIDGING THEORY AND PRACTICE

Edited by

M. Rafael Salaberry and Silvia Kunitz

Teaching and Testing L2 Interactional Competence

This volume features the latest research findings on L2 interactional competence (IC) to demonstrate the potential for developing and implementing research-based pedagogy that targets IC in early instruction in a variety of L2 learning and teaching contexts. Incorporating contributions from both leading and emerging researchers in the area, the book is organized into four sections to provide a systematic account of IC, defined as a set of skills required to construct an effective interaction with a variety of interlocutors in a variety of settings, and draws on research findings from studies in Conversation Analysis to highlight its efficacy as part of a well-rounded curriculum of L2 instruction. The volume provides a comprehensive overview of the different theoretical perspectives within the IC debate and moves into a discussion of research findings from a variety of contexts and their pedagogical implications. The book then presents examples of pedagogy in practice and also illustrates the potential for implementing IC in testing settings. This volume makes a valuable contribution to the growing literature on IC and will be of particular interest to graduate students and researchers in applied linguistics, second language acquisition, language education, curriculum and instruction studies, and educational linguistics.

M. Rafael Salaberry is Mary Gibbs Jones Professor of Humanities and Director of Research of the Center for Languages and Intercultural Communication at Rice University, USA.

Silvia Kunitz is University Lecturer in the Department of English at Stockholm University, Sweden.

Routledge Advances in Second Language Studies
Edited by John Hellermann and Søren Wind Eskildsen

Racialized Identity in Second Language Learning
Speaking Blackness in Brazil
Uju Anya

Teaching and Testing L2 Interactional Competence
Bridging Theory and Practice
Edited by M. Rafael Salaberry and Silvia Kunitz

For a full list of titles in this series, visit www.routledge.com/Routledge-Advances-in-Second-Language-Studies/book-series/RASLS

Teaching and Testing L2 Interactional Competence

Bridging Theory and Practice

Edited by M. Rafael Salaberry and
Silvia Kunitz

First published 2019
by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2019 Taylor & Francis

The right of the editors to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

With the exception of Chapter 13, no part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Chapter 13 of this book is available for free in PDF format as Open Access from the individual product page at www.routledge.com. It has been made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 license.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-1-138-03899-8 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-17702-1 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Contents

Introduction	1
M. RAFAEL SALABERRY AND SILVIA KUNITZ	
SECTION I	
Theoretical and Methodological Approaches	23
1 On the Nature and the Development of L2 Interactional Competence: State of the Art and Implications for Praxis	25
SIMONA PEKAREK DOEHLER	
2 Some Theoretical Reflections on the Construct of Interactional Competence	60
NUMA MARKEE	
3 The Construction of Interactional Incompetence in L2 Interaction	77
ERIC HAUSER	
SECTION II	
Research-Based Insights for Teaching	123
4 <i>Ohja. Ja. Ja.</i> ('Ohyes. Yes. Yes.'): Providing the Appropriate Next Relevant Action in L2 Interaction	125
CARMEN TALEGHANI-NIKAZM	
5 The Interplay Between Collaborative Turn Sequences and Active Listenership: Implications for the Development of L2 Interactional Competence	142
OLCAY SERT	

6	Developing and Teaching Interactional Competence in Japanese Style Shifting	167
	NAOKO TAGUCHI AND DINA RUDOLPH YOSHIMI	
7	Interactional Competence and Study Abroad: Empirical Methods, Findings and Pedagogical Implications	192
	KATE WHITE	
SECTION III		
	Research-Informed Pedagogy	213
8	Developing Interactional Competence With Limited Linguistic Resources	215
	HANSUN ZHANG WARING	
9	Instructed L2 Interactional Competence in the First Year	228
	SILVIA KUNITZ AND MENG YEH	
10	Making Sense of Interactional Trouble Through Mobile-Supported Sharing Activities	260
	NIINA LILJA AND ARJA PIIRAINEN-MARSH	
SECTION IV		
	Testing	289
11	What Counts as Evidence for Interactional Competence? Developing Rating Criteria for a German Classroom-Based Paired Speaking Test	291
	KATHARINA KLEY	
12	Testing Interactional Competence in Second Language Classrooms: Goals, Formats and Caveats	322
	THORSTEN HUTH AND EMMA BETZ	
13	Doing Versus Assessing Interactional Competence	357
	ERICA SANDLUND AND PIA SUNDQVIST	

Conclusion: Deepening Roots and Broadening Horizons in Interactional Competence Research and Praxis	397
--	------------

HANH THI NGUYEN

<i>Appendix: Transcription Conventions</i>	413
<i>Contributors</i>	415
<i>Index</i>	419

Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Introduction

M. Rafael Salaberry and Silvia Kunitz

The Goal of the Volume

This volume focuses on current research on second language (L2) interactional competence (IC) and on its pedagogical implications. While research on L2 IC has been developing since the 1990s (see Hall, 1993, 1995, 1999; Kramsch, 1986), the pedagogical implications of such research have hardly been discussed, and only a few attempts have been made to bridge the gap between research and practice with regard to the teaching of IC in the L2 classroom (see Barraja-Rohan, 1997, 2011; Betz & Huth, 2014; Huth, 2006, 2010; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; Wong & Waring, 2010). To address the limited role of IC as a guide for the development of L2 interactional abilities, the present volume will provide a variety of views from both researchers and teaching practitioners on the possible ways to implement teaching and testing procedures (primarily during the first two years of university L2 instruction) that are informed and guided by research findings on L2 IC. The authors of the chapters (a) discuss various approaches to the study of L2 IC, mostly from a conversation analytic (CA) perspective (see Section I); (b) present empirical findings on the development of L2 IC and their potential pedagogical implications (see Section II); (c) describe outcomes of pedagogical implementations informed by IC-based research (see Section III); and (d) illustrate issues and outcomes of IC-based testing (see Section IV). Each of these themes is addressed in the four sections that provide the organizational structure of the volume. Transcription conventions that are shared across chapters are presented in the appendix.

Background

The concept of IC as it is used today traces back to Hymes's (1972) view of communicative competence (CC) as the knowledge of how to use language appropriately in social context. What IC and CC have in common is an understanding of language use as inherently social (see the discussion in Hall, 2018). However, the two constructs differ in that,

in Hymes's model and in subsequent models that applied Hymes's view to language education and testing (e.g., Canale & Swain, 1980; Bachman, 1990), components of CC were considered statically, as cognitive properties/abilities of the individual and therefore separable from actual instances of language use (see this critique in Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Kasper & Ross, 2013). Overall, these early models were anchored in a rationalist approach to pragmatics that develops intention-based accounts of social actions, with an almost exclusive focus on the speaker (for a discussion of the differences between rationalist and discursive pragmatics, see Kasper, 2006). Such view was reflected in the language professionals' interest in L2 users' individual language proficiency.

It was only from the 1990s that a more dynamic and socioculturally grounded interpretation of interaction came to be adopted (see Hall, 1993, 1995, 1999; He & Young, 1998; Young, 2003, 2011), but it was the development of CA research on L2 users' talk (see, for example, the studies published in Gardner & Wagner, 2004, in Hall, Hellermann, & Pekarek Doehler, 2011, and in Pallotti & Wagner, 2011; see also Eskildsen & Markee, 2018) that effectively brought about an understanding of the situated and co-constructed nature of interaction as a process in which social actions are observably accomplished on a moment-by-moment basis, as interactants make sense of what they are doing in and through the unfolding of their turns-at-talk. The consequence, then, is that L2 users are to be considered for their emergent, co-constructed ability to interact with others by making sense of each other's actions. To put it differently, L2 users are to be assessed for their ability to understand the actions accomplished by prior turns-at-talk and to respond to those actions with relevant and fitting turns-at-talk (see also Huth, forthcoming). Such ability is what we understand today as IC.

Even though the construct of IC has been discussed in numerous publications and refined over the last two decades, there have been only a few attempts at designing instructional materials to teach L2 IC (Carroll, 2011a, 2011b; Olsher, 2011a, 2011b; Wong, 2011a, 2011b) and even fewer attempts at implementing IC-based units (Huth, 2006, 2010; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). To our knowledge, Barraja-Rohan (2011) was the first conversation analyst who made IC the main goal of instruction in an ESL course. These first implementation efforts have been carried out by conversation analysts who happened to work in L2 programs. The outstanding question is whether language teachers who are not conversation analysts by training would be able to incorporate the notion of IC into their teaching practice (or, even more modestly, whether the notion of IC would have some minimal effect on their teaching). The answer is a qualified yes judging by the fact that the publication of the present volume is inspired by the programmatic efforts of a group of teachers working at Rice's Center for Languages and Intercultural Communication (CLIC). These teachers, with the aid of the

institution, which supported their collaboration with CA specialists (see below), managed to create IC units of instruction and, in some cases, implemented a curriculum for the first two years of university L2 instruction that was guided by their understanding of the IC construct. To our knowledge, this was the first systematic effort to incorporate IC into the L2 curriculum at the university level.

Such collaborative, programmatic effort was the result of the teachers' interest in providing students with the communicative abilities that had been the main objective of the center for over a decade. Initial meetings among the members of the center focused on how to define the objective pursued by the curriculum (i.e., communicative ability in the L2). These discussions eventually led to the realization that such an objective, apparently simple to define at face value, was not as precise as needed to lead to the type of structural changes that were necessary to make it a viable academic goal. This first step towards strategic planning required linking up the database of information gathered from research studies with a similar repository of knowledge gathered through the experience and practice of teaching second languages. Through an honest process of reflection and discussion of teaching practices and how such practices actually addressed the avowed curriculum goals of the center, the inef-fable concept of CC of the beginning stages started to evolve into a less individually based, verbal-based concept to one that is co-constructed among participants and that includes embodied interactions that super-sede the strictly linguistic exchanges.

Through a number of initial internal workshops facilitated primarily by one of the editors of this volume (Kunitz), the faculty at CLIC was able to identify an important distinction to be made between the concept of CC from the early 1980s and the expansion of that definition to incorporate the notion of the interactional abilities that underlie the natural use of language. Specifically, during the workshops the teachers were instructed about the defining features of IC as previously described in research studies; at the same time, they were engaged in the hands-on process of analyzing L1 and L2 interactional data in order to identify the interactional skills that could constitute the learnables and teachables (Eskildsen & Majlesi, 2018) for their students. Through these activities, the teachers realized the importance of involving students in guided analyses of interactional data and of designing awareness-raising tasks that would sensitize the students to the interactional features of language use in context. This initial process of inquiry led to an ambitious effort to incorporate research findings towards the creation of an academically substantive L2 program through the design and implementation of a research-based L2 undergraduate curriculum. This project was institutionally supported through the promotion of professionalization efforts of the language teaching staff through funded research and training and through the funding of staff lines assigned to postdoctoral fellows who

were hired to lead the restructuring of the curriculum (three postdoc positions in total).

With the initial groundwork on the design of an IC-based curriculum under way, it was time to bring together established IC researchers and practitioners to discuss the most effective and efficient ways to put into effect the ambitious curriculum restructuring agenda being developed at CLIC. A symposium on the teaching and testing of IC was thus organized by CLIC in 2016. The themes addressed in this volume grew out of that symposium. This volume provides extended responses to the questions raised by both practitioners and researchers during the workshops and the symposium organized at the center. Overall, the volume connects theoretical discussions on the concept of IC, empirical findings, potential pedagogical implications, and outcomes of actual research-based pedagogy primarily in the first two years of university L2 instruction.

Conversation Analysis as the Theoretical Foundation of IC

As the readers will soon realize in the theoretical section of the volume, the debate on what actually constitutes IC and on its transferability to a variety of socio-interactional contexts is not settled yet (see also the 2018 first issue of *Classroom Discourse* focusing on IC, with a commentary by Eskildsen, 2018). Ultimately, the crux of the matter lies in the entry point to data analysis, which for some researchers should be entirely emic (i.e., participant-relevant; see Hauser, this volume, and Markee, this volume), while for others it can be etic (i.e., researcher-relevant; see Pekarek Doe- hler, 2018, this volume). For the purposes of this introduction, however, we leave all the subtleties to the theoretical discussion led in the first section of the volume and briefly outline the CA definition of IC that has been adopted in most of the chapters.

Conversation Analysis (CA) has been portrayed as a “naturalistic observational discipline” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973: 289) that analyzes (audio and video) recordings of naturally occurring interactions in order to explore how participants in interaction accomplish recognizable social actions (such as greetings, invitations, requests, rejections of invitations, etc.) and make sense of such actions. Conversation analysts therefore develop action-based accounts of what participants do (and understand each other to be doing) in and through interaction, on a moment-by-moment basis, rather than focusing on what abstract grammatical structures are used. It is in this sense that CA is framed within discursive pragmatics rather than rationalist pragmatics that develops intention-based accounts (see Kasper, 2006). The proof of the pudding, so to speak, is not the researcher’s etic interpretation of each turn-at-talk; instead, a CA analysis is empirically grounded in the participants’ own (or emic) interpretation of the co-participants’ prior turns, an interpretation which

becomes observable to analysts in the way each turn is responded to in the unfolding of the interaction. This analytical method is called *next turn proof procedure* (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999). For example, an utterance such as *the window is open*, taken in isolation, could receive many different interpretations; that is, it could be a plain announcement, a description of a picture in an L2 classroom task, etc. The key to understand how the participants themselves interpret such an utterance is in the action done in the immediately following turn; for example, in response to *the window is open*, a co-participant could say *yeah, sure*, while reaching towards the window and closing it. This would show that the original utterance had been interpreted as a request to close the window. Put in more abstract terms, as Wagner (2015) notes, meaning is “not in the word but in its actional consequences” (p. 88). That is, meaning is not inherently expressed and fixed in the linguistic packaging of a turn but is co-constructed through the action that the co-participant enacts in response to that turn. Therefore, IC lies in “the interpretive work of understanding that participants display” (Lee & Hellermann, 2014: 769) with each turn they produce, with each action they accomplish.

In CA terms, then, interactionally competent speakers should be able to design their turns for a particular recipient in a particular context (what CA calls *recipient design*) in order to accomplish recognizable social actions and adequately respond to the actions produced by their co-participants in the local and emergent circumstances of interaction as it unfolds (Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Pekarek Doehler & Poehon-Berger, 2015). What allows for the recognizability of the social action accomplished by a turn-at-talk is its design (e.g., the linguistic packaging) and its placement (i.e., the position of each turn) in the unfolding interaction. Ultimately, the ability to design and position turns-at-talk that accomplish recognizable actions lies in the speaker’s ability to use the mechanisms organizing talk-in-interaction (i.e., turn-taking, sequence and preference organization, and repair), coupled with the ability to use various linguistic and embodied resources (Markee, 2008; Pekarek Doehler & Fasel Lauzon, 2015). In what follows we provide a short overview of the interactional mechanisms mentioned above.

Turn-taking involves the ability to parse co-participants’ turns, to identify transition relevance places where changes in speakership may occur, and to display the relevance of one’s own turn to prior talk. To do so, a prospective next speaker needs to be able to monitor linguistic, prosodic, semantic and pragmatic details of a turn-in-progress. Sequence organization, on the other hand, concerns the ability to produce turns that are sequentially relevant and fitted to prior talk. Strictly connected to sequence organization is preference organization. Mastering preference organization means knowing which second actions are made relevant by a sequence-initiating action (or first action) and which format is appropriate. For example, an offer establishes the relevance of either acceptance

or rejection. However, these two options are not equal: “observable regularities” (Sidnell, 2010: 77) of talk-in-interaction show that second actions that align with the course of action projected by the first speaker are preferred. So, acceptance would be the preferred response to an invitation, while rejection would be dispreferred. Such organization is reflected in the way turns are formatted: dispreferred actions are performed through turns that are typically delayed and characterized by hesitations, mitigations, accounts, etc. Finally, repair is the mechanism that deals with interactional trouble as manifested through problems in speaking, hearing and understanding.

These three mechanisms govern the unfolding of talk-in-interaction and contribute to the establishment and the maintenance of intersubjectivity (or mutual understanding) among co-participants. The ability to use such mechanisms is therefore crucial for both L1 and L2 speakers. To give just a simple example, it is important for L2 speakers to know the format of dispreferred actions such as rejections to an invitation; that is, it is important to know how to say ‘no’ in a pragmatically appropriate way (with delays, appreciations, accounts, etc.), without inadvertently showing hostility or impatience. As Carroll (2011b) observes, teaching preference organization “is really about helping learners realize that how and when something is said is just as important as what words are used” (p. 117). This clearly speaks to the relevance of teaching IC and of developing CA-based IC instruction, where CA can provide reliable learning targets (Betz & Huth, 2014; Huth, forthcoming), around which innovative, research-based pedagogical materials can be designed. Ultimately, research is starting to point to the effectiveness of this type of instruction (see, for example, Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Huth, 2006; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; see also Kunitz & Yeh, this volume).

The Challenges in Incorporating the Concept of IC Into L2 Teaching

The concept of IC was formally introduced into the ongoing discussion of L2 teaching almost 30 years ago in the form of a vague reference to its importance in the context of the growing influence of the model of language competence advanced by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) (Kramsch, 1986; for a detailed history of the concept, see Hall, 2018). Kramsch (1986) provided a stark contrast between the concept of proficiency (as vaguely defined by ACTFL) and the concept of interaction (still under-defined at the time): “I will argue here that the. . . *oversimplified view* on human interactions *taken by the proficiency movement* can impair and even prevent the attainment of true interactional competence within a cross-cultural framework” (p. 367). The initial call to action from Kramsch was followed up by more precise theoretical and empirically based descriptions of the concept of

interaction as the latter was contrasted with the prevailing terminology of *proficiency*, *communication* and other similarly vaguely defined concepts. Several subsequent publications refined the concept of IC in the context of L2 learning (e.g., Hall, 1999; Hall et al., 2011; He & Young, 1998; Johnson, 2001; Kormos, 1999; Kramsch, 1993, 2010; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015; Young, 2011) and for the purpose of L2 learning (e.g., Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Huth, 2006; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; Taleghani-Nikazm & Huth, 2010), thus paving the way for its incorporation and integration into L2 instruction.

Even though the new concept of IC provided a more viable way to visualize the real-life communicative objectives of the communicative movement of the 1980s and 1990s, it also introduced new challenges. Two of the most important obstacles for the introduction of the concept of IC to the teaching profession are predicated on (a) the difficulties presented by the dynamic co-construction of interactional events for the assessment of language ability, and (b) the distinction of speech versus written modes of communication in the implementation of classroom-based language activities. Even though these challenges are inherently intertwined from a theoretical perspective, their independent status is given by the specific context in which they are relevant (testing or teaching). The first difficulty faced by IC proponents was the most apparent one given institutional needs to devise assessment procedures focused on individual abilities. By 2011, Young addressed the increasingly salient contrast between CC and IC: “The fundamental difference is that an individual’s knowledge and employment of these resources is contingent on what other participants do; that is, IC is . . . distributed across participants and varies in different interactional practices” (p. 430). The very notion of co-construction of knowledge brought up a challenge to a profession that was accustomed (since Chomsky, 1965) to visualizing language competence as an individual ability that was stable across contexts of use (thus generalizable across settings when it was tested). The majority of the chapters in this volume address this important challenge, either directly or indirectly, whereas the section on testing provides readers with the most comprehensive analysis of actual implementations of testing procedures that incorporate the co-constructed nature of interaction in general and IC in particular.

A second challenge for the incorporation of the concept of IC into the L2 curriculum was embedded in the institutional system of language instruction in the form of what has been described as a hierarchical two-tiered system that favors the definition of language as written code over language defined as part of the spoken mode of communication. Ironically, the distinction between speech modes (oral versus written) is not easy to identify given some prevalent conceptual notions deeply entrenched in the teaching profession that confound the definition of language. Early on, DiPietro (1987) described the pedagogical challenge

posed by the structural organization of most language departments in US universities:

It is customary in second-language education to think of instruction as having two tiers. The first tier is dedicated to achieving the basics. The second tier is the one in which the focus of instruction shifts to the so-called content areas.

(p. 109)

The two-tiered system is predicated on the fallacy of drawing a parallel between the spoken and written language on the one hand and the dichotomy of language skills and language content/literacy on the other hand. As a consequence, the unexamined assumption is that the first tier of language courses is to be dedicated to the development of abilities primarily defined within the realm of the spoken language, whereas the second tier of the curriculum is to be focused on the development of academic abilities primarily defined within the realm of the written language. This is not an unexpected contrast to find in the language teaching profession. By definition, the concept of IC highlights the interactional nature and needs of communication, whereas the initial concept of the communicative movement was mostly focused on the transactional needs of content-based communication. That is, the focus was on the delivery of content information rather than on the interactional process of communication.

Lest one assumes that the separation between spoken and written language abilities has been superseded by a more integrated curriculum, the recent MLA Teagle Report (2009) reaffirms the notion that language abilities used for spoken communication on the one hand and (standard) language use on the other hand are conceptualized as separate entities: "Speaking a second language does not necessarily make one a sophisticated citizen of our contemporary world" (p. 7). This position further affirms the privileged status accorded to the 'second tier' of the system at the university level. The conceptual mistake is reflected in the fact that the MLA Teagle Report (2009) focuses its analysis on superficial distinctions between different modes of language use, missing the point about the essential value of the dynamic, interactional, localized features of interactive oral communication:

The pedagogical emphasis . . . on language for communication seems sometimes to entail the willingness to accept approximations of pronunciation, grammar, and syntax, so long as the intended idea is more or less conveyed. . . . This notion of efficiency may be adequate for nonacademic language teaching programs.

(pp. 7–8)

Interestingly, the misunderstanding about the substantive academic role of the analysis and learning of the spoken mode of communication has been

addressed numerous times by many researchers in second language acquisition and teaching. Perhaps the clearest such defense comes from Kramsch (1993), who singled out the main point that was missing from arguments that, in attempting to justify a two-tiered system, trivialized the use of spoken language as input data worthy of consideration for any academic program:

Authentic speech is often presented and read in language classes in the same uncritical way as such language is used by most native speakers—as if the classroom could ever be, or even should try to imitate, the natural environment of restaurants and workplaces.

(p. 179)

To put things in perspective, we need to assess the significance of incorporating an IC-based curriculum that would ‘rescue’ the relevance and importance of properly defined ‘oral skills’ in L2 development and L2 learning. On this point, the lack of incorporation of the concept of IC into the L2 curriculum (and of the important communicative abilities it represents) is especially noticeable in the lower levels of the L2 curriculum. In the United States, for example, about 80% of all college students who study a second language do not continue beyond the first two years of instruction (Goldberg, Looney, & Lusin, 2015). Because of the lack of focus on interactional abilities, especially for beginning students, it is possible that the majority of students are being deprived of the opportunity to develop a more realistic, contextualized definition of language (e.g., Carter & McCarthy, 2001; O’Keeffe, McCarthy, & Carter, 2007), and of the opportunity to practice their language skills accordingly.

The Gap Between Research and Teaching

Despite the fact that the first calls for a socially contextualized notion of CC go back to almost 30 years ago (cf. Kramsch, Young, Hall, etc.), we are still in the early days of the process by which we can develop and implement the concept of CC (as first outlined by Hymes) that will be carried over into the operationalization of an IC-based curriculum. The notion of a very slow-moving process in the development of a socially contextualized concept of communication in L2 teaching and learning is directly substantiated by the cautionary approach and limited generalizations of some of the authors on this volume. As an example, the author of chapter 1, Pekarek Doehler, sets out to provide a state-of-the-art analysis on the nature and development of IC with further “implications for praxis.” Keenly aware of the enormity of her task, Pekarek Doehler cautions readers that her perspective should be understood as part of the thinking of

a researcher in the field of CA-SLA concerned with fundamental research into L2 development. They are not analyses of a researcher

in education or pedagogy, nor can they pretend to draw on any substantial amount of experience in the field of language teaching.

(Chapter 1, p. 26)

Pekarek Doehler's humble approach to the task of describing the state of the art of research on IC and potential implications for research is indicative of the current gap between studies on IC and the implementation of such knowledge in L2 instruction.

Even though the concept of IC has been increasingly researched in the field of L2 studies, few concrete examples of the implementation of IC in L2 instruction have been documented (e.g., Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Huth, 2006; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). This gap between research and educational implementation is significant. On the one hand, various CA studies have been conducted on L2 users' interactional resources (see, for example, Gardner & Wagner, 2004; Greer, 2010) and their development over time (see Hall et al., 2011; Hellermann, 2008; studies in Pallotti & Wagner, 2011; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015; studies in Pekarek Doehler, Wagner, & González-Martínez, 2018), both in the classroom and in the wild. On the other hand, to the best of our knowledge, the design of pedagogical material that is informed by CA findings within IC-based research has been focused primarily on two languages; that is, English (Carroll, 2011a, 2011b; Olsher, 2011a, 2011b; Wong, 2011a, 2011b) and German (see Betz & Huth, 2014, and the collection of materials published in the journal *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*). This comes as no surprise, since English and German are well-studied languages within the CA field; therefore, there is a wealth of CA findings that can constitute reliable learning targets (Betz & Huth, 2014) for these languages. Note also that the materials designed so far have been developed by conversation analysts. These observations, in turn, lead to the identification of two issues: first of all, the issue of IC instruction for languages for which there are none or just a few CA findings available and, second, the issue of bringing CA to teachers so that CA-based IC instruction can be implemented by a larger pool of instructors. These issues will be addressed by at least some of the chapters in this volume (and especially in Kunitz & Yeh, this volume).

The use of an IC-based curriculum has its challenges. First of all, in an IC-based curriculum interactional skills are both the tool and the object of language learning; at the same time, the contingent nature of talk-in-interaction introduces another level of complexity since interaction is locally constituted and highly co-constructed on a moment-by-moment basis, features which make it rather unpredictable (and which are in sharp contrast with the traditional view of communication as a series of predictable transactional exchanges). The immediate question that arises, then, is the extent to which explicit classroom instruction may be a viable way to allow learners to develop such a socially oriented type of ability.

The latest focus of some programs on activities outside the classroom environment (in the wild and study abroad) seems to acknowledge the contextual limitations of the classroom as a language learning environment (see, for example, the studies in Hellermann, Eskildsen, Pekarek Doehler, & Piirainen-Marsh, forthcoming). Notwithstanding these limitations of language use prompted by contextual factors, one could turn the previous argument on its head and argue that (especially adult) L2 learning can benefit from (or indeed necessitate) the support of guided tasks in the class for L2 learners to identify and benefit from features of socially based language interaction (on this matter, see also Wagner, 2015, who argues for the learners' need to debrief their 'in-the-wild' activities in the classroom). Another factor that needs to be considered for the incorporation of IC to the classroom environment is the possible effect of limited linguistic resources for the proper analysis of IC. On this point, one could argue that IC instruction may be too advanced for students enrolled in the first two years of the language curriculum. However, there are possible solutions to address this problem. Betz and Huth (2014), for instance, argue for the need to incorporate the use of the L1 in IC instruction. Similarly, Waring (this volume) provides a systematic approach to this challenge.

At the same time, in the field of testing, the theoretical difficulties brought up by the assignment of individual grades to a co-constructed performance started a much-needed discussion (see, for example, Bachman, 2007; Chalhoub-Deville, 2003). In the meantime, there has been increasing interest in studying the interactional organization of standardized and classroom-based tests, and the practices enacted by test takers in these settings (see, for example, Brooks, 2009; Galaczi, 2014; Kley, 2015; Kasper & Ross, 2013; Seedhouse & Nakatsuhara, 2018; He & Young, 1998). However, research on testing procedures targeting the assessment of IC is scant at best. It has been mostly the researchers who, having implemented units of IC-based instruction (i.e., Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Huth, 2006; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; see also Betz & Huth, this volume), have also developed classroom-based testing tools to assess specific interactional practices that are the target of instruction.

To understand the significance of the gap between research on IC phenomena and the incorporation of IC into the teaching arena, we need to consider the costs and consequences of such a dissociation of efforts. In principle, researchers may be reluctant to make research-based proposals that, for a variety of reasons beyond the sound logic of the research claim, may not be successfully implemented in the classroom. At the same time, even when there is a solid plan of action that researchers are willing to support, teachers need to be convinced of the positive, practical value of such proposal, which should be perceived as feasible and relatable to the reality of L2 classrooms. In other words, the costs associated with the implementation of any research-based proposal (IC contextualized

curriculum in this case) are not to be understated. The fact that we are now past the 30-year mark when Kramsch first sounded the alarm about the narrow vision of the ACTFL movement should give us an indication of the ambitious task ahead of us.

One way to solve the potential tension between the researchers' goals and theory-oriented attitudes and teachers' need for ready-made solutions that can be efficiently applied in the classroom is to directly involve the teachers in the research team, so that the research-based proposal can be felt as shared and collaboratively co-constructed rather than imposed (for a discussion on the challenges of curricular innovations, see also Markee, 1997). A practical solution would focus on increasing the teachers' involvement in action research projects (Burns, 2011) where the teachers can directly implement and test the given research-informed pedagogical proposal in their classrooms. This is indeed what happened at CLIC, where some of the teachers who were involved in the professional development program held at the center carried out their own research-informed instructional projects to create a set of instructional materials (<http://climaterials.rice.edu>) that would achieve the goal of teaching and testing IC in the way best suited for their own students.

Finally, we should keep in mind that the hierarchical separation of research and practice is not unique to the field of second language research and teaching. Schön (1992) described this dilemma as endemic to the basic and applied sciences in general: "The rule is this: first, the relevant basic and applied science; then, the skills of application to real-world problems of practice" (p. 27). This problem, Schön adduces, is the consequence of adherence to the concept of positivism in the sciences and even more precisely to the notion of technical rationality whereby applications follow theory. Against this background, Schön's (1983) introduction of the concept of Reflection-in-Action or Knowing-in-Action represented a new approach to cognitive design theory that is primarily based on the conceptual design process common to applied professions such as architecture in which the practitioner (the architect)

listens to the situation's back talk, forming new appreciations which guide his further moves. . . . The unique and uncertain situation comes to be understood through the attempt to change it and changed through the attempt to understand it.

(p. 132)

In line with the basic premise of Schön's interactive approach to design (i.e., from theory to practice and from practice to theory), the researchers and teachers who agreed to author the chapters in this volume provide us with detailed, nuanced and promising ways to bridge the gap that has persisted for such a long time in the quest to define a true level of CC. Moreover, the efforts of researchers and teachers working in

collaboration as teams (as showcased in detail in Chapter 9 by Kunitz and Yeh) provide an even more integrated approach to bridge the gap between research and applications of scholarship. Needless to say, such collaboration is not easy to achieve, since it requires a continuous dialogic integration of different perspectives and needs, and an institutional commitment of resources.

Organization of the Volume

Section I: Theoretical and Methodological Approaches

Section I focuses on the conceptualization of the proper theoretical definition of IC to identify and circumscribe the theoretical foundation necessary for any type of pedagogical project on the development of an IC curriculum in the L2 classroom. All three chapters in this section dovetail with each other, raising important theoretical points to be considered: from the distinction between linguistic competence and IC to the incorporation of a multi-semiotic approach to the understanding of interaction and the development of knowledge through co-constructed interactions. The opening chapter by Pekarek Doehler traces the history of proposals that led to the definition of a theoretical construct of IC, using Hymes's initial conceptualization of CC as her point of departure to contrast it with the Chomskyan formalist definition of language competence. More important, Pekarek Doehler presents a detailed argument that justifies the theoretical relevance of IC, while also raising important questions to be addressed by future research. One important point of discussion she explicitly identifies is the potential division of the main construct of IC into two sub-constructs. That is, the verbal, prosodic and embodied methods used by speakers to organize and co-construct their interactions can be defined at two different levels. First, there is a universal, general-knowledge competence to participate in interactions (e.g., the generic concepts of turn-taking or making repairs) that is already present in the L1 of any learner, and perhaps transferable. Second, there are aspects of this competence that can be more properly defined as part of the language-specific ability to use L2 resources in particular ways that are sensitive to the locally contextualized situation: "adapted to the local circumstances of ongoing interactions, as well as to the precise others participating in these" (Pekarek-Doehler, [Chapter 1, p. 30]). This theoretical distinction brings up a number of important questions for research, including: under what conditions are L2 learners able to successfully transfer their knowledge from the L1 to organize their interaction in the L2? How do L2 learners diversify the resources available to them throughout time? Do the interactional resources in the (sociolinguistically) constrained environment of the classroom provide enough relevant exposure to the L2 to develop the learner's resources?

Broadening the scope of Pekarek Doehler's analysis, Markee proposes a theoretical distinction between the terms *competence* and *interactional competence*, where the first belongs to the ethnomethodological CA tradition and the second to the CA-SLA tradition within applied linguistics (CA-SLA is the label used for the branch of CA that works within the field of Second Language Acquisition). Markee's apparent goal is to caution researchers not to minimize the potential contribution of the original (emic) perspective of ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis (EMCA) to understanding and theorizing the true nature of human competence; that is, human beings' ability to competently make sense of each other's actions through the interactional mechanisms of turn-taking, repair and sequence organization. A proper description of the learning process within this purview is described by Markee as the process of learners' "developing common-sense understandings of the world, including how they do language learning" (Chapter 2, p. 65). Not only does Markee claim that the emerging interactional modifications of behavior need not rely on an exogenous (mostly cognitive) theory of acquisition, but he also proposes an extended notion of competence that would include multimodal, multi-semiotic expressions of interactional performances. Interestingly, Markee dovetails with Pekarek Doehler's claim regarding the need to rely on a distinction between two distinct sub-constructs of competence: "SL users'/learners' competent ability to do talk-in-interaction can safely be assumed, which leaves the epiphenomenal by-products of this competence—their locally situated interactional repertoires—as the phenomenon that is to be assessed" (Chapter 2, p. 66).

Section I concludes with a provocative proposal from Hauser regarding the apparent dissociation between linguistic proficiency (or individual competence as traditionally defined in SLA) and IC: the latter is totally dissociated from the former, thus raising the possibility that learners may be linguistically competent but interactionally incompetent. What's more, Hauser claims that we cannot even talk of IC developing over time. Hauser gathers this is a necessary conclusion given that, by definition, interactional abilities are co-constructed and localized (cf. He & Young, 1998). On the other hand, he does concede that learners may develop the resources necessary to interact with others, even describing concrete processes that can help L2 learners develop their repertoire of resources to interact in the L2: "formulaic expressions used to summon someone or to initiate repair, . . . awareness of the importance of gaze and bodily position, . . . , reflection on how interactional (in)competence has been constructed in particular episodes of interaction," etc. (Chapter 3, p. 102).

Section II: Research-Based Insights for Teaching

In Chapter 4 Taleghani-Nikazm analyzes third-turn response behaviors (question-answer-expansion) among beginning and intermediate L2

German learners engaged in conversations mediated via online video. Her analysis reveals that the learners were able to produce response tokens in third turns following a question-answer sequence demonstrating the learners' ability to express a stance towards the previous interactional exchange. However, the linguistic choices used in the third turn did not match target-like behaviors among native German speakers. This finding suggests the need for explicit instruction on the appropriate linguistic choices to convey the epistemic and affective stance towards prior talk as part of third-turn interactions.

In Chapter 5 Sert follows the development of collaborative turn completions in the audio-recorded interactions conducted by undergraduate L2 English learners taking part in a course devoted to the development of oral communication skills. These interactions consisted of extended, loosely guided discussions in which the students engaged outside of class on topics of their choice. Sert points out that collaborative completions such as formulating subordinate clauses, offering candidate lexical items and producing turn-initial conjunctions are strong indicators of active listenership and reciprocity on the part of the listener and are therefore crucial indicators of L2 IC development. Even without receiving explicit instruction on collaborative completions and other IC features, the four extracts of data selected by Sert demonstrate the development of active listenership through the increase in the number of collaborative completions over time and the diversification of interactional resources (i.e., subordinate clause completion, etc.). Given this positive outcome resulting from the simple engagement in interaction, one wonders about the extent to which an IC-based curriculum could further expand the students' progress in developing their interactional skills.

Unlike the data from previous chapters in which L2 learners had limited access to routine samples of natural language use, in Chapter 6 Taguchi and Yoshimi analyzed data from L2 Japanese learners who had access to socially situated language interactions in a study-abroad setting. Taguchi and Yoshimi tackle an important aspect of IC, namely, the ability to style-shift in Japanese, triggered by discourse boundaries to convey solidarity versus formality and distance with the use of the two clause-ending Japanese forms *desu/masu* or the equivalent plain forms. Taguchi and Yoshimi point out that typical teaching practices introduce the *desu/masu* alternative as a type of default structure for learners to overcome the perceived difficulty of mastering the complexity of style shifting in Japanese. Their data, however, confirms previous findings that, provided that learners are exposed to natural language samples, they will be able to manage style shifting in Japanese and become effective interlocutors. Finally, in Chapter 7 White expands on the analysis from Taguchi and Yoshimi about the potential positive effect of natural settings of interaction provided by academic study-abroad programs on the development of IC. White points out that, not surprisingly given its basic theoretical

tenets, previous research on pragmatics has focused primarily on individual competence measured against the standard of idealized native speakers and with the use of deterministic (right/wrong) measures of language knowledge. Against this background, the IC approach to research the development of interactional abilities in the L2 has turned to the collection of data in sociolinguistically oriented environments such as homestays and interactions with local speakers in situ while incorporating both etic and emic perspectives (e.g., data from the learners as they interact in these settings as well as their reactions to their participation).

Section III: Research-Informed Pedagogy

The studies in Section III illustrate some pedagogical applications aimed to introduce students to a view of language as action. These studies show that CA-based IC instruction is possible even at lower levels of proficiency. Specifically, Chapter 8 shows how the recording of a naturally occurring interaction which is accomplished with simple grammar and vocabulary can be used in the classroom in order to illustrate a range of interactional practices, such as opening and closing, issuing and rejecting a request, and self-repair. In Waring's chapter, beginning-level ESL students listening to a request sequence occurring during a phone call, are guided in the analysis of the interactional features displayed in the tape and finally engage in a role play of the conversation. Waring's main point is that IC does not presuppose linguistic complexity; in other words, it is possible to accomplish a fairly wide range of social actions even with limited linguistic resources. A survey conducted after the implementation of this unit showed that the students enjoyed this type of activity and found it useful. Finally, Waring concludes her chapter with critical comments concerning the description of the Basic User of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) which conceptualizes this level of proficiency as simply involving descriptive abilities and the skill of exchanging information. She calls, instead, for more systematic specifications of what it means to be interactionally competent at lower levels of proficiency.

Chapter 9, on the other hand, illustrates a more comprehensive attempt at designing IC units for an IC-based curriculum that covers the first two semesters of university language instruction in Chinese as a Foreign Language. The interactional skills targeted in the study by Kunitz and Yeh concern active listenership and topic management. The study addresses some of the issues mentioned before, such as the challenges faced by instructors who are not CA specialists and who engage in the ambitious task of teaching IC in a language, such as Chinese, for which there is not a wealth of CA findings. In their chapter, Kunitz and Yeh summarize the main phases that led to the design of specific instructional materials and then report on the outcome of their pedagogical intervention by

looking at two students' development of the targeted interactional skills. Their study shows the benefits of the collaboration between conversation analysts and practitioners and the need for this kind of collaboration in order to implement research-based or at least research-inspired IC teaching units.

Finally, Chapter 10 illustrates an example of experiential pedagogy that bridges the wild with the classroom by involving the students in tasks to be accomplished in the wild (here real-life service encounters) and in the debriefing of such tasks in the classroom. Specifically, Lilja and Piirainen-Marsh use two sets of data, that is, the students' self-recorded service interactions and recordings of their debriefing interactions in the classroom, to show how the possibility of replaying prior interactions through their mobile phones allows students to make sense of and mobilize their attention to moments of interactional trouble in the wild. In other words, the debriefing activity in the classroom creates "affordances for joint problem-solving," through which the students attend to details in the prior interaction and co-construct a new understanding of it. As the authors observe, "the ability to analyze how utterances can be heard and understood in their interactional context is a crucial part of interactional competence" (Chapter 10, p. 281). Their data show that such ability can be achieved by engaging in moments of evidence-based and dialogic reflection (Walsh & Mann, 2015).

Section IV: Testing

The section on testing of IC addresses the important goal of determining the (various levels of) competence required to be a participant in interaction. In Chapter 11 Kley introduces the section on the testing of IC while acknowledging that the inherently emic nature of IC (i.e., participant-based) is incompatible with the inherently etic viewpoint (i.e., observer-based) of the testing profession. She points out, however, that "if IC is emphasized in the classroom and interactional practices are even taught, teachers have to also assess their students' IC" (Chapter 11, p. 292). To accomplish the integration of teaching and testing objectives, Kley focuses on the development of classroom-based rubrics that can combine the students' perspective (emic) and the teachers' perspective (etic). In practice, Kley suggests the use of a two-step process that requires first a detailed micro-level analysis of students' data to describe and tally developmental features that can help us define IC among L2 speakers. This first step can then be expanded into the design of a specific rubric that builds upon the first stage of data collection. In essence, Kley proposes a novel idea that integrates both the emic and etic perspectives into a seamless sequence.

Huth and Betz have been among the first to gather data from previous research on CA and IC to design pedagogical activities that can be part of an IC-based curriculum. In their chapter, they turn their attention to

the development of practical testing formats that could be used to assess learners' knowledge of IC practices developed through IC-based teaching materials. Huth and Betz acknowledge that the assessment of an ability that is by definition co-constructed at the moment of interaction and that is deployed to the effect of achieving intersubjectivity (open to choices) and mutual understanding (vague and imprecise) brings up difficulties that are not apparent in the testing of the more traditional targets of learning. On the other hand, the authors point out that the assessment of traditional L2 instructional units (e.g., pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar) is predicated on the use of "normative frameworks" that when applied to IC would be focused on "the orderly succession of turns in interaction," which are to be regarded as a form of generic practice. Huth and Betz affirm the existence of generic practices in the sequence organization of turn-taking or repair, for instance, that can be tested through rather conventional written tests. In particular, they focus on closings in telephone conversations, contrasting their use in L2 German and L1 English. The actual implementation of such written tests does not come without challenges, but Huth and Betz provide a comprehensive analysis of their proposed testing format for IC constructs.

Finally, complementing the work of Kley on the development of rubrics, Sandlund and Sundqvist focus their attention on the opposite task: how do raters interpret rubrics which are, by necessity, abbreviated definitions of the IC construct? More specifically, how do raters assess the various types of interactions among test takers (or the absence of such interaction) as they try to define those actions as part of the information described on the given rubric? Sandlund and Sundqvist analyze (variable) raters' interpretations of rubrics on language use collected for the purpose of grading a high-stakes national test in Sweden (modeled on descriptors from the CEFR test). The imprecise definitions of interaction in the rubric they selected provide Sandlund and Sundqvist with an opportunity to identify the variable focus of raters on various samples of data.

References

- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F. (2007). What is the construct? The dialectic of abilities and contexts in defining constructs in language assessment. In J. Fox, M. Wesche, D. Bayliss, L. Cheng, C. E. Turner, & C. Doe (Eds.), *Language testing reconsidered* (pp. 41–71). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Barraja-Rohan, A.-M. (1997). Teaching conversation and sociocultural norms with conversation analysis. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 14, 71–88.
- Barraja-Rohan, A.-M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(4), 479–507.

- Betz, E., & Huth, T. (2014). Beyond grammar: Teaching interaction in the German classroom. *Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 42(2), 140–163.
- Brooks, L. (2009). Interacting in pairs in a test of oral proficiency: Co-constructing a better performance. *Language Testing*, 26(3), 341–366.
- Burns, A. (2011). Action research in the field of second language teaching and learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning: Volume 2* (pp. 237–253). New York: Routledge.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1–47.
- Carroll, D. (2011a). Taking turns and talking naturally: Teaching conversational turn-taking. In N. R. Houck & D. H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation* (pp. 91–103). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.
- Carroll, D. (2011b). Teaching preference organization: Learning how to say ‘no.’ In N. R. Houck & D. H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation* (pp. 105–118). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2001). Ten criteria for a spoken grammar. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 63–88). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Chalhoub-Deville, M. (2003). Second language interaction: Current perspectives and future trends. *Language Testing*, 20, 369–383.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- DiPietro, R. J. (1987). *Strategic interaction: Learning languages through scenarios*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Eskildsen, S., & Markee, N. (2018). L2 talk as social accomplishment. In R. Alonso (Ed.), *Speaking in a second language* (pp. 69–103). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2018). Building a semiotic repertoire for social action: Interactional competence as biographical discovery. *Classroom Discourse*, 19(1), 68–76.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Majlesi, A. R. (2018). Learnables and teachables in second language talk: Advancing a social reconceptualization of central SLA tenets. Introduction to the Special Issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102(Supplement 2018), 3–10.
- Galaczi, E. (2014). Interactional competence across proficiency levels: How do learners manage interaction in paired speaking tests? *Applied Linguistics*, 35, 553–574.
- Gardner, R., & Wagner, J. (2004). *Second language conversations*. London: Continuum.
- Goldberg, D., Looney, D., & Lusin, N. (2015). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- Greer, T. 2010. Identity in interculturality: Using (lack of) cultural knowledge to disalign with an identity category. *The Language Teacher* 34 (3), 3–8.
- Hall, J. K. (1993). The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The sociocultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language. *Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 145–166.
- Hall, J. K. (1995). (Re)creating our worlds with words: A sociohistorical perspective of face-to-face interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 206–232.

- Hall, J. K. (1999). A prosaics of interaction: The development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 137–151). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, J. K. (2018). From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires: Reconceptualising the objects of L2 learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 25–39.
- Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.). (2011). *L2 interactional competence and development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hall, J. K., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). L2 interactional competence and development. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 1–15). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- He, A. W., & Young, R. F. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. In A. W. He & R. F. Young (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 1–26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, J., Eskildsen, S. W., Pekarek-Doehler, S., & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (Eds.). (forthcoming). *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of second language interaction ‘in the wild.’* Berlin: Springer.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1999). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Huth, T. (2006). Negotiating structure and culture: L2 learners’ realization of L2 compliment-response sequences in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 2025–2050.
- Huth, T. (2010). Can talk be inconsequential? Social and interactional aspects of elicited second language interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(4), 537–553.
- Huth, T. (forthcoming). Conceptualizing interactional learning targets for the second language curriculum. In S. Kunitz, N. Markee, & O. Sert (Eds.), *Classroom-based conversation analytic research: Theoretical and applied perspectives on pedagogy*. Heidelberg: Springer (Educational Linguistics series).
- Huth, T., & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research* 10, (1), 53–79.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings* (pp. 269–293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Johnson, M. (2001). *The art of non-conversation: A reexamination of the validity of the oral proficiency interview*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kasper, G. (2006). Speech acts in interaction: Towards discursive pragmatics. In K. Barvodi-Harlig, C. Felix-Brasdefer, & A. Omar (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (vol. 11, pp. 281–314). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Kasper, G., & Ross, S. J. (2013). Assessing second language pragmatics: An overview and introductions. In S. J. Ross & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Assessing second language pragmatics* (pp. 1–40). Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Kley, K. (2015). Interactional competence in paired speaking tests: Role of paired task and test-taker speaking ability in co-constructed discourse. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Iowa.
- Kormos, J. (1999). Simulating conversations in oral-proficiency assessment: A conversation analysis of role play and non-scripted interviews in language exams. *Language Testing*, 16, 163–188.
- Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70, 366–372.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (2010). Theorizing translingual/transcultural competence. In G. S. Levine & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (pp. 15–31). Boston: Cengage Heinle.
- Lee, Y., & Hellermann, J. (2014). Tracing developmental changes through conversation analysis: Cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48, 763–788.
- Markee, N. (1997). *Managing curricular innovation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics* 29(3), 404–427.
- MLA (Teagle Foundation Working Group). (2009). Report to the Teagle Foundation on the undergraduate major in language and literature. *Profession* 2009, 285–312.
- O’Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2007). *From corpus to classroom: Language use and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olsher, D. (2011a). Responders: Continuers. In N. R. Houck & D. H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation* (pp. 153–170). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.
- Olsher, D. (2011b). Responders: Change-of-state tokens, news markers, and assessments. In N. R. Houck & D. H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation* (pp. 171–192). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.
- Pallotti, G., & Wagner, J. (Eds.). (2011). *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives*. Manoa: University of Hawai’i at Manoa.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Fasel Lauzon, V. (2015). Documenting change across time: Longitudinal and cross-sectional CA studies of classroom interaction. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 409–424). Boston, MA: Wiley.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–268) Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., Wagner, J., & González-Martínez, E. (Eds.). (2018). *Longitudinal studies on the organization of social interaction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 7, 289–327.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

- Schön, D. A. (1992). Designing as reflective conversation with the materials of a design situation. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 5(1), 3–14.
- Seedhouse, P., & Nakatsuhara, F. (2018). *The discourse of the IELTS speaking test: Interactional design and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (English Profile Studies).
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Taleghani-Nikazm, C., & Huth, T. (2010). L2 requests: Preference structure in talk-in-interaction. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 29(2), 185–202.
- Wagner, J. (2015). Designing for language learning in the wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 75–101). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Walsh, S., & Mann, S. (2015). Doing reflective practice: A data-led way forward. *ELT Journal*, 69(4), 351–362.
- Wong, J. (2011a). Pragmatic competency in telephone conversation openings. In N. R. Houck & D. H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation* (pp. 119–134). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.
- Wong, J. (2011b). Pragmatic competency in telephone conversation openings. In N. R. Houck & D. H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation* (pp. 135–152). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
- Young, R. F. (2003). Learning to talk the talk and walk the walk: Interactional competence in academic spoken English. *North Eastern Illinois University Working Papers in Linguistics*, 2, 26–44.
- Young, R. F. (2011). Interactional competence in language learning, teaching, and testing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 426–443). New York: Routledge.

Section I

Theoretical and Methodological Approaches

Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

1 On the Nature and the Development of L2 Interactional Competence

State of the Art and Implications for Praxis

Simona Pekarek Doehler

Introduction¹

When chatting over a cup of coffee, participating in a professional meeting or buying a ticket at a sales counter, people synchronize their mutual conduct, coordinate their actions, make these recognizable to each other and continuously adapt them according to the needs of the moment. While each participant's verbal contribution is formatted linguistically, it is also articulated with those of others and is grounded in the organization of mutual activities based on the management of turn-taking, adjacent actions and larger sequences of interaction. Engaging in communicative interaction presupposes that the participants draw on highly organized, systematic—and hence mutually recognizable—procedures for action by means of which they navigate the various organizational layers of talk-in-interaction and their coordination. Without such procedures (or ‘methods’), people's taking a turn-at-talk, opening a conversation, disagreeing with others and so on would not be accomplished in such orderly and coordinated ways as they routinely are.

We start to learn these procedures from the very first days of our lives, and we refine them throughout our social trajectories. But what happens when it comes to interacting in a second language (L2)? Since Dell Hymes's (1972) classic statement on communicative competence, second language acquisition (SLA) research has been steadily moving towards a more holistic understanding of L2 learning and use, extending its scope far beyond morpho-syntax and lexicon. Yet the systematic procedures that L2 speakers draw on for coordinating social interaction have remained long unexplored. It is only a decade since research started to emerge that paid detailed empirical attention to L2 interactional competence (IC). Today, the field is thriving. The increasingly rich empirical findings enhance our understanding of the nature and the development of L2 IC, and open new perspectives for more applied research into the teaching and the assessment of that competence (see the chapters in the present volume). It is hence time to step back and take a look at the path we have traveled so far, and to anticipate avenues for future research.

In this chapter, I discuss the present state of the art in empirical research on L2 IC and its development. While I believe that we have come a long way in the past decade of research on the topic, I also see the field facing a number of methodological challenges as well as important conceptual and applied questions that remain to be addressed: what exactly do we refer to by the notion of IC, and how is this distinct from communicative competence? What can we learn from existing research as to the developmental trajectory of L2 IC? What areas call for more attention in future research? And what implications ensue for the teaching and the assessment of L2 IC?

In what follows, I first briefly retrace the move from a research focus on communicative competence towards a concern with IC and point out the distinctive characteristics of the latter. I then present how current research addresses L2 IC, and discuss the cumulative evidence stemming from existing studies as to the basic features of L2 IC development. I conclude by spotlighting current challenges and future avenues for research, as well as issues that are critical for L2 teaching and testing. With regard to this latter section, I wish to stress that the arguments presented here are those of a researcher in Conversation Analysis in the field of SLA (CA-SLA) concerned with fundamental research into L2 development. They are not analyses of a researcher in education or pedagogy, nor can they pretend to draw on any substantial amount of experience in the field of language teaching (or testing, for that matter). Accordingly, rather than providing suggestions for praxis, they are intended to open a dialogue with experts in these other fields. It is these experts who know best what measures can be taken in real-life teaching and assessment situations in response to the results stemming from empirically grounded SLA research.

Looking Back: From Communicative Competence to IC

Dell Hymes's (1972) seminal work on the notion of communicative competence has provided a key impetus towards a more holistic understanding of SLA. Highlighting the fundamentally social and contextual nature of competence, Hymes's theorizing represented a radical break with the—then mainstream—formalist understanding according to which language could be studied independently from its use and social context.

Following Hymes's (1972) conceptualization of communicative competence, various lines of research have been concerned with sociolinguistic abilities, related to culturally specific norms of conduct and/or with pragmatic development in an L2. The distinctive feature of these endeavors, as opposed to current concerns with IC, has been their focus on social conventions rather than on locally situated procedures for action. Within the field of Interlanguage Pragmatics (see the classic collection of studies in Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993), for instance, studies have been

mainly concerned with the realization of speech acts (such as requests) or issues of discourse coherence (e.g., the use of discourse markers). Only a few studies have paid attention to the development of more dynamic, conversational skills (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Salisbury, 2004, on disagreement sequences), yet some recent work on L2 pragmatics interested in L2 speakers' participation in extended discourse has more centrally addressed social interaction (cf. Kasper & Ross, 2013; e.g., Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2013, on requests in interaction).

The way the notion of communicative competence has been dealt with subsequent to Hymes's initial statement has rapidly come under critique from interactionally oriented research and from language socialization studies. Since the 1990s (but see already Kramsch, 1986), researchers have called for more dynamic and context-sensitive understandings of communicative competence (e.g., Firth & Wagner, 1997; Hall, 1993; He & Young, 1998; Kasper, 2004; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Kramsch, 2002; Wagner, 2004; Young, 2007; for a discussion see Hall & Pekarek Doe- hler, 2011): While work on communicative competence has focused on the spoken modality, it has done so often from a monologic perspective.²

These developments are to be seen against the background of more general trends in SLA. Despite the Hymesian revolution, models of competence in SLA research have for long remained tributary to a fundamentally monologic and individualistic language ontology, with a focus on linguistic form and cognitive processing as opposed to contextual communicative dynamics and the organization of social discursive practices (for critiques of such a view, see Atkinson, 2002; Firth & Wagner, 2007; Kasper, 2009; McNamara & Roever, 2006). When social interaction was at stake in SLA research, it tended to be treated as a possible locus for the acquisition of linguistic forms (see, e.g., the Interaction Hypothesis, as described in Long, 1996, and ensuing work), but not as a proper object of learning. This historic embeddedness of the thinking about communicative competence and SLA provided a stage where systematic investigations into the nature and development of L2 IC have long been marginalized.

It is only under the more recent ascent of so-called socially oriented SLA studies, including sociocultural theory (Lantolf, 2000), language socialization (Kramsch, 2002) and CA-SLA (Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007), that the dynamics of L2 interaction has become a focus of empirical analysis. Succinctly put, these approaches share an understanding of social interaction as the bedrock of human linguistic (and more generally mental) functioning and, hence, as a starting point for the study of L2 learning. This implies a radical reversal of a traditional logic dominating the field of SLA, according to which second language learning consists mainly in the individual's acquiring a formal system that can then be put to use within communicative practice. For a socially oriented approach, interactive practice is the very locus not only of the exercise of language,

but also of its development: Language learning is seen as a situated practice, that is, as embedded in the accomplishment of social actions, and cannot be reduced to the individual's cognitive processing of input and restructuring of mental representations. Accordingly, the very object of learning is redefined as the ability to interact in an L2, and thereby to participate in social encounters.³ Not surprisingly, with this 'social turn' in SLA (Block, 2003), the nature and the development of L2 IC have emerged as central objects of investigation, most prominently within the framework of CA-SLA.

Within the past 50 years of research, we have moved from a monologic, often individualistic treatment of communicative competence with a focus on conventions for language use, towards a dialogic, distributed and locally contingent view of IC with a focus on *in situ* social practices and the routine procedures employed for their social coordination. This shift can relevantly be seen against the background of the epistemological groundings of the work at hand. This grounding is in linguistic anthropology, on the one hand, as regards communicative competence, later drawing mainly on speech act theory in Interlanguage Pragmatics. It is in ethnomethodological CA (with roots in interpretive sociology and a socio-constructivist view of human agency), on the other hand, as regards current empirical work on L2 IC.

Towards an Understanding of IC

Conceptual Developments

The above-described move towards current understandings of IC has been progressive, increasingly drawing on CA. Influential conceptualizations of the notion of IC started to emerge in the 1990s, most prominently in the work of Joan-Kelly Hall (1993, 1995, 1999) and Richard Young (He & Young, 1998; Young, 2008; but see also Oksa, 1990). In this research, IC is seen as emerging from participation in interactive practice, that is, "socioculturally conventionalized configurations of face-to-face interaction by which and within which group members communicate" (Hall, 1993: 146). New emphasis is put on the collaborative aspect of language use in interaction (He & Young, 1998). Accordingly, first empirical studies in this line focus on participation, and on the L2 speaker becoming a more central participant, as part of what Young (2008) calls "an approach in which language learning is viewed as changing participation in discursive practice" (p. 251).

For instance, in a study partially inspired by CA, Young and Miller (2004) make a strong point about IC resting on and evolving within repeated participation in a micro-community of practice. They show how an adult Vietnamese learner of English changes her mode of participation (from peripheral to full participation) in weekly writing conferences

with an instructor across a time-span of four weeks. Changing patterns of participation are conceptualized in terms of increasing interactional skills as regards turn-taking management and the sequential organization of the activity by the target learner. These are treated as indicators of IC development. Importantly, Young and Miller suggest that the observed interactional development can be understood as part of a larger socialization process whereby L2 speakers are initiated into specific interactional practices within a given activity, interactional environment and community of practice.

These earlier conceptualizations and developments are soon met by work drawing centrally on CA. Kasper (2006) defines IC as the ability “to understand and produce social action in their sequential contexts” (p. 86), relating to issues of turn-taking, action formation, repair and the organization of larger sequences of activities (including the recognition and identification of boundaries between these). Importantly, Kasper stresses the fact that these abilities involve people’s drawing on multiple semiotic resources, linguistic, paraverbal and embodied. Markee (2008) proposes an understanding of (and a methodology for exploring) IC in terms of a range of skills for using language to accomplish social actions: sociolinguistic aspects, that is, knowing *in situ* when, how and with whom to engage in conversation; knowledge of the interactional dynamics of specific discursive practices (turn-taking, sequential organization of talk, openings, disagreements, closings, definition requests, etc.); discursive-pragmatic skills (topic introduction and maintenance and its appropriate placement); linguistic resources. IC is here centrally related to the management of the dynamics of talk-in-interaction, but also to the formal resources deployed in and for the organization of interaction and the related social conventions for language use.

To date, the most important advancements in understanding L2 IC as it is observable in the details of social interaction have been provided by work in CA-SLA. In this context, IC is increasingly understood in terms of members’ ‘methods’ (i.e., systematic procedures; cf. Garfinkel, 1967) for organizing social interaction, relating to such issues as turn-taking, repairing, opening or closing a conversation, initiating a storytelling or conveying a disagreement (Hellermann, 2008, 2011; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Pekarek Doehler, 2010). These methods include verbal, prosodic and embodied resources, and ways of sequentially organizing actions and joint activities. Because these methods are shared among members of a given group, they enable members to organize their conduct in mutually recognizable and acceptable ways (see Mori & Koschmann, 2012, on the accountability of competence). Importantly, ‘competent’ members have at their disposal alternative methods for getting the same interactional business accomplished. These alternative methods provide for conduct that is adapted to the

local circumstances of ongoing interactions, as well as to the precise others participating in these; this is captured by the CA notions of *context sensitivity* and *recipient design* respectively (cf. Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). The availability of alternative methods is exactly what L2 speakers often lack (cf. Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018, in press), which entails limited adaptive abilities on their part (see Sect. 4 and 5 below).

The above understanding of IC is at the antipodes of a view of competence as context-independent property ‘enclosed’ in the individual’s mind/brain: IC is seen as *ability for joint action* that is contingent upon the details of the social interaction people participate in, and emerges for the people’s cumulative experience of social interactions while continuously being adapted in the course of such interactions (see the notion of ‘competence-in-action’; Pekarek Doehler, 2010).⁴ This also implies that IC is situation-based and context-bound, and as such it is ‘publicly’ observable within participants’ practices that are shaped into being in ways to be understood, attended to and accepted by co-participants. While participants come to new situations endowed with such experience, the IC they deploy therein is not simply brought along by individuals but also brought about by the social interaction at hand.

Empirical Studies: CA-SLA

Today, CA-SLA offers an increasing number of longitudinal and (more rarely) cross-sectional studies concerned with the development of L2 IC, based on close scrutiny of the local and contingent adaptations and mutual coordinations that make up the process of social interaction (for current longitudinal work in CA, see the papers collected in Pekarek Doehler, Wagner, and González-Martínez, 2018). This work is based on a conception of learning and of competence as situated and embodied: learning a language is defined as a social practice, and competence as being co-construable, shaped through the participants’ mutual actions (Firth & Wagner, 2007; Markee & Kasper, 2004). The existing research converges on a key finding: IC is not simply ‘transferred’ from the first language, but is recalibrated, re-adapted in the L2; L2 speakers’ methods for interaction change over time as part of their evolving L2 IC. This of course does not mean that speakers learn social interaction anew. Rather, when interacting in an L2, they build on interactional abilities they had developed since infancy to deal with generic features of social interaction. Yet they also recalibrate these in the course of L2 development. Beginner L2 speakers may, for instance, employ only basic methods for turn-taking or disagreeing, but then refine these in the process of becoming more efficient L2 speakers.

Existing studies typically focus on a distinct action or course of action (e.g., initiating repair, disagreeing with others, opening a storytelling) and investigate how speakers' 'methods,' that is, systematic procedures (including linguistic resources) for accomplishing that type of action or course of action, change over time. This line of research has explored the development of L2 speakers' practices for turn-taking (Cekaite, 2007), disengaging from classroom tasks (Hellermann, 2008), disagreeing (Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011), opening tasks (Hellermann, 2008) and storytellings (Hellermann, 2008; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018), responding to such tellings (Ishida, 2011), repairing conversational trouble (Hellermann, 2009, 2011; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, in press), and more generally managing participation (Nguyen, 2011; see also Pallotti, 2001). Less commonly, studies have focused on a precise linguistic form so as to document how that form becomes used in new action contexts (Eskildsen, 2011) or for new interactional purposes (e.g., Kim, 2009; Ishida, 2009; Masuda, 2011; see also Pekarek Doehler & Berger, in press).

Some of the existing studies overtly draw on an understanding of competence that is closely related to Garfinkel's notion of accountability (see also Mori & Koschmann, 2012): 'competent' conduct is produced in ways that make it recognizable to others for what it is (i.e., it provides an account of itself); by virtue of that very fact, it becomes observable as such not only to co-participants, but also to the researcher. Yet, as we will see in what follows, accounting for change or development of IC from an emic perspective, i.e., from the point of view of how conduct is treated by co-participants as more or less competent (rather than in terms of what 'competent' L1 speakers do), represents a critical challenge for current CA-SLA research. This may be because participants often do not overtly treat L2 speakers as not-yet-competent. Rather, unless mutual understanding is at stake, they tend to accommodate L2 speakers' conduct in ways that favor the progressivity of interaction.

For the sake of space, I report only on a limited number of studies. I first focus on what we can learn from classroom studies and then discuss research exploring social interactions in non-instructional settings. In each section, I group the studies as a function of the basic organizational layer of social interaction they analyze, such as turn-taking or sequence organization.

Classroom Studies on the Development of L2 IC

Organizing Larger Sequences of Interaction: Storytelling, Task Opening and the Like

To date, most studies exploring the development of IC have been based on longitudinal and/or cross-sectional classroom data (but see below).

Pioneering systematic investigations into L2 IC development were provided by Hellermann (2008, 2009, 2011), based on an impressive set of longitudinal classroom data involving 800 adult ESL students (for more information see Hellermann, 2008). Hellermann analyzed various interactional practices related to task openings and closings, story openings and repair. For instance, Hellermann (2008) examines how students change their practices for opening teacher-assigned dyadic tasks as well as storytellings over a period of several terms. Overall, he documents that intermediate students go about opening tasks and storytellings differently than beginner students, and that this difference essentially boils down to how they build into the openings means for checking co-participants' readiness to attend to the task or to the story. Issues of task opening are illustrated in Excerpts 1 and 2, taken from Hellermann (2008), whose interpretation we summarize here. In Excerpt 1, students have been invited to ask their peers if they are happy, sad, tired or shy, and to write down the peers' answers. After having addressed a first classmate, Jorge, who has been attending the ESL class for two weeks, looks for another peer to engage in the task (line 50).

50 Jo: ((looks to other students)) (Digna) ((writes other
 51 student's name on his worksheet))
 52 (5)
 53 V: (meese) times
 54 Jo: ((shifts posture to Digna)) Digna. Es ()
 55 tu tu estas (.) are you happy?
 56 D: happy? Yes.
 57 Jo: (3) ((writes))

Figure 1.1 Excerpt 1 (Hellermann, 2008: 72)

Jorge's task opening is characterized by a posture shift (line 54), by means of which he enacts his engagement in the task in an embodied manner, and by the use of an address term (line 54) that functions as a summons designed to attract the peer's attention. Noteworthy is the fact that his launching of the task directly follows the summons: Jorge does not wait for the peer to respond to the summons and display her availability to engage in the task. Nine months later, Jorge's way of opening a dyadic task has changed, as illustrated in Excerpt 2. The students have been asked to address yes/no questions to their peers:

78 Te: try to ask many different students.
 79 Jo: ((Jorge shifts posture toward his deskmate)) okay
 80 Julia,
 81 Ju: okay ((Julia is writing))
 82 Jo: are you ready?
 83 Ju: (1) ((stops writing and orients posture to Jorge))
 84 (come on)
 85 Jo: okay ((clears throat))
 86 (1)
 87 Jo: did you (2) °okay° (2) did you call tre- (1) did
 88 you call relatives yesterday?
 89 Ju: yes I ((looks to board)) yes I did.

Figure 1.2 Excerpt 2 (Hellermann, 2008: 74–75)

Just like in Excerpt 1, Jorge shifts his posture so as to orient to his peer, non-verbally enacting his preparation to engage in the task (line 79), and produces a summons (line 80). However, unlike in Excerpt 1, Jorge does not directly launch the tasks after the summons but waits for his peer to respond (line 81). He then explicitly checks whether his peer is ready to engage in the task (line 82) and waits until he gets a ‘go-ahead’ signal (lines 83–84). The launching of the task itself is preceded by two ‘okays’ (lines 85, 87) which indicate its imminence, and is based on Jorge’s orientation towards a two-step procedure: check co-participant’s availability; launch task.

The two excerpts illustrate a general tendency observed in the data: at beginning levels of proficiency, students launch tasks abruptly, without any preliminary work designed to contextualize the task opening. By contrast, at intermediate levels of proficiency, students use pre-task opening talk so as to check for co-participants’ availability to engage in the task and to establish the contextual grounds for launching the task proper. This provides evidence for change in how L2 speakers sequentially organize their actions, testifying to their increased ability to design transitions into new sequences of talk to be attended to by recipients.

Hellermann’s (2008) findings for story openings are along similar lines: beginner learners open stories abruptly, *in medias res*, while more advanced students increasingly use story prefaces to project an upcoming story, and to secure recipients’ readiness to attend the story. Excerpts 3 and 4 illustrate typical story openings by beginner students:

mm husband #uh:# call my uncle.

Figure 1.3 Excerpt 3 (Hellermann, 2008: 98)

I need bus I go to the trimet¹

Figure 1.4 Excerpt 4 (Hellermann, 2008: 98)

1. *trimet* here refers to the website of the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon

By contrast to the above, intermediate-level students increasingly use devices (such as temporal adverbials or past tense) by means of which they frame the story as relating to past events, and they regularly produce story prefaces anticipating an incipient storytelling and checking the grounds for recipients' availability to attend to the telling. This is illustrated in Excerpt 5:

09 S: °huh heh heh° uh d- diuh
 10 A: huh
 11 S: do you see the: uh drama #uh# friends?
 12 A: ((puzzled look))
 13 S: friends?
 14 Y: friends=
 15 =yeah friends. the drama=
 16 A: ↑friends yes=
 17 S: =yah
 18 A: ye(h)s
 19 S: the oh:: that guy's eh Ross ((pointing)) d-
 20 do you know Ross?
 21 A: eh no um I I ((gestures)) saw the ((gestures)) final ah:
 22 S: [AHHH
 23 A: [ah: yeah
 24 S: just the [final AHHHH [AHHHH
 25 A: [just a little just a [little bit
 26 I don't know um [many things about [this uh[:
 27 S: [#ah# [#yi# [#i:#n the
 28 drama, i- in the drama, uh the some guy's, uh
 29 some [guy's
 30 A: [married
 31 S: wife is a lesbian.
 32 A: mm =
 33 S: =so they divorced, and uh the wife is uh married to
 34 woman
 35 A: wow

Figure 1.5 Excerpt 5 (Hellermann, 2008: 100)

As discussed by Hellermann (2008), in Excerpt 5 the storyteller produces two preliminary questions (lines 3, 11) to the telling, and thereby adapts the way that the story is designed to be understood by the recipient (see, for instance, the change in referential expression from *Ross*, line 11, to *some guy*, line 20). Also, he uses adverbials (lines 19–20: *in the drama*) and tense (line 25: *they divorced*) to frame the upcoming report in terms of situation and past event so as to make it recognizable, from its very onset, as a storytelling. Thereby, the story opening is better ‘fitted’ to the ongoing course of actions, and better designed to be attended to by co-participants. The story is not only attended to by the recipient, but its climax is also received as newsworthy by a sequence-closing *wow* (line 35).

In a nutshell, then, Hellermann’s work documents change in sequential organization of practices, and how these are ‘tuned’ to be attended to and accepted by co-participants. These elements point to an increased IC in the students’ L2, as seen in their increased ability to recipient-design their actions for others. While Hellermann’s ESL students might have appropriated these methods both within the classroom and outside of it (they were living in the United States), it seems reasonable to think of such methods for opening a storytelling or a dyadic task as being ‘teachable material,’ that is, as pertaining to procedures for social action that can be made explicit, analyzed and practiced within the classroom (see, e.g., Barraja-Rohan, 1997; Betz & Huth, 2014, for proposals concerning the teaching of social interaction).

Sequentially Organizing Actions: Proffering Dispreferred Actions Such as Disagreements

Similar observations apply to findings stemming from analyses of how L2 speakers format so-called dispreferred actions, that is, second actions such as disagreeing with an assessment, rejecting a request or declining an invitation.⁵ Pekarek Doehler and Pochon-Berger (2011) conducted a cross-sectional study comparing disagreement sequences in the French L2 classroom at two levels of competence, intermediate and advanced (8th grade and 12th grade). The study documents change over time in how the students structure their disagreeing turns, as well as in some of the linguistic resources they use. Intermediate-level students tend to proffer disagreements in a straightforward manner, typically by using polarity markers such as ‘no’ in turn-initial position (see Excerpt 6); they hence show a mismatch between the action accomplished (a dispreferred action) and the turn-format used (a preferred action turn-format). (In the translation, DET means ‘determiner’).

By contrast, advanced students show increased use of hedges and of ‘yes-but’ turn-formats by means of which they first display (moderate) agreement and only then proffer disagreements. In other words, they use so-called dispreferred action turn-formats (Pomerantz, 1984) in ways that have been documented as typical for L1 speakers (Sacks, 1987; Pomerantz, 1984). An illustration is provided in Excerpt 7, taken from a

02 et [quelle <musique>]
 and which music

03 LOR: [de la pop musique]
 DET pop music

04 de la po[p musique]
 DET pop music

05 MIC: [non:]c'est-=
 no it's

06 LOR: =hip hop=

07 OLI: =hip hop=

Figure 1.6 Excerpt 6 (Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011)

group of students who discuss the topic of abortion. Before the start of the excerpt, Catherine has pronounced herself in favor of abortion and now elaborates on her position by saying that, if born, the child might have parents who do not love it because they did not want it (lines 1–4):

01 CAT: ((turn continued))

02 des: (.) des parents qui: qui le veulent pas, (.)
 DET DET parents who don't want him

03 qui l'aiment pas, (.)
 who don't love him

04 >parce qu'ils eh: ils ont pas voulu un en- enfant, < euh
 because they they didn't want a ch- child

05 (1.3*)

06 JAN: °j- (.) m- ou:ai:s eh°(0.8) mais (.) je pense *euhm (4.5)
 yeah but I think ehm

07 euhm (1.9) oui c'est: c'est dommage pour euh ((laughter))
 ehm yes it's it's too bad for eh

08 .h +pour le bébé ((laughing))+ ((laughter))
 for the baby

09 mais- euhm (0.6) *je pense euh une personne peut euh (0.7)
 but ehm I think eh a person can eh

 jan *looks at CAT

10 l- la femme peut (.) peut pen- euh (0.5) réfléchir (.)
 th- the woman can can eh think about

11 qu'est ce qu'elle veut fair- e- si (.) elle veut
 what she wants to do if she wants

12 se protéger et si elle ne (fait-) pas euh (..)euhm::
 to protect herself and if she doesn't do eh ehm

13 je pense si elle est vraiment un peu intelligent (.)
 I think if she is really a bit smart

14 elle se protège si elle ne veut pas un- un enfant.
 she protects herself if she doesn't want a- a child

Figure 1.7 Excerpt 7: 'l'avortement' (DK-A-4)

Jana's turn is structured in two parts. She starts off with an aligning move extending over lines 6 through 8, where she offers first a hesitant agreement (*ou:ais* 'yeah'; note also that her turn is delayed, which is typical for disagreeing/dispreferred responses) and then a more resolute one (*oui c'est: c'est dommange pour euh. h pour le bébé* 'yes it's too bad for the baby,' lines 7–8), while Jana's accompanying laughter embodies a somewhat ironic, or even sarcastic stance: 'too bad for the baby' (lines 7–8). This prefaces the disagreement proper, introduced by means of the *mais* 'but' at line 9. Thereby, a 'yes-but' (lines 6–8; 9 sq.) dispreferred action turn-format is implemented, in which the disagreement with Catherine's precedingly uttered position is pushed further back into the turn. Also, Jana's lengthy turn is attended to by her classmates and the teacher as displayed by their gaze and bodily orientation towards her (not shown in the transcript).

Overall, the study shows that students progressively diversify their linguistic and sequential resources for the management of disagreement: the less proficient learners mostly produce overt disagreements characterized by polarity markers (75%), turn-initial positioning and the absence of hedges; by contrast, with the more advanced learners, the use of polarity markers decreases significantly (37%), and dispreferred action turn-formats (Pomerantz, 1984) start to emerge. The advanced students use a variety of delaying devices that push the disagreement proper back in the turn (hesitation markers, agreement tokens and more generally prefatory talk that displays agreement), and they put to use a large array of linguistic resources (hedges, among others) to fine-tune their positions. Advanced students thus deploy a variety of techniques to manage the preference for agreement in ways that come closer to what people do in ordinary (L1) conversation.

These findings converge with Hellermann's (2008) results on task and story openings insofar as they suggest that the development of L2 IC can be usefully understood as a progressive diversification of methods for action, comprising an increased sensitivity for such issues as recipient design, context sensitivity and, as evidenced above, preference organization. Differently from Hellermann, though, the above study on disagreements focused on L2 speakers who were experiencing the L2 mostly in the classroom (French classrooms in a German-speaking region). While disagreements were not an explicit target of L2 instruction, debates on topical and potentially controversial issues (abortion, the military, environmental policies, etc.) were often used as a site for L2 communicative practice, especially at the upper secondary level of schooling, and provided ample opportunities for disagreeing with others. The reported results indicate that the L2 students have developed their abilities for doing disagreements through the very practice of communication *within* the classroom. While 'methods' for doing disagreement and a range of other dispreferred actions (rejections of requests or invitations, for instance) may be favored by specific types of classroom interactions, they

may also lend themselves to explicit instruction and targeted practice in the classroom (see below).

Taking Turns-at-Talk

Now, things might be different if we look at other features of social interaction, such as turn-taking. For instance, Cekaite (2007), in a longitudinal, micro-analytic study combining the framework of language socialization with CA methodology, follows a 7-year-old Kurdish immigrant child in an immersion context in a Swedish classroom. She situates the child's progress along a developmental continuum of verbal conduct moving towards fuller participation that can be observed through the child's turn-taking behavior across three stages, ranging from remaining silent, through inappropriate turn-taking, to correct identification of slots for turn-taking: Around the middle of the school year, the child is observed to use 'heavy' attention-getting devices such as imperatives or high volume, and Her turns are placed at moments when they disrupt the ongoing course of activities. By contrast, towards the end of the school year, the child has become more proficient in Swedish and more competent in producing interactionally appropriate and successful turn-taking: Her self-selected turns are precision-timed and relevantly fitted to the ongoing flow of talk; that is, they are not disruptive anymore. Based on Cekaite's study, precision timing and issues of placement can be seen as further indicators of IC, along with the abovementioned issues of recipient design, context sensitivity and preference organization. Cekaite's (2007) findings partly converge with Pallotti's (2001) earlier study of a 5-year-old Moroccan girl in an Italian nursery school. Pallotti shows how the child, over the eight months of the study, produces more and more autonomous turns, often based on partial recyclings of the turns of others, thereby displaying increased ability to participate in social interactions within the nursery school. Interestingly, both of these studies are concerned with beginner speakers of an L2, and they both provide evidence for learning-by-doing within a classroom context which, for the (immigrant) L2 speakers, represents an immersion environment (the classmates speak the local language as a shared L1).

Repairing Interactional Trouble

Other classroom studies have documented subtle changes in L2 speakers' repair practices. Hellermann (2011) investigates changing practices for *other-initiating repair* of someone else's talk. He presents a longitudinal study of dyadic interactions between two adult (initially beginner) ESL learners over five terms. While the students initiate repair on their peer's talk from the onset, they change, over time, their practices for doing so. Hellermann observes in the latter stages of the study the use

of a wider repertoire of methods for other-initiating repair as well as the emergence of accounts that deal with the potentially face-threatening nature of repair. The author argues that these developments bear testimony to a greater IC on the part of the subjects studied, which, however, is not independent from the communicative environment in which they interact: “the findings after analysis may point to changes in an individual’s sequential practices but will also point to the concomitant shifts in contexts for those sequential practices including language task design, the available material resources, peer competences and teacher expectations” (Hellermann, 2011: 167). This latter point is an important one that reminds us of the eminent contingency of IC development over time upon the type of language practice entailed not only by the classroom as opposed to other social environments, but also by different patterns and procedures implemented within the classroom.

The diversity of the target objects studied under the heading of IC within L2 classroom settings, ranging from task and story opening, through disagreement and repair, to turn-taking, raises the question of what can reasonably be taught or practiced inside the classroom, that is, what facets of IC can be made into focal objects of instruction and/or practice in the classroom context. Much can be learned in this regard from how IC develops in the ‘wild,’ that is, in real-life situations outside of designedly instructional settings.

IC Development in the ‘Wild’

As described above, the existing work on the development of IC has predominantly focused on educational settings, mostly classroom interaction and tutorials. It is only very recently that L2 interactions ‘in the wild’ (cf. Wagner, 2015), taking place outside of instructional settings, have become an object of longitudinal studies on L2 IC, exploring study-abroad (Barraja-Rohan, 2015; Ishida, 2009, 2011; Masuda, 2011) or homestay contexts (Berger & Pekarek Doehler, 2018; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018), conversations-for-learning (where L2 speakers meet with L1 or L2 speakers for practicing conversation; Y. Kim, 2016) or business and service encounters (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; S. Kim, in press).

Organizing Larger Sequences of Interaction: Opening Telephone Conversations, Doing and Attending Storytellings and the Like

A pioneering argument in the field was proposed earlier on by Brouwer and Wagner (2004), who document how an L2 speaker, over the course of three business telephone conversations occurring within three days, adapts his way of opening the conversation as part of his developing IC in the language, but also as a function of the changing social relationships

between participants. In all three of the telephone calls, Steffen Di Simon-
sen (S), a Danish company employee, calls a German colleague, and the
secretary Mrs. Laden (L) answers the phone. Excerpt 8 reproduces the
first telephone opening:

- 1 ((telephone rings))
 2 L: La:den?
 (family name)
 3 S: Ja-, Steff en Di: dansk dippemarked.
 yes (first name) (middle name) (company name)
 4 (0.5)
 5 L: J[a gu]’n ta::g?
 yes good day
 6 S: [Hello:.] ((English pronunciation))
 7 S: •hh habscht schie:: herr Bierhoff er zu hause.
 have you mister (family name) at home

Figure 1.8 Excerpt 8 (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004: 36)

As the authors argue, the opening of the call looks somewhat disorderly: there are greetings in overlap (lines 5, 6), speech perturbations and delays, and S’s “Hello” in line 6 seems to be out of place (or else it can be heard as a response to the absence of recipient reaction in line 4). Two telephone conversations later, caller and call-taker are better coordinated (Excerpt 9):

- 1 ((telephone rings))
 2 L: La:den?
 (family name)
 3 S: Steff en Di: dansk dippemarked. guten ta::g,
 (first name) (middle name) (company name) good day
 4 L: ja gu:tn ta:g.
 yes good day
 5 S: hast du herrn Bierhoff er zu hause heute.
 have you Mr. (family name) at home today

Figure 1.9 Excerpt 9 (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004: 37)

Here, the opening runs more smoothly, and speakership shifts fluently without delays or overlap. Recognition and greetings are paired, and turns do not seem to be sequentially misplaced. As Brouwer and Wagner

(2004) argue, within the course of only three calls, both participants have routinized a social practice, allowing them to subtly coordinate the opening sequence of their telephone interaction.

The authors' argument provides a strong case for change in social practices occurring sometimes quite rapidly, through repeated engagement in the same type of interactional task or action in coordination with others; and it occurs in ways where L2 development is inextricably intertwined with change in social relationships, and larger processes of socialization. While such processes pertain to all kinds of social interactions, they have been brought to the forefront more centrally by research on L2 IC development in the 'wild' than by classroom research (but see Hellermann, 2008).

A major focus of research on L2 IC development in real-life situations outside of designedly instructional settings has been on storytelling, possibly because of its ubiquitous nature in everyday social interaction. Barraja-Rohan (2015), for instance, follows a Japanese university student sojourning in Australia in three interactions in a conversation-for-learning setting over the course of 19 weeks. She shows that the focal student's storytellings increase in complexity and length (the first story is composed of three turn-construction units—TCUs—while the third extends over multiple TCUs and turns); also, the student develops new interactional resources for accomplishing the tellings, such as the use of direct reported speech. Y. Kim (2016), in turn, explores recipient conduct during storytelling (see also Ishida, 2011). She observes a Korean adolescent student, who came to the United States for a year, in conversations-for-learning with an L1 speaker of English, taking place every two weeks. Over time, the student deploys a wider variety of recipient responses, and these increasingly occur at an appropriate position during the storytelling and in a timely manner. The author concludes that the focal participant's performance as a story recipient became more active and resourceful, as part of his growing L2 IC. Both studies identify increased variety of resources and change in structural aspects of interaction (turn complexity, sequential positioning) as basic features of IC development, and this echoes the observations on turn-taking, repair and storytellings offered by other studies (see also below).

Two recent studies investigated the storytelling practices of an upper-intermediate speaker of French L2 (the *au pair* Julie) in ordinary conversation with her host family over a period of nine months, exploring practices for opening storytellings (Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018) as well as for bringing these to a climax and a close (Berger & Pekarek Doehler, 2018). Both studies document significant change, over time, in the 'methods' that the target subject, Julie, draws on in her storytellings. For instance, at the start of her stay, Julie's practices for launching a story show features sharing traits of Hellermann's (2008) beginner

and intermediate-level ESF learners (see above): Although the launching of the tellings is abrupt, it does involve, albeit only minimally, framing devices such as indication of time and space by means of temporal markers or adverbials. An illustration is provided in Excerpt 10, which occurs during month 2. Marie, the host mother, has just brought to an end her report on traffic rules in the country:

04 MAR: [hhh.
 05 JUL: [°oui°.
 yes
 06 (3.3)
 07 JUL: +↑mh ((eating))+
 08 (1.0)
 09 JUL: et:=on^a décidé qu'on va: ehm (1.0) euh euh bricoler
 and we decided that we are going to make
 10 >quelque chose< pour .hh e:hm (1.0) eh- eh- e::h Noël.
 something for Christmas
 11 (1.1)

Figure 1.10 Excerpt 10: *cadeau* ‘gift’ (Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018)

At the beginning of her stay, Julie’s storytellings come in *in medias res*: she does not display any relation to the ongoing conversation, which ‘competent’ L1 speakers routinely do (Jefferson, 1978; Mandelbaum, 2013; Sacks, 1974). She only minimally announces the incipient telling as a telling, using past tense (*on a décidé* ‘we have decided’). And she does not check for the recipient’s ability or readiness to attend to the story. Also, she sometimes uses turn-initial continuity markers such as *ET*: ‘and’ (line 9) where disruption markers such as ‘but’ would be expected (cf. Jefferson, 1978). The quoted features provide a sense of Julie’s stories as coming somewhat ‘out of the blue.’ Also, they often encounter problems with reciprocity (see the gap in line 11).

This stands in sharp contrast to how Julie opens her storytellings later on during her stay. She deploys a range of techniques to both announce that some new sequence is being opened with her storytelling, and indicate how (and if) it is related to preceding talk. This is illustrated in Excerpt 11, where the telling actually is presented as occasioned by preceding talk:

- 01 MAR: ts. >bon< c'est clair que dans l'idéal c'est mieux de prendre-
well it's clear that ideally it's better to take
- 02 (0.4) d'avoir un petit job le week-end et pis:=
to have a little job on the week-end and then
- 03 JUL: =ouais.
yeah
- 04 (0.5)
- 05 MAR: .h mais moi je trouve- je pense tu trouves pas si facilement
but me I find I think you don't find so easily
- 06 °°hein.°°
PRT
- 07 +(3.3)((drinking sound))+
- 08 JUL: °mais° MOI je connais une fille qui euhm <travaille
but me I know a girl who works
- 09 à la ga::re>?
at the train station
- 10 JUL: dans=le: (1.4) °dans le petit bar là dans le::° (0.2)
in the in the little bar there in the
- 11 °tu peux aussi euh boire un thé° [ou boire une bière hh.
you can also have a tea or have a beer
- 12 MAR: [m;hm.
((storytelling ensues))

Figure 1.11 Excerpt 11: *moi je connais une fille* 'I know a girl' (Julie_100216) (Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018)

Here, Julie initiates a complex story preface (lines 8–11) designed to check the grounds for referent availability. Note her use of a presentational construction (*moi je connais une fille qui. . .* 'Me, I know a girl who. . .,' lines 8–9) to introduce the target referent as a new topic of her talk, ending on a try-marked rising intonation (line 9) that invites the recipient's confirmation, which is then followed by further specifications (lines 10–11). This is responded to by Marie by means of a *mhm* that both confirms referent recognition and provides a go-ahead signal for Julie to tell the story. The story proper (not shown in the excerpt) ensues. Also noteworthy is the fact that, at the start of her story preface, Julie uses *mais* 'but' as a 'disjunct marker' (Jefferson, 1978), frequently found in story openings in L1 conversations and serving to alert the recipient that a new sequence is being opened. Additionally, Julie uses lexico-semantic resonances (see her *travail* 'works' in line 8 that ties back to Marie's *job* 'job' in line 2) to display the relatedness of her story to the ongoing course of action. Also, during this latter stage, Julie's stories are attended to by recipients and met with their uptake and often also affiliation.

Overall, Pekarek Doehler and Berger's (2018) study documents change over time both in how the L2 speaker uses linguistic resources for the purpose of storytelling (*mais* 'but,' presentational constructions, etc.), and in how she sequentially organizes story openings. By means of various techniques for displaying relevance or disruption with regard to prior interactional business, securing reciprocity and projecting the story as being of a specific kind (a funny story, a complaint story, etc.) the L2 speaker increasingly tailors her story openings so as to make them recognizable for her co-participants. The development of a wider repertoire of such techniques enables her to deploy conduct that is increasingly adapted to the particular others she is interacting with (see her pre-telling) as well as to the precise interactional situation at hand (see her 'fitting' of the storytelling to the ongoing courses of action). Diversification of methods here again sustains increased context-sensitive and recipient-designed conduct as core elements of IC development in the L2. The extent of the documented change is remarkable, given that Julie had followed 12 years of French instruction prior to her arrival in the French-speaking region, when she was rated an upper-intermediate L2 speaker.

Repairing Interactional Trouble

In a more recent study, we have further expanded our understanding of IC by scrutinizing repair organization with the same subject, Julie. Previous studies (e.g., Hellermann, 2009, 2011) have shown that, over time, L2 speakers become more skilled in identifying what might be a possible trouble source (i.e., self-initiating repair), but they are also increasingly able to provide a solution to the trouble by themselves (self-repair). While these findings reflect, among others, L2 speakers' increased linguistic abilities, we were interested in another feature of repair: How does the L2 speaker deal with the need to call for help when she herself is unable to solve her problem? In Pekarek Doehler and Berger (in press), we tracked Julie's word-search practices during dinner table conversations with her host family over the duration of her stay. Results show a clear developmental trajectory: during the initial months, Julie deals with gaps in her lexical repertoire by either suspending her talk in mid-turn or using her L1 and metalinguistic questions or comments, such as 'How do you say X in French?' or 'I don't know how to say.' That is, she fully relies on co-participants to provide solutions to the linguistic problem at hand (line 8, Excerpt 12). Over time, however, she increasingly uses techniques to solve trouble in the L2, by means of periphrases (Excerpt 12) or tentative solutions marked as candidates by rising intonation (Excerpt 13):

04 Jul: °moi non plus mais° (..) avan- je pense que je les ai vu (.)
 me neither but bef- I think that I saw them

05 ramasser des- (..) des=euh: °des trucs de (z')arbres°.
 pick-up DET DET DET things of trees

06 (1.6)

07 Jul: de:s (1.6) euh
 DET

08 Mam: des pîves
 DET pinecones

09 (1.0)

10 Jul: des pî:ves
 pinecones

Figure 1.12 Excerpt 12: Julie_100323, 'pives'

19 Jul: mais de:s (..) des bras? ((rit))
 but DET DET arms

20 Mam: ah des branches(..)
 oh DET branches

21 Jul: ah. (..) des br|anches.
 oh DET branches

22 Mam: ah pour faire un feu ou quoi.
 oh for making a fire or so

Figure 1.13 Excerpt 13: Julie_100323, 'branches'

Interestingly, this shift entails a change in how the word-search sequences disrupt the progressivity of the ongoing interaction: at the beginning of Julie's stay, her stopping *in medias res* or using 'heavy' means for recruiting participants' help, such as metalinguistic questions, typically entails exposed side sequences (Jefferson, 1987) that suspend the ongoing activities. In contrast, only a couple of months later, her use of paraphrases or most often try-marked candidate solutions favors a more embedded resolution of the linguistic trouble. This, in turn, testifies to the L2 speaker's growing ability to strike a balance between the competing principles of intersubjectivity (warranting mutual understanding) and progressivity (favoring the forward movement of the social interaction) (cf. Heritage, 2007). Maintaining such a balance is a further feature of L2 interactional development over time.

A Note on L2 IC Development in the 'Wild'

The case of Julie is particularly noteworthy: prior to her experience with a host family, Julie had followed 12 years of French instruction in school.

Upon her arrival, she was rated an upper-intermediate (B2) speaker of French in a test compatible with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). In light of the abovementioned empirical findings regarding Julie's story openings and word searches, these observations have important implications.

For one thing, in Julie's case, much of her IC regarding effective ways of opening a new conversational sequence and dealing with issues of recipient design (during storytellings) as well as recruiting co-participants to help (during word searches) has undergone significant development once she was confronted with intense interactional practice in the L2—and it has done so quite expediently, within only a couple of months. There is no information available about the type of French instruction she had followed before, nor about its intensity; yet the reported results, and in particular the rapidity of the observed change, suggest the overwhelming benefit, for the development of IC, of participating in real-life face-to-face interaction.

For another thing, Julie's rating as an upper-intermediate speaker upon her arrival suggests that she had quite solid linguistic and possibly other competences (e.g., sociolinguistic, discursive, pragmatic). Although, again, no information is available as to the precise type of test administered, the abovementioned findings indicate that there was a gap between the level of the competences targeted by the CEFR-compatible test and the speaker's ability to engage in social interaction.

Finally, it cannot be disputed that mastery of the language helps interaction. For instance, as opposed to Hellermann's (2008) beginner learners, Julie was able to use tense-marking from the onset of the study, which allowed her to index incipient storytelling by recognizably referring to past events. However, an increase in linguistic proficiency does not automatically entail an increase in IC. Studies on initial L2 development show how learners use alternative means to accomplish interactional work when their linguistic repertoires are still limited. Pallotti (2001) and Berger (2016), for instance, document the use of repetition of (parts of) other people's utterances as a means for successful turn-taking and participation in multi-party conversations in school settings. And Goodwin, Goodwin, and Olsher (2002) prominently show how a speaker with severe aphasia manages to successfully participate in social interaction within his family. So, linguistic and interactional competences are complexly intertwined. Also, there is some evidence that, when developing their IC, L2 speakers develop ways of using linguistic constructions for specifically interactional purposes (Pekarek Doehler, 2018). Recall the emergence of the 'yes-but' turn-format for disagreements, or the use of *mais* 'but' as a disjunct marker in storytelling: What emerged here were not linguistic forms (these were available to the L2 speakers before), but the use of grammar-for-interaction. More systematic evidence for such development is scarce to date, though relevant insights have been

provided by studies on interactional uses of discourse markers (Ishida, 2009; Kim, 2009) and on the expansion of linguistic constructions into new types of action environments (Eskildsen, 2011). Such observations call for further systematic research into the complex interconnectedness between linguistic proficiency and IC.

Discussion: Relevance of the Findings and Implications for Praxis

With the ever-increasing mobility characterizing the 21st century's social world, we face an unprecedented need for people's adaptive social abilities. The capability to interact with others, and to adapt one's own conduct to that of others as well as to the social situation at hand, is a central vector for social and professional integration, and has proven to be key to people's being recognized as valid participants, social agents and—ultimately—members of a social group. The importance of understanding what it is that makes people proficient in engaging in social interaction, and in particular in the in situ dynamics of verbal interaction in real time—be it in an L1 or an L2—cannot be overestimated. In this chapter, I have discussed empirical research that provides important insights into the nature and the development of IC in an L2. In this section I sum up the cumulative evidence emanating from that work, and I outline what I see as critical challenges for the teaching and the assessment of that competence.

Understanding the Developmental Trajectory of IC

The existing findings stemming from longitudinal and cross-sectional research on IC development over time converge on the following: IC is not simply 'transferred' from the L1 but is re-elaborated in the L2. While this re-elaboration is a socially distributed process based on speakers' cumulative experiences in jointly acting with others, the resulting competences can be seen as both social and individual in nature: they consist in socially elaborated methods that speakers bring to bear on and adapt to new interactional situations. IC development over time in an L2 involves change in L2 speakers' use of linguistic resources as well as change in the ways speakers sequentially organize actions and courses of action. Empirical findings support an understanding of L2 interactional development as basically resting on a *diversification of practices* (or 'methods,' in the ethnomethodological sense of the term) for getting precise actions accomplished, such as proffering a disagreement or initiating repair. In a nutshell, the *developmental trajectory* runs as follows: less proficient L2 speakers tend to start off with a limited set of techniques for accomplishing a given action or dealing with a given organizational principle of social interaction; over time, they diversify these techniques both as

regards the sequential organization of actions and the linguistic resources put to use, and this diversification allows them to deploy increasingly locally adequate conduct.

Diversification of methods for action is the basis for speakers' increased ability to tailor their talk in a way for it to be attended to and understood by the precise others they are interacting with, and to be 'fitted' to the local circumstantial details of the ongoing interaction (cf. Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015). In other words, *recipient design* and *context sensitivity* (Sacks et al., 1974)—and hence adaptive abilities—lie at the heart of L2 IC development over time. L2 speakers' management of these issues—as well as of related issues such as precision timing, preference organization and the maintenance of progressivity—allows for more locally relevant conduct, and for conduct that is treated as appropriate and acceptable by co-participants, and that, therefore, is locally efficacious (cf. Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Markee, 2008). The construct of IC as presented here is based on a long tradition of empirical CA research, and its relevance for L2 is supported by the work discussed above. Yet investigations into the development of L2 IC are still in their infancy. After the past decade of research on the issue, important methodological challenges remain to be addressed, such as relevant ways of establishing collections of interactional phenomena based on longitudinal data (see Wagner, Pekarek Doehler, & González-Martínez, forthcoming, for a recent discussion). A key issue is how to bring an emic, i.e., a participant-relevant, perspective to bear on the changes in interactional practices observed over time.

Based on the findings so far, cornerstones of a future research agenda start to emerge: (a) What aspects of L2 IC develop at what level of proficiency; are there dimensions of IC that systematically emerge prior to others? (b) What precise role does linguistic competence play in IC, and how is it in turn affected by IC? (c) How is the development of L2 IC impacted by different types of social interaction and various types of participant frameworks and social relations within these, be it inside or outside of the classroom? These questions await being addressed by future (fundamental) research into the issue. Below, I outline some challenges for more applied research.

Identifying Criteria for Tracking IC Development and Assessing IC

Based on the cumulative evidence stemming from the studies presented in this chapter, change and diversification of practices over time as indicators of IC development can be empirically documented with regard to the basic organizational principles of social interaction: turn-taking organization, repair organization, action formation, sequences and preference organization, as well as the overall structural organization of interaction.

Schegloff (2007) refers to these as “generic orders of organization” and adds, “I mean the various organizations of practice that deal with the various generic organizational contingencies of talk-in-interaction without which it cannot proceed in any orderly way” (Schegloff, 2007: xiv). These “generic orders of organization” can in turn be split up into concrete features of interaction, and the research discussed in this chapter has demonstrated how these features can relevantly be used for tracking IC development over time:

Turn-taking organization:

- Practices for self- and other-selecting turns-at-talk and doing so at sequentially appropriate moments, for dealing with overlap, for holding the floor and projecting a multi-unit turn, etc.
- These practices pertain basically to ways of taking the floor in a precision-timed and locally adequate manner and for holding the floor as a means for participating actively in a social interaction.

Repair organization:

- Practices for self- and other-initiating or accomplishing repair and for recruiting co-participants’ help, etc.
- These practices pertain to ways of overcoming trouble with speaking, hearing or understanding in talk by warranting mutual understanding while maintaining the progressivity of talk.

Action formation:

- Practices for designing turns as actions: asking questions, proffering offers, accepting invitations, making or declining requests, etc.
- These practices pertain to how turns-at-talk are designed to be recognized as accomplishing precise actions.

Sequence organization (and, relatedly, preference organization)

- Practices related to designing next turns as responding in precise ways to prior turns: offering agreement or disagreement with an assessment, granting or rejecting a request, accepting or declining an invitation or an offer, etc.
- These practices pertain to ways in which turns and actions are displayed as being coherent with each other (adjacency pair organization), and how alternative second actions are routinely accomplished as part of the preference organization of talk-in-interaction.

Overall structural organization:

- Practices for opening and closing a conversation, opening or closing storytelling sequences, transitioning between larger interactional sequences, etc.
 - These practices pertain to how an interaction is structured into larger sequences, and how the boundaries of these and relations to preceding sequences are made recognizable to co-participants.
-

Figure 1.14 Features of interaction to track L2 IC development over time

As shown in the preceding sections, close scrutiny of these features in L2 speakers' talk over time informs us about the speakers' (growing) ability to deal with fundamental aspects of social interaction in their L2: recipient design, context-sensitive conduct, preference organization, precision timing, sequential placement, progressivity. One important question is whether and how these features can be operationalized as criteria for assessing IC.

There have been important efforts undertaken in the domain of L2 assessment and testing research to get a better grasp on IC (for recent research reviews see Sandlund, Sundqvist, & Nyroos, 2016, on oral proficiency tests; and Taguchi & Roever, 2017, on assessing L2 pragmatics). However, while our theoretical understanding of IC has been consolidated over the past decade, a consistent operationalization of the construct is still missing. What McNamara and Roever (2006) pointed out a decade ago has not lost any of its relevance: "The project of communicative language testing, despite its significant achievements, remains incomplete. Current understanding of the social dimension of communication, it turns out, poses extremely difficult challenges that to date have not been met" (p. 44). CA-based research on measuring IC has shown paths towards operationalizing IC (e.g., Gan, 2010; Kasper & Ross, 2007; Lazaraton, 2002; Roever & Kasper, forthcoming; Young, 2008; see already He & Young, 1998). Yet CA-SLA research also warns against an individualistic view of IC as 'belonging' to a participant, as being simply 'brought along' to social interaction, rather than being brought about in concord with others. The fact is that existing tests still do not capture people's abilities for interaction (Taguchi & Roever, 2017). While aspects of action formation have been tackled by pragmatic research on language testing as observable features of proficiency, it seems realistic to think that other dimensions of the generic organizational principles of social interaction, as outlined above, will ultimately lend themselves to operationalization in useful ways.

A promising step in that direction has been offered by Youn (2015) in her extensive study on the assessment of L2 IC (referred to by the author as "L2 pragmatics in interaction"). Drawing on L2 pragmatics and CA-based research on IC, Youn develops data-driven rating criteria designed for classroom assessment of IC (as deployed within role plays) relating to such issues as turn-organization, repair and sequence organization, and demonstrates relative convergence of ratings based on these criteria among the 12 raters involved in the study. Importantly, the use of such bottom-up criteria as a basis for assessment is in line with fundamental research on the development of L2 IC. For instance, one of Youn's criteria is pre-requests in request formulations (though under the somewhat vague general category of 'content delivery'). The real-world relevancy of this criterion is corroborated by the fact that, as documented by several studies on L2 IC development (see above), over time L2 speakers display

increased use of pre-sequences and prefaces of various types as part of their developing L2 IC (see Hellermann, 2008, and Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018, for story prefaces; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2011, for disagreement prefaces; along similar lines, Al Gahtani & Roever, 2013, document the progressive emergence of pre-requests). Such observations suggest that the above list of features of interaction lends itself to be further explored as to the features' applicability as criteria for rating.

Yet such an enterprise faces important challenges of practicality, among these the time-consuming nature of such ratings (cf. Youn, 2015) as well as the complicated test design and administration of test situations that require the co-presence (physical or virtual) of interlocutors, such as role plays or interviews (Roever & Kasper, forthcoming). One of the major challenges for future developments in this field is hence to strike a balance between the real-life validity of assessing/testing IC and its practicality. Another key challenge is to account for the fact that IC is fundamentally the ability to co-construct courses of action with others (see Brown, 2003, on the "co-construction of speaking proficiency"): IC is always contingent upon co-participants' actions, as part of the minute social coordination of individuals' conduct that makes up the dynamics of social interaction. An individual's observable IC is therefore always related to the precise other(s) she is interacting with (see Roever & Kasper, forthcoming, for a recent discussion of the examiner's effect on test takers' displayed interactional abilities). An individualistic test design is not equipped to deal with this co-constructed competence.

Exploring Pathways From the Classroom to the 'Wild' and Back

Another area that deserves much attention in future research pertains to the consequences that ensue from empirical findings on the development of L2 IC for pedagogy and classroom practice. We know from research on interaction within educational settings that the classroom itself is a diversified interactional space (e.g., Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004; see also the papers in Markee & Kunitz, 2015, and in Kunitz, Sert, & Markee, forthcoming), offering various opportunities for IC development. The findings reported in this chapter suggest that some aspects of L2 IC may be more resistant to classroom learning than others, yet this of course hinges on the type of classroom practice students experience. The case of Julie is significant in this regard: After 12 years of schooling, it takes only a couple of months of real-world interactional practice with her host family for Julie to show important development in her L2 IC, regarding such fundamental issues as sequential organization of actions, recipient design and context-sensitive conduct, as shown through her storytelling and word-search practices. Other findings yet point to the important contribution of classroom practice to IC development: the

French-as-a-foreign-language students observed doing disagreements in lower vs. upper secondary classrooms relevantly developed procedures for dealing with the preference organization of talk-in-interaction, assumedly through classroom instruction only, in ways that come close to what we know about L1 speakers' practices. Such diverse observations outline an extensive future research agenda regarding the 'teachability' of IC—through either explicit instruction or targeted practice within the classroom—as well as the conditions for its development, relating to levels of L2 mastery, length and intensity of instruction, classroom interactional culture and related student entitlements, and so on.

One among many questions worth exploring is how and to what extent structural aspects of interaction related to, for instance, story opening, opening of dyadic tasks, opening or closing of conversations, or the formatting of (e.g., dispreferred) actions can be made explicit in the classroom and/or favored by targeted practice, such as classroom debates or specific designs of dyadic tasks.⁶ The fact is that, to date, IC is still insufficiently integrated into L2 curricula.⁷ As Taguchi and Roever (2017) put it: "targeted teaching of particular aspects of conversation . . . has not been sufficiently attended to" (p. 227). Today, the growing empirical research on the nature and the development of L2 IC offers rich grounds for opening new avenues towards exploring better ways of integrating IC as a pedagogical object.

A key aspect worth close scrutiny in this regard is how L2 learners' living environments can be exploited for L2 teaching. A currently emerging line of research is specifically concerned with how CA findings of the type reported in this chapter can be brought to bear on initiatives that integrate out-of-school interactional experiences, that is, experiences in the 'wild' (cf. Wagner, 2015), into the pedagogical setup within the school. This research explores ways of designing pedagogical tasks that can be carried out into out-of-classroom real-life encounters (Hellermann, Thorne, & Harley, in press; Kasper & Kim, 2015), and, conversely, ways of bringing out-of-classroom interactional experiences back into the classroom through target activities fostering reflection and analysis (Lilja, Piirainen-Marsh, Clark, & Torretta, in press; Wagner, 2015).

Pioneering initiatives in this regard are both *Språkskap* and *The Icelandic Village*. In the former, a network of teachers, L2 speakers, researchers and interaction designers developed a scheme to support Swedish L2 learning in everyday interactions by setting up spaces for the L2 speakers to reflect on the interactional resources used in real-world social encounters (Clark & Karl, 2011). In the latter, employees of small client-oriented businesses such as groceries, hot dog stands or bakeries were invited to systematically address incoming students of Icelandic in the local language, without switching to English (Theodórsdóttir & Friðriksdóttir, 2013). Further attempts for building up such social infrastructures for the learning and teaching of an L2 are under way (see some of the

chapters in Hellermann, Eskildsen, et al., in press). While the efficiency of these initiatives for L2 IC development over time yet remains to be assessed, they open promising avenues for designing pedagogies that are increasingly in line with findings from fundamental research. In light of the empirical findings reported in this chapter, such an enterprise needs to be grounded in an understanding of IC as sedimented from experience, recognizing that speakers' repeated engagement in locally contextualized socially purposeful interactional practice is key to the development of IC in the L2.

Notes

- 1 I thank Numa Markee and two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on an earlier version of this chapter. I am also grateful to Carsten Roever for having drawn my attention to Soo Jung Youn's work on testing interactional competence, and for having helped me understand the specific challenges of test design and administration in interactionally sensitive testing.
- 2 Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale's (1983) influential works on communicative competence can be regarded as symptomatic in this regard: communicative competence has been subdivided into linguistic, sociolinguistic, strategic and discursive competence, but the focus has remained on the individual contribution of the learner (for critiques of such an individualistic reification of communicative competence, see He & Young, 1998; McNamara & Roever, 2006).
- 3 In the field of *first* language acquisition, a similar orientation can be found earlier on in research on language socialization. Language socialization studies (e.g., the classic work by Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986) are interested in the process of becoming a social and linguistic member of a group through language use in social activity. By seeing socialization as a basis for language development, this research tradition posits that language development is anchored in socially enacted interactional practices.
- 4 As Schegloff (1989) put it, "not yet-competent members . . . learn to deal with the moment-to-moment contingencies of life in interaction, and the details of language use and conduct, *in* the moment-to-moment contingencies of life in interaction, with their deployments of language and other conduct" (p. 152; original emphasis).
- 5 *Preference organization* is a technical term used in CA (Pomerantz, 1984; Sacks, 1987). It has nothing to do with individual liking (that is, a psychological understanding of preference), but refers to an organizational principle of social interaction, relating to normative ways of how next actions respond to prior actions. The basic principle runs as follows: aligning (preferred) next actions such as accept, agree and grant are delivered directly, typically without hesitation and in turn-initial position (preferred action turn-format); by contrast, disaligning/dispreferred actions such as refuse, disagree and deny are delayed and most often pushed back in the turn (dispreferred action turn-format).
- 6 One might be more skeptical about how to make aspects of the finer granularity of social interaction, such as the timing of turn-taking or practices for self-initiating repair, into 'teachables.'
- 7 For applications of CA findings to aspects of teacher training see, e.g., Sert (2015); Walsh (2012); Wong and Waring (2010); and some papers in Kunitz, Sert, and Markee (forthcoming).

References

- Al-Gahtani, S., & Carsten, R. (2013). "Hi doctor, give me handouts": low-proficiency learners and requests. *ELT Journal*, 67(4), 413–424.
- Atkinson, D. (2002). Toward a sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(4), 525–545.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Salisbury, T. (2004). The organization of turns in the disagreements of L2 learners: A longitudinal perspective. In D. Boxer & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Studying speaking to inform second language learning* (pp. 68–87). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (1997). Teaching conversation and sociocultural norms with conversation analysis. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 14, 71–88.
- Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (2015). "I told you": Storytelling development of a Japanese learning English as a second language. In S. W. Eskildsen & T. Cadierno (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 271–304). Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Berger, E. (2016). *Prendre la parole en L2. Regard sur la compétence d'interaction en classe de langue*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Berger, E., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Tracking change over time in second language talk-in-interaction: a longitudinal case-study of storytelling organization. In S. Pekarek Doehler, E. González-Martínez, & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Longitudinal studies on the organization of social interaction* (pp. 67–102). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Betz, E., & Huth, T. (2014). Beyond grammar: Teaching interaction in the German language Classroom. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 47, 140–163.
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Brouwer, C. E., & Johannes, W. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 29–47.
- Brown, A. (2003). Interviewer variation and the co-construction of speaking proficiency. *Language Testing*, 20(1), 1–25.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In: J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt. (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2–27). New York, London: Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1(1), 1–47.
- Cekaite, A. (2007). A child's development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(1), 45–62.
- Clark, B., & Karl, L. (2011). *Språkskap. Swedish as a Social Language*. Malmö: Folkuniversitetet and Interactive Institute.
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2011). The L2 inventory in action: Conversation analysis and usage-based linguistics in SLA. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 337–373). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and some fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285–300.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/Foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, Focus Issue, 800–819.

- Gan, Z. (2010). Interaction in group oral assessment: A case study of higher- and lower- scoring students. *Language Testing*, 27(4), 585–602.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goodwin, C., Goodwin, M. H., & Olsher, D. (2002). Producing sense with non-sense syllables. Turn and sequence in conversation with a man with severe aphasia. In C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence* (pp. 56–80). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, J. K. (1993). The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The sociocultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language. *Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 145–166.
- Hall, J. K. (1995). (Re)creating our worlds with words: A sociohistorical perspective of face-to-face interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 206–232.
- Hall, J. K. (1999). A prosaics of interaction: The development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning*, (pp. 137–151). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, J. K., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). L2 Interactional competence and development. In J. K. Hall & J. Hellermann (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 1–15). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- He, A. W., & Young, R. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 1–24) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hellermann, J. (2008). *Sam actions for classroom language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, J. (2009). Looking for evidence of language learning in practices for repair: A case study of self-initiated self-repair by an adult learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 53(2), 113–132.
- Hellermann, J. (2011). Members' methods, members' competencies: Looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated repair. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 147–172). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, J., Eskildsen, S. W., Pekarek Doehler, S., & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (Eds.) (in press). *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Hellermann, J., Thorne, S., & Harley, J. (in press). Building socio-environmental infrastructures for learning. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Heritage, J. (2007). Intersubjectivity and progressivity in person (and place) reference. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person reference in interaction* (pp. 255–280). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). London: Penguin.
- Ishida, M. (2009). Development of interactional competence: Changes in the use of *ne* in L2 Japanese during study abroad. In H. T. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 351–386). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i.

- Ishida, M. (2011). Engaging in another person's telling as a recipient in L2 Japanese: Development of interactional competence during one-year study abroad. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 45–85). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Jefferson, G. (1978). Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 219–248). London: Academic Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 86–100). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 551–576.
- Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review*, 19(1), 83–99.
- Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view? *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, (IRAL) 47, 11–36.
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.). (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Kim, Y. (2015). Conversation-for-learning: Institutional talk beyond the classroom. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 390–408). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. *Language Learning*, 52.
- Kasper, G., & Ross, S. J. (2007). Multiple questions in oral proficiency interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 2045–2070.
- Kasper, G., & Ross, S. J. (2013). Assessing second language pragmatics: An overview and introductions. In S. Ross & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Assessing second language pragmatics* (pp. 1–40). Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kim, S. (in press). Stabilization of routine multi-word expressions in service encounters. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Kim, Y. (2009). Korean discourse markers in L2 Korean speakers' conversation: An acquisitional perspective. In H. T. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 317–350). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Kim, Y. (2016). Development of L2 interactional competence: Being a story recipient in L2 English conversation. *Discourse and Cognition*, 23(1), 1–29.
- Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70, 366–372.
- Kramsch, C., (Ed.). (2002). *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives*. London: Continuum.
- Kunitz, S., Olcay, S., & Markee, N. (forthcoming). *Emerging issues in classroom discourse and interaction: Theoretical and applied CA perspectives on pedagogy*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Lazaraton, A. (2002). *A qualitative approach to the validation of oral language tests*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lilja, N., Piirainen-Marsh, A., Clark, B., & Torretta, N. (in press). The Rally Course: Learners as co-designers of out-of-classroom language learning tasks. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Mandelbaum, J. (2013). Storytelling in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 492–507). Chichester, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(3), 404–427.
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 491–500.
- Markee, N., & Kunitz, S. (2015). CA-for-SLA studies of classroom interaction: Quo vadis? In N. Markee (Ed.), *Handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 425–440). Boston, MA: Wiley.
- Masuda, K. (2011). Acquiring interactional competence in a study abroad context: Japanese language learners' use of the interactional particle *ne*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(4), 519–540.
- McNamara, T., & Roever, C. (2006). *Language testing: The social dimension*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 501–518.
- Mori, J., & Koschmann, T. (2012). Good reasons for seemingly bad performance: Competences at the blackboard and the accountability of a lesson. In G. Rasmussen, C. E. Brower, & D. Day (Eds.), *Evaluating cognitive competence in interaction* (pp. 89–117). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nguyen, H. T. (2011). A longitudinal microanalysis of a second language learner's participation. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 17–44). Manoa: University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories. In R. A. Schweder & R. A. Levine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 276–320). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Oksa, E. (1990). Language contact and culture contact: Towards an integrative approach in second language acquisition. In H. W. Dechert (Ed.), *Current trends in European second language acquisition research* (pp. 230–243). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pallotti, G. (2001). External appropriations as a strategy for participating in intercultural multi-party conversations. In A. D. Luzio, S. Günthner, & F. Orletti (Eds.), *Culture in communication: Analyses of intercultural situations* (pp. 295–334). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language, learning and documenting learning in conversation analytic SLA

- research. In P. Seedhouse & S. Walsh (Eds.), *Conceptualizing 'learning' in applied linguistics* (pp. 105–127). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Elaborations on L2 interactional competence: the development of L2 grammar-for-interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 3–24.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2018). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(4), 555–578. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw021>
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (in press). On the reflexive relation between developing L2 interactional competence and evolving social relationships: A longitudinal study of word-searches in the 'wild.' In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2011). Developing 'methods' for interaction: A cross-sectional study of disagreement sequences in French L2. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 206–243). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–268). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., Wagner, J., & González-Martínez, E. (Eds.). (2018) *Longitudinal studies on the organization of social interaction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 57–111). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roever, C., & Kasper, G. (forthcoming). Speaking in turns and sequences: Interactional competence as a target construct in testing speaking. *Language Testing*.
- Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (pp. 337–353). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1987). On the preference for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 54–69). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
- Sandlund, E., Sundqvist, P., & Nyroos, L. (2016). Testing L2 talk: A review of empirical studies on second language oral proficiency testing. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 10(1), 14–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12174/edpf>
- Schegloff, E. A. (1989). Reflections on language, development, and the interactional character of talk-in-interaction. In M. Borstein & J. Bruner (Eds.), *Interaction in human development* (pp. 139–153). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1986). *Language socialization across cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Taguchi, N., & Roever, C. (2017). *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Theodórsdóttir, G., & Friðriksdóttir, K. (2013). Íslenskuþorpið: Leið til þátttöku í daglegum samskiptum á íslensku [The Icelandic Village: Guided participation in interaction in Icelandic]. *Milli mála*, 13–42.
- Wagner, J. (2004). The classroom and beyond. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 612–616.
- Wagner, J. (2015). Designing for language learning in the wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 75–101). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Wagner, J., Pekarek Doehler, S., & González-Martínez, E. (forthcoming). Longitudinal research on the organization of social interaction: Current developments and methodological challenges. In S. Pekarek Doehler, E. González-Martínez, & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Longitudinal studies on the organization of social interaction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Walsh, S. (2012). *Teacher development and classroom interaction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. New York: Routledge.
- Young, S. J. (2015). Validity argument for assessing L2 pragmatics in interaction using mixed methods. *Language Testing*, 32(2), 199–225.
- Young, R. F. (2007). Language learning and teaching as discursive practice. In Hua, Z., Seedhouse, P., Cook, V., & Wei, L. (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching as social interaction* (pp. 251–271). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Young, R. F. (2008). *Language and interaction: An advanced resource book*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Young, R. F., & Miller, E. R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 519–535.

2 Some Theoretical Reflections on the Construct of Interactional Competence

Numa Markee

Introduction

In this chapter, I wish to reflect on a number of interrelated issues that pertain to the conceptualization of interactional competence (IC) as a theoretical construct in the body of work that uses the methods of ethnomethodological conversation analysis (EMCA) to examine second language acquisition processes (CA-SLA). In this respect, I am fortunate that this chapter follows the contribution to this collection by Pekarek Doehler (see also Pekarek Doehler, 2017; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018; Pekarek Doehler & Fasel Lauzon, 2015; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015, which collectively represent the current state of the art in this area of CA-SLA) in that I can simply direct readers to her work as a convenient jumping-off point for my own discussion.

More specifically, I situate my discussion of IC as a theoretical contribution to the debate concerning whether this is the most appropriate superordinate term to describe what CA-SLA is about that was initiated in the recent special issue of *Classroom Discourse* (volume 9, issue 1). More specifically, I compare and contrast how the notions of competence and IC have been used in the parent discipline of sociological CA and in CA-SLA in applied linguistics (AL), respectively, and argue that, for a number of interrelated reasons, the simpler term *competence* is to be preferred.

Some Preliminary Observations

In line with (all?) other authors in the AL and CA-SLA literatures, I have always used the term *IC* rather than *competence* as the technical term that describes the underlying machinery of talk-in-interaction (specifically, turn-taking, repair, sequence and preference organization: see, for example, Markee, 2000, 2008). However, in the last few years, I have become increasingly skeptical that sociological and CA-SLA versions of (interactional) competence mean the same thing. While the term *IC* is indeed sometimes used in the sociological CA literature—see, for example,

Psathas (1991)—the most common term in this literature is *competence*. So, an obvious question to ask is whether these two terms are exact synonyms. In an insightful personal communication that addresses this question, Tim Koschmann (March 3, 2017) remarks:

To respond to your question, I agree that the EM/CA community and the applied linguistics community talk about and think about competency in different ways. First, I think you are right that while there is some mention of ‘interactional competence’ in EMCA writing, it is not a central focus of the literature and, by my reading, the expression is not used in consistent ways. But there is, I think, a deeper difference. Interactional competence is, for applied linguistics, something that the field is seeking to evaluate or assess. For EM and CA, competence is presumed. Sacks’ notion of ‘doing being ordinary’ and Garfinkel’s instructed action both represent models of competent action. Members are assumed to be competent and the analyst’s job is one of documenting what that competence might entail.

This statement not only confirms my initial hunch that these two terms are *not* in fact synonymous but also suggests (correctly, I think) that the basic assumptions that govern how competence is treated in sociological CA and CA-SLA are subtly different. But what might some of these differences be, and, furthermore, what might some of the larger theoretical implications of these preliminary observations be for CA-SLA?

Now, I am certainly not the first to have misgivings about what the term *IC* means in CA-SLA. Most recently, this concern has emerged in Waring (2018) and particularly in Hall (2018), who notes that this nomenclature has certain inherent ambiguities, in that it is commonly used to refer both to the underlying competence of second language (SL) speaker-learners to engage in meaningful intersubjective action and also to the developmental emergence of so-called *objects of language learning*. She therefore suggests that the term *interactional repertoires* might be a useful alternative to the notion of *IC* understood principally as a developmental phenomenon (in passing, Hall acknowledges that I coined this latter term in Markee, 2008, and correctly points out that I understood interactional repertoires to be a component—or, as I actually put it, a *by-product*—of *IC*, not an alternative to it). But my principal objection to the use of *IC* as the default umbrella term for the underlying machinery of talk-in-interaction in our field is more fundamental than Hall’s. Specifically, I argue that in AL this term comes with a considerable amount of intellectual baggage, and that this baggage has the unfortunate effect of diluting the radical nature of the EMCA respecification of cognitive theories of SL learning that first emerged in the late 1990s. Thus, in order to distance current EMCA work in CA-SLA studies from this extraneous intellectual baggage, I propose that the simpler term *competence* is

preferable to the more usual term *IC* in our field. As a first step to making this argument stick, let us now explore the historical background to how sociological CA and CA-SLA came to use the terms *competence* and *IC*, respectively.

Historical Background

In an interview with Charles Goodwin recorded by Salomon (in press), Goodwin states that Emanuel Schegloff borrowed the term *competence* from Chomsky (1965) very early on in his career. As is well known, Chomsky defined *competence* in highly abstract, etc (i.e., researcher-relevant) terms as a hard-wired biological endowment that is located in the mind of the individual. He further asserted that it was this psycholinguistic mechanism that enabled all normal human beings to learn their first language perfectly with remarkable speed and little effort. Chomsky also famously contrasted competence with the category of performance, which he dismissed as a degenerate aspect of language use that was of no theoretical interest to linguists. Now, while both Chomsky and Schegloff share the assumption of competence (see also Koschmann's previous commentary on this matter), what Schegloff means by this term is also clearly quite different from how Chomsky formulated this concept. More specifically, Schegloff respecified the term *competence* in radically emic (i.e., participant-relevant), and specifically post-cognitive, ethnomethodological terms. Following Garfinkel (1967), ethnomethodology (EM) is concerned with how members arrive at common-sense understandings of their own and others' everyday actions by using certain members' methods that they publicly display to other participants (and, by extension, to researchers). So, according to Schegloff, what this means in the context of ordinary conversation—which is viewed as the *primordial site of sociability* (Schegloff, 1987)—is that participants are able to *competently perform or achieve naturally occurring talk as observable real-time behavior* by orienting to the empirically observable practices of turn-taking, repair, sequence and preference organization. And, essentially, this is still how *competence* is understood in sociological CA, and especially in classical CA (by classical CA, I mean the kind of CA that focuses on the verbal aspects of talk-in-interaction and that, unlike work on human action—see Goodwin, 2018, for an influential overview—pays little or no attention to the role of various forms of embodiment in such behavior).

In contrast, as Pekarek Doehler (this volume) has correctly noted, the notion of competence in theoretical linguistics and AL has undergone a great deal of theoretical development that continues to this day. More specifically, over time, the Chomskyan notion of competence morphed into the Hymesian construct of *communicative* competence (Hymes, 1972). This development redrew the rather artificial theoretical boundaries between competence and performance that had been posited by

Chomsky and laid the foundations for the development of the communicative language teaching and testing movement (see, among others, Allen & Widdowson, 1974; Bachman, 1990; Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell, 1995). Eventually, Hymes's still relatively formal and static conceptualization of communicative competence itself became the focus of criticism from a language socialization perspective (see Kramsch, 1986, who actually coined the term *IC*). Subsequently, as reported by Pekarek Doehler (this volume), the construct of *IC* underwent further theoretical development by authors who also drew on sociocultural theory (SCT), situated learning theory and practice theory. So, to go back to the dialogue between Koschmann and myself mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the fact that the notion of *IC* in AL and CA-SLA has always been much more complex and more interdisciplinary than the concept of competence in sociological CA constitutes the most important difference between these two disciplines.

In this context, CA methods first began to be applied to SL learning in the mid- to late 1990s (see Firth & Wagner, 1997; Markee, 1994, 1995), and the first full-blown conversation analytic model of *IC* (Markee, 2000) soon followed. This model attempted to apply a purist version of EMCA to the study of SL learning by showing how users/learners were able to use the underlying machinery of talk-in-interaction as real-time resources for doing learning, at least in the short term. However, other hybrid versions of CA-SLA work soon followed. Why did this happen? While the early CA-SLA critique of cognitive theories of learning certainly gained a lot of attention, it is important to remember that cognitive interactionist researchers did not take these attacks lying down. Indeed, they mounted a vigorous counter-attack of their own by questioning whether an inherently post-cognitive discipline such as CA could ever say anything interesting about what were claimed to be the quintessentially psycholinguistic processes of language learning (see, for example, the cognitive responses in Firth & Wagner, 1997; Markee, 2004). Even more worryingly, coming from an SCT perspective—with which CA obviously has a good deal of common ground—Hall (2004) made the related argument that, absent an exogenous, a priori social theory of language learning, the CA papers in Markee (2004) had failed to make the case that CA could be used by itself as a viable tool for demonstrating language learning.¹ So, the idea that a marriage between SCT (and/or other social theories of learning) and CA methods potentially provided a viable answer to the concerns raised by cognitive and SCT researchers rapidly gained popularity in the field (see, for example, Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Hellermann, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2011; Hellermann & Cole, 2008; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Young & Miller, 2004, and several of the contributions to the volume edited by Hall, Hellermann, & Pekarek Doehler, 2011). And this theoretical eclecticism—or, less kindly, theoretical baggage—is still widely accepted in CA-SLA today.

Before I explain why I believe this development was/is quite problematic, let me first make three important points. First, *this critique in no way impugns the analytic quality of hybrid CA-SLA or sociocognitive work that uses CA methods for its own purposes*: in fact, much of this research is exemplary. Second, people often change their minds. For example, within CA-SLA, Johannes Wagner no longer sees a need to hitch CA to exogenous theories of language learning as a prerequisite for doing CA-SLA (see Kunitz & Skogmyr Marian, 2017, note 1). Similarly, Pekarek Doehler and colleagues' current work on IC, referenced at the beginning of this chapter, exemplifies a much more purist approach to doing CA-SLA than her early work did. In this context, note in passing that this body of work—while not framed in such terms—actually constitutes an excellent, empirically sustained rebuttal to the claim made by Hall (2004) that CA methods need to be supplemented by exogenous theories of learning in order to have anything useful to say about language learning. As a further observation that speaks to this second point, I would like to point out that the paper by Hellermann (2018) is notable for the way in which this author explicitly grounds his discussion of *competencing* in EM. So, there are incipient signs that the theoretical high tide of hybrid CA-SLA may have already crested. But it certainly has not ebbed completely, so this critique still holds for at least some current CA-SLA work today. Third, and finally, it is important to note that EMCA is not a splendidly isolationist discipline that refuses to enter into any sort of dialogue with other approaches to understanding human action. EMCA has fruitfully borrowed—but always made its own—important notions such as *cognition in the wild* (see Hutchins, 1995) from other disciplines. It obviously has important epistemological commonalities with other offshoots of EM, such as discursive psychology (see, for example, Kasper, 2009; Markee, 2011; Markee & Seo, 2009) and interactional linguistics (see Pekarek Doehler, 2018). Furthermore, it has demonstrably made important contributions to broad, multi-disciplinary research proposals. In the context of sociological CA, see, for example, the chapters by Goodwin (2006) and Schegloff (2006) in Enfield and Levinson (2006), which are important contributions to these editors' proposals for the development of the then new interdisciplinary field of human sociality. And in CA-SLA, see the chapters by Barraja-Rohan (2015), Pekarek Doehler and Pochon Berger (2015) and Wagner (2015) in Cadierno and Eskildsen (2015) on how CA-SLA interfaces with usage-based linguistics (UBL). But the point is that, as noted by Eskildsen (2018), (1) the contributions made by CA to such exchanges are always distinctive; (2) they crucially involve a division of labor between local and generic accounts of language learning; and (3) in his case at least, the dialogue between CA and UBL has caused him to rethink in important ways his initial views on UBL.

Let us now return to the question of why the development of hybrid CA was/is problematic. For my part, although I never accepted that CA had to be wedded off to exogenous theories of language learning as a precondition to it gaining a legitimate seat at the SLA table, it was not until I published Markee (2008) that I developed a personally satisfying answer to the cognitive (and, by extension, the SCT) critique of EMCA's viability as a tool for doing SLA. Briefly, in this paper, I respecified the notion of language acquisition in social terms by defining this construct as interactionally competent, multi-semiotic *language learning behavior* in and through which participants display to each other (and therefore also to analysts) observable changes of state in their emerging interactional repertoires over more or less extended periods of time. And I further proposed a methodological procedure called *language behavior tracking* that outlined how researchers might track such changes longitudinally in a consistent fashion. But, for present purposes, the most important point that I made in this paper was that hybrid CA and—even more so—social approaches to SLA that unproblematically appropriated CA methods for their own purposes violated *from the outset* the foundational principle of *ethnomethodological indifference to a priori theory* (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970) that makes EMCA so distinctive. This insight leads me to question how ethnomethodological such research actually was/is.

Now, this conclusion may be of little interest to researchers who are not committed to doing EMCA work. But for anyone who *does* claim to be doing EMCA, this conclusion should surely give us pause. As I also argued in Markee (2008), the kind of theory that is consistent with an EMCA outlook on human action is a *members'* (not a *researchers'*) theory of how language learning is done. Furthermore, such theories emerge out of intense, qualitative, empirical analysis that exploits the immense power of CA's members' methods as a resource for developing common-sense understandings of the world, including how they do language learning. This perspective (which also informs my contention that users'/learners' interactional repertoires emerge as by-products of their competent orientations to the underlying machinery of talk-in-interaction) clearly stands many of the fundamental assumptions of etic, experimental research in particular on their head, as such research adopts a theory-first, empirical-confirmation-second approach to constructing knowledge (though see Kendrick, 2017, on the question of how qualitative and experimental may fruitfully be combined in current EMCA research). And to my mind, it is precisely this radically different conceptualization of how human action might be conceptualized that hybrid CA (perhaps unintentionally) threw/throws away by relying on a priori, exogenous theories of learning. I obviously find this unfortunate, and all of these considerations are bound up with my preference for using the simpler

term *competence* as this is understood in the sociological CA literature rather than *IC* in CA-SLA.

An Ethnomethodological Perspective on CA-SLA and Its Implications

Broadly speaking, this is still how I understand *IC*—or, as I now prefer to call it, *competence*—in CA-SLA. But I think that there are at least two other reasons that go beyond the historical baggage argument I have already outlined for CA-SLA researchers to use the simpler term *competence* instead of *IC*. First, to go back to Koschmann's earlier comments again, it seems to me that competence can also be partially assumed in CA-SLA, although for somewhat different reasons than in sociological CA. In first language acquisition, the ability to talk has to be learned through intensive talk-in-interaction between caregivers and children (see Wootton, 1997), but once children have learned how to talk, their competence in the L1 can then be assumed. In contrast, in sequential SLA, at least (and here I am not using the word *sequential* in a technical CA sense, but as an antonym to *concurrent* SLA), SL users/learners are not communicatively deficient: they already have vast experience in taking turns, repairing trouble, participating in extended sequences of talk and doing preferred and dispreferred actions in their L1. In this sense, therefore, SL users'/learners' competent ability to do talk-in-interaction can safely be assumed, which leaves the epiphenomenal by-products of this competence—their locally situated interactional repertoires—as the phenomenon that is to be assessed. This proposal thus obviously reconnects CA work in SLA with the parent discipline of sociological CA by recognizing important ways in which competence can be assumed in CA-SLA, while also recognizing CA-SLA's legitimate interest in assessing how L2 users'/learners' interactional repertoires evolve over time.

Second, to my ear at least, the term *IC* seems (perhaps unintentionally) to prioritize the theoretical importance of verbal aspects of human action over other forms of semiosis. At least, this seems to be the case in Pekarek Doehler's work referenced earlier in this chapter, which (like classical CA) makes no mention of how embodied forms of semiosis such as eye gaze, body torque, facial expressions and gestures of various kinds are routinely and exquisitely choreographed with talk. Now, Hellermann and Pekarek Doehler (2010) and Pekarek Doehler (2013) are earlier exceptions to this generalization. Note further that Pekarek Doehler (2018) calls for aspects of embodiment to be included in future work on *IC*, so it will be interesting to see how she updates her thinking on such matters in her ongoing research program.

In this context, it is worth noting that multimodal research in the sociological CA literature which treats competence as a multi-semiotic phenomenon goes back to the late 1970s and is now more common than

classical CA research that focuses only on the verbal aspects of talk-in-interaction (for a comprehensive overview of this topic, see Deppermann, 2013; see also Goodwin, 1979, 1994, 1996, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c, 2003a, 2003b, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2018; Mondada, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2014b, 2016, who are two of the most important names in this literature). And in the CA-SLA literature, although such research is more recent, it is also growing rapidly in both size and importance: see, for example, Belhiah (2013a, 2013b); Broth and Forsberg Lundell (2013); Burch (2014); Burch and Kasper (2016); Eskildsen (in press); Eskildsen and aus der Wieschen (in press); Eskildsen and Markee (2018); Eskildsen and Wagner (2013, 2015, in press); Hellermann (2008, 2018); Hellermann, Thorne, and Fodor (2017); Kunitz and Skogmyr Marian, (2017); Lazaraton (2004); Lee and Burch (2017); Lilja (2014); Majlesi and Broth (2012); Majlesi and Markee (2018); Markee (2008); Markee and Kunitz (2013); Markee and Seo (2009); Mori (2004); Mori and Hasegawa (2009); Mori and Hayashi (2006); Olsher (2004); Seedhouse (2015); Seo (2011); Seo and Koshik (2010); Sert (2015); and Thorne, Hellermann, Jones, and Lester (2015), among others. Indeed, it is safe to conclude that such research is now part of the mainstream in CA-SLA research as well (see Kasper & Wagner, 2011, 2014; Markee, 2015). So, it seems to me that the general term *competence*—which now subsumes the kind of competence that is the bread and butter of classical CA *and* the kind of extended competence that is the focus of multimodal CA—is preferable to the term *IC* in that the former simply specifies more accurately what the de facto scope of most EMCA already is.

Of course, it is important to acknowledge that doing multimodal research complexifies the CA enterprise quite considerably. I do not have the space to go into these matters in any great detail here, but significant technical issues pertaining to data collection must be resolved before transcription and analysis can begin (see, for example, Zuengler, Ford, & Fassnacht, 1998; Mondada, 2013). And transcription and analysis also become exponentially more difficult. For example, in my own work, I have always used the rule of thumb that it takes about 20 hours to transcribe 1 hour of recorded interaction to Jeffersonian standards of transcription (see Jefferson, 2004). But some of the more complex frame grabs in Markee and Kunitz (2013), which are transcribed to the kinds of multimodal standards shown in Goodwin (2018: 18), actually took several hours to produce just on their own. Add to this the fact that while Jeffersonian standards of transcription are universally accepted as the de facto standard for classical CA transcripts, no such consensus exists in multimodal CA² (indeed, it sometimes seems that there are as many ways of transcribing multimodal action as there are multimodal researchers). For example, the transcription conventions developed by Mondada (2014a) are often viewed as a popular alternative to those developed by Goodwin, although, as Mondada suggested to me in a personal

communication on September 6, 2016, it is worth noting that she regards these two approaches to transcription as *complementing*, rather than *competing* with, each other. And, indeed, there is no reason why certain aspects of these two transcription systems cannot be combined (see, for example, the transcripts in Majlesi & Markee, 2018). Other difficult transcription-related matters include the range of embodied actions that theoretically need to be included in such transcripts. More specifically, it is impossible to transcribe every aspect of multimodal action, so contingent choices have to be made about what to include in such transcripts in light of the phenomenon being studied. In addition, the transparency of multimodal transcripts often becomes an issue since so much more information is included in such transcripts. And last but not least, there is considerable ongoing theoretical disagreement as to what multimodality actually buys us. For example, Schegloff (2007: 10–12; 2010: 32) is skeptical that there is enough empirical evidence to convincingly make the claim that non-verbal conduct is ordered in adjacency pair terms. On the other hand, this is one of the main issues that is addressed in the special issue of the *Journal of Pragmatics* edited by Hazel, Mortensen, and Rasmussen (2014). And, of course, this issue also figures prominently in the oeuvre of both Charles Goodwin and Lorenza Mondada (see the references already cited).

So, doing multimodal CA is undoubtedly a difficult thing to do well. Many of the issues discussed above are obviously also quite pertinent to the study of competent action that subsumes both talk-in-interaction and embodiment in CA-SLA. But what I want to emphasize here is that, in terms of *future* CA research on language learning, we need to engage in a wide-ranging discussion of the theoretical adequacy of Jeffersonian and multimodal transcripts as tools for doing CA-SLA research. Let me draw on two publications in my own work to jumpstart this discussion.

In my initial analysis of definition talk focusing on the word *corral* in Markee (1994)—which was based on a Jeffersonian transcript—I was able to develop a reasonably insightful account of when L10 (the user/learner who did not know the meaning of this word) first understood and then learned this word, at least in the short term. However, when I retranscribed the same data to multimodal standards of transcription and reanalyzed them in Markee (2005), I was able to identify various embodied behaviors which not only confirmed the original analysis but also enabled me to develop a rich, complex understanding of how verbal and multimodal behaviors unfolded in tandem with each other in real time.

In Majlesi and Markee (2018), we analyzed a much more complex piece of classroom interaction and noted that the talk analyzed in this publication would simply be incomprehensible to readers who did not have access to the handout that the students were orienting to as they attempted to complete the learning task they were engaged in. So, the inclusion of this multimodal cultural artifact from the local environment

was foundational to the analysis. We then carried out two parallel analyses of the final 24 seconds of interaction that brought this learning task to a successful conclusion. The first was based on a Jeffersonian transcript, and the second was based on a multimodal transcript which combined elements from the transcription conventions shown in Goodwin (2018) and Mondada (2014a). As a result of this comparison, we were able to show that although we were able to get some general, though still useful, analytical purchase on how this talk was organized from the Jeffersonian transcript, certain fine-grained details, such as what the exophoric referents of pronouns such as *that* or *this* might be in the local environment, were simply not recoverable from this transcript. In contrast, not only did the multimodal transcript allow us to understand these matters with ease, but it also opened up completely new questions for analysis.

More specifically, it turns out that while the original Jeffersonian transcript suggested that only two students were interacting during some of the initial verbal turns of the excerpt under study, the multimodal transcript showed that one of these students (who, as a beginner, had a very limited interactional repertoire) also used a large circular gesture as an additional resource to try to explain what he wanted the other student to do. In addition, this transcript further showed that the same gesture was simultaneously adopted as a *return gesture* (De Fornel, 1992) by another student during this same stretch of talk. So, while the Jeffersonian transcript suggested a dyadic participation framework, the multimodal transcript documented the fact that at least three students were actually participating in this stretch of interaction. Furthermore, the multimodal transcript also allowed us to observe the fact that the circular return gesture discussed above was subsequently also independently used by other students during the remainder of the learning task.

In short, these findings clearly demonstrate that while multimodal transcripts can be used to develop rich confirmations of insights derived from Jeffersonian transcripts, they can also be used to develop analyses that diverge significantly from analyses that are based on Jeffersonian transcripts. In conclusion, I invite other CA-SLA researchers to look at their own current and future data transcription and analytical practices to see how such empirical issues play out in their own work, and also to reflect on the broader theoretical significance of using terms such as *competence* or *IC* in CA-SLA.

Notes

- 1 Note, however, that Hall's simultaneous call for longitudinal research (echoed by Kasper, 2004) in CA-SLA is well taken and served as an important catalyst for subsequent progress in the field.
- 2 In this context, notice that, in his interview with Salomon (in press), Charles Goodwin makes an interesting case for emphasizing the *continuities* rather than the *differences* between Jefferson's and his own transcription conventions.

References

- Allen, J. P. B., & Widdowson, H. G. (1974). Teaching the communicative use of English. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 12, 1–22.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (2015). “I told you”: Storytelling development of a Japanese learning English as a second language. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 271–304). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Belhiah, H. (2013a). Gesture as a resource for intersubjectivity in second language learning situations. *Classroom Discourse*, 4(2), 111–129. DOI:10.1080/19463014.2012.671273
- Belhiah, H. (2013b). Using the hand to choreograph instruction: On the functional role of gesture in definition talk. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97, 417–434.
- Broth, M., & Forsberg Lundell, F. (2013). Napouléon’s sequential heritage. Using a student error as a resource for learning and teaching pronunciation in the French foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 4, 89–109.
- Brouwer, C. E., & Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 29–47.
- Burch, A. R. (2014). Pursuing information: A conversation analytic perspective on communication strategies. *Language Learning*, 64, 651–684.
- Burch, A. R., & Kasper, G. (2016). ‘Like Godzilla’: Enactments and formulations in telling a disaster story in Japanese. In M. T. Prior & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Emotion in multilingual interaction* (pp. 57–85). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cadierno, T., & Eskildsen, S. (Eds.) (2015). *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1–47.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 5–35.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- de Fornel, M. (1992). The return gesture: Some remarks on context, inference and iconic gesture. In P. Auer & A. Di Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language* (pp. 159–176). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Deppermann, A. (2013). Multimodal interaction from a conversation analytic perspective: Introduction to a special issue. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46, 1–7.
- Enfield, N. J., & Levinson, S. C. (2006). *Roots of human sociality*. New York: Berg.
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2018). Building a semiotic repertoire for social action: interactional competence as biographical discovery. *Classroom Discourse*, 9, 68–76.
- Eskildsen, S. W. (in press). The daily routine: Learning to do public writing in the L2 classroom. In S. Kunitz, O. Sert, & N. Markee (Eds.), *Classroom-based conversation analytic research: Theoretical and applied perspectives on pedagogy*. Heidelberg: Springer.

- Eskildsen, S. W., & aus der Wieschen, M. V. (in press). Embodied and occasioned learnables and teachables in early EFL classroom. In H. Nguyen & T. Mala-barba (Eds.), *Conversation analytic perspectives on English language learning and teaching in global contexts: Constraints and possibilities*. Bristol: Multi-lingual Matters.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Markee, N. (2018). L2 talk as social accomplishment. In R. Alonso Alonso (Ed.), *Learning to speak in an L2* (pp. 69–103). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Wagner, J. (2013). Recurring and shared gestures in the L2 classroom: Resources for teaching and learning. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1–23.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Wagner, J. (2015). Embodied L2 construction learning. *Language Learning*, 65, 419–448.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Wagner, J. (in press). From trouble in the talk to new resources: The interplay of bodily and linguistic resources in the talk of a speaker of English as a second language. In S. Pekarek Doehler, E. González-Martínez, & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Documenting change across time: Longitudinal studies in the organization of social interaction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in second language acquisition research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285–300.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Garfinkel, H., & Sacks, H. (1970). On formal structures of practical actions. In J. C. McKinney & E. A. Tyriakian (Eds.), *Theoretical sociology* (pp. 338–366). New York: Appleton Century Crofts.
- Goodwin, C. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 97–121). New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Goodwin, C. (1994). Professional vision. *American Anthropologist*, 96, 606–633.
- Goodwin, C. (1996). Transparent vision. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 370–404). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. (2000a). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489–1522.
- Goodwin, C. (2000b). Practices of seeing: Visual analysis—An ethnomethodological approach. In T. van Leeuwen & C. Jewitt (Eds.), *Handbook of visual analysis* (pp. 157–182). London: Sage.
- Goodwin, C. (2000c). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489–1522.
- Goodwin, C. (2003a). Pointing as situated practice. In S. Kita (Ed.), *Pointing: Where language, culture and cognition meet* (pp. 217–224). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goodwin, C. (2003b). The body in action. In J. Coupland & R. Gwyn (Eds.), *Discourse, the body, and identity* (pp. 19–42). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Goodwin, C. (2006). Human sociality as mutual orientation in a rich interactive environment: Multimodal utterances and pointing in aphasia. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality* (pp. 96–125). New York: Berg.

- Goodwin, C. (2007). Environmentally coupled gestures. In S. D. Duncan, J. Cassell, & E. T. Levy (Eds.), *Gesture and the dynamic dimension of language* (pp. 195–212). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Goodwin, C. (2009). Embodied hearers and speakers constructing talk and action in interaction. *Cognitive Studies*, 16, 51–64.
- Goodwin, C. (2011). Contextures of action. In J. Streek, C. Goodwin, & C. LeBaron (Eds.), *Embodied interaction* (pp. 182–193). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. (2013). The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 8–23.
- Goodwin, C. (2018). *Co-operative action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, J. K. (2004). Language learning as an interactional achievement. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 607–612.
- Hall, J. K. (2018). From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires: Reconceptualizing the objects of learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 9, 25–39.
- Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.) (2011). *L2 interactional competence and development*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hazel, S., Mortensen, K., & Rasmussen, G. (2014). Introduction: A body of resources—CA studies of social conduct. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 1–156.
- Hellermann, J. (2006). Classroom interactive practices for developing L2 literacy: A microethnographic study of two beginning adult learners of English. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 377–404.
- Hellermann, J. (2007). The development of practices for action in classroom dyadic interaction: Focus on task openings. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 83–96.
- Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, J. (2011). Members' methods, members' competencies: Looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated repair. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 147–172). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, J. (2018). Linguaging as competencing: Considering language learning as enactment. *Classroom Discourse*, 9, 40–56.
- Hellermann, J., & Cole, E. (2008). Practices for social interaction in the language-learning classroom: Disengagements from dyadic task interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 30, 186–215.
- Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). On the contingent nature of language-learning tasks. *Classroom Discourse*, 1, 25–45.
- Hellermann, J., Thorne, S. L., & Fodor, P. (2017). Mobile reading as social and embodied practice. *Classroom Discourse*, 8(2), 99–121, DOI: 10.1080/19463014.2017.1328703
- Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269–293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 131–167). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 551–567.
- Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view? *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 47, 11–36.
- Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). A conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 117–142). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2014). Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34, 171–212.
- Kendrick, K. H. (2017). Using conversation analysis in the lab. *Research in Language and Social Interaction*, 50, 1–11.
- Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70, 366–372.
- Kunitz, S., & Skogmyr Marian, K. (2017). Tracking immanent language learning behavior over time in task-based classroom work. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51, 507–535.
- Lazaraton, A. (2004). Gesture and speech in the vocabulary explanations of one ESL teacher: A microanalytic inquiry. *Language Learning*, 54, 79–117.
- Lee, J., & Burch, A. R. (2017). Collaborative planning in process: An ethnomethodological perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51, 536–575.
- Lilja, N. (2014). Partial repetitions as other-initiations of repair in second language talk: Re-establishing understanding and doing learning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 71, 98–116.
- Majlesi, A. R., & Broth, M. (2012). Emergent learnables in second language classroom interaction. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 1, 193–207.
- Majlesi, A. R., & Markee, N. (2018). Multimodality in second language talk: The impact of video analysis on SLA research. In D. Favareau (Ed.), *Co-operative engagements in intertwined semiosis: Essays in honour of Charles Goodwin* (pp. 247–260). Tartu: University of Tartu Press.
- Markee, N. (1994). Toward an ethnomethodological respecification of second language acquisition studies. In E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Research methodology in second-language acquisition* (pp. 88–116). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Markee, N. (1995). Teachers' answers to students' questions: Problematizing the issue of making meaning. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 62–92.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Markee, N. (2004). Special issue on classroom talks. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88.
- Markee, N. (2005). Conversation analysis for second language acquisition. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 355–374). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics* 29, 404–427.
- Markee, N. (2011). Doing, and justifying doing, avoidance. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 602–615.
- Markee, N. (2015). Where does research on classroom discourse and interaction go from here? In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 509–526). Malden: Wiley Blackwell

- Markee, N., & Kunitz, S. (2013). Doing planning and task performance in second language acquisition: An ethnomethodological respecification. *Language Learning*, 63, 629–664.
- Markee, N., & Seo, M-S. (2009). Learning talk analysis. *IRAL*, 47, 37–63.
- Mondada, L. (2006). Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices: projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. *Discourse Studies*, 8, 117–129.
- Mondada, L. (2007). Multimodal resources for turn-taking: Pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies*, 9(2), 194–225.
- Mondada, L. (2009). The embodied and negotiated production of assessments in instructed actions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42, 329–361.
- Mondada, L. (2011). The organization of concurrent courses of action in surgical demonstrations. In J. Streeck, C. Goodwin, & C. LeBaron (Eds.), *Embodied interaction: Language and body in the material world* (pp. 207–226). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mondada, L. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to data collection. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 32–56). Chichester: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mondada, L. (2014a). Conventions for multimodal transcription. Retrieved from https://franz.unibas.ch/fileadmin/franz/user_upload/redaktion/Mondada_conv_multimodality.pdf
- Mondada, L. (2014b). Bodies in action: Multimodal analysis of walking and talking. *Language and Dialogue*, 4, 357–403.
- Mondada, L. (2016). Challenges of multimodality: Language and the body in social interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 20, 336–366.
- Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 501–518.
- Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 536–550.
- Mori, J., & Hasegawa, A. (2009). Doing being a foreign language learner in a classroom: Embodiment of cognitive states as social events. *IRAL*, 47, 65–94.
- Mori, J., & Hayashi, M. (2006). The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: A study of interactions between first and second language speakers. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 195–219.
- Olsher, D. (2004). Talk and gesture: The embodied completion of sequential actions in spoken interaction. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language conversations* (pp. 221–245). London: Continuum.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2013). Social-interactional approaches to SLA: A state of the art and some future perspectives. *Language, Interaction and Acquisition* 4, 133–159.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2017, March). The development of L2 interactional competence: 'Methods' for action and grammar-for interaction. Plenary presentation at the 2017 American Association of Applied Linguistics Conference, Portland, OR.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Elaborations on L2 interactional competence: The development of L2 grammar for interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 9, 3–24.

- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2018). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(4), 555–578. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw021>.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Fasel Lauzon, V. (2015). Documenting change across time: Longitudinal and cross-sectional CA studies of classroom interaction. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The Handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 409–424). Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–268). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Psathas, G. (1991). *Interactional competence*. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Salomon (in press). Interview with Charles Goodwin. Forum: Qualitative Social Research.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Between micro and macro: Contexts and other connections. In J. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch, & N. Smelser (Eds.), *The micro-macro link* (pp. 207–234). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2006). Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality* (pp. 70–96). Oxford: Berg.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2010). Commentary on Stivers and Rossano: “Mobilizing Response.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43, 38–48.
- Seedhouse, P. (2015). L2 classroom interaction as a complex adaptive system. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 373–389). Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- Seo, M-S. (2011). Talk, body, and material objects as coordinated interactional resources in repair activities in one-on-one ESL tutoring. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 107–134). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawaii.
- Seo, M-S., & Koshik, I. (2010). A conversation analytic study of gestures that engender repair in ESL conversational tutoring. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2219–2239.
- Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thorne, S. L., Hellermann, J., Jones, A., & Lester, D. (2015). Interactional practices and artifact orientation in mobile augmented reality game play. *Psychology Journal*, 13, 259–286.
- Wagner, J. (2015). Designing for language learning in the wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 75–101). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Waring, H. Z. (2018). Teaching L2 interactional competence: Problems and possibilities. *Classroom Discourse*, 9, 57–67.

- Wootton, A. J. (1997). *Interaction and the development of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, R. F., & Miller, E. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 519–535.
- Zuengler, J., Ford, C., & Fassnacht, C. (1998). *Analyst eyes and camera eyes: Theoretical and technical considerations in 'seeing' the details of classroom interaction*. Report Series 2.40 (11006). Albany, NY: National Research Center on English Learning and Achievement.

3 The Construction of Interactional Incompetence in L2 Interaction

Eric Hauser

Introduction

Adopting a conceptualization of interactional competence as wholly co-constructed within and through interaction, this chapter presents a single case analysis of an instance of the co-construction of second language (L2) interactional incompetence. The data come from video recordings of a meeting of a neighborhood organization in Tokyo, of which the researcher is a member. The analysis shows how the researcher, an L2 user of Japanese, is co-constructed through talk, gaze, gesture and bodily position as interactionally incompetent, as, for example, unable to complete repair initiated by another on his talk. Implications for L2 pedagogy of this conceptualization of interactional competence (and incompetence) are discussed.

The distinction between competence and performance that is made within, for example, generative linguistics is well known and goes back several decades. Criticism of this distinction also goes back several decades. As Wootton (1975) put it,

acceptability is not just a question of producing sentences which are comprehensible sentences in a language, but also of using expressions aptly in the light of, for example, social conventions. This in turn has led to an erosion (which is by no means complete or uncontroversial) of the distinction between competence and performance. (p. 23)

Though he does not mention Hymes in connection with this erosion, it is not hard to imagine that Wootton had in mind Hymes's (1974) explication of communicative competence:

Within the social matrix in which it acquires a system of grammar a child acquires also a system of its use, regarding persons, places, purposes, other modes of communication, etc.—all the components of communicative events, together with attitudes and beliefs regarding

them. There also develop *patterns of sequential use of language in conversation, address, standard routines, and the like*. In such acquisition resides the child's *sociolinguistic competence* (or more broadly, *communicative competence*), its ability to *participate in its society as not only a speaking, but also a communicating member*.

(p. 75, second emphasis in original, others mine)

In Hymes's concept of *communicative competence*, competence is expanded to include much more than linguistic competence as conceived in generative linguistics, and the distinction between competence and performance is, perhaps, eroded, as it involves knowledge of various aspects of how "to participate" in "communicative events," but this erosion is incomplete, as it is the individual who acquires and, presumably, brings this competence to each such event. Wootton may also have had in mind Cicourel's (1971) comments regarding competence and performance:

The sociologist . . . must be interested in competence *and* performance or situated usage, for it is the interaction of competence and performance that is essential for understanding everyday activities. Imputations of competence by members to each other and the recognition of this competence are integral elements of projected and 'successful' social action.

(pp. 138–139, emphasis in original)

Here also, the distinction is eroded, and competence is at least partially removed from the individual and seen as part of social action, but, again, the erosion is incomplete, as competence and performance are argued to interact.

Jump forward two decades or so, and we still find people struggling with the incomplete erosion of the competence/performance distinction. Jacoby and Ochs (1995) argue

that to study language behavior, discourse, and *social interaction*—which some might call linguistic or communicative *performance*—is to study communicative *competence*, not as an abstract construct or model, but as it plays out in all its incredible complexity as people go about managing their identities, their relationships, and their lives.

(p. 179, first emphasis mine, others in original)

A few years later, He and Young (1998) discuss *interactional competence*, a term which they attribute to Kramsch (1986).¹ They state that "individuals do not acquire a general, practice-independent communicative competence; rather *they acquire* a practice-specific interactional

competence by participating with more experienced others in specific interactive practices” (p. 7, emphasis mine). They also state that

interactional competence is *not an attribute of an individual participant*, and thus we cannot say that an individual is interactionally competent; rather we talk of interactional competence as something that is *jointly constructed by all participants*.

(p. 7, emphasis mine)

What, though, is this concept of interactional competence that He and Young discuss? Is it different from Hymes’s concept of communicative competence? Does it involve the complete erosion of the competence/performance distinction mentioned by Wootton? Is there interaction between interactional competence and performance in social interaction? One answer is that there is more of an emphasis on interaction and particular practices. However, this would already seem to be part of Hymes’s (1974) explication of communicative competence, as it includes “patterns of sequential use of language in conversation, address, standard routines, and the like,” as well as the “ability to participate” as a societal member. While they emphasize co-construction, Jacoby and Ochs (1995) are also willing to continue using the term *communicative competence* in relation to the study of “social interaction.” A second answer is that communicative competence is conceptualized as the possession of the individual, something which different individuals bring to the interaction, while interactional competence is conceptualized as “jointly constructed by all participants,” as He and Young (1998) put it. However, there is a contradiction in their discussion of interactional competence, as they also state that “they [i.e., individuals] acquire a practice-specific interactional competence,” which indicates that it is something acquired and possessed by individuals.

Since He and Young (1998), there has been continuing discussion of what interactional competence actually is, as well as a growing body of empirical work on, in particular, L2 interactional competence. The conceptual contradiction between interactional competence as something constructed by the participants in interaction and as something acquired by the individual remains. The erosion of the competence/performance distinction mentioned by Wootton four decades ago remains incomplete. Below, as I explore interactional competence, or, more specifically, interactional *incompetence*, I attempt to adopt a more radical view of this concept and view it as totally and solely constructed by participants in interaction. I thus use interactional competence as a concept in which the competence/performance distinction is completely eroded. I will return later to a discussion of what this could mean for L2 learning and pedagogy.

Data and Transcription

My exploration of interactional incompetence involves a focus on a single data extract. It is from a video recording of a meeting of a neighborhood organization in a residential area of Tokyo. This organization is responsible for such things as organizing neighborhood festivals and conducting fire prevention patrols. The researcher (me),² who is a member of this organization, has already set up the recording equipment, but the meeting itself has not started yet. At a prior meeting, the researcher gained permission to record from most members of the organization, who also signed consent forms written in Japanese. However, at this particular meeting, there will be some people who usually do not attend. The researcher has prepared for this by bringing extra consent forms.

The interaction in this extract is occasioned by the arrival of one of the people who does not usually attend, Izumi. The researcher has noticed this and retrieves a consent form. He then approaches Izumi. Figure 3.1 shows most of the participants who produce talk in this extract.

The complete data extract can be found in Appendix A. The data are transcribed following a three-tiered system, with the Japanese talk transcribed in the first tier, a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss in the second, and an idiomatic English translation in the third. Symbols used in the second tier can be found in Appendix B. The transcription of talk is based on CA conventions (Jefferson, 2004). In order to limit the necessity for verbal descriptions of non-verbal behavior, frames are used to show such things as gaze and bodily positioning. As in the frame below (Figure 3.1), each frame has been whitened to protect the anonymity of

Figure 3.1 Meeting room with the participants who produce talk, except for Zenkaicho

the participants. Certain features of non-verbal behavior (e.g., changes in body position or gaze) are highlighted within frames with arrows. When a frame contains transcription of talk, the frame is taken from the start of such talk. The correspondence between the frame and the talk is also marked with a vertical line (|) in the transcript.

The purpose of working with this data extract is to show how some of the participants—namely, Izumi, Koyama, Harayama and the researcher himself—collaboratively construct, or co-construct, the researcher as interactionally incompetent in Japanese. As the interaction is fairly complicated, and as many readers will be unfamiliar with Japanese, I first describe in some detail what happens, moment-by-moment, in the interaction. Next, I discuss how the researcher's interactional incompetence is constructed through the actions of the different participants. Finally, I discuss what the conceptualization of interactional (in)competence that I adopt could mean for L2 learning and pedagogy.

Coming to Grips With the Data Extract

The extract begins as Izumi has just arrived and various people have greeted him. The researcher has also noticed his arrival and has moved to retrieve a consent form.

There is some quiet talk between Izumi and Harayama which is not really picked up by the microphone. Izumi then turns away from

Segment 1

- 01 I: ima ↑furoo haitte kita bakkari nan da yo=
 now bath enter-AS come-AS just CP-N CP IP
 I just now had a bath.
- 02 K: =ara? [hhuh ↓huh
 PT
 Oh?
- 03 Y: [doko_ doko de.
 where where PP
 Where?
- 04 I: ↑ee?=
 PT
 Huh?
- 05 K: =sappari (shite no).=
 refreshed do-AS LK
 You look refreshed.
- 06 Y: =jibun chi de.=
 own house PP
 At your own house?
- 07 I: =jibun chi de.=moo | ↑ato neru dake da yo.
 own house PP already after sleep only CP IP
 At my own house. I was ready to go to bed.

Frame 1

08 K: h heh heh heh

Harayama and announces in a louder voice that he has just had a bath. Given that this is in the evening and that Japanese typically do not go out after having a bath, this announcement is hearable as a possible complaint. The start of the announcement does not seem to be addressed to anyone in particular, but by the end of the announcement, Izumi and Yamanaka establish mutual gaze and Izumi seems to be addressing Yamanaka. There is a brief exchange between these two about where Izumi had his bath, after which Izumi adds the information that he was ready for bed. This adds to the hearability of his announcement as a complaint, implying that he had forgotten about this meeting and was planning to stay home. After this additional information, Yamanaka gazes back down, returning his attention to documents on the table, and Izumi shifts his gaze to middle distance. There are also some comments and laughter from Koyama (lines 02, 05 and 08), though these are not responded to. In participating in the interaction, Koyama shifts his gaze to Izumi and visually scans his body. He also turns his head towards Izumi and moves his left leg back so that his body is partially turned in Izumi's direction, in what, following Heath (1986), can be considered a display of reciprocity towards Izumi's talk. However, as shown in frame 1, his body remains mostly oriented towards the table, in an unstable 'torqued' posture (Schegloff, 1998), projecting at most limited interaction with Izumi, as well as an intention to turn back to his prior business. After his laughter in line 08, Koyama turns back towards the table.

During this brief interaction, the researcher retrieves a consent form and approaches Izumi. However, he does not try to enter the interaction, and while it is still in progress, he stops some distance from Izumi, with his gaze averted.

After the talk related to Izumi's announcement ends, with Izumi, Yamanaka and Koyama all disengaging from the interaction, the researcher resumes his approach towards Izumi.

Segment 2

09 (1.9)

10 R: ° sumimasen | Izumi san.° (0.5) | ° (xxxxx) ano.°
excuse-me FAMILY NAME-TITLE SF

Frame 2

Frame 3

11 | daigaku no kenkyuu no tame ni: | ↓nanka
 university LK research LK for PP SF
daigaku no kenkyuu
no tame ni

Frame 4

Frame 5

12 ↑bideo toritain | des' kedo:_ (.)
 video take-MD-N CP but

Frame 6

13 [(xx)

Excuse me, Mr. Izumi, I'm recording (taking) a video for university research ...

As he approaches Izumi, the researcher summons him by name, prefaced with a formulaic apology. Izumi, who has been gazing down (frame 2), responds by shifting his gaze to the researcher (frame 3). The summons also attracts the attention of Koyama, though it is clear that he does not take himself as the addressee. Rather, he turns to observe the researcher as he talks to Izumi (frames 3, 4, 5 and 6). Koyama shifts his gaze to the researcher by rotating his entire body to his right. This involves rotating his lower body approximately 90 degrees, his upper body a bit more, as can be seen in the position of his shoulders in frame 5 and rotating his head approximately 180 degrees. In comparison with his bodily reorientation when he was interacting with Izumi a few seconds earlier, this reorientation to observe the researcher is somewhat greater. While his body posture is still torqued (Schegloff, 1998), his lower body is now oriented away from the table, in a display of reciprocity (Heath, 1986) that projects the possibility of more extended involvement in the interaction initiated by the researcher.

What the researcher says after the summons is quiet and unintelligible, but he then goes on to state, in lines 11 and 12, that he is recording a video for university research, with this accompanied by a gesture towards one of the video cameras (frame 6). The researcher uses a form of the verb *toru*, meaning 'to take,' to refer to the action of recording. While there is nothing unusual about the Japanese expression *bideo o toru*, the verb *toru* is semantically broad and can be used to refer to a variety of actions. Throughout, Izumi maintains his gaze on the researcher. As the researcher articulates "des' kedo," Koyama shifts his gaze slightly to Izumi (frame 6).

Next, Izumi initiates repair on what the researcher has said.

Before beginning to articulate the repair initiation, Izumi turns his head and glances briefly at Koyama (frame 7) and then turns it further to shift his gaze to Harayama. As he articulates the repair initiation, and specifically as he restarts it, he also moves his head forward and tilts it slightly to his right (frame 8). One result of these head movements and gaze shifts is that the repair initiation is addressed to Harayama (Lerner, 2003; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974).

Segment 3

14 I: [| nani o- | nani o toru tte (yutta/yutteru).
 what O what O take QT (say-AS/say-AX)
 What does he say he's taking?

Frame 7

Frame 8

In the terminology of Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977), this is a relatively strong repair initiation, in that Izumi also uses the verb *toru* and specifically targets the object of this verb as the trouble source.

Harayama, Koyama and the researcher all respond to the repair initiation.

Segment 4

- 15 R: [[° (xxxx)=h (xxx)°
 16 K: [[° (xxxxxx)°
 17 H: [[| bideo. daigaku no kenkyuu
 video university LK research

Frame 9

- 18 | de ↑ komyunikeeshon¿ | ((nods))
 PP communication

A video. For his university research on communication.

Frame 10

Frame 11a

Frame 11b

As Koyama responds, he shifts his gaze to Izumi (frame 9) and also moves almost completely out of torqued position by moving his right leg and right shoulder back (frames 9 and 10), projecting the possibility of more extended engagement in the interaction (Schegloff, 1998). However, his response is not picked up well by the microphone, and he stops slightly before Harayama says “komyunikeeshon,” glancing briefly at Harayama (frames 11a, b). With this glance to Harayama, together with the fact that the repair initiation was addressed to Harayama, Koyama

seems to recognize that Harayama is responding to Izumi. It is therefore fairly likely that Koyama does not actually complete his response. The researcher's response is also not picked up well, though he appears to laugh slightly and then looks at the camera as he continues. While Harayama is responding, Izumi averts his gaze and glances at the camera (frame 10). As Harayama finishes, Izumi adopts middle gaze, not looking at anyone or anything in particular (frame 11a). Harayama's response to the repair initiation first treats the trouble as a hearing problem, as he states the object of the verb *toru*. Immediately, though, he adds information about why the video is being recorded, treating the trouble as a problem of understanding the purpose of the recording.

Harayama's explanation can be understood, following Goffman (1981), as the animation of words spoken on behalf of the researcher as principal. That he is animating words spoken on behalf of the researcher is especially clear as Harayama finishes, as he shifts his gaze to the researcher, so that they establish mutual gaze (frame 11b, from a camera across the room), uses slightly rising intonation and nods once. He thus provides the researcher with an opportunity to confirm the words spoken on his behalf.

The repair work continues as Izumi states a candidate understanding. Meanwhile, the researcher confirms what Harayama has said.

Segment 5

- 19 I: | bi [deo toru no:?
 video take N
 He's recording a video?
- 20 R: [hai. ((nods))
 yes

Yes.

Frame 12

21 K: |soo. ((nods; I nods))

right
That's right.

Frame 13

Izumi maintains his gaze to middle distance as he produces his candidate understanding, said with rising intonation. As he starts, both Koyama and the researcher shift their gaze to him (frame 12), with the researcher also saying “hai” and nodding once, thus confirming the accuracy of Harayama’s explanation. Koyama then confirms the candidate answer and nods, during which Izumi also nods a few times (frame 13).

Segment 6

22 (0.2)

23 H: de

PP

And,

24 I: |kuroi |° (bokasu).° |

black

(mask)

Frame 14

Frame 15

Frame 16

25 K: | heh heh heh [heh heh

heh heh heh

Frame 17

26 I: [bokash'te.
mask-AS

Mask my face in black.

27 [heh heh .h [heh heh heh .h heh heh heh=

28 H: [| ano:: [sono hen wa
SF that area TP

ano
heh heh .h

Frame 18

kenkyuu
((starts nodding))

32 H: =nan de. [ano:
CP-N PP SF
Uh, about that, he won't misuse it. It's for research purposes, uh ...

Izumi now uses talk and gesture to make a joke about obscuring his face in the video (frames 14, 15, 16 and 17).

Harayama starts to talk again in line 23 but stops as Izumi starts his joke. As Izumi starts, he shifts his gaze to Koyama and the two of them establish mutual gaze (frame 14). While the researcher smiles, Koyama responds as the joke's addressee by laughing out loud (frame 17). This becomes shared laughter as Izumi also starts to laugh, but the extent of the shared laughter between Izumi and Koyama is limited as Izumi turns back towards Harayama (frame 18) and Koyama disengages by looking down (frame 18), after which he turns back to the table (frame 19) and then starts to walk away (frame 20). Izumi also seems to invite laughter from Harayama as he shifts his gaze back to him while continuing to laugh (frame 18), but Harayama does not appear to join in, instead continuing with his explanation of the research. Through smiling, the researcher also participates in the shared laughter. Izumi does not, though, use gaze to invite the researcher to join. The researcher's participation in the laughter can thus be seen as peripheral.

After his joke and the laughter, and apparently ignoring Harayama, Izumi next sits down while addressing a next question to the researcher.

Segment 7

33 I: [| doo yu- | doo yu kenkyuu | sun noʒ
 how say- how say research do-LK N
 What kind of research are you doing?

Frame 21

Frame 22

Frame 23

34 R: suh- sore wa daijoobu [des' ka?
 tha- that TP okay CP Q
 Is it okay?

35 I: [ih heh heh huh huh

Izumi starts the question while he is in the process of sitting, with his gaze down (frame 21). However, he then restarts the question while shifting his gaze to the researcher (frame 22), so that the researcher is clearly the addressee. This question, with the stress on

yuu, can be heard as both a question and a comment on the research itself as unusual, possibly trivial. The researcher does not respond by attempting to answer the question, and, with his further laughter, Izumi does not treat an answer as missing. Instead, the researcher asks his own question about Izumi's willingness to be a participant.³ Meanwhile, Koyama continues to walk away (frames 21, 22 and 23), though he does turn to look back from across the room (frame 24, in segment 8).

Harayama, on the other hand, treats Izumi's question as calling for an answer and starts to provide one, though it is unclear exactly what sort of research he thinks the researcher is doing.

As Harayama begins his answer to Izumi's question, the researcher moves closer to Izumi (frame 24) and places the consent form on the table (frame 25). While this is happening, the former head of the organization, Zenkaicho, enters and places a pair of slippers, which are kept on a rack just outside the entrance to the room, on the floor (frames 25 and 26). Several people, including Harayama and the researcher, greet Zenkaicho, and Harayama stops trying to answer the question. (It is possible that Harayama's abandoned answer is a joke, but this is hard

Segment 8

36 R: [soo ° (xxxxx) °
 37 H: [(ya) | ↑nihon korai nihonjin no korai
 no Japan ancient Japanese-people LK ancient

Frame 24

in Japan may be likely to have occasionally experienced. Finally, it must be emphasized that the construction of the researcher as interactionally incompetent is momentary, lasting only a few seconds and across a few turns-at-talk.

The Researcher as Needing Assistance, Koyama as Responsible

One thing to note is that, even before there is any sign of trouble, Koyama turns to observe the interaction between the researcher and Izumi. In fact, he shifts his attention to this interaction upon hearing the researcher's summons of Izumi. This shift of attention is not a hidden mental event; rather, it is physically embodied and publicly visible through Koyama's bodily position and gaze.⁵ As can be seen by comparing frame 1 and, for example, frame 5, the shift in bodily positioning is relatively greater when Koyama shifts his attention to the interaction between the researcher and Izumi than it is when he shifts his attention to Izumi upon the latter's announcement of just having had a bath. Based on this, the degree to which Koyama shifts his attention when he turns to observe the interaction between the researcher and Izumi can also be understood as relatively greater. In addition, his observation of the interaction is not passing, as he continues to observe while the researcher starts to explain the video cameras and, when the researcher reaches a possible point of turn completion, shifts his gaze to Izumi to observe his response. Even after disengaging from the interaction and walking away, which he does once the repair work is complete, Koyama turns to observe again the interaction between the researcher and Izumi from across the room. In doing this, Koyama treats the researcher as possibly in need of assistance. In addition, as the new head of the organization, he bears some responsibility for what happens at the meeting and, specifically, for allowing the meeting to be recorded. His understanding of this responsibility is publicly visible in his behavior.⁶

The Researcher as Unable to Repair Trouble

When someone initiates repair on talk addressed by another to himself or herself in the prior turn, that is, when there is other-initiation of repair in the next turn, the default addressee of the repair initiation is the person who produced what is being targeted as the trouble source (Bolden, 2011, 2012; Egbert, 1997; Lerner, 2003; Sacks et al., 1974). However, when Izumi initiates repair on the researcher's talk, he uses gaze shift to address the repair initiation to Harayama (Lerner, 2003; Sacks et al., 1974).⁷ This is not a subtle shift of gaze, as it involves turning his gaze approximately 180 degrees as well as moving his head towards Harayama. He thus positions Harayama as a kind of broker (Bolden, 2011, 2012, 2014; Greer, 2015) who can complete the repair on behalf of the researcher (Bolden,

2011), who is thus positioned as being unable to complete the repair on his own. In addition, he does this even though he shows, through the relatively strong form of repair initiation, at least partial understanding of what the researcher has said.

Though three people, including the researcher, respond, with the repair initiation addressed to Harayama, it is Harayama's response that takes precedence. Both Koyama and the researcher, remaining on the periphery of the interaction between Izumi and Harayama, produce quiet responses and stop before Harayama finishes, though the researcher does confirm Harayama's explanation of the recording. As the repair work continues, the participation structure shifts as it is Koyama who confirms Izumi's candidate understanding. The researcher, however, remains on the periphery and does not attempt to answer. This is in contrast to one thing that is shown by Egbert (1997), which is that when someone other than the person who has produced the trouble source responds to the repair initiation prior to the response of the trouble-source producer, this may be treated by the trouble-source producer (and possibly the repair initiator) as inappropriate. Here, though, the researcher does not attempt to treat Harayama's response to the repair initiation as inappropriate. When Izumi tells his joke (segment 6, lines 24 and 26), one thing that is accomplished is to show that the repair work has been sufficient and need not continue. This state of affairs has been brought about with the contributions of Harayama and Koyama, but the researcher's attempted response to the repair initiation has not been treated as relevant and the researcher has not contested the right of others to complete the repair. The researcher is thus constructed by all four participants, including the researcher himself, through talk, gaze and bodily position, as unable to repair trouble in his own talk.

The Researcher as Possibly Unable to Understand a Joke

When Izumi tells his joke, he addresses it through his gaze and bodily position to Koyama, who laughs in response. He then shifts his gaze to Harayama while laughing, though this does not seem to result in Harayama joining the laughter. Even though the researcher smiles in response to the joke, at no time does Izumi seem to invite him to join the laughter. By doing this, Izumi seems to treat his joke as a sort of inside joke, one that Koyama and Harayama should be able to understand, but that the researcher possibly would not. As with the public visibility of Koyama's observation of the interaction between the researcher and Izumi and of his responsibility for the meeting being recorded, Izumi's inside-joke treatment of his joke is also publicly visible through his gaze and bodily position.

Bringing the Researcher in From the Periphery

In these ways, then, over the course of a few turns-at-talk spanning several seconds, the researcher is moved to the periphery of the interaction, interaction which he actually initiated through his summons of Izumi, and thus is constructed as interactionally incompetent. This is momentary, however, as the participants also do things to bring the researcher in from the periphery and, thus, to re-establish him as interactionally competent. In addition to the researcher's attempts to participate in the interaction with Izumi, Harayama seeks confirmation of what he has said on the researcher's behalf, confirmation which the researcher gives, so there is an orientation on the part of both Harayama and the researcher that it is the researcher who has the epistemic right to complete the repair (Bolden, 2011). After the completion of the repair work, Izumi addresses his next question to the researcher, thus treating the researcher as capable of understanding and answering the question.

Interactional Competence, Resources and L2 Learning and Pedagogy

I have, of course, only looked at one episode of interaction. Also, by focusing on the construction of incompetence, I have perhaps risked adopting a deficit view of an L2 user as a deficient communicator (Firth & Wagner, 1997), something which has not been my intention. Rather, my intention has been to show how an L2 user *is constructed as* interactionally incompetent, not that the L2 user *is* interactionally incompetent. What I hope to have shown by looking at this one episode is how interactional incompetence, and, by extension, interactional competence, can be conceptualized as completely constructed in and through the interaction and how issues of competence and incompetence are, first and foremost, participants' concerns. (See also Bolden, 2014, for how linguistic and cultural competence and incompetence are participants' concerns.) With such a conceptualization, L2 interactional competence becomes detached from any direct connection with proficiency. Someone with limited L2 proficiency can nevertheless be constructed as interactionally competent—something which I have found through much of my research to be fairly common—while someone with decades of experience of extensive L2 use, someone like me, can nevertheless be constructed, even if only momentarily, as interactionally incompetent. This claim that L2 interactional competence is not directly connected with proficiency may in some ways be similar to the argument made by Pekarek Doehler (this volume) that increases in proficiency do not entail increases in interactional competence. However, my claim is based on conceptualizing interactional competence as wholly constructed by participants within interaction, whereas Pekarek Doehler's argument is based on the recognition that, on the one hand, L2

users can accomplish sophisticated interactional work with limited linguistic resources, while, on the other hand, language knowledge gained in the classroom or measured on proficiency tests may not always be immediately available for an L2 user to draw on in interaction.

If interactional competence is conceptualized as completely constructed in and through the interaction, it does not make much sense to talk of the development of an individual's interactional competence over time. I recognize that such a statement is counter to what is argued in most CA-SLA work on L2 interactional competence, including work reported or reviewed in other chapters of this volume. I also recognize that people do change over time and, hopefully, improve in their ability to use an L2. I would like to suggest that there is a need to distinguish interactional competence as it is constructed within interaction and the resources (as well as the methods or practices; Pekarek Doehler, this volume) that participants draw on in the construction of themselves and others as interactionally competent. One thing that develops over time is the resources—L2 resources but also possibly other sorts of resources, such as new ways of positioning and moving the body—that an L2 learner brings to the interaction. It is here, it seems to me, that the conceptualization of interactional competence that I have tried to argue for in this chapter has implications for L2 pedagogy, for while the L2 learner can develop such resources outside the classroom, this development can also be strongly facilitated when the language classroom affords opportunities to gain new resources and to practice making use of those resources. This may involve explicit instruction on particular resources (e.g., instruction on formulaic expressions used to summon someone or to initiate repair), awareness raising (e.g., awareness of the importance of gaze and bodily position) or reflection on the learner's successes or difficulties in actual episodes of interaction (e.g., reflection on how interactional (in)competence has been constructed in particular episodes of interaction in which the L2 learner was a participant). In the case of reflection on an interactional success, there could be consideration of what resources were used and how they could continue to be used in the future. In the case of reflection on an interactional difficulty, there could be consideration of how the difficulty was (or was not) solved and what resources could be used to solve or avoid similar difficulties.

When an L2 learner participates in interaction using his or her L2, he or she participates in the construction of his or her L2 interactional competence. This is done through the use of various resources, not limited to specifically L2 linguistic resources, some of which are brought to the interaction by participants, some of which emerge through the interaction and some of which can be found in the local environment of the interaction. As the L2 learner gains new resources, how he or she participates in the construction of his or her L2 interactional competence can also change. Nevertheless, the individual L2 learner is never more than

just one participant in this construction, which is something that both L2 learners and teachers should be aware of. This, more than anything else, is, in my view, the primary pedagogical implication of the analysis presented in this chapter.

Notes

- 1 However, the use of this term can be traced back farther. For example, Speier (1971) defines socialization as “the acquisition of interactional competences” (p. 189).
- 2 Except for myself (referred to as “(the) researcher”) and one other participant, all participants have been given Japanese surnames as pseudonyms. This reflects common practices in Japan for address and person reference, in which surnames rather than personal names are often used. One participant, who arrives later and does not play a central role in the interaction that I analyze, is referred to as “Zenkaicho,” which means “Former Organization Head.” One reason for using this designation, rather than a surname, is that his status as the former head of the organization is relevant for the interaction in which he is involved. (See note 4.)
- 3 It may also be noted that an explanation of the research is written on the consent form which the researcher has in his hand and will give to Izumi. A participant indicates his consent by signing the bottom of the form, after which the researcher detaches this part and gives the participant the other part, which contains the information about the research as well as contact information.
- 4 There is some ambiguity about whether Zenkaicho is now the former head or about to be the former head, and correspondingly about whether Koyama is the current head or about to be the current head. Koyama has already started to fulfill the responsibilities of the head of the organization, having, for example, organized this meeting. However, the formal transfer of leadership will occur at this meeting. This ambiguity is played out in the interaction (not shown in the transcript), as the head of the organization should sit in a chair located at a particular place, the *kamiza*, a culturally recognizable location. Both Koyama and Harayama insist that Zenkaicho sit in the *kamiza*, while Zenkaicho bodily and through talk makes it clear that he would prefer to sit elsewhere. Eventually, Zenkaicho gives in and sits in this location.
- 5 A methodological/analytical point is perhaps in order here. At the symposium that this book is based on, there was some discussion of how CA does not try to ‘look inside people’s heads,’ that is, that it is not concerned with hidden, or private, mental events. This should not be taken to mean, though, that CA cannot be concerned with such things as attention, knowledge or learning. Rather, different senses of what is meant by *private* can be discerned. As argued by Crist (1999), “two senses of ‘private’ can be confused when pondering the idea of subjective meaning as ‘private.’ One is the vernacular, shared meaning—a personal matter, an aspect kept hidden, or a secret jealously guarded. The other sense of ‘private’—the skeptical—denotes something ineffable, inscrutable except to the owner, in principle unobtainable, or always incompletely known” (p. 52). While mental events can be kept private, and thus hidden, this is not something which is intrinsic to the mental. Rather, unless such events are intentionally kept private, they are publicly observable as part of what participants do. (Depending on how well or poorly they are kept private, they may be observable even when this is attempted.) This can also be related to Wittgenstein’s (1953) arguments against private language, which do not entail

that people do not use language to talk silently to themselves. One thing that distinguishes CA from, e.g., behaviorism is that CA does not adopt the skeptical sense of *private*. See also work in discursive psychology which draws on CA (e.g., Edwards, 1997).

- 6 A reviewer has pointed out that I am bringing in ethnographic evidence as part of the analysis. The reviewer is correct, but I do not see a problem with this, as long as the ethnographic evidence is both reliable and relevant for the analysis, which I think it is here. For more detailed discussion, see Hauser (2011) and related comments in Maynard (2011).
- 7 It should be noted that Lerner (2003) states that “gaze direction, if inconsistent with other forms of addressing, will ordinarily give way to them” (p. 196). As Lerner (2003) shows, other-initiation of repair tacitly selects the producer of the trouble source as the next speaker. In this interaction, though, gaze does not “give way to” such next-speaker selection.

References

- Bolden, G. B. (2011). On the organization of repair in multiperson conversation: The case of ‘other’-selection in other-initiated repair sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 44, 237–262.
- Bolden, G. B. (2012). Across languages and cultures: Brokering problems of understanding in conversational repair. *Language in Society*, 41, 97–121.
- Bolden, G. B. (2014). Negotiating understanding in ‘intercultural moments’ in immigrant family interactions. *Communication Monographs*, 81, 208–238.
- Cicourel, A. W. (1971). The acquisition of social structure: Toward a developmental sociology of language and meaning. In J. D. Douglas (Ed.), *Understanding everyday life* (pp. 136–168). London: Routledge.
- Crist, E. (1999). *Images of animals: Anthropomorphism and animal mind*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Edwards, D. (1997). *Discourse and cognition*. London: SAGE.
- Egbert, M. M. (1997). Some interactional achievements of other-initiated repair in multiperson conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27, 611–634.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285–300.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Greer, T. (2015). Appealing to a broker: Initiating third-person repair in mundane second language interaction. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 9, 1–14.
- Hauser, E. (2011). Generalization: A practice of situated categorization in talk. *Human Studies*, 34, 183–198.
- He, A. W., & Young, R. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. In R. Young & A. W. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 1–24). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heath, C. (1986). *Body movement and speech in medical interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jacoby, S., & Ochs, E. (1995). Co-construction: An introduction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28, 171–183.

- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70, 366–372.
- Lerner, G. H. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society*, 32, 177–201.
- Maynard, D. W. (2011). On ‘interactional semantics’ and problems of meaning. *Human Studies*, 34, 199–207.
- Nguyen, H., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai’i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Body torque. *Social Research*, 65, 535–596.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361–382.
- Speier, M. (1971). The everyday world of the child. In J. D. Douglas (Ed.), *Understanding everyday life* (pp. 188–217). London: Routledge.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Wootton, A. (1975). *Dilemmas of discourse: Controversies about the sociological interpretation of language*. London: George Allen Unwin.

Appendix A: Complete Transcript of Data Extract

Complete transcript of data extract

- 01 I: ima ↑ furoo haitte kita bakkari nan da yo=
now bath enter-AS come-AS just CP-N CP IP
I just now had a bath.
- 02 K: =ara? [hhuh ↓ huh
PT
Oh?
- 03 Y: [doko_ doko de.
where where PP
Where?
- 04 I: ↑ ee?=
PT
Huh?
- 05 K: =sappari (shite no).=
refreshed do-AS LK
You look refreshed.
- 06 Y: =jibun chi de.=
own house PP
At your own house?
- 07 I: =jibun chi de.=moo | ↑ ato neru dake da yo.
own house PP already after sleep only CP IP
At my own house. I was ready to go to bed.

Frame 1

08 K: h heh heh heh

09 (1.9)

```
10 R: ° sumimasen | Izumi san.° (0.5) | ° (xxxxx) ano.°
      excuse-me      FAMILY NAME-TITLE      SF
```

excuse-me

FAMILY NAME-TITLE

SF

Frame 2

Frame 3

11 | daigaku no kenkyuu no tame ni: | ↓nanka
 university LK research LK for PP SF
daigaku no kenkyuu
no tame ni

Frame 4

Frame 5

12 ↑ bideo toritain | des' kedo:_ (.)
 video take-MD-N CP but

Frame 6

13 [(xx)
 Excuse me, Mr. Izumi, I'm recording (taking) a video for university research ...

14 I: [| nani o- | nani o toru tte (yutta/yutteru).
 what O what O take QT (say-AS/say-AS-AX)
 What does he say he's taking?

Frame 7

Frame 8

15 R: [[° (xxxx)=h (xxx)°
 16 K: [[° (xxxxxx)°
 17 H: [[| bideo. daigaku no kenkyuu
 video university LK research

Frame 9

18 | de ↑ komyunikeeshon? | ((nods))
 PP communication

A video. For his university research on communication.

Frame 10

Frame 11a

Frame 11b

19 I: | bi [deo toru no:?
 video take N
 He's recording a video?
 20 R: [hai. ((nods))
 yes

Yes.

Frame 12

21 K: | soo. ((nods; I nods))
 right
 That's right.

Frame 13

22 (0.2)
 23 H: de
 PP
 And,
 24 I: | kuroi |° (bokasu).° |
 black (mask)

Frame 14

Frame 15

Frame 16

25 K: | heh heh heh [heh heh

Frame 17

26 I: [bokash'te.
mask-AS
Mask my face in black.
27 [heh heh .h [heh heh heh .h heh heh heh=
28 H: [| ano:: [sono hen wa
SF that area TP

Frame 18

29 I: = [heh .h
30 H: [| akuyoo shinai [kara. | kenkyuu mokuteki=
bad-use do-NG because research goal
31 I: [heh heh ((starts nodding))

Frame 19

kenkyuu
((starts nodding))

Frame 20

32 H: =nan de. [ano:
CP-N PP SF

Uh, about that, he won't misuse it. It's for research purposes, uh ...

33 I: [| doo yu- | doo yu kenkyuu | sun noʔ
how say- how say research do-LK N
What kind of research are you doing?

doo yu-

Frame 21

Frame 22

Frame 23

34 R: suh- sore wa daijoobu [des' ka?
 tha- that TP okay CP Q
 Is it okay?

35 I: [ih heh heh huh huh

36 R: [soo ° (xxxxx).°
 37 H: [(ya) | ↑nihon korai nihonjin no korai
 no Japan ancient Japanese-people LK ancient

Frame 24

38 kara aru:_
 from EX
 (No, there is ancient Japan, Japanese from ancient times ...)
 39 Y: a:s [:::'.
 GREETING ((abbreviated version of "otsukaresama desu"))
 40 S: [| konbanwa:
 EVENING GREETING

Frame 25

41 K: [|ots'karesama de::s'.
GREETING CP

42 ?: [ha::i
yes

Frame 26

43 H: [(xxxxx).

44 ?: [(ots'karesama [de:s::'.
GREETING CP

45 ?: [(koro)kese sama des'.
GREETING CP

46 ?: as::'.
GREETING

47 Z: n.
mm-hm

((interaction between Izumi and Washizu and Izumi and the researcher not shown))

Appendix B: Symbols Used in Morphemic Gloss (Adapted from Nguyen & Kasper, 2009)

AS:	aspect marker (not in Nguyen & Kasper)
CN:	conditional (not in Nguyen & Kasper)
CP:	copula
EX:	existential verb (not in Nguyen & Kasper)
IP:	interactional particle
LK:	linking particle
MD:	modality marker (not in Nguyen & Kasper)
N:	nominalizer
NG:	negative morpheme
O:	object marker
POL:	polite form
PP:	postposition (not in Nguyen & Kasper)
PT:	other particle
Q:	question marker
QT:	quotative
SB:	subject marker
SF:	filler
TP:	topic marker

Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Section II

Research-Based Insights for Teaching

Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

4 *Ohja. Ja. Ja.* ('Ohyes. Yes. Yes.')

Providing the Appropriate Next Relevant Action in L2 Interaction

Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm

Introduction

This chapter focuses on responsive behavior of beginning and intermediate German second language (L2) learners in the wh-question informing answer context when engaged in a task-oriented interaction. The analysis will illustrate that German L2 learners in the data corpus demonstrate the interactional skills of producing response tokens and talk in the appropriate position, namely, in the closing third turn. However, a close analysis of their turn design specifics reveals that the learners' choice of language (for example, response token) seems not to be fully target-like compared to the German. Thus, these German L2 learners seem to know that some talk displaying their understanding of and stance towards their co-participant's talk is the expected and appropriate next relevant action. However, their German linguistic repertoire does not seem to include the appropriate response token. This may be due to the design of typical instructional materials, which fail to explicitly focus on and practice this particular aspect of interaction.

A key element in the sequential organization and practice of taking turns-at-talk is the "possibility of responsiveness" (Schegloff, 2007: 1); that is, the speaker's ability to show by way of their turn design that what they are saying and the action that they are performing is in response to what their recipient or another speaker has just said and done in the previous turn. Speakers select a variety of resources (for example, lexis, prosody, syntax, non-verbal means, etc.) to construct their turn to demonstrate their understanding of the prior talk, signal their problems with talk, express agreement or disagreement and show their affective and epistemic stance towards the content expressed by their co-participant (Gardner, 2001, 2007; Heritage, 1984, 2002, 2013; Schegloff, 2007; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977; Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006). In this view, 'recipients' in a conversation are in fact active co-participants who shape the ongoing conversation and create intersubjectivity (Ford & Fox, 1996; Gardner, 2001; Goodwin, 2000). Consider the interaction below (Excerpt 1), which comes from Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen's (2015: 50) work on response formulations in everyday English conversations and which illustrates a wh-question and response sequence.

Excerpt 1: “Who did you go with” (Virginia)

1	PRU:	who did you go with.	Question (1 st position)
2		(0.6)	
3	VIR:	(mm) (0.3) Beth and Legette.	Response (2 nd position)
4		(0.3)	
5	PRU:	<u>o:h.</u>	Response (3 rd position)
6		(0.6)	

The wh-question (line 1) seeks to elicit specific information from its recipient (Virginia) to which only she has access. Following a brief pause (line 2), the recipient (Virginia) provides the sought-after information (line 3). In return, Prudence, the recipient of the information, produces the token *o:h* (line 5). Heritage (1984), who refers to this token as the “change-of-state” token (p. 299), shows that American and British English speakers commonly use this token in interactional environments in which the speakers are receiving new information. More specifically, the token *oh* in this particular sequential position signals the recipient’s stance towards the information just received as new, while also signaling a change in the recipient’s status from not knowing to knowing. In terms of the sequential environment, we have a wh-question (line 1) in the first position which makes relevant an answer as the next action, and we in fact have an answer (line 3) which is produced in second position as the relevant next response. This base sequence of question-answer is then expanded by a “sequence-closing third” (Schegloff, 2007: 118). This is the position in which the speaker who initiated the action explicitly receives the prior information and expresses a stance towards it. Thus, by producing a closing third turn, the speaker who initiated the question-answer sequence minimally offers their understanding of the second position response, signals that it was adequate and proposes a closing of the sequence. Other minimal forms of post-expansion that English speakers use in closing third turn positions include, for example, the confirmation token *okay*, which claims receipt of prior information and acceptance of the stance expressed in the prior turns-at-talk (Beach 1993, 1995). Speakers may also use an evaluative term such as *great*, *very nice*, etc. to communicate their stance towards their co-participant’s response turn (Schegloff, 2007). A post-expansion turn can also be non-minimal and elaborate where at least one further turn following the third turn position is projected. This can be due to problems of understanding of second-position response, in which case the speaker initiates repair and thereby a new sequence, or due to some topic-related special interest (p. 148). For example, *really?* with rising intonation in response to a piece of information is used to express doubt about the truth of the information and elicits verification for the just-provided information (Thompson et al., 2015).

Recent empirical research on German conversations has shown that German speakers also use a range of specific linguistic resources to construct their turns in post-expansion position (both minimal and non-minimal) to explicitly register receipt of prior talk, indicate that or how they have understood a prior turn and express their position towards the prior talk and received information. It has been demonstrated that response tokens such as *achso*, *ach*, *oh*, *stimmt*, *achja* and *genau* are used by German speakers to register different information about their understanding of the prior talk, whether the information is new or already known and whether they agree with the information, and their epistemic or affective stance towards the prior talk (Betz, 2015; Betz & Golato, 2008; Golato & Betz, 2008; Golato, 2012). For instance, Golato (2012) has shown that while the token *oh* is also used by German speakers, it is used to express affective states (e.g., joy, physical pain or disgust), whereas speakers use *achso* to mark a change of epistemic level, for instance, when understanding or remembering something (p. 253). Excerpt 2 (taken from Golato & Betz, 2008: 12–13) illustrates an instance of the German change-of-state token *achso* in everyday conversation.

Excerpt 2 (Golato & Betz, 2008, [Oregon2A_043])

```

RI      08  M:      [.h [<<all>des is (do') auf der]
              [.h [<<all>that is (PRT') on the]

          09  M: RHEINallee oder?>
              rhineallee isn't it?>

          10      (--)

R       11  I: NEE: des is in düsseldOrf.
              no that is in düsseldorf.
              [<<p>glAUbich> ]
              [<<p>I believe>]
              [ ]
⇒      12  M: [AchSO. ]

          13  I: .hhh ähm das i' das is diese' son verLAG
              .hhh uhm that i' that is this like a publisher

          14      für' für verschIEDene wIRtschaftszEITungen .h
              for' for various business publications .h

          15      <<len>dE EM:> und ...
              <<lem>dm> and ...

```

In this data excerpt, which is a telephone conversation between two friends, Ina is talking about her job search and informing Markus about her job applications (not included above). Markus initiates repair¹ on a specific referent that Ina mentioned in just prior talk by offering a candidate understanding of the referent's location (line 8). In response,

Ina first rejects her co-participant's candidate understanding *NEE*: ('no'), and then corrects the referent (line 11). In return, Markus receives the corrected and new information with an *AchSO.*, thereby claiming receipt and understanding of Ina's turn (line 12). The study notes that by using *achso* in the third turn position within repair sequences and elicited informings and tellings, German speakers indicate that they have just undergone a change of state from being a not-informed to an informed co-participant.

Excerpt 3 is another example of a minimal response token in German. This example, which is taken from Golato (2012), exemplifies the use of *oh* in German conversation. Here, two girls who recently visited an amusement park are involved in a make-believe game as they are jumping up and down on pillows on the floor. In line 3, L initiates repair, which results in S's suggestion for the pillow to be a trampoline (line 4).

Excerpt 3 (Golato, 2012: 247 [Sandra and Lena 4/4_14])

- 01 L: ((4 sec. high pitch singing while jumping))
- 02 S: ↑(d/has) is das trampolin.=okay?=
↑(this/has) is the trampoline okay?=
03 L: =was?
=what?
- 04 S: SOLL DAS das trampolin sein.
SHOULD THIS the trampoline be.
SHOULD THIS be the trampoline.
*excited sounding
- 05 L: *↑↑o:h↓=↑chj:a.
↑o:h↓=↑chy:es.
- 06 S: .hh ja. und das is .h das hier is (wellebad).
.hh yes. and this is .h this here is (wavepool).

In response to S's suggestion for the pillow to be a trampoline (line 4), L responds with a very high-pitched and sound-stretched *oh*, which is latched to a confirmation token *ja* (line 5). Given the phonetic realization of *oh* and its latched position to *ja*, Golato (2012) argues that the token responds to the prior suggestion and treats it as a good idea. This appears to be confirmed in line 6, where S continues with the make-believe game.

When learning an L2, knowing its vocabulary and correct linguistic forms (morpho-syntax) alone is not enough to be able to talk and interact with others. L2 learners need to develop the ability to use language to accomplish social interactions, specifically to analyze prior talk, provide the next relevant move and display their affective and epistemic stance towards their co-participant's prior turn. Therefore, formulating response turns and using response tokens appropriately are crucial interactional skills that learners of an L2 need to develop (Gardner, 2001; He & Young, 1998; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; Ishida, 2009; Kasper, 2006; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011, 2015; Pekarek Doehler & Fasel Lauzon, 2015). However, there are very few empirical studies which examine the details of L2 learners' responsive behavior in its sequential context, particularly in the post-expansion position (i.e., after a second-position response turn). The majority of studies have focused on English speakers learning Japanese (e.g., Ishida, 2009). No previous research has focused on the L2 use of German responsive behavior from a conversation analytic perspective; therefore, we know very little about German L2 learners' interactional skill, in particular their ability to formulate appropriate response forms in closing third turns.

In the next section, the chapter will provide an analysis of German L2 learners' use of responsive behavior in a post-expansion, specifically in a learner's response following receipt of an answer to their question. In the analysis, I will demonstrate that while German L2 learners in the data corpus appropriately display an orientation to providing the next relevant interactional move, their turn design may not appropriately signal their epistemic and affective stance. The chapter ends with a discussion of the L2 interactional skills and responsive practices shown in the data. The discussion will suggest that the observed skills and practices may be a result of limited, and possibly non-existent, explicit instruction in the sequential organization of interaction, and in the practice of signaling, in post-expansion position, one's epistemic and affective stance towards a co-participant's prior talk.

Data Corpus

The analysis presented in this chapter is based on four hours and 20 minutes of video-recorded conversations between adult American students of German, who were enrolled in beginning and intermediate German language classes at a large American university during the fall semester of 2016 and spring semester of 2017. The conversations, which were recorded outside of the classroom, were part of a class project for which students were required to meet with their given partner via Zoom (a video-conferencing program), Skype or Google Hangouts to complete the assigned task. For both levels of students, the task typically included prompts for conversations, in particular for an exchange of opinions about specific aspect(s) of that week's topic of the textbook and the lesson.

The goal of the task was to create an informal space for the learners to practice speaking, and to engage with the topic outside of their class. For example, one of the tasks at the beginning of the semester was to meet and get to know one other by finding out more information about each other. Another task was to discuss a topic related to the course content and to find out about each other's views on that topic. A total of 34 German L2-English L1 students were recorded. The recordings at the elementary level are between 5 and 10 minutes long, while those made by students at the intermediate level are each 20 minutes long.

L2 Response Behavior in Post-Expansion Position

As was discussed earlier, response turn-formats and tokens are central to managing understanding and progressivity in interaction. Speakers use a variety of lexical choices and grammatical formulations in their response turns to show understanding and index their stance towards their recipient's prior talk. When interacting in an L2, formulating response turns and using response tokens appropriately in everyday L2 conversation are crucial interactional skills (He & Young, 1998; Kasper, 2006; Peka-rek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011; Young, 2008). As the analysis of Excerpt 4 will show, L2 learners may merely display orientation to the turn-taking system and positioning of the next relevant move but fail to demonstrate recognition and understanding of parts of the prior talk and the action that it performs. Excerpt 4 illustrates an interaction between two learners of German at the beginning level. Here, the L2 learners Dan and Mitch met towards the end of the semester outside of class via Skype in order to complete the assigned task of discussing specific aspects of a German film that the class had been viewing.

Excerpt 4: A1_P12_F (wie gehts)

- 01 D: hallo mitch.
 hi mitch.
- 02=> M: hallo dan. guten tag. u:h **wie gehts**,
 hi dan. hello. u:h how are you,
- 03=> D: **ich bin sehr müde, und du?**
 i'm very tired, and you?
- 04 (.)
- 05=> M: **u:h ich bin sehr gut**^[2]. jah. a:h danke schön. (.)
 u:h i'm very good. yes. a:h thank you. (.)
- 06 M: a:h ich habe ein frage, u:h für du^[3] dan,...
 a:h i have a question, u:h for you dan, ...

Examining the opening exchange between Mitch and Dan, at first glance we see that the learners accomplish a *hello* and *how-are-you* sequence in German (Taleghani-Nikazm, 2002). However, a closer look at the details of the learners' turns reveals that this exchange appears to be slightly different from a typical conversation opening sequence between L1 speakers of German. For instance, in addition to the use of the greeting form *guten tag* (line 2), which is rather formal for this particular context, other features of the first few opening turns of this interaction also suggest that it is atypical in comparison to a conversation opening sequence between L1 speakers. Note, for example, that Dan's non-canonical response *ich bin sehr müde* ('I'm very tired') to the first *how-are-you* does not receive an uptake (line 3). More specifically, in response to Mitch's inquiry, Dan responds with a negative description of his state of being, namely, that he is very tired, and then extends his turn by reciprocating Mitch's *how-are-you*. In return, Mitch responds only to the second part of Dan's turn, namely, the reciprocal *how-are-you* and not to his just having informed him that he is tired. Dan's description of being very tired could be considered as a "downgraded" (Jefferson, 1980: 155) form of conventional response to an inquiry. Jefferson (1980: 156) further notes that after a downgraded version of a standard response to an inquiry, the speaker may continue with a report on trouble, or, alternatively, the co-participant may inquire about possible trouble sources. It should be mentioned that while Jefferson's finding is based on English conversation, similar observations can be made about my German conversational data. For instance, Excerpt 5 is an example from my German data corpus of a telephone opening sequence between two friends, Julia and Maria. Prior to their conversation, Julia had been dealing with a stomach flu (not included in the transcript). Julia's non-conventional formulation in line 7 of *nicht so gut* ('not so well') in response to Maria's *how-are-you* in line 5 is treated by Maria as not adequate for sequence closing, in that she requests an explanation for Julia's downgraded response (line 8). In so doing, Maria's request invites Julia to provide a possible elaboration or negative telling.

Excerpt 5 (wie geht's/nicht so gut)

01 J: hallo?
hello?

02 (0.29)

03 M: h hallo:,
h hi:,

04 J: hi: grüß dich=
hi: hello=

(0.2)

05=> M: na, wie gehts?
PRT how are you?

06 (0.3)

07=>J: nicht so gu:t,
not so goo:d,

08=>M: ne? was ist denn lo:s,
no? what's going on,

Going back to the L2 opening sequence depicted in Excerpt 4, we see that the L2 learner (Mitch) not only does not demonstrate any orientation to his recipient's non-standard response in the sequential third position, but also produces an upgraded response *ich bin sehr gut* ('I'm very good') to the reciprocated inquiry (line 5). This is then followed by the particle *ja* (yes), an expression of appreciation, and some other talk related to the pedagogical activity, which initiates a new action. Considering the interactional environment in which Mitch's response is produced, it could be heard as a disaffiliative action in that he not only fails to respond to Dan's first part of the turn, which may have been fishing for an opportunity to complain, but furthermore replies with an upgraded state of his own well-being in contrast to his recipient's. Dan, however, does not display orientation to Mitch's response as disaffiliative; instead, the co-participants move on to discuss the reason for the meeting. This data excerpt illustrates how, in moving through the ritual of conversation openings, these L2 learners merely display orientation to the turn-taking system and the positioning of the next relevant move but fail in displaying an affective and epistemic stance towards the content of their co-participant's prior talk. As I will discuss later in the chapter, it seems as if these L2 learners are performing an opening script typically presented in an L2 textbook.

L2 learners may orient to post-expansion position and produce a minimal form of response, such as a response token or multiple tokens in the closing third position, to treat the response as adequate and to display their epistemic stance towards the prior turn.

The following data excerpts illustrate such instances. The interactional environment in the data excerpts involves asking an information question, responding to the question with the information, and minimal post-expansion in the form of a response token. The social action of informing refers to an action through which the speaker delivers information as new or informative to a non-knowing recipient such that they become (more) knowing (Hayano, 2013; Heritage, 1984). A speaker can, for example, use a wh-question to elicit new and unknown information about their recipient. Excerpt 6 illustrates an exchange between two beginning-level German students who met via Google Hangouts during the end of the semester to collaboratively complete the homework assignment, which involved sharing opinions about ‘friendship’ and what it means to them. In line 3, L2 learner B utters a wh-question to which L2 learner A provides the information in lines 5 and 6. Learner B’s response turns in lines 7 and 14 are of interest.

Excerpt 6: A1_P4_Friendship [ist sehr wichtig]

- 01 A: is: das, OH ja okay oh ja, hallo: hehehe
is: that, OH yes okay oh yes, hello: hehehe
- 02 (0.7)
- 03 B: ha[llo::,u:hm: was denkst du über freundschaft.
he[llo::,u:hm: what do you think of friendship.
[
- 04 A: [heheheh
- 05 A: u::hm ich denke das freund↑schaft, ist u:h sehr
u::hm I think that friend↑ship, is u:h very
- 06 A: wichti:g↑ u:hm hhh· mt-
importa:nt u:hm hhh· mt-
- 07=> B: ohja ja.ja.
ohyes yes.yes.
- 08 A: ja? hehehe u:hm ich möchte >we[ll-< uhm: ich möchte
yes? hehehe u:hm i’d like >we[ll-< uhm: I’d like to
[
- 09 B: [hehehe
- 10 A: uhm viel freunde habe:n, uhm [*(.) und (.) u-u-you know
uhm have: many friends, uhm [* (.)and(.)u-u-you know

*B gives several nods

- 11 A: u:h junge und u:hm (0.7) o-o-or man u-eyh-ehehe man
u:h boys and u:hm (0.7) o-o-or man u-eyh-ehehe man
- 12 A: und freu-[frau, freu(h)nd? Hehehe
and frie-[woman, frie(h)nd? hehehe
[
- 13 B: [heheh
- 14=> B: **ja ich auch ich auch.**
yes me too me too.
- 15 (1.0)
- 16 A: u::h[m was den-was denkst du,?
u::h[m what then-what do you think?
[
- 17 B: [u:hm:

The above data excerpt illustrates a wh-question-answer sequence. Learner B poses a question (line 3), thereby eliciting information from its recipient about their thoughts on a specific social phenomenon, namely, 'friendship,' which is the topic of that week's class. The question makes a response of a particular type relevant, namely, a description and explanation of its recipient's thought and knowledge. The question also elicits its recipient's stance or position towards a particular social phenomenon. In response, A produces a multi-clausal turn (lines 5–6 and 8–13). Her response contains an assessment of 'friendship' (lines 5–6) *es ist sehr wichtig* ('it is very important'), with which she explicitly expresses her stance towards this human conduct. Her assessment also makes a next turn by her recipient relevant. In both German and English everyday conversations, assessments in first positions typically receive an agreement or disagreement in the form of a second assessment (Auer & Uhmman, 1982; Pomerantz, 1984). In responding to an assessment, speakers can agree by using an acknowledgment token (e.g., *ja* 'yes') followed by an upgraded evaluative term. When disagreeing with an assessment, speakers typically use a downgraded evaluative term. Speakers may also proffer an equal second assessment by using expressions such as *finde ich auch* ('I think so too/I agree'; see Auer & Uhmman, 1982). Note that in line 7, learner B does not respond to learner A's assessment with a second assessment, but rather by the token *oh* plus a repetition of the German acknowledgment token *ja ja.ja*. ('yes yes.yes.'). As was shown earlier in the chapter, the response token *oh* exists in both German and English (Golato, 2012; Heritage, 1984, 2002). However, they do not have the same function. In English, when the token *oh* is positioned at the beginning of an agreement to an assessment, such as in *oh yes*, the respondent indexes independent

but equivalent access to the phenomenon being assessed (Heritage, 2002). So, in an English-speaking context, learner B's *ohja* could be heard as agreeing with learner A's assessment of 'friendship,' which is a phenomenon that learner B, as a human being, has independent knowledge of and experience with. Therefore, the response token *oh* in this position shows learner B's ability to evaluate this particular social conduct independently. Unlike in English, however, the German token *oh* is typically used as an affective marker to register emotional change of state (Golato, 2012: 247). Thus, English *oh* and German *oh* are not identical, a notion that may falsely exist among English L1 learners of German. In Excerpt 6, learner B's responsive behavior (*ohja ja,ja.*) demonstrates her listenership and orientation to the sequential positioning of a turn, while also displaying her understanding and stance towards her recipient's prior talk. However, the linguistic resources that learner B uses do not quite fit in this particular interactional environment. Instead, a more typical L1 German responsive behavior would have been a second assessment such as *ja ist sehr wichtig* ('yes it's very important'), adding an intensifier to agree with the first assessment speaker. Another possible more fitted response token in this context would have been *genau* ('exactly'), either stand-alone or co-occurring with *ja* ('yes') as in *ja genau* ('yes exactly'). The particle *genau* in response turns to informings has been shown to be used by speakers in combination with the agreement token *ja* ('yes') to claim equal access to the knowledge expressed in the prior talk: by using *ja genau*, speakers confirm the prior talk and index congruency and mutual stance towards the information and stance expressed by their recipient (Betz, 2014; Betz, Taleghani-Nikazm, Drake, & Golato, 2013; Oloff, 2017). This interactional function of *genau* has also been shown in institutional contexts. When used by the test giver in response to the test taker's turn, *genau* confirms the information provided by the test taker and closes the sequence (Oloff, 2017). When used by the test taker, *genau* marks epistemic congruency and agreement with the prior talk and information.⁴

In lines 8–12, learner A continues her response to learner B's inquiry on the topic 'friendship,' indicating that she wants many friends, males and females. In return, learner B explicitly expresses her shared position by producing a response turn which includes an agreement token *ja* ('yes') and a repeated *ich auch* ('me too') (line 14). This is produced in post-expansion position and treats the prior turn, i.e., B's response, as sufficient. Learner A then asks learner B for her opinion (line 16), thereby initiating a new question-answer sequence while displaying her orientation to learner B's turn as closing the prior sequence. Similarly to learner B's earlier response turn, it seems that the response token of *genau* ('exactly') in combination with the agreement token *ja* ('yes') would have been a more typical linguistic choice in German in this particular interactional environment and for this particular function.

The last data excerpt (Excerpt 7) is another example of the question-response-closing third turn. Here, we have a conversation between two intermediate-advanced learners of German. These are learners who had both spent some time in Germany. The task in this data excerpt is to talk about immigration and discuss the question of where the speakers would move to if they had to leave their home and whether they would go alone (line 1). Similarly to previous instances, the response token produced by the learner in the closing third turn position is not fitted and therefore not aligned with the informing turn.

Excerpt 7: ZP1_G3600_SM: nach Deutschland gehen 'going to Germany'

- 01=>1 M: wohin würden sie gehen, uh warum dorthin[↑] und allein.
 where would you go, uh why there[↑] and alone.
- 02 (.)
- 03=>2 S: u::h jA. ich würde nach deutschland gehen, .hhh uh ich
 u::h yEAs. *i would go to germany, .hhh uh i*
- 04 S: war schon mal in deutschland und habe da ein bischen
 was already in Germany and lived there a bit
- 05 S: gelebEN und uhm mit meiner deutschen
 and uhm with my german
- 06 S: stadtsangehörigkEIT, hatte ich auch nicht vie:l
 citizenshIP, I had not mu:ch problems,
- 07 S: probleme, unterkunft und arbeit zu finden, ja ich möchte
 finding a place to stay and a job, yes of course
- 08 S: natürlich mit meiner familie u:h dorthin gehen, ich bin
 I'd want to go there u:h with my family, i am
- 09 S: sehr uhm mit meiner familie-ich mag meiner familie
 very uhm with my family-i like my family,
- 10 S: gerne, und hoffentlich könnte ich mit denen nach
 and hopefully I could go with them
- 11 S: deutschland gehe(h)n.
 to german (h)y.
- 12=>3 M: ^ahja <u::hw haben sie in uh-so-also sie haben in
 ^ahja >u::hw have you in uh-so-then you have been
- 13 M: deutschland gegangen und haben sie menschen getroffen un
 to Germany and have you met people and what
- 14 M: was haben sie gemacht? in u:h deutschland.
 did you do? in uh: Germany.

In lines 2–11, S provides the answer to M's wh-question (line 1). Some of the information may have been new to its recipient, for example, having German citizenship due to having had a German mother (which is not common among American students), or having already lived in Germany. In return, M first produces the token *^ahja*, with the stress on the first syllable, which is followed by talk that demonstrates his understanding of S's answer turn (lines 12–14). Although the response token *ahja* is a German token, previous work suggests that M is not using it in a target-like way. For instance, in their study of the German response token *achja/ahja*, Betz and Golato (2008) show that when the token is produced with the prosodic prominence on the first syllable and realized as a pitch peak, *^achja/^ahja*⁵ regularly occurs alone, i.e., without further talk by the recipient. In addition, they show that German L1 speakers use *^achja/^ahja* when they are unable to provide the next fitted utterance due either to an ambiguity or to lack of background knowledge regarding the prior utterance. In such cases, where there is no repair and only silence, speakers produce the token *^achja/^ahja* as a “place holder for the relevant next action” (Betz & Golato, 2008: 76). Therefore, for German native speakers, *^achja/^ahja* in this interactional environment does not function as a closing third turn.

As noted above, however, M's response turn begins with the token *^achja* produced with the stress on the first syllable, followed by some additional talk demonstrating his understanding of some of the content of S's turn combined with a follow-up question. When comparing M's response-turn construction with L1 German speakers' use of *^achja*, it is clear that M's use of *^achja* in this interactional environment would not be heard as typical by a German native speaker. The German change-of-state token *achso* would seem to be more appropriate for this context (see Excerpt 2 and analysis), since M's talk following *^achja* does not display a problem or an inability to understand S's answer turn, but rather indicates that the new information was understood and has prompted further questions.

The above data excerpt and analysis represent another example of L2 learners performing the next relevant action, hence displaying alignment with the prior action, but without using the appropriate response token. In other words, L2 learners in the data shown above are able to provide the relevant next turn and to orient to the sequential position of the closing third turn but are unable to use the appropriate lexical items for signaling their affective and epistemic stance towards the immediate prior talk of their co-participant.

Summary and Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to gain a deeper understanding of L2 interactional competence and what L2 learners do with their language

in semi-pedagogical interaction. This was achieved by focusing on a detailed description of linguistic resources that L2 learners utilize to systematically respond to their co-participant and to accomplish a variety of social actions while engaged in pedagogical tasks. The analysis focused on a particular interactional context, namely, question-response-minimal post-expansion, and examined L2 learners' ability to monitor the linguistic details of their co-participants' response turn and actions and to use the appropriate L2 linguistic resources to signal their epistemic and affective stance towards their co-participant's response to their inquiry. The analysis illustrated that while L2 learners in the data demonstrate their orientation to the next relevant action, they fail to use the target-like method of signaling their affective and epistemic stance towards the immediate prior turn of their co-participant. This is in line with previous studies which have shown that adult L2 learners typically transfer co-participant behavior and interactional competence from their L1 into their L2 (Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2002; Taleghani-Nikazm & Huth, 2010); therefore, L2 response tokens may be used in a target-like way (e.g., Clancy, Thompson, Suzuki, & Tao, 1996; Gardner, 2001). A possible contributing factor to L2 German learners' non-target-like use of response tokens may be a lack of explicit instruction on this particular sequential responsive behavior in instructional materials and practice in the classroom. A perusal of current German instructional materials at the beginning and intermediate levels reveals that there are no research-informed materials which include instructions on the German response tokens used in closing third turns. As a result, learners will only acquire them during study-abroad experiences or other types of exposure to the target language outside of the classroom. On the basis of this chapter's findings, there is clearly a need for effectively translating interaction research into pedagogical practice, in particular for integrating authentic patterns of everyday interaction into German L2 instruction.

In addition, there has been a growing trend among L2 instructors to use online video communication services, such as Skype and Google Hangouts, to create spaces outside of the classroom for L2 learners to engage in hybrid conversations to practice speaking with other learners and/or native speakers and to collaboratively complete tasks using the target language. However, these tasks' instructions are frequently centered on the task itself (e.g., having a discussion, an argument, an exchange of opinions, etc.) and fail to provide the learners with the specific interactional and linguistic tools and practices that would help them engage in the tasks in a more target-like way. If a learner is unaware of the appropriate L2 responsive practices in particular interactional environments, she or he may have little choice but to use tokens or other linguistic resources from their L1 when organizing their L2 interactional conduct in mutually understandable and accountable ways. The findings presented in this chapter provide empirical evidence of the need for CA-research-informed

L2 instructional materials (such as those described in Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Betz & Huth, 2014) which focus on the sequential aspect of interaction, and provide instructional modules which help L2 instructors raise their learners' awareness of the nuances of interaction (in both their L1 and L2) such that they can become more effective interactants in their L2.

Notes

- 1 Note that "RI" in the transcript marks the repair initiation turn, and that "R" marks the turn which completes the repair.
- 2 In addition to the purely talk-in-interactional issues in this exchange, in this context the collocation *ich bin sehr gut* 'I'm very good' is itself problematic in that the target-like form would be *mir geht es sehr gut* 'I'm doing very well.' Mitch's utterance, which appears to be a calque from English, could possibly be heard as self-praise by a German native speaker, especially one who was unaccustomed to interacting with German L2-English L1 speakers.
- 3 This is ungrammatical, in that this is the nominative form of the second person singular 'you' whereas the grammatically correct form would be the accusative *dich* 'for) you.'
- 4 For details on König's (2014) and Widdrat's (2016) studies on *genau* in institutional settings see Oloff (2017, p. 213).
- 5 In Jefferson's (1984) CA transcripts, the pitch peaks are typically marked with ^.

References

- Auer, P., & Uhmann, S. (1982). Aspekte der konversationellen Organisation von Bewertungen. *Deutsche Sprache*, 10, 1–32.
- Barraja-Rohan, A.-M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(4), 479–507.
- Beach, W. A. (1993). Transitional regularities for 'casual' "Okay" usages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19(4), 325–352.
- Beach, W. A. (1995). Preserving and constraining options: "Okays" and "official" priorities in medical interviews. In Morris, G. H., & Chenail, R. J. (Eds.), *The talk of the clinic: Explorations in the analysis of medical and therapeutic discourse* (pp. 259–289). New York: Routledge.
- Betz, E. (2014, June). *Confirming and agreeing: Different uses of responsive 'genau' in German*. Paper presented at the International Conference of Conversation Analysis, Los Angeles, USA.
- Betz, E. (2015). Indexing epistemic access through different confirmation formats: Uses of responsive '(das) stimmt' in German interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics: Special Issue Reference in Interaction*, 87, 251–266.
- Betz, E., & Golato, A. (2008). Remembering relevant information and withholding relevant next actions: The German token *achja*. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41(1), 58–98.
- Betz, E., & Huth, T. (2014). Beyond grammar: Teaching interaction in the German language classroom. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 47(2), 140–163. [Introduction to Special Focus Issue Series.]

- Betz, E., Taleghani-Nikazm, C., Drake, V., & Golato, A. (2013). Third-position repeats in German: The case of repair and request-for-information sequences. *Gesprächsforschung*, 14, 133–166.
- Clancy, P. M., Thompson, S. A., Suzuki, R., & Tao, H. (1996). The conversational use of reactive tokens in English, Japanese, and Mandarin. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(3), 355–387.
- Ford, C. E., & Fox, B. A. (1996). Practices in the construction of turns: The ‘TCU’ revisited. *Pragmatics*, 6(3), 427–454.
- Gardner, R. (2001). *When listeners talk: Response tokens and listener stance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gardner, R. (2007). The ‘right’ connections: Acknowledging epistemic progression in talk. *Language in Society*, 36(3), 319–341.
- Golato, A. (2012). German ‘oh’: Marking an emotional change of state. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(3), 245–268.
- Golato, A., & Betz, E. (2008). German ‘ach’ and ‘achso’ in repair uptake: A resource to sustain or remove epistemic asymmetry. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, 27, 7–37.
- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(10), 1489–1522.
- Hayano, K. (2013). *Territories of knowledge in Japanese conversation* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.
- He, A. W., & Young, R. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. In R. Young & A. W. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 1–24). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (2002). ‘Oh’-prefaced responses to assessments: A method of modifying agreement/disagreement. In C. Ford, B. Fox, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence* (pp. 196–224). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heritage, J. (2013). Epistemics in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 370–395). Chichester, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Huth, T., & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research*, 10(1), 53–79.
- Ishida, M. (2009). Development of interactional competence: Changes in the use of ‘ne’ in L2 Japanese during study abroad. In H. T. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 351–385). Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Jefferson, G. (1980). On ‘trouble-premonitory’ response to inquiry. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50(3/4), 153–185.
- Jefferson, G. (1984). Transcription notation. In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. ix–xvi). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kasper, G. (2006). When once is not enough: Politeness of multiple requests in oral proficiency interviews. *Multilingua*, 25, 323–350.
- König, K. (2014). *Spracheinstellungen und Identitätskonstruktion. Eine gesprächsanalytische Untersuchung sprachbiographischer Interviews mit Deutsch-Vietnamesen*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Oloff, F. (2017). ‘Genau’ als redebeitragsinterne, responsive, sequenzschließende oder sequenzstrukturierende Bestätigungspartikel im Gespräch [German ‘genau’ as intra-turn, responsive, sequence-closing or sequence-structuring confirming particle in conversation]. In H. Blühdorn, A. Deppermann, H. Helmer, & T. Spranz-Fogasy (Eds.), *Diskursmarker im Deutschen. Reflexionen und Analysen* (pp. 207–232). Göttingen: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Fasel Lauzon, V. (2015). Documenting change across time: Longitudinal and cross-sectional CA studies of classroom interaction. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 409–424). West Sussex, UK: Wiley Blackwell.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2011). Developing ‘methods’ for interaction: A cross-sectional study of disagreement sequences in French L2. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 206–243). Bristol: Wiley.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–270). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 225–246). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2002). A conversation analytical study of telephone conversation openings between native and nonnative speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(12), 1807–1832.
- Taleghani-Nikazm, C., & Huth, T. (2010). L2 requests: Preference structure in talk-in-interaction. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 29(2), 185–202.
- Thompson, S. A., Fox, B. A., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2015). *Grammar in everyday talk: Building response actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361–382.
- Widdrat, M. (2016). Eine kontrastive Untersuchung zum Gebrauch des deutschen Wortes *genau* als Diskursmarker und dessen Äquivalente im Spanischen. Masterarbeit in Romanischer Philologie. Philosophische Fakultät. Potsdam: Universität Potsdam.
- Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2006). Surprise as an interactional achievement: Reaction tokens in conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69(2), 150–182.
- Young, R. F. (2008). *Language and interaction*. London; New York: Routledge.

5 The Interplay Between Collaborative Turn Sequences and Active Listenership

Implications for the Development of L2 Interactional Competence

Olcay Sert

Introduction

Participation practices in an L2 (second/foreign/additional language) in teacher-student interactions (Sert, 2017a) and learner-learner interactions (Hellermann, 2008) as well as in interactions in the wild (Lilja & Piirainen-Marsh, 2018; Wagner, 2015) provide affordances for learners to use the L2 in interactional routines. The development of L2 interactional competence (IC; see Hall, Hellermann, & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018) is to some extent traceable through a close investigation of locally situated and contingent actions that are routinized. From the perspective of Conversation Analysis (CA) for second language acquisition (SLA) (Markee & Kasper, 2004; Markee & Kunitz, 2015), we rely on such routinized behavior, which “we have picked up and calibrated in our navigations through life. It all derives from usage” (Eskildsen & Cadierno, 2015: 5). If usage is a *sine qua non* of emergent learning behaviors (Markee, 2008), then opportunities provided to language learners in expanding-circle¹ countries (Kachru, 1985, 1992) should also include engagement in meaningful interactions in L2. Such an ideal, however, is not undertaken in all parts of the world.

This chapter reports preliminary findings based on analyses of L2 Discussion Task interactions involving learners who had previously had limited opportunities to practice oral communication. The participants are enrolled in an oral communication skills course designed to provide opportunities to practice L2 (i.e., English) discussions in groups. The audio-recorded data are longitudinal in nature, providing instances of talk from six different points in time in an academic year in a Turkish higher education context. The study focuses on participants’ deployment of responsive actions, and specifically focuses on turn completions in collaborative turn sequences. It conceptualizes turn completions as ‘demonstrations of active listenership’ and thus argues for an interplay between collaborative turn sequences and demonstration of active listenership in relation to L2 IC.

I adopt a conversation analytic approach to data (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), followed by a post-analytic corpus linguistic annotation to present frequencies and a plot analysis using corpus software. The findings revealed that the participants produce an increased number of collaborative completions over time, and the students demonstrate more active listenership as they become more experienced interactants in L2 discussions. The functions and grammatical diversity emerging in such actions indicate a developmental trajectory, which has potential to inform research on L2 IC, in addition to being relevant to teaching and testing situations. In the following section, I present a review of listenership, collaborative completions and L2 IC. In the analysis and findings section, I first present a sequential analysis of representative extracts from the collection. I then move on to presenting the quantitative findings from post-analytic observations. The CA findings on co-construction of the focal collaborative turn sequences and their quantitative representation show similarities to findings from recent work on L2 IC (Pekarek Doehler, 2017, 2018). The individual performance scores provided in the post-analytic discussions may, however, present a divergence from the ethnomethodological roots of our understanding of human interaction, albeit providing useful insights for research on testing and understanding L2 IC as an individual and collaborative construct.

Listenership and Collaborative Turn Sequences

Social interaction is a co-constructed accomplishment. It is situated within the activities carried out by interactants, who in each turn-at-talk display to one another their (non-)understanding of the previous turn. This give and take of social life requires participants to, in a way, orient to, or attend to,² the immediately preceding turns-at-talk. If that is so, then the concepts of speakership and listenership are interwoven into one another and are in constant flux, and so are the roles of speaker and listener. When we, however, look back at the history of L2 teaching/learning research, the communicative competence paradigm has focused “more on individual speech production than on the listener and acknowledgement of what has been said” (Walsh, 2011: 165). Listenership, as almost a requirement of being an interactant, involves “providing appropriate listener feedback” (Stubbe, 1998: 257), appropriateness being related to local contingency here.

Listenership has also been referred to as *recipency*, which is concerned with “linguistic production and speech behavior of recipients or listeners in different contexts” (Xu, 2014: 35). It is obvious, however, that participants in talk-in-interaction can also display non-linguistic recipency, using, for example, head nods, so they are active co-participants who shape the ongoing conversation and establish and maintain intersubjectivity. A review of the literature shows that recipency and listenership

have been investigated both from conversation analytic (Beach, 1993; Gardner, 2004) and discourse analytic (McCarthy, 2002) perspectives. In his comprehensive work, using the umbrella term *response tokens*, Gardner (2001) documented the use and functions of eight different response tokens and showed how they are used as, for example, continuers and newsmarkers. Gardner also adds “collaborative completions” to the range of activities participants do in the role of listener. Collaborative completions are listener activities in which, according to Gardner, “a speaker finishes a prior speaker’s utterance” (p. 2).

Lerner (2004) investigated collaborative completions using a broader category: collaborative turn sequences. He argued that a completion by a recipient can be a way “to display *understanding* of or agreement with an ongoing turn” (p. 237, emphasis mine). Collaborative completions, then, may qualify as demonstrations of understanding. As a listener behavior, it can be argued that compared to other forms of listenership, they are ‘stronger’ in a continuum of active listenership. This is because minimal response tokens may at best “claim *attention* and/or understanding rather than showing it or evidencing it” (Schegloff, 1982: 78). Therefore, it is possible to argue that by producing minimal listenership tokens an L2 speaker might be listening, but how attentive this listenership is or whether it shows understanding of the previous L2 utterance is open to question. Yet, if an L2 speaker is producing a collaborative completion as a recipient of the immediately preceding utterance, then it can be claimed that there is a level of *attentive listening*³ and the L2 user is demonstrating, rather than just claiming, active listenership. The following example from the database used in the present chapter is a case in point:

S1: even if he *can* do it=

S2: =it will be: late

By providing a completion, S2 demonstrates active listenership and shows that s/he has been attentive to her/his interlocutor’s formulation. How s/he completes the turn is by format tying: using syntax as a resource and producing a clause at the syntactic boundary. In addition to the linguistic and interactional resources that are employed by S2, there needs to be a level of listenership that is attentive to the previous utterance, so that understanding can be demonstrated, and *alignment* can be achieved at interactional, semantic and morpho-syntactic levels. Such an alignment through increased use of responsive turns has been argued to be an indicator of L2 IC (Dings, 2014).

Adopting He and Young’s (1998) conceptualization of IC and taking a longitudinal perspective, Dings (2014) investigated the interactions of a Spanish language learner during an academic year abroad. She focused on alignment activity, a concept that includes recipient activities like

assessments, formulations, collaborative contributions and collaborative completions. She found that the learner's employment of collaborative completions in addition to other resources increased over time. In another study, focusing on L2 learners of Japanese in a study-abroad setting, Taguchi (2014) argued that collaborative turn completions can be strong indicators of linguistic and interactional development, drawing on their increasing use over time. Longitudinal development of learners' interactional resources (Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018) to accomplish context-sensitive, locally contingent actions is also the central concern for the present chapter, as I argue that demonstration of active listenership through collaborative completions may be an indicator of IC.

(Development of) L2 IC

With the turn of the new millennium and the growing interest in the use of CA to investigate interactional practices in an L2, IC has been taken up by a number of researchers as a research agenda. Taking a longitudinal perspective, using CA, researchers brought evidence of the development of L2 IC from turn-taking, sequence, repair and preference organization (Pekarek Doehler & Pochon Berger, 2015). The contexts and L2s under investigation varied, ranging from story openings in L2 French in an au-pair setting (Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018) to self-selection in post-expansion sequences in EFL classrooms in Japan (Watanabe, 2017). The term *IC*, as Hall (2018) argues, comes with its conceptual package based on linguistic anthropology and sociology, and the term *competence* has a cognitive package deriving from a Chomskyan understanding. Nevertheless, it has become a central phenomenon and a research agenda to look into and draw implications for broader applied linguistic matters (see Figure 5.1) in CA-SLA, including the development of L2 IC (e.g., Cekaite, 2017), teaching of L2 IC (e.g., Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Kunitz & Yeh, this volume; Waring, 2018), L2 classroom IC in teacher education (e.g., Sert, 2015, forthcoming; Walsh, 2006) and testing of L2 IC (e.g., Galaczi, 2014; Sandlund & Sundqvist, this volume; Huth & Betz, this volume).

Research on the development of IC has documented the changing interactional resources in L2 classroom task openings (Hellermann, 2008) and evolving repair practices in classrooms (Hellermann, 2011) as well as in computer-mediated spoken interaction (Sert & Balaman, 2018). It has portrayed increased use of the resources under investigation and a diversification in functions and grammatical complexity (Pekarek Doehler, 2018). It is this developmental agenda that is the focal point of inquiry in this chapter. Adopting the notion of IC as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct (Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018) in the form of repertoires for actions (Hall, 2018), situated learning capacities (Hellermann, 2018) and intersubjective agency (Markee, this volume),

Figure 5.1 A research agenda for L2 IC across domains of investigation

I focus on the interplay between listenership and collaborative sequences, arguing for the demonstration of active listenership as an indicator of a developing repertoire for L2 use and IC.

Data and Method

Context and Participants

The data for this chapter come from a corpus of L2 interactions in discussion tasks (L2DISCO; Sert, 2016, 2017b, 2017c), from an approximately 400,000-word corpus of L2 (i.e., English) group discussions audio-recorded as part of an undergraduate-level oral communication skills course offered at a Turkish higher education institution. The corpus involves 174 multi-party discussions between students in groups

that consist of three or four individuals, and the total time of interactions amounts to 58 hours of audio recordings. The students recorded their own interactions (ranging from 15 to 25 minutes each) at six different times in two academic semesters, at approximately the beginning, middle and end of each semester. The recordings were required as part of the courses Oral Communication Skills (OCS) 1 and 2, offered in the first year of a four-year undergraduate program. The courses were designed to provide practice time for the students to freely carry out discussions in groups, but the recordings were not done in the classroom. The students, keeping the same groups, recorded their conversations based on the topics that they chose, outside of the classrooms in their free time. The course did not include any explicit element of teaching IC, but it was designed just to give these students time for practice, as this was a requirement due to the profiles of these students. The students also used these interactions to reflect on their performance at the end of each semester.

Before they enrolled in this department, the students, all L2 users of English, had taken a central multiple-choice university entrance and placement test that did not assess productive skills (writing and speaking) as well as listening, and was heavily based on grammar, reading and vocabulary. In their primary and secondary school years, the majority of these students had gone through grammar- and vocabulary-oriented language education, with little or no emphasis on speaking or listening.⁴ The two semesters offered to these students for this class provided them with the opportunity to practice group conversations. The topics selected by the students ranged from the impact of technology to same-sex marriage. The students, having maintained the same three or four members of their groups throughout the year, recorded their own conversations and reflected on them at the end of each semester. One of the groups was randomly selected for closer investigation for this study. Table 5.1 provides information on the duration and topic of each recording for this specific group. The group consists of three female students (ages ranging from 18 to 20) who audio-recorded their

Table 5.1 Information on each recording

<i>Recording time</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Duration</i>	<i>Total number of words</i>
1	Technology and privacy	13:36	1,641
2	The gap between the rich and the poor	15:01	1,936
3	Motivation	13:47	1,701
4	Gay marriage	15:17	2,144
5	Foreign words	15:32	2,058
6	Age difference in marriage	15:23	1,842

own interactions six times in an academic year. Consent was granted from the participants as well as from the university research ethics committee for the use of the data. The names used in the transcriptions and analyses are pseudonyms.

Method and the Analytic Procedures

This study adopts CA (Sacks et al., 1974) to investigate the locally contingent sense-making practices of the participants, by taking a micro-analytic approach to the methods used to co-construct conversational actions, paying close attention to turn-taking, sequence organization, repair and preference organization. It should be noted here that the lack of video data is an obvious limitation, especially considering that gaze is an important resource for turn management in the kinds of sequences described in this study. The use of audio recordings, however, was a decision embedded in the course design, and any kind of change imposed by the research may have interfered with the natural and predetermined features of an ongoing course.

Following the production of CA transcriptions (Jefferson, 2004), all six recordings were investigated closely at minute-level detail. Collaborative completion emerged as a focus, and each instance of turns and sequences (a total of 54 instances) that include collaborative completions has been investigated in fine detail. A sub-collection for word searches in these instances was also made to differentiate between collaborative turn sequences that include word searches and those that do not, as word searches form a self-initiated other-repair trajectory and may require less attentive listening compared to the others.

Following the conversation analytic transcription and analysis of the data, the transcriptions were annotated to be processed by corpus software. Each instance of turn completion (see the example in the previous section) was annotated using the <turncomp> tag, while collaborative turn sequences that do not include a word search were annotated using <turncomp> <nows>. The TXT files were then uploaded to the AntConc software (Anthony, 2014) for frequency and plot analysis (see Figures 5.2 and 5.3 in the next section). It should be noted here that the frequency-based plot analysis does not impose any exogenous theory on the CA analysis carried out, but it is done rather to present a post-analytic observation. It may, however, potentially raise concern among scholars (see Hall, 2018; Hauser, 2011, this volume; Hellermann, 2018; Markee, this volume) as such an approach to data may put us at risk of decontextualizing phenomena (Hellermann, 2018) and may create a sense of the term *IC* that is located in the linguistic anthropological tradition, referring to the fundamental variability of individual knowledge (Hall, 2018). I will discuss such matters in the final section.

Analysis and Findings

Using four extracts as representative points in time, this section will document the interplay between demonstrations of active listenership and collaborative turn sequences in relation to L2 IC. The extracts will depict how L2 users change their listenership behavior over time, evidencing a continuum from no or limited displays of listenership at the beginning of the first academic term to demonstration of active listenership over time. The analytic focus will be on how the interactants increasingly use turn completions, observable through subordinate clause completions, offers of candidate lexical items and turn-initial conjunctions. Collaborative sequences that do not include word searches will also be categorized separately. Following a sequential analysis of the extracts, the results of a frequency-based post-analytic quantification will also be provided, drawing on the corpus linguistic annotations and plot analysis performed using AntConc.

Extract 1 comes from the very first recording of the first semester. The topic of the discussion is data privacy, and the students are discussing whether governments should have access to our private data or not.

Extract 1: Time 1, 4:36–5:36

```

177 SED: er: if government should access er our er (0.7)
178 mails, er our messages: or our callings (.)
179 er they can use (.) in e- politics i think be-
180 >i don't know why:< (0.3) ↑but i er c:an't feel relax
181 when i'm er (0.3) speaking er: (0.2) about (.) politics
182 er: in (.) on the phone.
183 (1.1)
184 >what do you think about this?<
185 (2.3)
186 BUS: i ↑think if (.) government access (0.4) er: (.) everyone's
187 er: database (.) er unnecessarily: er::
188 <it ↑cause to> er:: accuse er innocent people.
189 maybe punish (.) them.
190 (1.0)
191 AYS: and: er: (1.1) i: h er would like to add something about
192 cri:me er: people er: in: a case of a cri:me er they can:
193 er:: find >they can find< some proof.

```

Before Extract 1 started, the participants had been discussing the topic for more than four minutes in an almost round-robin format, which also seems to be the case in the extract. From lines 177 to 182, in an extended telling sequence with no hearable interruptions from the co-participants, SED explains her stance on the subject matter, indicating apprehension towards the government's ability to access people's private communication channels (*er our er (0.7). mails, er our messages: or our callings*). She

formulates her position using an *if* conditional (*er: if government should access er*), explaining the perceived potential outcome for her (*they can use (.) in e- politics i think be-*). In line 180, starting with a marker of uncertainty first (*>i don't know why:<*), she elaborates on her reservation starting with a prosodically marked conjunction (*but*) followed by a stance-taking expression (*i er c:an't feel relax*), narrowing down the communication channels she has mentioned earlier to telephone conversations (*on the phone*) and specifying the topic of talk as politics (*when i'm er (0.3) speaking er: (0.2) about (.) politics*). Although her turn includes linguistic errors like the missing suffix in an adjective (*relax*), odd use of vocabulary (*our callings*), self-initiated self-repairs while using a preposition (*in (.) on the phone*) and a number of intra-turn pauses, which may qualify as indicators of L2 speech, her turn seems to be intelligible as there is no initiation of other-repair.

No other participant claims the floor at the transition relevance place (TRP) in line 182, and following more than one second of silence, SED asks for the opinions of others on the topic (*>what do you think about this?<*), and possibly her stance. She offers the floor to the listeners by formulating her question explicitly, marking the task at hand as a discussion that requires a personal stance (*you think*), but this is followed by another silence, this time 2.3 seconds in line 185. In a delayed fashion, BUS provides a second pair part, initiating her turn contingently with a prosodically marked stance marker (*i think*), adding that such access may result in accusations towards and punishment of innocent people, thus taking a stance, as projected by the previous turn. Note that BUS recycles the same '*if* conditional' format used by SED in the previous turn, albeit by reformulating the grammatical form. Her turn also includes elements of L2 talk observable through problems in subject-verb agreement (*<it cause to>*).

One second of silence follows the TRP in line 190, after which AYS obtains the floor. She starts her turn with a turn-initial conjunction that indicates addition (*and: er:*), followed by a hesitation marker and a long intra-turn pause in line 191. Using a preface for her addition, produced in pragmatically and grammatically accurate form (*i: h er would like to add something about cri:me*), she brings in a sub-topic (crime) which indicates something less than agreement with the previous speakers' positions, as AYS argues that such access to private information can help people to find some proof in case of crimes.

The analyses of Extract 1 and the majority of interactions at the beginning of the term show that the interactants use limited resources to display listenership: listenership tokens that display actions like acknowledgment, confirmation and (dis)agreement are rare. There are extended individual turns and long inter-turn gaps, silences after TRPs and examples of explicit turn allocations, some of which have previously been described as features of first encounters in L2 discussion tasks

(Balaman & Sert, 2017a). Duration of speech needs to be noted as well, as only three turns were produced in a minute-long interaction, which changes as the students become more experienced interactants as they practice discussing in English.

Extract 2 represents a discussion among the same group of students at the end of the first semester. The topic the group chose for discussion was motivation, and how we can motivate children and students to be successful in life. The extract depicts a recording time in which the participants display more attentive listening, evidenced through listenership tokens as well as collaborative turn sequences in the form of turn completions.

Extract 2: Time 3, 6-06_7-02

518 SED: maybe he: er: ↑li:ve er: (2.3) ((snaps fingers))live::
 519 >I don't know<.
 520 (0.9)
 521 BUS: ex↑perience:::
 522 AYS: er can not experience something or::=
 523 BUS: =D[ON't have =
 524 AYS: [cannot have
 525 BUS: =don't have self confidence in working (.) er area and
 526 in future his l- (h)in (.)in his future life.=
 527 AYS: =because of(.) lack ↑of(.) courages.
 528 BUS: ↑yes yes.
 529 AYS: ()
 530 SED: and he can er or he: er (0.7) feel lonely.
 531 SED: [because of=
 532 AYS: [yes
 533 SED: =this er situa↑tion er because ehm (1.0)
 534 as er büşra you ↑said ehm (.) if (0.9) er he lost he-
 535 his confi↑dence=
 536 BUS: =yes
 537 SED: he feel lone (.) er he feel alone.

In line 518, preceded by 2.3 seconds of silence, SED initiates an embodied word search. Her word search is marked by a long pause, snapping fingers, the stretched sound at the end of the turn (*live::*) and the claim of insufficient knowledge (Sert & Walsh, 2013) produced in line 519, thereby inviting others to provide the missing lexical item. Following almost a second of silence, in line 521 BUS offers an alternative word (*experience:::*), thus orienting to the word search and displaying listenership as well as understanding of SED's invitation to provide the lexical item being sought. BUS's offer of an alternative word triggers a collaborative sequence, in which AYS incorporates BUS's alternative wording into a longer utterance (*can not experience something or:::*) in line 522. In lines 523 and 524, BUS and AYS compete for the floor, and, subsequently, BUS

produces an utterance arguing how lack of self-confidence may influence someone's future career.

Line 527 represents one of the analytic foci of this chapter: latched with the previous turn, AYS initiates a turn completion, formulating it with a turn-initial conjunction (=because of (.)) *lack of (.)) courages.*), creating a subordinate clause, thus displaying complexity at the morpho-syntactic level. This is the end of the first semester, and such collaborative sequences in the form of turn completions start emerging increasingly in the data; this is one of the three examples at the end of the first semester where no apparent word search exists, unlike the collaborative sequence from lines 518 to 521. The difference between what happens in the collaborative sequence that includes a word search (518–521) and in this one (526–527) is that in the former, we have a self-initiated other-repair that alerts the listener and projects a completion, whereas the latter requires a higher level of (that is, more attentive) listenership (i.e., demonstration of active listenership) so as to fine-tune the temporality and syntactic structure of the delivery. This is why these two types (collaborative completions with and without word searches) have been coded differently for post-analytic treatment and are considered to be at the far end of the listenership continuum.

What follows in line 528 is a prosodically marked and repeated confirmation token (*yes yes*) by BUS, displaying agreement. In line 530, SED, who initiated the word search in line 518, obtains the floor and using a turn-initial conjunction (*and*) elaborates on the topic in a multi-unit turn till the end of line 537. While she is providing this elaboration, AYS in line 532 and BUS in line 536 provide listenership tokens. It should be noted that SED also initiates a formulation marking reported speech (*büşra you said*) and provides a reformulation (*he lost he-his confidence*) of what BUS said earlier in line 525, demonstrating understanding (as opposed to only claiming).

The analysis of Extract 2 reveals that at the end of the semester, the students perform the discussion tasks differently in terms of how they display and demonstrate active listenership, by taking more rapid turns, attending to word searches by offering alternative wordings and completing turns by format tying and using syntactically more complex structures. Their discussions, to use a metaphor, become less institutionalized, moving from a debate environment (like in Extract 1) to a more natural discussion, in which active listenership as is demonstrated here seems to play an important role. It looks like there is a tendency to maintain such a format, as the analyses of the interactions in the second semester illustrate.

In Extract 3, which comes from recording time 5 (mid-second semester), we witness a diversification of actions performed through turn completions and collaborative turn sequences. In this particular recording, the students are discussing the use of foreign words in Turkish, mainly referring to borrowings and loan words.

Extract 3: Time 5, 2–31_3–19

723 AYS: er: we: find er:: new er turkish words to: .hh er::
 724 (0.7)
 725 BUS: yes:
 726 AYS: equal to [er:]foreign ↑words (0.3) but er:
 727 BUS: [yes]
 728 AYS: some er we can: er ↑can't find
 729 a Turkish (.) er word sometimes=
 730 SED: =for [example] er [to () fax]
 731 AYS: [(false)] [oturgaçlı götürgeç]
 732 SED: or er:
 733 AYS: belgege[çer
 734 SED: [belgege↑çer its too long and its
 735 its <produ:cing> is hard [I t↑hink
 736 BUS: [yes yes
 737 BUS: er it hap↑pen (.) it's ekceptable to use this er::
 738 this words from foreign language.
 739 >for example ↑fax< fax is er:: sho:rt and
 740 easy to: ↑use .hh belgege↑çer is (.) very ↑lo:ng
 741 and er:: (0.3) not used.

From lines 723 to 729, AYS engages in a multi-unit telling in which she explains that sometimes it is easy to find equivalent Turkish words for foreign borrowings (lines 723–726), but sometimes it is not (728–729). Her telling is oriented to with listenership tokens in lines 725 and 727. BUS's production of *yes:* in line 725 follows a stretched hesitation marker and 0.7 second of silence, and thus looks like a continuer offering the right to the floor to AYS. In line 730, SED demonstrates active listenership by tying her utterance to AYS's with no silence in between, using a formulaic phrase (*for [example]*) and providing an immediate example: *to fax*. This is also oriented to by AYS as she provides a Turkish alternative translation for a bus (*otobüs*) in line 731: *oturgaçlı götürgeç*.⁵ Furthermore, following the discourse marker *or* produced in line 732 by SED, which prompts the listener to provide an alternative, AYS provides the Turkish version of *fax*, *belgegeçer*, completing what is projected in line 732. Overlapping with the end of the word produced by AYS, SED obtains the floor and criticizes the use of the Turkish version of the word *fax* due to its length by using a stance-marking formulaic expression (*I think*), overlapped with an agreement marker in line 736 by BUS. With this agreement marker BUS claims the floor and elaborates on the point made by SED, justifying the use of foreign words from line 737 to 741 by taking 'ease of use' as the main criterion.

This extract has explicated the diverse use of listenership tokens, for example, how they are used to accomplish actions like agreement (line 736), as also evidenced by the elaboration provided at the end of the

extract. More importantly, it has also shown that turn completions accomplish diverse interactional practices, including ‘providing an immediate example.’ The interlocutors also start attending to discourse markers that project actions, like *or* projecting a subsequent alternative (*belgegeçer* instead of *fax*). These are instances of demonstration of active listenership, which have increased in number and diversified in terms of functions over time. Extract 4 is also a case in point. It comes from the final recording of the year. This time the group is discussing the age difference between married partners. In addition to an example of format tying, the analysis will also show how word searches are attended to more quickly as listeners become more attentive to immediately preceding turns-at-talk.

Extract 4: Time 6, 6–39_7–10

```

12  SED: er and(.)also there is a er: one view(.)in the soci↑ety
13      .h er think(.)like ↑that (0.7)womans get older er::
14      >get older< (0.8)er: how can [i say ↑FASTER ]↑than,
15  BUS:                                     [the view of them]
16  BUS: huh.=
17  AYS: =°yes yes°=
18  SED: =mans (.) because they er giv[e]
19  AYS:                                     [t]heir >biological<.=
20  SED: their fbiologica[lf]
21  AYS:                                     [si]tua↓t[ions.]
22  SED:                                     [ye::s] (.) .h because they,
23      when they have a ba↑by .hh er::h (0.7)they effort (.)
24      a lot of:(0.6)er °give effort how can [i say° ? ]
25  BUS:                                     [ye:s give]effort.

```

In line 12, SED starts her turn by referring to a view in the society (*there is a er: one view (.) in the society*). Possibly trying to put forward that women get older faster than men do, she initiates a word search before being able to propose her argument, observable through the hesitation markers, restart (*>get older<*), 0.8 second of silence and the explicit word-search marker (*how can i say*). However, compared to the word-search sequence exemplified in Extract 2, this search does not include over-long silences, as an alternative understanding (*the view of them*) is introduced at the onset of the word-search marker. Yet BUS aborts her completion as she notices that the candidate phrase she offered was wrong, as evidenced by SED’s production of the sought-after word (*FASTER than*) and the change-of-state token in line 16. Preceded by listenership tokens that display understanding by AYS in line 17, SED goes on to provide an account (*because they er give*) for her argument.

Her account giving is interrupted and overlapped by AYS’s completion (*their >biological<*), which starts a collaborative sequence as SED takes this up in line 20, and AYS further completes the noun phrase with a word in line 21 (*situat ions.*). Note that the turns are format-tied, fitting

Figure 5.6 illustrates that there is a continuum from low frequency to higher frequency in the total number of turn completions in collaborative sequences, ranging from 1 (the minimum) in recording time 1 to 17 (the maximum) in recording time 6. The students engaged in turn completions only once at the beginning of the semester, eight times in the second recording time and seven times in the third, amounting to 16 times in the first semester. During the second semester, on the other hand, there are 38 instances of turn completions in total: 15 at the beginning of the semester, 6 in the fifth recording time and 17 at the end of the semester. As the descriptive frequencies suggest, there is no steady development, starting from the lowest and increasing in a meaningful way in each recording over time. However, the difference between the total frequencies in each semester (16 vs. 38), and the difference between the first recording at the beginning of the year and the last recording at the end of the year, is striking (1 vs. 17).

As argued earlier in the chapter, the turn completions in collaborative turn sequences which include word searches are different in terms of the way they demonstrate active listenership. The ones that include word searches form a self-initiated other-repair, alerting the interlocutor within a micro-second level, and thus demonstrate, I would argue, less attentive listenership compared to turn completions that are latched to the previous turn and are generally tied in terms of grammatical format. Figure 5.7 illustrates the case in point.

When we exclude word searches from our calculations of turn completions, we again see an obvious difference between the totals when semester 1 (7 instances) and semester 2 (19 instances) are compared.

Figure 5.7 A plot analysis of turn completions with word searches excluded

Furthermore, there is no occurrence at the beginning of the first semester. Recording time 2 features four instances, and recording time 3, the last recording of the first semester, features three instances. In the second semester, although there is an increase in the total number of instances, this increase is not linear: at the beginning of the second semester, in recording time 4, we see nine instances. Then in recording time 5 this number decreases to two, and in the final recording of the year there are eight. Figure 5.8 represents the continuum of development over time when all instances of turn completions are considered.

If we even slightly consider these increasing instances of demonstrations of active listenership as indicators of developing interactional repertoires and IC, how would we argue for an increased performance for an individual student? Put another way, can we correlate these findings to make judgments about individual performance? It is obvious that these students did not produce equal numbers of turn completions, as Figure 5.9 indicates.

According to this figure, AYS produced 50% of the total turn completions throughout the year, whereas BUS produced 31% of them while SED produced 19% of them. Figure 5.10 illustrates the individual quantitative difference in performance when word searches are excluded from the calculation.

Figure 5.10 shows that AYS produced 54% of the total number, whereas BUS, like in the total percentages, produced 31%, and SED 15%. These results, overall, clearly indicate that AYS is the student who completed turns more than the other two students. Can this be an indicator of a relatively higher level of individual competency? Should we also consider other possibilities, like the accuracy of the linguistic resources employed, conversational dominance or a potential moderator role? Can one build

Figure 5.8 Distribution of turn completions over time

Figure 5.9 Frequency chart of individual student differences in use of turn completions

Figure 5.10 Frequency chart of individual student differences in use of turn completions, excluding word searches

a correlation between demonstration of listenership and other indicators of individual competence? Can these findings be used to inform testing, or oral proficiency assessment situations? My first reaction would be a bold negative answer as a conversation analyst, delivered with a pinch

of hope for the positive answer as an applied linguist. I will elaborate on these issues in the following section.

Discussion and Conclusion

In this chapter, I have proposed and illustrated the interplay between turn completions and active listenership, arguing for increased and diversified demonstration of active listenership as an indicator of L2 IC. In doing so, I have provided an analysis of collaborative completions in a longitudinal corpus of L2 interactional discussion tasks. The analysis has shown that interactants started using more collaborative completions to demonstrate active listenership over time. Additionally, a closer analysis of the completions has illustrated the diversification of interactional resources over time, including deployment of (1) subordinate clause completion, (2) offers of candidate lexical items and (3) turn-initial conjunctions. The findings regarding the increased and more diversified interactional resources, as well as grammatically more complex use of them, are in line with recent findings from other L2 contexts (e.g., Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015). The post-analytic quantification brought further quantitative support to the claims, at the risk of decontextualizing IC as individual performance. Such a take on IC may be considered by testers as necessary if assessing individual performance based on paired interactions is a goal. Before moving on to the issue of testing, I will elaborate on the demonstration of active listenership in relation to IC.

In earlier work, Stubbe (1998) provided a functional continuum or gradient which illustrates listeners' degree of involvement with speakers' utterances. The continuum shows "low involvement" at one end (e.g., with minimal responses from listeners), with resources that can be produced "automatically and still appear sufficiently attentive" (p. 259) to the speakers' utterances. The other end of the continuum includes listener behaviors that display "high involvement" with the speaker, and the model is "a useful means of distinguishing the different degrees of both positive affect and interactional involvement signalled by a listener's feedback in informal conversation" (p. 259). If active listenership is a *goal* to be attained by L2 users, then we need to be able to bring evidence for a continuum of responsive actions, ranging from claims of listenership at one end and demonstration of active listenership at the other end. The difference between a claim and a demonstration in this continuum shall be parallel to Sacks's (1992) conceptualization of claims and demonstrations of understanding, a distinction that has more recently been investigated by Mondada (2011). While claims of listenership may be automatic and do not guarantee understanding of the previous turn-at-talk, demonstration of active listenership requires attentive listening for an L2 speaker, and can be demonstrated through, for instance, collaborative

completions that include format tying at the morpho-syntactic level. Figure 5.11 illustrates such a continuum.

A speaker can display listenership in a variety of ways, for example, by engaging in mutual gaze, a head nod or a minimal recipient token at one end or by producing a completion at the syntactic boundary at the other. I argue that with regard to L2 IC as a locally situated and co-constructed phenomenon, as has been depicted in CA-for-SLA research, both the gaze behavior and the syntactic completion are interactional accomplishments, and their import to an external examiner of the interaction cannot be gradable. If such listenership behaviors are, however, decontextualized to analyze relative individual performance both at a specific moment in time and in all occurrences in different times, we may potentially start observing interactional change across time, hence the development of interactional repertoires. Our analyses of L2 discussion tasks have shown that collaborative completions increase over time, and their forms and functions also start showing variations as the interactants become more experienced discussants. One may attribute this development to the increasing experience of L2 users, or to, at a micro-level, their development as attentive listeners with increased language abilities who increasingly demonstrate active listenership. Such attribution, however, can be questioned, as Hellermann (2018) argues: to what do we attribute the change we observe, the individual or the context? It appears that although the findings of the present study, especially the post-analytic quantification, can be questionable with regard to its conceptualization of IC as individual performance, they may prove valuable for testing circles.

Galaczi (2014) was one of the first scholars to investigate the interactional achievements of test takers who had been allocated to top-down proficiency levels. Proficiency levels (A1, A2, etc.) are attributed to learners drawing on a mixture of performance indicators, generally based on linguistic performance. Looking into the interactional achievements (e.g., collaborative completions) of learners in these different proficiency groups, then, may be slightly misleading. Testing situations in the form of, for instance, paired or group interactions also pose a challenge as the focus is interactional co-constructions, but the assessment to be done is

Figure 5.11 The listenership continuum

for individual students. In my post-analytic treatment of findings, I tried to make a case for this argument by revealing the individual students' performance based on frequency counts. Using these numbers to attribute levels of proficiency is a challenge to be tackled by researchers. However, descriptions of such achievements can nevertheless inform test designers in some ways, as Dings (2014) argues:

It could be revealing to analyze learners at various oral proficiency levels to see whether the development of the interactional resources appears to correlate to general oral proficiency levels.

(p. 753)

Demonstrations of active listenership, then, warrant further research as such listener behaviors require the attentive listening that a test situation or a mundane interaction requires, and there are promising developments in the field documenting how interactants accomplish a variety of actions, including collaborative resolution of interactional troubles (Hırçın Çoban, 2017) in contexts like oral proficiency interviews and paired interactions. The interactional resources found can potentially be correlated with linguistic resources that are revealed, so as to present a picture of a possible relationship between interactional resources and linguistic competence at different levels. Yet again, it should be noted that correlations based on coding have the risk of leading to premature quantification, since in contexts like discussion tasks, one can expect different factors like socialization to have an impact on listener behavior.

The oral communication skills course syllabus that facilitated both in-class and out-of-class discussions for this student group may also have been influential in the development of interactional resources. The course and the discussion tasks provided the venue for interaction in the first place. Presenting a different participant profile compared to participants in L2 in-the-wild studies (Wagner, 2015), learners in EFL contexts who get relatively fewer opportunities to speak rely on the achievements of course designers for instructed language learning. In such contexts, authentic tasks play a more important role than they do in contexts where the L2 is readily available outside of the classroom. Therefore, course designs that facilitate interactions with others in the immediate environment (e.g., Kunitz & Yeh, this volume), online task designs that facilitate L2 interaction within groups (e.g. Balaman, 2016; Balaman & Sert, 2017b) and activities with those at a distance (Çimenli, 2017) play an important role for language learners and should be encouraged.

Finally, it is important that IC be grounded on a robust methodological, conceptual and analytical base, which will motivate and encourage more researchers to carry out future investigations into L2 interaction as a local accomplishment. The field of language learning and teaching needs more research on actual language use rather than perceptions of or beliefs about

it. It is obvious that the term *IC* is going through a ‘phase,’ with conceptualizations offered by leading scholars (Hall, 2018; Hauser, this volume; Hellermann, 2018; Markee, this volume). Such debates are always welcome in applied linguistics, and an element of criticality generally fuels development. With this intellectual dialogue, I hope, development of L2 interactional resources will always be a focus of investigation to generate practical solutions for learners and teachers. There are only few methodologies other than CA that can enable this goal, and whatever conceptualization of IC is taken up by future researchers, there is a good chance that each study will enhance our understanding as long as it is true to the methodology.

Notes

- 1 Although the term *expanding circle*, referring to countries like Turkey in which English is used as a foreign language “with few in-country uses” (Lowenberg, 2002, p. 431), was not too problematic in its historical context of use, today’s realities of Extramural English (Sundqvist, 2009) in a globally interconnected world pose a threat to the validity of this term.
- 2 *To attend* to here is used in the sense of the origins of the word in Middle English, that is, “to apply one’s mind or energies to” (Oxford Dictionary).
- 3 It should be noted here that the term *attentive listening* in this chapter is not parallel to its connotation as a concept that is part of communicative competence (Cook, 1999). It also shies away from the kind of attention referred to by Schegloff (1982). In my use of the word, in *TALK-in-interaction*, attentive listening has more to do with a recipient’s linguistic demonstration (as opposed to a claim; see Mondada, 2011) of a level of ‘understanding,’ which possibly involves and even temporally follows ‘listening’ that is attentive; hence attentive listening. Understanding an immediately preceding utterance, of course, is also possible through a simultaneous orientation to other modalities too, but in a context where a recipient is producing a format-tying utterance with little or no gap (e.g., a turn completion), it seems that the orientation is mostly linguistic. If so, it is a result of primarily attentive listening, possibly combined with other cues.
- 4 Studies with similar groups of students show that their proficiency level is around B2 according to according to the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)* descriptors. See Bardakçi (2015) for an example.
- 5 *Çok oturmaçlı götürgeç* refers to *otobüs* (a bus) and literally translates as ‘a vehicle with many seats’ but is not a presently used word in Turkish. Many people believe that the term was offered by the Turkish Language Association (TDK; a government body) as an alternative to the previously used English-origin Turkish word *otobüs*. *Çok oturmaçlı götürgeç* is still used to make fun of or criticize the policies of the TDK. However, the TDK’s attempt to make people use this word is an urban myth, as argued by Prof. Dr. Şükrü Halûk Akalın (online).

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the feedback I received from the audience during the Interactional Competence symposium organized at Rice University- (CLIC-2016) and during the IC colloquium in IPRA 2017.

References

- Akalın, S. H. (2017, October 30). Bir şehir efsanesinin öyküsü. Retrieved from www.akalin.gen.tr/TR,195/bir-sehir-efsanesinin-oykusu.html
- Anthony, L. (2014). *Antconc 3.2. 4m*. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University.
- Balaman, U. (2016). *A conversation analytic study on the development of interactional competence in English in an online task-oriented environment* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Balaman, U., & Sert, O. (2017a). Local contingencies in L2 tasks: A comparison of context-sensitive interactional achievements across two different task types. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 10(3), 9–27.
- Balaman, U., & Sert, O. (2017b). Development of L2 interactional resources for online collaborative task accomplishment. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30(7), 601–630. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1334667>
- Bardakci, M. (2015). Turkish EFL pre-service teachers' pronunciation problems. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 10(16), 2370–2378.
- Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(4), 479–507.
- Beach, W. (1993). Transitional regularities for 'casual' 'okay' usages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 325–352.
- Cekaite, A. (2017). What makes a child a good language learner? Interactional competence, identity, and immersion in a Swedish classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 45–61.
- Çimenli, B. (2017). Rolling the ball back: Topic maintenance in computer mediated English as a lingua franca interactions (Unpublished MA Thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Cook, H. M. (1999). Language socialization in Japanese elementary schools: Attentive listening and reaction turns. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(11), 1443–1465.
- Dings, A. (2014). Interactional competence and the development of alignment activity. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 742–756.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Cadierno, T. (2015). Advancing usage-based approaches to L2 studies. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 1–16). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Galaczi, E. D. (2014). Interactional competence across proficiency levels: How do learners manage interaction in paired speaking tests? *Applied Linguistics*, 35(5), 553–574.
- Gardner, R. (2001). *When listeners talk: Response tokens and listener stance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gardner, R. (2004). *Acknowledging strong ties between utterances in talk: Connections through right as a response token*. Proceedings of the 2004 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society. The University of Sydney, July 13–15 2004.
- Hall, J. K. (2018). From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires: Reconceptualising the objects of L2 learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 25–39.
- Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.) (2011). *The development of interactional competence*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hauser, E. (2011). On the danger of exogenous theory in CA-for-SLA: A response to Hellermann and Cole (2009). *Applied Linguistics*, 32(3), 348–352.

- He, A. W., & Young, R. F. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. In R. F. Young & A. W. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 1–24). Philadelphia, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, J. (2011). Members' methods, members' competencies: Evidence of language learning in longitudinal studies of other-initiated repair. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *The development of interactional competence*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, J. (2018). Linguaging as competencing: considering language learning as enactment. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 40–56.
- Hırçın Çoban, M. (2017). Resolving interactional troubles in paired oral proficiency assessment in an English as a foreign language context (Unpublished MA Thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and the literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching*, 25(1), 1–14.
- Lerner, G. H. (2004). Collaborative turn sequences. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 225–256). Amsterdam, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins.
- Lilja, N., & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2018). Connecting the language classroom and the wild: Re-enactments of language use experiences. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(5), 694–717.
- Lowenberg, P. H. (2002). Assessing English proficiency in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, 21(3), 431–435.
- Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(3), 404–427.
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 491–500.
- Markee, N., & Kunitz, S. (2015). CA-for-SLA studies of classroom interaction: Quo vadis? In N. Markee (Ed.), *Classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 425–439). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McCarthy, M. J. (2002). Good listenership made plain: Non-minimal response tokens in British and American spoken English. In R. Reppen, D. Biber, & S. Fitzpatrick (Eds.), *Using corpora to explore linguistic variation* (pp. 49–71). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mondada, L. (2011). Understanding as an embodied, situated and sequential achievement in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), 542–552.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2017, March). *The development of L2 interactional competence: 'Methods' for action and grammar-for-interaction*. Plenary talk given at the conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Portland, USA.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Elaborations on L2 interactional competence: The development of L2 grammar-for-interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 3–24.

- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2018). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(4), 555–578. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw021>
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–268). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation [1964–72]*, 2 Vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of ‘uh huh’ and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 71–93). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Sert, O. (2016, April–May). *Active listenership as an indicator of L2 interactional competence: Insights from an ‘oral communication skills’ course*. Paper presented at the Symposium on the Teaching and Testing of L2 Interactional Competence, Houston, USA.
- Sert, O. (2017a). Creating opportunities for l2 learning in a prediction activity. *System*, 70, 14–25.
- Sert, O. (2017b, April). *Tracking an L2 speaker’s use of complementizer that in discussion tasks*. Paper presented at the conference Thinking, Doing, Learning, Munich, Germany.
- Sert, O. (2017c, July). *The interplay between collaborative sequences and active listenership: Implications for L2 interactional competence*. Paper presented at the 15th conference of the International Pragmatics Association, Belfast, Ireland.
- Sert, O. (forthcoming). Transforming CA findings into future L2 teaching practices: Challenges and prospects for teacher education. In S. Kunitz, N. Markee, & O. Sert (Eds.), *Emerging issues in classroom discourse and interaction: Theoretical and applied CA perspectives on pedagogy*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Sert, O., & Balaman, U. (2018). Orientations to negotiated language and task rules in online L2 interaction. *ReCALL*, 30(3), 355–374. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344017000325>
- Sert, O., & Walsh, S. (2013). The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education*, 27(6), 542–565.
- Stubbe, M. (1998). Are you listening? Cultural influences on the use of supportive verbal feedback in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 29(3), 257–289.
- Sundqvist, P. (2009). *Extramural English matters: Out-of-school English and its impact on Swedish ninth graders’ oral proficiency and vocabulary* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Karlstad University, Karlstad.
- Taguchi, N. (2014). Development of interactional competence in Japanese as a second language: Use of incomplete sentences as interactional resources. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(2), 518–535.
- Wagner, J. (2015). Designing for language learning in the wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen

- (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 75–101). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. New York: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. London: Routledge.
- Waring, H. Z. (2018). Teaching L2 interactional competence: Problems and possibilities. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 57–67.
- Watanabe, A. (2017). Developing L2 interactional competence: increasing participation through self-selection in post-expansion sequences. *Classroom Discourse*, 8(3), 271–293.
- Xu, J. (2014). Displaying status of reciprocity through reactive tokens in Mandarin task-oriented interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 74, 33–51.

6 Developing and Teaching Interactional Competence in Japanese Style Shifting

Naoko Taguchi and Dina Rudolph Yoshimi

Introduction

Early models of communicative competence in second language learning (Bachman & Palmer, 1996, 2010; Canale & Swain, 1980) conceptualized language ability as a psycholinguistic trait that exists within individuals independent from context. Recently language competence has been reconceptualized in a broader framework that focuses on dynamic and dialogic aspects of communication. Most notable in this shift is the emergence of *interactional competence* (Hall, 1995; Hall, Hellermann, & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Young, 2008, 2011), which views language ability as locally situated and shared among participants in ongoing discourse. In this view, a communicative act is not a construct of an individual participant: it is jointly constructed by all participants as they orient themselves towards the mutual goal of meaning making and use their linguistic and interactional resources to achieve this goal. Adopting this theoretical framework, this chapter presents interactional competence in L2 Japanese by describing linguistic and interactional resources that enable participants to co-construct social actions in Japanese.

Young (2008) categorizes three types of resources for a successful interaction: identity, linguistic and interactional. *Identity resources* refer to the positioning of participants to each other, involving features like people's roles, social status and relationships. *Linguistic resources* involve linguistic forms (e.g., grammar and lexis) that characterize a communicative event and help construct interpersonal and textual meanings. The last area, *interactional resources*, is most relevant to the present chapter. Interactional resources help participants construct meaning with others in collaboration. These resources assist participants' understanding of discourse organization and the communicative act at hand, which in turn facilitates their contribution to the joint meaning-making process. Young (2008) presents four areas of interactional resources: *speech acts*, which involve the sequential organization of a communicative act; *turn-taking*, with which participants manage transfer of speakership in a conversation; *repair*, in which participants solve a communication problem; and *boundaries*, in which participants distinguish different communicative activities.

This chapter focuses on the last area, the ability to signal discourse boundaries, as an index of interactional competence in Japanese. Boundaries are defined as “opening and closing acts of a particular practice that serve to distinguish a given practice from adjacent talk” (Young, 2008: 71). Different communicative practices draw on different linguistic and interactional conventions. Small talk provides one example. The structure, content and forms of small talk among friends at a party are markedly different from those among strangers in a supermarket check-out line. To become interactionally competent, one needs to develop the ability to recognize different communicative activities and shift between activities expertly through deploying expected linguistic and interactional resources.

This chapter examines style shifting as an interactional resource for signaling discourse boundaries in Japanese. We will first present a description of two primary speech styles—the *desu/masu* and plain form—and style shifting between the forms. Then, we will present empirical data on Japanese learners’ style shifting. The data come from 18 students during a semester study abroad in Japan. The students were tasked with conversing with a same-age peer, but the researcher occasionally joined the conversation, asking questions and commenting on the ongoing topic. The data illustrate how students’ use of the *desu/masu* and plain forms shift from the time when they converse only with their peer (two-way dialogue) to the time when they converse with their peer and the researcher (three-way dialogue). The rest of the chapter will present pedagogical implications for beginning learners of Japanese. Because introductory-level Japanese textbooks exclusively focus on the *desu/masu* form, neglecting the plain form in instruction (e.g., Cook, 2008), learners are often on their own to discern the potential for the co-existence of the two speech forms. We argue that this approach to instruction can be revised by introducing style shifting earlier in the curriculum through awareness raising. We will illustrate an indexical approach to teaching speech styles with exemplifying instructional activities.

Japanese Speech Styles and Style Shifting

Two clause-ending forms in Japanese, the *desu/masu* form and the plain form, are recognized as two primary speech styles that index social meanings of formality, affect and distance, among others (Cook, 2006; Ikuta, 2008; Maynard, 1993; Okamoto, 1999). In the *desu/masu* form, the copula *desu* comes after nouns, adjectives and adjectival verbs, and the suffix *masu* is attached as a verb ending. The plain form is the non-honorific counterpart of the *desu/masu* form. It involves the dictionary form of verbs and adjectives, and *da/dearu* following nouns and adverbs, which is often omitted in spoken discourse. In the examples below (Figure 6.1), the *desu/masu* form is underlined, and the plain form is in bold. (Appendix A contains grammatical glosses.) Both sentences have the same meaning, but the copulas attached to the noun differ: the *desu/masu* form *desu* in (1), and the plain form *da* in (2).

1) <i>Desu/masu</i> form	Ano	sensei	wa	shinsetsu	<u>desu.</u>
	that	teacher	TOP	kind	COP
	'That teacher is kind.'				
2) Plain form	Ano	sensei	wa	shinsetsu	da.
	that	teacher	TOP	kind	COP
	'That teacher is kind.'				

Figure 6.1

Consciously or subconsciously, people make a choice between the plain and *desu/masu* forms in a conversation, unless they elect to use an incomplete clause ending. Traditionally the *desu/masu* form is associated with formal speech addressed to out-group members (people who are older, of higher status and non-intimate), and the plain form with informal speech addressed to in-group members (people of lower status and age, and in an intimate relationship) (Ide, 1989). However, the indexical approach maintains that there is no one-to-one mapping between contextual features and speech style: rather, Japanese speakers shift between these forms in a single conversation by attending not only to static contextual features but also to dynamic ones, such as sequential turns, the addressee's attitudes and interpersonal distance (Cook, 2006, 2008; Fukushima, 2007; Geyer, 2013; Ikuta, 2008; Masuda, 2016; Nazikian, 2010; Okamoto, 2011), as in the following TV interview excerpt adapted from Nazikian (2010) (Figure 6.2).

- 1 A: *ikutsu?*
how old
'How old are you?'
- 2 B: 56 desu yo.
56 COP FP
'I'm 56.'
- 3 A: *watashi kara mitara wakai to omoi masu kedo ne*
I from saw-IF young QT think COP but FP
'From my point of view, I think you are young, but.'
- 4 B: *so iwareru to ureshii n desu kedo demo yappari*
so told NOM glad NOM COP but but after all
- 5 *zutto sorebakkari matte ikiteiru wakeniwaikanai*
all along that-only wait-TE live-PROG cannot afford to
- 'I'm glad to be told so, but after all, I can't afford to live waiting only that all along.'

Figure 6.2

The interviewer asks a question in the plain form (bolded text) in line 1, and the interviewee responds using the *desu/masu* form (underlined text). Instead of sticking to the same speech style, the speakers change their style. The interviewer switches to the *desu/masu* form in line 3, whereas the interviewee shifts to the plain form in lines 4 and 5. Notably, the interviewee uses both speech forms adjacent to each other in a single turn (lines 4–5). Each speaker's choice indicates a variety of social meanings. The use of the plain form in line 1 conveys solidarity, while the *desu/masu* form in lines 2–4 conveys formality and distance. The speaker also uses the plain form to express spontaneous feelings, as in line 5.

As described above, style shifting is a common phenomenon in a Japanese conversation. Studies have revealed that a shift from the *desu/masu* to the plain form occurs when the speaker expresses a spontaneous assertion of emotions and thoughts, soliloquy-like remarks, evaluations, solidarity and empathy (Cook, 2002, 2008; Fukushima, 2007; Geyer, 2013; Ikuta, 2008; Makino, 2002; Okamoto, 1999). In contrast, a shift from the plain to the *desu/masu* form can index psychological distance, presentation of the public self and authoritative voice. Okamoto (2011) also showed that the speaker's agency—the affective stance the speaker wants to project to the listener—determines the choice of a particular speech style. These findings show that static situational elements alone cannot determine the shifting between speech styles.

Style shifting is a mundane but critical linguistic resource that people use to project certain social meanings. People need to know which speech style to use to index social meanings of formality, familiarity and affect. At the same time, they must understand how to shift between different speech styles responding to dynamic contextual features such as participation frameworks and speakers' attitudes. These contextual features are constantly changing in ongoing discourse and thus create the potential for boundaries within talk, which become visible with linguistic and non-linguistic features marking those boundaries. Style shifting is a linguistic signal of discourse boundaries. Style shifting indicates people's understanding of the changing discourse context, as well as their ability to respond to the change and transit between activities. Style shifting also creates changes in the discourse context.

Acquisition of Speech Styles and Style Shifting in L2 Japanese

A long-standing belief among communities of Japanese language teachers is that the dynamic and complex nature of style shifting makes it difficult for learners of Japanese to acquire its proper use. Consistent with this belief (and perhaps because of the grammatical simplicity of the *desu/masu* form), Japanese instructional materials typically introduce the *desu/masu* form at the beginning of instruction and do not introduce the plain form until much later; as a result, learners tend to use the *desu/masu* form as their default style

and do not deploy the plain form. While claims regarding the difficulty of speech styles are ubiquitous (and style shifting is not even mentioned), previous literature suggests that community experience has a positive effect on their acquisition (Cook, 2008; Iwasaki, 2011; McMeekin, 2014). For example, Iwasaki (2010) analyzed oral proficiency interviews between learners of Japanese and a native speaker instructor. All learners predominantly used the *desu/masu* form at the beginning of the study-abroad program. However, at the end of the term, two learners used the plain form as their base style (about 70%) in the formal interview when the *desu/masu* style was appropriate. They consistently and appropriately shifted to the *desu/masu* form when asking the interviewer questions or making a request, indicating that their overuse of the plain form was related to their subjective choice of styles based on the social meanings they acquired through socialization while abroad.

Indeed, several studies have revealed how learners acquire the indexical uses of speech style through socialization (Cook, 2008; Iwasaki, 2011; McMeekin, 2014). These studies focused on homestays as a context where learners gain access to different speech styles and their social meanings. In McMeekin's (2014) study, learners predominantly used the *desu/masu* form with their host family, but a few learners started using the plain form as they became socialized into the daily routines of their homestay. For example, through routine exchanges about food with a host mother, one learner recognized that emphatic utterances like *oishii* ('It's delicious!') take the plain form because they index self-directed thoughts and emotions. The student gradually adopted the plain form in these emphatic expressions by repeating them after her host mother. Socialization into speech styles occurred through the host mother's modeling of the appropriate speech style in a daily exchange, her prompting the learner to participate in the exchange, and the learner's repetition of the exchange.

Although these studies documented acquisition of speech styles while abroad, empirical findings are limited when it comes to the acquisition of style *shifting*. Research on native speakers of Japanese has established that shifting between speech forms is not arbitrary: speakers strategically implement their speech styles turn-by-turn to index their public identities and situational meanings (e.g., Cook, 2008; Geyer, 2013; Okamoto, 2011). For example, analyses of professor-student conversations confirmed that participants do not always conform to the traditional view of speech forms tied to social position, i.e., professors' higher status marked with their use of the plain form and students' lower status marked with their use of the *desu/masu* form (Cook, 2006; Masuda, 2016; Okamoto, 1999). Instead, professors and students shift between the *desu/masu* and plain forms. Professors often opt for the *desu/masu* form to index their professional identity and deference, but they also switch to the plain form to display their affective stance. Similarly, students occasionally shift to the plain form to express emotions, make a soliloquy-like remark or co-construct the professor's utterance.

How do learners of Japanese develop knowledge of this intricate, dynamic style shifting? Through socialization into style shifting, students

in a study-abroad context may develop the understanding that style shifting is an important interactional resource to construct a variety of stances and social personae. They may also gain the understanding that these different stances and personae projected by style shifting are part of their interactional resources for signaling discourse boundaries. The next section addresses this issue of L2 style shifting with empirical data collected in a study-abroad program.

Japanese Learners' Style Shifting¹

This section presents data collected from 18 international students in a private university in Tokyo (Taguchi, 2015). Students were paired randomly and instructed to have a free, informal conversation with their peer on everyday topics for 20 minutes. Their conversations were recorded at the beginning and end of the semester (three months). Although the task was set up as a peer-to-peer interaction, the researcher participated in the conversation occasionally to introduce variation in the participation framework. We analyzed whether students' speech styles changed between the time when they conversed with their peer and the researcher, and the time when they conversed only with their peer. These changes were considered as students' act of signaling transitions across boundaries corresponding to different participation frameworks. In a peer-to-peer conversation, a certain level of informality might be expected because of a shared background between students, but this framework may change in a conversation when a third person with a different background (the researcher as an older Japanese professor) is present. Style shifting can serve as an interactional resource that interposes a discourse boundary between spates of adjacent talk that are marked by interlocutors' orientation to a shift in the participation framework.

A total of 18 conversations were analyzed (conversations of nine student pairs recorded at the beginning and end of the semester). While the majority of the conversation was two-way (between students), about 40% of the conversation (based on the time spent) was three-way (the researcher and two students). The conversations were transcribed and coded for three utterance-ending forms: the *desu/masu* form, the plain form and utterances in which neither the *desu/masu* nor the plain form was used.² Percentages of these utterance-ending types were compared over the semester to track change.

In the conversations recorded at the beginning of the semester, the *desu/masu* and plain forms appeared at the same rate, 48% and 46% respectively. This pattern changes dramatically at the end of the semester, where the plain forms increased to 70%, whereas the *desu/masu* forms decreased to 15%. Several students demonstrated sensitivity to the changing participation structure and differentiated speech styles according to the addressee. We will highlight a case of student R. In the end-of-the-semester

conversation, this student used the *desu/masu* form less than 2% of the time during two-way conversation when talking only with her peer, while the frequency jumped up to almost 50% during three-way talk when the researcher joined the conversation. At the beginning of the semester, however, this student used the *desu/masu* form predominantly (83%–95%), regardless of the participants' membership.

Excerpt 1 (Figure 6.3) illustrates R's style shifting from a two-way to a three-way conversation at the end of the semester (Taguchi, 2015: 92–93). When conversing with her peer alone, R marked all utterance endings with the plain form, but she shifted to the *desu/masu* form when the researcher joined the conversation (line 10). Noteworthy was the false start associated with shifting. In line 13, when telling a story about her part-time job in a Japanese restaurant, R first uses the plain form in *shiteita* ('was doing'). Then she repairs it to the *desu/masu* form *shiteimasu* in line 14. This self-repair happens again in lines 18–19. R first produces the plain form *haitta* ('entered'), and then repairs to the *desu/masu* form (*hairimashita*). In both cases, T does not respond to R's self-repair. She responds unproblematically to R's use of the plain form and thus does not orient to the self-repair. T orients to the content of the talk rather than the speech form.

10	T	<i>senpai</i>
senior	<i>koohai?</i>
junior	<i>do,</i>
what kind of	<i>donna</i>	<i>keiken</i>
experience	<i>shi-ta?</i>
do-PST
		'senpai-kohai? What kind of experience did you have?'					
11	R	<i>hh.</i>
hh	<i>ano,</i>
well	<i>a::,</i>
ah	<i>senpai</i>
senior	<i>wa:</i>
TOP	
		'haha, well, ah... senior is...'					
12	T	<i>un.</i>
uh-huh	'uh-huh'				
13	R	<i>watashi wa</i>
I TOP	<i>ho:ru</i>
hall	<i>[no</i>
LK	<i>shi-tei-ta</i>
do-PROG-PST		
		'I was doing hall-related work'					
14	T	<i>[un.</i>
uh-huh
'uh-huh'					
15 →	R	<i>shite-imasu,</i>
do-PROG	<i>ano</i>
well	<i>soshite</i>
then	<i>isshoni</i>
together	<i>ho:ru</i>
hall	<i>o</i>
O
		do					
16		<i>hito</i>
person	<i>wa</i>
TOP	<i>watashi</i>
me			

'I am doing hall-related work. Well, then, there is another person who is doing hall-related work together.'

17	T	<i>un</i> yes 'yes,'	<i>un.</i> yes yes'				
18	R	<i>no:</i> LK	<i>sakini</i> before	<i>kono</i> this	<i>resutoran</i> restaurant	<i>ni</i> LOC	<i>hait-ta</i> enter-PST
19 →		[hairi, <i>mashi-ta.</i> enter-PST 'She entered this restaurant before me.'					
20	T	[<i>aa</i> ah 'I see.'	<i>aa.</i> ah				
21		Un. yes 'yes' (1.0)					

Figure 6.3 Excerpt 1

These self-repairs display R's attention to the different social meanings that the *desu/masu* and plain forms project. Grammatically, using a different speech form here causes no communication breakdown because the difference is localized at the morphological ending, not in meaning. This is evident in the researcher's continuer in line 14 (*un*), which displays that R's utterance is understood without a problem. Yet R proceeds to change it to the *desu/masu* form ending, thereby demonstrating her awareness of the indexical meaning of speech styles, and the inappropriateness of her use of the plain form. It seems that R treats the *desu/masu* form as a simple index of deference and formality and the plain form as an index of solidarity and familiarity. It is possible that R intentionally shifted from the plain to the *desu/masu* form as she moved from a dyad to a triad. Her style shifting served as a means to project a different 'self' to her peer and to the researcher across discourse boundaries.

In summary, empirical data in this section has illustrated one Japanese learner's interactional competence as indexed through her ability to style-shift appropriately corresponding to changing contextual dynamics. As shown in the case of this learner, during a semester stay in Japan, some learners developed awareness of the change in the participation framework (from dyad with a peer to triad with a peer and a teacher) and demonstrated the ability to differentiate speech style according to the shift occasioned by the arrival of the teacher. Style shifting was a reflection of their subjectivity and their strategic attempt to project different social meanings across contexts. Style shifting served as a linguistic tool for signaling transition across discourse boundaries.

Although the data illustrate the potential of study-abroad experiences and socialization to assist learners' style-shifting abilities, style shifting was observed only in a few learners' cases, indicating that the acquisition of style shifting is challenging for learners even with exposure in a study-abroad program. Japanese speakers style-shift to enact different social identities, but, quite often, this indexical use of speech styles is neither salient nor systematic, making it difficult for learners to notice the mapping between speech forms, social meanings and contexts.

The next section addresses this challenge involved in learning style shifting. We will present pedagogical approaches and instructional materials that help raise learners' awareness of this mundane but critical linguistic resource. Goals of the approaches are two-fold: to develop learners' understanding that two speech styles (the polite and plain forms) can co-exist in a single conversation and even within a single turn of talk, and that speakers often shift between these forms corresponding to changing contextual dynamics.

Teaching Japanese Speech Styles and Style Shifting

The understanding of the indexical nature of Japanese plain and *desu/masu* forms which underlies researcher insights on style shifting provides the impetus for a fundamental shift in the pedagogical approach to the instruction of these forms. As noted above, research on Japanese discourse has clearly indicated that speakers' use of plain and *desu/masu* forms in mundane talk-in-interaction is incompatible with the conventional 'either-or dichotomy' that characterizes much, if not most, textbook instruction on the two forms (e.g., polite form for formal situations and plain form for casual situations cf. Moody, 2014: 43). Specifically, researchers have found that speakers shift between forms within the same stretch of discourse and with the same interlocutor (Cook, 1998; Matsumoto, 2004).

These findings have compelled researchers in Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) to develop pedagogical approaches to teaching the plain and *desu/masu* forms that are compatible with the indexical view of the forms in two key ways: first, there has been a proposal to teach an expanded range of stances indexed by each form, respectively (Moody, 2014); and, second, there has been a demonstration of the need for explicit instruction that guides learner attention to the role of dynamic contextual features in the construction of highly situated indexical meanings (Ishida, 2001, 2009). In Moody's (2014) work, beginning-level learners in a Japanese classroom are presented with four contextual dimensions (i.e., formality, familiarity, social position and affective distance) which may be indexed by the plain and *desu/masu* forms. Notably, these dimensions are not mutually exclusive, making it possible for several dimensions of the context to be in competition with each other at any particular moment in an interaction. For example, when speaking to a peer, the reciprocal use of the plain form might be assumed

because of familiarity, but if the situation is confrontational in nature (e.g., the speaker challenges the sincerity of the peer's words), affective distance may be co-constructed between the two interlocutors through style shifting. Thus, while instruction is still organized around a set of dichotomous choices, the pedagogical presentation of the forms no longer provides students with a single-faceted litmus test approach to the use of the forms. Rather, students are scaffolded into an exploration of the indexical possibilities of the plain and *desu/masu* forms and are encouraged to attend to the nuances of interpersonal alignment that the forms afford. As the instructor presents students with scenarios where two or more contextual dimensions are in competition, the students are, in turn, challenged to recognize and conceptualize style selection, including style shifting, as a strategic choice with the potential for some degree of individual variability (2014: 45).

While Ishida's earlier work (2001, 2009) also attends to the four contextual dimensions adopted by Moody, Ishida focuses on these dimensions more as signals to facilitate (a) learner noticing of the other's use of plain and *desu/masu* forms with the goal of (b) identifying opportunities for the learner's own strategic deployment of these forms vis-à-vis the interlocutor's use, all with a particular focus on style shifting in getting-to-know-you conversations (2009: 48). In Ishida's year-long study, beginner-level students of Japanese participated in awareness-raising sessions prior to participating in each of four ten-minute conversation sessions (per semester) with an unfamiliar Japanese-speaking peer. A 30-minute session preceded the initial conversation session, with instruction focused on learners' expectations regarding the use of plain and *desu/masu* forms in conversational activities. The learners' anticipation that they would begin by using the *desu/masu* form, while endeavoring to find common interests, and opportunities to joke with their partner that might invite a style shift to the plain form, is consistent with Tsuda's (2010) findings that non-familiar participants' talk in first-time conversational interactions reveals a shift from initial reliance on *desu/masu* forms to an increased use of plain forms in conversations where participants enjoy the conversation, establish rapport and do not demonstrate evidence of any unpleasant feelings towards each other. After each conversation session, learners filled out a reflection sheet, which prompted them to think about the (non-)use of the two forms by the native speakers (NSs) and the contextual features relevant to this use during the conversation.

Ishida's focus on style shifting in the course of a single interaction reflects his interest in instruction that promotes learner agency from the earliest days of classroom instruction, the goal being to increase interpersonal engagement with the conversation partner through alignment of styles, specifically through jointly negotiated style shifts. He explores whether raising learners' awareness of the dynamic contextual features that contribute to the joint construction of indexical meanings (i.e., of the plain and *desu/masu* forms) enables them to be more responsive to the moment-to-moment shifts in stance and interpersonal alignment that are associated with style shifting

in everyday conversation. The instructional emphasis on responsiveness is characterized by pre-conversation awareness-raising sessions where learners are directed to think about opportunities for style shifting their scheduled interaction with a Japanese-speaking conversation partner might afford them, how they will identify those opportunities through contextual cues in the discourse, and how they will shift their use of plain or *desu/masu* forms to engage with their interlocutor at that point in the interaction. He found that many of the students who received the pragmatics-focused training became adept at noticing changes in their conversational partner's use of plain and *desu/masu* forms. Similarly, he found that these learners expressed disappointment (on reflection sheets and in comments to the researcher) when their efforts at style shifting occasioned by dynamic contextual features were not collaboratively taken up by the conversation partner.

Ishida (2009: 56ff) provides an example of a successful learner style shift, where the learner jointly negotiates a shift from the *desu/masu* style he had been using up to this point in the conversation to a use of the plain form that aligns with the partner's increasingly frequent use of the form in her own talk. Crucially, the learner's style shift is accomplished not only by deploying the less familiar plain form, but also by deploying a question format—the plain form + *no* produced with rising intonation—that was used by the partner in proximate prior discourse, but with which the learner had not previously demonstrated interactional competence. The following (abbreviated) presentation of the example reveals the collaborative construction of the learner's style shift, both with respect to the learner's use of resources from the conversation partner's talk (M, line 1), and with respect to the partner's uptake of those resources in alignment with the stance indexed by the learner's style shift (C, line 5):

- 1M: *a K ni sunderu no:?* (0.5)
 Ah K town LOC live-PROG Q
 'ah, do you live in K town?'
 2C: *eeh:::* T. (0.5)
 Umm T town
 I live in T town.

Figure 6.4

Over the next 13 turns, conversation partner and learner engage in the topic with the partner using several plain forms and the learner producing unmarked utterance endings (i.e., zero forms). Following this spate of talk (ending with the conversation partner's acknowledgment *sokka sokka* 'I see, I see'), there is an extended pause of 2.6 seconds, which the learner ends with a turn initiating a new topic:

- 3M: *so kka so kka* (2.6)
 so Q so Q
 'I see, I see.'

- 4C: (yeah) (0.3) on- ongaku wa: uhm (0.4)
 (yeah) mu- music TOP uhm
 ‘(yeah) As for music, uhm’
 5M: nan- (0.3) nani o:: ki- (.) kiku no?
 Wha- what O li- listen Q
 ‘what do you listen to?’

Figure 6.5

The learner’s turn in line 4 takes the same form as the conversation partner’s topic-initiating question produced 13 turns earlier—plain form question marked with sentence-final particle *no* and rising intonation. Ishida (2009: 58) notes that this is the learner’s first use of the plain form in a question. The disfluency with which the turn is produced (an utterance-initial token of self-directed speech, three instances of word-level restarts, a filler and several pauses) suggests that this first try comes at considerable effort by the learner. Nonetheless, this style shift to the plain form (i.e., the utterance-final plain form and particle *kiku no?* (‘. . . do you listen (to)’) is produced in the clear, and an engaged response *ongaku: wa nee:* (‘As for music. . .’) to the new topic is immediately initiated by the NS partner. The positioning of this turn to end a possible lapse in the conversation between the two interlocutors, and to manage a discourse boundary by collaboratively constructing a style shift that maintains the mutual orientation towards social closeness and affective alignment of the immediate prior talk, highlights the extent to which learner interactional competence is in evidence.

Both Ishida and Moody ground their instructional proposals in empirical classroom studies of beginning JFL learners, highlighting the accessibility of an indexical approach to instruction on the plain and *desu/masu* forms at even the earliest stages of classroom learning. They show that understanding the indexical functions of plain and *desu/masu* forms requires a heightened awareness of and orientation to the role of dynamic contextual features of talk-in-interaction. Such an understanding is also consistent with instruction directed towards learner development of interactional competence. Developing interactional competence requires a learner to focus on increasing (i) awareness of the contingent and sequential progression of talk-in-interaction, and (ii) facility in identifying and orienting to moment-to-moment shifts in the dynamic features of the discourse context (e.g., participation framework, turn-taking procedures, joint construction of stance, etc.) that organize and structure that talk.

From this perspective, then, instructional innovation aimed at supporting JFL classroom learners’ development of interactional competence with respect to deploying plain and *desu/masu* forms for boundary marking and stance indexing, among other interactional functions, will be characterized by two key features: tolerance for complexity and a heightened sense of learner agency.

Promoting Tolerance for Complexity: Pedagogical Explanations and Model Dialogues

This section will discuss (a) strategies for creating learner-centered pedagogical explanations and (b) considerations for presenting models of style shifting. These instructional approaches are aimed at significantly pushing students onto a path of guiding their own noticing (Schmidt, 1990, 1993), developing their own points for hypothesis testing, and generating their own experience-based, learner-centered understandings of and accounts for the use of style shifting in conversational interaction. By supporting learners' self-directed exploration of language use in familiar and/or self-selected contexts, and by scaffolding learners' concept development, the instructor provides a context within which learners benefit from their willingness to 'tolerate complexity' while pursuing their own answers (e.g., selecting the speech form).

The value of promoting learner tolerance for complexity stems from a fundamental insight of sociocultural theory (SCT): an abstract concept ("scientific concept" for Vygotsky) is not amenable to direct teaching. Rather, concept development emerges through a process of successively higher levels of generalization; it is "more than the sum of certain associative bonds, more than a mere mental habit; it is a complex and genuine act of thought that cannot be taught by drilling" (Vygotsky, 1986: 149). In effect, Vygotsky argues that a given "scientific concept" is not "learned" or "mastered" as an independent and discrete whole, but rather the concept develops into maturity through aligning, differentiating and otherwise juxtaposing itself with other concepts that are concurrently developing as part of the learner's awareness and understanding of the world.

Negueruela (2008), in an experimental study on teaching Spanish modality (i.e., the indicative/subjunctive distinction in verbal mood), demonstrates how Vygotsky's original insight readily informs the instruction of abstract grammatical concepts in the foreign language classroom. Specifically, learners are provided with a crystallized concept of the grammatical notions of subjunctive and indicative moods presented as a "didactic tool" (p. 212) and are led to understand that it is not grammatical rules, but rather "the speaker's intent [that] is central to making meaning" (p. 209). The instructor then provides a range of examples in conjunction with which learners can apply their proto-understanding, and against which they can test hypotheses and extend their understanding of how the concept plays out in actual usage. As they increase their exposure to usage, encountering expected uses and instances that run counter to their understanding in some way, they modify their concept in a manner that both is highly personal and reflects the idiosyncrasies of their learning history. At the same time, such concept development promotes the creation of a metalanguage that underlies and guides the learner's conceptual growth. Negueruela's original work was more recently

followed up by van Compernelle (2014), who implemented concept-based instruction in pragmatics teaching the French address forms (*tu/vous*). L2 French learners were explicitly introduced to abstract concepts of power, distance and self-presentation via pictures illustrating two individuals' relationship and stance to each other. These concepts were mapped onto the linguistic forms of *tu* and *vous* that represent the target concepts via learners' verbalization of the concepts assisted by a tutor.

Perhaps of greatest significance to the point under consideration in this chapter (i.e., style shifting) is the fact that, since conceptual growth is driven by exposure to a broad range of naturally occurring language use, grammatical items that figure in regular and interactionally meaningful ways in pragmalinguistic phenomena (e.g., style shifting for boundary marking of changes in participation framework, for shifts in stance indexing, etc.) will inherently be part of the input, and thus need not be avoided in conjunction with the instruction of the lesson, nor is it necessary for learners to wait to learn the pragmatics of the form at some more advanced level when they are *ready for pragmatics*.

From this perspective, then, learners' classroom experience can train them to cultivate a *tolerance for complexity* specifically to accept, work through and, ultimately, benefit from pedagogical explanations that are, from the outset, intentionally and strategically presented as helpful as a first step, but designedly incomplete. Such an approach presents a stark contrast to grammatical instruction in the conventional JFL classroom, where prescribed rules of use are presented as *correct*, as are *exceptions to the rule*.³ Notably, such instruction is not problematic in and of itself. However, since textbook grammatical explanations are evaluated for their user-friendliness based on their breadth of applicability and their succinctness, there is a tendency to leave out aspects of a given form's usage, including aspects with high frequency of occurrence in everyday talk, that do not *fit well* with the user-friendly account (cf. Iwai, 2010, 2013, on *n desu* to create a more pleasant, conversational tone, which does not *fit well* with the standard explanation of *n desu* as an explanatory marker—'it is the case that'). Current textbook explanations of the plain and *desu/masu* forms, with their emphasis on single-style usage and near total avoidance of any mention of the potential for style shifting, provide another clear example of this point (see also Cook, 2008).⁴

Along with pedagogical explanations of target instructional items, perhaps the most ubiquitous component of instructional materials is the model dialogue. Conventional model dialogues are created primarily to illustrate use of target vocabulary and grammatical items in a conversational context. There is no question that a broad range of commonly used conversational practices, including, on rare occasion, style shifting, may be found in these purported models; yet, as Ishida (2009) points out, even when such style shifts are modeled, there is no account or explanation

provided for the practice, leaving learners both to independently notice and to individually interpret the significance of this practice.

Moreover, as presented in most textbooks currently in use, the exchange of talk in the model dialogue tends to take on the feel of a fixed, formulaic progression of turns rather than an instance of a conversation that could have progressed in a variety of ways. One reason for this is the generic, undifferentiated quality of the context in which the models are purportedly being produced. Without the incorporation of such contextual awareness into instruction, the learner has no way of noticing how language use in the model is (or is not) responsive to the social, affective and interactional aspects of the moment in question (i.e., “Why does the interaction progress as it does?”). The resulting inflexibility of discourse flow, combined with the relative rarity of changes in participation framework in the course of the dialogue’s interactional window, renders the conventional model dialogue an inadequate pedagogical resource for modeling the role of dynamic contextual features in a speaker’s deployment of style shifting as an interactional resource.

One way to address this constrained, and on the whole inauthentic, quality of textbook dialogues is to provide learners with samples of naturally occurring talk (Jones & Ono, 2005). Jones and Ono (2005) quite correctly point out that naturally occurring talk provides learners with access to conversational interaction that is performative, that is, that encompasses a range and depth of authentic phenomena (e.g., pauses, overlapping talk, repair, etc.) that are part of the unscripted production and receipt of talk. A further aspect of this performative quality is that naturally occurring discourse is, to a varying degree, accountable to the immediate context of its production. In this respect, models of style shifting are not only plentiful but also no further away than a home video, a YouTube channel or TiVo recording.

This abundance of available naturally occurring discourse is of significant value for presenting learners with input wherein they may track participants’ choice of speech style, and, in turn, be exposed to a range of opportunities for noticing (Schmidt, 1990, 1993) style shifting. The challenge in making use of these materials, however, is in identifying naturally occurring instances that are (a) relevant to communicative settings in which learners might participate, and (b) instantiations of indexical meanings and/or discourse functions that are accessible to learners vis-à-vis their level of linguistic proficiency, cultural awareness and interactional competence. One way to ensure that such samples of naturally occurring speech are accessible is to have learners collect their own examples and share them with the instructor (who may then share them with the class)⁵ through the class website. Since access to an extensive range of naturally occurring materials is not limited to the instructor, and since many learners are already avid consumers of Japanese video content, having learners provide clips of or share links to instances of style shifting

that they have noticed ensures a diverse set of examples which are likely to be of interest to fellow classmates.

A further advantage to this approach is that it promotes the type of extensive, self-directed exposure (Kitai & Chan, 2015) to style shifting that feeds into the SCT-grounded concept development presented above. Learners can use their developing conceptualizations of style shifting to anticipate where speakers may choose to deploy this indexical strategy, and to closely track interaction at such moments to determine whether their expectations are met, and to adjust their understanding in accordance with the development of talk-in-interaction and outcomes at and around the moment style shifting is deployed. Perhaps the best examples of the effectiveness of this strategy come from engagement with naturally occurring input with which the learner has a personal involvement, specifically, the NS keypals' e-mail responses in Kakegawa's (2009) study, and the conversational partner's talk in Ishida's (2009) study and Walter's (2011) study.

Promoting Learner Agency Through Highlighting Interactional Accomplishment

The second feature, promoting learner agency (van Lier, 2008), recognizes that although a broad range of input can support learner noticing and concept development, ultimately learners must be able not only to notice moments where style shifting is appropriate, but to act on their awareness with precision timing in order to deploy this interactional resource effectively. While Kakegawa (2009) noted that the written format of e-mail exchanges might be necessary to provide learners with the time necessary to think through their options for style shifting, Ishida (2001, 2009) found that some of the learners in his treatment group were able to respond with the requisite precision timing (see example above). Notably, however, these learners were only able to do so in the *second* semester of their JFL studies. Walter (2011) suggests that additional variability in learner awareness may be attributed to the NS interlocutors with whom students interact. Thus, while taking into account the potential value of time for planning and reflection (especially for beginning learners), as well as the apparent need for more extensive opportunities for scaffolded practice (i.e., before interacting directly with NS conversation partners), we propose the following learner-directed activity.

The activity, developed and implemented as an experimental treatment for a first-semester, beginning JFL class (Yoshimi, 2005), relies on the creation of a shared metalanguage, generated by the learners (in contrast to Negueruela's teacher-generated didactic tool) and moderated by the instructor, that focuses on talk as a resource for 'doing meaningful things.' Per Yoshimi (2008: 311), "the notion of 'doing' was constructed

with reference to the organization of (sequence, opening and closing moves, transitional moves), orientation toward (stance, positionality, social identities), and accomplishment of (actions, preferences, response behaviours, particular linguistic resources)” some target activity. A communally shared metatalk is collaboratively constructed over the course of the semester as an outcome of explicit pragmatics-focused discussion of samples of naturally occurring talk (i.e., identified by learners as part of their class work, or by the instructor). For the instruction of style shifting, then, it is incumbent upon the instructor to identify the nature of the interactional work that the style shift is supporting, and the nature of the surrounding talk, prior to initiating the activity.

Using Excerpt 1 in the previous section as an example (reformatted), the instructor would put the dialogue up on the board/projector, and then invite the class to label each line using the class’s shared metatalk. A sample of the first few lines might look like this:

((You are chatting with your classmate in an informal style about your co-worker when the teacher comes by, overhears your story and asks you a question))

1	T: <i>senpai koohai?</i> ‘senpai-kohai?’	<i>Uptake (echo question)</i>
2	<i>do, donna keiken</i> <i>shi-ta?</i>	<i>Information question (wh-question)</i> ‘What kind of experience did you have?’
3	S <i>hh. ano, a::,</i> ‘haha, well, ah. . .’	<i>Initiate response (two fillers)</i>
4	<i>senpai wa:</i> ‘senior is. . .’	<i>Initiate response content</i>
5	T <i>un.</i> ‘Uh-huh’	<i>Response token (minimal)</i>
6	S <i>watashi wa ho:ru</i> <i>[no shit-imasu]⁶</i> ‘I was doing hall-related work’	<i>Response content (completed turn)</i>
7	T <i>[un.</i>	<i>Response token (minimal)</i>

Figure 6.6

The instructional focus of this example would be the style shift to the *desu/masu* form produced by the student in line 6. Notably, there is nothing in the right-hand labeling that cues the need for a style shift. Thus, if a student were provided a blank sheet that provided only these labels in the right-hand column and no contextual cue for the setting, she might choose to construct a conversation that reversed the style shift, or that did not entail a style shift at all. For example:

((You are speaking with your teacher about tomorrow's exam when your Classmate butts in))

1	C: <i>ashita no shiken?</i>
'Tomorrow's exam?'	<i>Uptake (echo question)</i>
2	<i>ashita shiken aru no?</i>
'Is there an exam tomorrow?'	<i>Information question (wh-question)</i>
3	Y: <i>eeto:, nm,</i>
'Um:, well'	<i>Initiate response (two fillers)</i>
4	<i>sensei ga:</i>	<i>Initiate response content</i>
5	C: <i>un.</i>
'Uh-huh'	<i>Response token (minimal)</i>
6	Y: <i>ashita shiken ga arimasu[to</i>
'said we have an exam tomorrow'	<i>Response content (completed turn)</i>
7	C: <i>[hee?</i>
['What (the heck)?!'	<i>Response token (expressive)⁷</i>

Figure 6.7

The second dialogue, then, is created entirely from the learner's personal experience, with the learner using the metatalk labels to guide his production, and with that production being developed within the capacity of his interactional competence. In working through this activity, the learner develops a sense of conversational flow and positioning of the style shift—required in line 7 since Y speaks about the teacher's action in the teacher's presence, even though the addressee is a peer with whom use of the plain form would be anticipated—within that flow. The inclusion of fillers, response tokens and fragmented production (lines 4 and 6) all contribute to raising learner awareness of the rhythm and pace of Japanese conversation, as well as the co-occurring contextualization cues (i.e., the classmate's *desu/masu* form in line 6 that marks the awareness of the participation framework within which his talk is produced) that condition the style shift. These dimensions of the activity enable learners to recognize contexts where style shifting is appropriate, while at the same time providing scaffolded practice that constitutes a relatively thorough 'performance' of a model based on a naturally occurring stretch of talk.

The pedagogical approaches presented above are, first and foremost, grounded in empirical findings regarding the use of plain and *desu/masu* forms—including style-shifting—in authentic mundane conversation. These findings make it clear that the claim that Japanese speakers use 'one style at a time' in a given context is nothing more than a pedagogical fiction where mundane conversation is concerned. This results in two critical changes in conventional JFL pedagogical practice. First, learners must be exposed to the plain and *desu/masu* forms as discourse pragmatic resources from the onset of instruction. Not only should the pseudo-rule of 'one style at a time' be permanently

retired, but the practice of ascribing one or two static functions to each form (e.g., ‘polite form for formal situations and plain form for casual situations’) must also be removed from the instructional repertoire.

This is not to say that instructing learners on the use of the plain and *desu/masu* forms in conjunction with moment-to-moment shifts in dynamic contextual features will create pragmatically authentic, error-free learner production of the forms, such as the use of style shifts to mark discourse boundaries or changes in affective stance. Even Moody (2014) recognized that beginning learners who are provided with a fairly straightforward pedagogical introduction (i.e., to a range of dynamic contextual features that may influence style choice or style shift) will still require time, exposure to contexts where features are in conflict, and scaffolded discussions of “What it would mean if I used {plain/*desu/masu*} here?” as part of the process of learner engagement with, and learner mastery of, a complex concept.

Thus, a second key component of updating the instruction of plain and *desu/masu* forms is recognizing that learners are far more tolerant of complexity than teachers and instructional materials have heretofore given them credit for. There is no support for the conventional wisdom that ‘starting simple’ will prevent learners from excessive errors in the early stages of their learning. Rather, as Negueruela’s (2008) work demonstrates, the teacher may provide an explanation of the use of the forms that can serve as a primitive pedagogical tool that allows learners to take their first step towards developing a concept of speech style shift as an interactional resource. Subsequently, learners enhance and expand their understanding of this kernel of learning through active listening and tracking of others’ language use, as well as through the development of their own metatalk and hypothesis testing about the use of the forms.

Moreover, Ishida’s (2001, 2009) learners demonstrated that, over the course of the first year of study, they became increasingly adept at tracking the use of others’ language, with some learners eventually displaying a capacity to notice instances of style shifting in their conversational partner’s talk and, and subsequently deploy novel instances of these speech practices in their own speech.

Finally, it was noted that since learner meaning making plays a critical role in the development of complex interactional resources such as style shifting, learners must be able not only to notice patterns of style shifting in the talk of others but also to act on their awareness with precision timing in order to deploy this interactional resource effectively. An increased familiarity with the dynamic contextual features that influence a speaker’s decision to shift styles, and an increasing understanding of how the decision contributes to the joint construction of meaning in the interaction, would provide the foundation for growth in the learner’s interactional competence. Thus, training learner use of metatalk to recognize interactional moments where style shifting may occur is also essential for enhancing the learner’s sense of agency not only with respect to controlling and/or directing the flow of a collaboratively constructed

speech activity, but also with respect to determining what meanings are jointly created through this talk. Drawing on their personal experiences to conceptualize the dynamic contextual features that they envision impacting their own use of the forms enables learners to further develop their capacity to take control of the direction and content of their interactions with others.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have identified patterns of learner production that demonstrate increased interactional competence for style shifting among learners in study-abroad contexts. Recognizing that effective instructional practices might enhance this development, we have identified instructional practices that support the early introduction of this important interactional resource to learners in the JFL classroom. Both the empirical findings and the pedagogical practices recognize that learner development of the capacity to deploy style shifting requires that learners not only are aware of the dynamic contextual features in the flow of talk, but are also able to recognize the appropriateness of style shifting in response to moment-to-moment shifts in the participation framework and stance marking, both of which contribute to the joint construction of discourse boundaries. This chapter, then, demonstrates that neither the ‘difficulty’ of teaching style shifting nor the ‘complexity’ that underlies the abstract theoretical concept of indexicality presents an obstacle to learner development of the capacity to deploy style shifting in effective, appropriate and interactionally competent ways.

We will conclude this chapter with several future directions. In terms of directions for future research, we need to cultivate creative ways to track students’ changing capacities in using speech styles and style shifting corresponding to increasing opportunities for input and practice both in JFL settings and in study-abroad contexts. The study presented in this chapter used a pre-post design, analyzing students’ data collected at the beginning and end of a semester abroad. More systematic, incremental data collection sessions are necessary to capture subtle changes in students’ systems over time, ideally in conjunction with tracking the type and extent of their exposure outside the JFL classroom, and during their study-abroad experiences. In addition, as illustrated in the section on pedagogy, tracking students’ awareness of style shifting is equally important to their actual deployment of style shifting. Future research can explore methods to track awareness and understanding, along with the use of style shifting.

Future directions in Japanese pedagogy, both in developing instruction for the beginning JFL classroom and in developing instruction for preparing learners for study-abroad experiences, may benefit most from recognizing that, with respect to the instruction of style shifting, the division of grammar from interaction is no longer tenable. Rather, the pedagogical antidote to complexity (as opposed to predictability) of language use is

training learners to manage that complexity on their own, be it through tracking particular features of their conversation partner's talk, or be it through gaining some 'control' of the flow of talk by imposing their own metalanguage on it, in order to observe the dynamic relationship between contextual features and discourse forms more effectively. It remains an empirical question as to whether learners who are presented with these purportedly challenging aspects of interactional competence at an earlier point in their learning are at an advantage when they participate in study abroad as a result of their having had more time to develop their awareness of and 'feel' for a broader range of interactional contexts and relevant dynamic contextual variables. Regardless of where learners study, however, it is clear that opportunities to increase learner engagement with the interactional intricacies of the plain and polite forms, and the shifting between them, are at hand for the instructor who recognizes and respects learner tolerance for complexity and learner capacity for agency as foundational to the development of learner interactional competence.

Notes

- 1 This is part of a larger study published as a book monograph (Taguchi, 2015). The excerpt and analyses displayed in this section were reproduced with permission from Multilingual Matters. Participants in the study were four males and 16 females (mean age of 22, ranging from 19 to 29). There were six Chinese, three Taiwanese, three Americans, two Singaporeans, one New Zealander, one Brunei, one Korean and one French person. They belonged to the intermediate level in an intensive Japanese program (based on the placement exam) and thus were judged to have basic knowledge of the *desu/masu* and plain forms. Ten students were living in a dormitory, five had a homestay arrangement, two were living alone in an apartment, and one was in a shared house.
- 2 In addition to utterance endings, endings of subordinate clauses were also analyzed according to these three categories. The following were excluded from the analysis: backchannels, laughter, exclamations, parroting and simple repetition, formulaic expressions and ungrammatical forms (6.4% of the data).
- 3 That is, some piece of language use is identified as *correct* because it behaves as we expect, i.e., according to the rule; and an exception to the rule can also be *correct* because it behaves as we expect, that is, according to what has been said about anticipated exceptions to the rule.
- 4 An additional problematic facet of conventional instruction on the plain and *desu/masu* forms is the strong tendency for learner overproduction of (monoclausal, or, at best, biclausal) turns ending in the *desu/masu* form. It appears to be the case that once learners are instructed to use the *desu/masu* form, they adopt this as a pedagogically correct and classroom-safe strategy for completing their turn; i.e., once they get to the *desu/masu* form, they are in a safe zone and trust that they will be evaluated as having correctly finished their sentence. Pushing learners, particularly those who have little exposure or access to Japanese outside of the classroom, out of this entrenched habit at the intermediate and advanced levels can be challenging.
- 5 Kitai and Chan (2015) note that learners report benefiting from searching for their own video content (for assignments), but are much less likely to report a benefit from listening to other students' presentations about the video segments they have identified. For this reason, having the teacher guide the presentation of learner-identified video segments as instructional models is preferable.

- 6 This line has been altered to omit the repair, which is not the central focus of this activity.
- 7 Since a minimal response token would be inappropriate here, the student would be allowed to make this small edit to ensure that the created dialogue and the metatalk labels matched appropriately.

References

- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (2010). *Language testing in practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical aspects of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Cook, H. (2006). Japanese politeness as an interactional achievement: Academic consultation sessions in Japanese universities. *Multilingua*, 25(3), 269–292.
- Cook, H. (2008). *Socializing identities through speech style*. New York, Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, H. M. (1998). Situational meanings of Japanese social deixis: The mixed use of the ‘masu’ and plain forms. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 8(1), 87–110.
- Cook, H. M. (2002). The social meanings of the Japanese plain form. In N. Akatsuka & S. Strauss (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 10* (pp. 150–163). Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Fukushima, E. (2007). On the topic of mixed style of ‘desu/masu’ form and non-‘desu/masu’ form—Taigu communication among Japanese business people. *Waseda daigaku Nihongo kyoikugaku [Waseda University Study of Japanese Language Education]*, 138, 24–32.
- Geyer, N. (2013). Discernment and variation: The action-oriented use of Japanese addressee honorifics. *Multilingua*, 32(2), 155–176.
- Hall, J. K. (1995). ‘Aw, man, where you goin’?’ Classroom interaction and the development of L2 interactional competence. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 37–62.
- Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). *L2 interactional competence and development*. New York, Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua—Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8(2–3), 223–248.
- Ikuta, S. (2008). Speech style shift as an interactional discourse strategy: The use and non-use of ‘desu/masu’ in Japanese conversational interviews. In K. Jones & T. Ono (Eds.), *Style shifting in Japanese* (pp. 71–89). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ishida, K. (2001). Learning the pragmatic functions of the Japanese ‘masu’ and plain forms (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI.
- Ishida, K. (2009). Indexing stance in interaction with the Japanese ‘desu/masu’ and plain forms. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *Pragmatic competence* (pp. 41–68). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Iwai, T. (2010). Becoming a good conversationalist: Conversational competence as a target of JFL instruction (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI.
- Iwai, T. (2013). Using 'n desu' in small talk: JFL learners' pragmatic development. In K. Kondo-Brown, Y. Saito-Abbott, S. Satsutani, M. Tsutsui, & A. Wehmeyer (Eds.), *New perspectives on Japanese language learning, linguistics, and culture* (pp. 27–47). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Iwasaki, N. (2010). Style shifts among Japanese learners before and after study abroad in Japan: Becoming active social agents in Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(1), 45–71.
- Iwasaki, N. (2011). Learning L2 Japanese “politeness” and “impoliteness”: Young American men's dilemmas during study abroad. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 45(1): 67–106.
- Jones, K., & Ono, T. (2005). Discourse-centered approaches to Japanese language pedagogy. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 39(2), 237–254.
- Kakegawa, T. (2009). Development of the use of Japanese sentence-final particles through email correspondence. In Taguchi, N. (Ed.), *Pragmatic competence* (pp. 301–334). New York, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kitai, S., & Chan, W. M. (2015). Learning language and culture through video clips: An action research study. In W. M. Chan, S. K. Bhatt, M. Nagami, & I. Walker (Eds.), *Culture and foreign language education: Insights from research and implications for the practice* (pp. 299–330). New York, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Makino, S. (2002). When does communication turn mentally inward: A case study of Japanese formal-to-informal switching. In N. Akatsuka & S. Strauss (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics Vol. 10* (pp. 121–135). Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Masuda, K. (2016). Style shifting in a professor-student conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 101(1), 101–117.
- Matsumoto, Y. (2004). Alternative femininity. In S. Okamoto & J. S. Shibamoto Smith (Eds.), *Japanese language, gender, and ideology: Cultural models and real people* (pp. 240–255). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maynard, S. K. (1993). *Discourse modality: Subjectivity, emotion, and voice in the Japanese language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- McMeekin, A. (2014). Japanese learners' indexical uses of the da style in a study abroad setting. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 48(1), 1–38.
- Moody, S. J. (2014). Should we teach rules for pragmatics? Explicit instruction and emergent awareness of Japanese plain and polite forms. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 48(1), 39–69.
- Nazikian, F. (2010). Interviewdanwaniokeru jyotaino kino [functions of plain form in interview]. In M. Minami (Ed.), *Gengogakuto nihongokyoiku [Linguistics and Japanese education] vol. V* (pp. 141–173). Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Neguera, E. (2008). Revolutionary pedagogies: Learning that leads (to) second language development. In J. P. Lantolf & M. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages* (pp. 189–227). Equinox: London.
- Okamoto, S. (1999). Situated politeness: Manipulating honorific and non-honorific expressions in Japanese conversation. *Pragmatics*, 9(1), 51–74.
- Okamoto, S. (2011). The use and interpretations of addressee honorifics and plain forms in Japanese: Diversity, multiplicity, and ambiguity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(1), 3673–3688.

- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21–42). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Taguchi, N. (2015). *Developing interactional competence in a Japanese study abroad context*. Bristol, New York: Multilingual Matters.
- Tsuda, S. (2010). Interpersonal functions of the polite forms ‘desu/masu’ in Japanese conversations. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 19(3), 81–89.
- van Compernelle, R. A. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and instructed L2 pragmatics*. Bristol, New York: Multilingual Matters.
- van Lier, L. (2008). Agency in the classroom. In J. P. Lantolf & M. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages* (pp. 163–186). Equinox: London.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Walter, I. (2011). Learners’ noticing of Japanese speech styles: Pedagogical issues and possibilities. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 8(1), 336–361.
- Yoshimi, D. R. (2005, March). ‘What do I say next?’: *The value of raising learner awareness of conversational sequence*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association of Teachers of Japanese, Chicago, USA.
- Yoshimi, D. R. (2008). Learner competence as a resource in the Japanese as a foreign language classroom: Issues in oral assessment. In J. Mori & A. S. Ohta (Eds.), *Japanese applied linguistics: Discourse and social perspectives* (pp. 301–326). New York: Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd.
- Young, R. F. (2008). *Discursive practices in language learning and teaching*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Young, R. F. (2011). Interactional competence in language learning, teaching, and testing. In H. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in language learning and teaching* (pp. 426–443). New York: Routledge.

Appendix A

Grammatical Glosses

AUX	auxiliary verb
COP	various forms of copula verb <i>be</i>
CP	conjunctive particle
DM	discourse marker, fillers
FP	sentence final particle
<i>hanashite</i>	incomplete sentence ending
HES	hesitation
<i>kimasu</i>	polite (<i>desu/masu</i>) form
<i>kuru</i>	plain form
LK	linking nominal
LOC	locative
NEG	negative morpheme
NOM	nominalizer
O	object marker
PROG	progressive aspect
PST	past tense
Q	question marker
QT	quotative marker
SUB	subject marker
TE	te-form (conjunctive particle <i>te</i>)
TOP	topic marker

7 Interactional Competence and Study Abroad

Empirical Methods, Findings and Pedagogical Implications

Kate White

Introduction

Study-abroad experiences have long been a focus in second language (L2) research, often because “it is generally assumed that study abroad should confer greater benefits because students have greater access to native speakers” (Segalowitz & Freed, 2004: 174). While past research has established the benefits of study abroad in many areas (e.g., oral proficiency, pronunciation, grammatical accuracy, etc.; see Anderson, 2012; Ecke, 2014; Isabelli-García, 2010; Kinginger, 2009; Tschirner, 2007; Vande Berg, Paige, & Lou, 2012; among others), much is still unknown (Magnan & Lafford, 2012). This is especially true for research on study abroad regarding the development of interactional competence (IC), or the ability to engage in co-constructed conversations with other speakers of the target language (TL) in a variety of settings (Dings, 2014).

As L2 researchers and teachers have begun to focus more on IC, some have turned to study abroad as an empirical setting for IC research, due to both the greater access to native speakers mentioned above and the access to interaction in the TL in a variety of settings (e.g., Dings, 2014; Taguchi, 2015b; Shively, 2015). However, this access can be difficult to operationalize and measure—how can we know how much and in what settings the students use the TL, especially outside of the classroom? This chapter provides an overview of studies that have explored the development of IC and related topics in study-abroad settings. It also addresses pedagogical and programmatic implications from research findings on the development of IC in study abroad.

Current Concerns in Study-Abroad Research

Study abroad is often considered “to be a crucial step in the development of the ability to use a language in a range of communicative settings” (Kinger, 2009: 5). It is advertised to students as almost universally beneficial, offering both academic progress and fun, once-in-a-lifetime

experiences. However, as Kinginger goes on to point out, a central issue that has plagued study-abroad research is the enormous amount of variation in the day-to-day experience of students while abroad. Study abroad provides many avenues for interaction, including the opportunity to observe local norms, to engage in contextualized practice and receive immediate feedback, to encounter real-life consequences in interaction and to gain exposure to a variety of speakers and settings (Taguchi, 2015a). Much of the previous research in the field (especially US-based studies) has reflected a “desire to prove the effectiveness of study abroad, with learners developing language abilities” that are treated as concrete and measurable, producing outcomes, or gains, that are especially useful for administrative purposes (Kinger, 2009: 29). It has been difficult to both isolate mechanisms of change and measure them, given the amount of variation inherent in the experience.

In many past studies, scholars have attempted to focus on specific topics that could produce measurable evidence of students’ progress from study abroad, i.e., through linguistic development. Such studies have had several quantitative areas of focus, including: gains in specific areas of linguistic or cognitive ability (i.e., fluency, listening comprehension, etc.; e.g., Du, 2013; Freed, Segalowitz, & Dewey, 2004; Llanes & Muñoz, 2009; Mora & Valls-Ferrer, 2012; O’Brien, Segalowitz, Freed, & Collentine, 2007; Takahashi, 2015); comparisons of learning settings and populations of students (i.e., study abroad vs. at home or students who have studied abroad vs. not; e.g., Churchill, 2009; Freed et al., 2004; Isabelli-García, 2010; Llanes & Muñoz, 2009; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004); global constructs such as proficiency (measured via tests such as the oral proficiency interview, etc.; e.g., Davidson, 2010; Di Silvio, Donovan, & Malone, 2014; Hernández, 2010; Martinsen, 2010); and exposure to the TL over time abroad (as a quantitative variable; e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011; Brecht, Davidson, & Ginsberg, 1995; Du, 2013; Freed, 1995; Ranta & Meckelborg, 2013). Studies have also explored other aspects of study-abroad experiences with qualitative approaches (e.g., self-reports of TL use/exposure, recordings of host-family interaction, accounts of social participation, etc.; e.g., Athanasopoulos, Damjanovic, Burnand, & Bylund, 2015; Isabelli-García, 2006; McMeekin, 2017; Ranta & Meckelborg, 2013; Takahashi, 2015). Gains have been shown in many areas across studies, including oral proficiency, pragmatic ability, pronunciation, oral fluency, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary breadth, discursive strategies and literacy (see Anderson, 2012; Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011; Garcia-Amaya, 2012; Llanes, 2011; Mora & Valls-Ferrer, 2012; Segalowitz, 2010; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004; Taguchi, 2008; Tschirner, 2007; among others). In a meta-analysis of 66 studies that incorporated a cross-sectional comparison of learning abroad and at home, Yang (2016) found that, in general, study-abroad students outperform learners at home.

However, findings are not consistent across studies, and a meta-analysis cannot reveal individual or programmatic variation. For example, the positive benefit of a homestay is not an absolute (Kinging, 2015), with variations in the homestay environment having more impact on learning. Some studies have also shown greater gains from at-home groups rather than from groups abroad (Freed et al., 2004; Vande Berg et al., 2012). These inconsistencies may be due to variations in assessment materials, research focus, proficiency scales, programmatic organization and individual motivation (Ecke, 2014). Overall, many have begun to argue that, despite efforts to isolate variables in order to prove students' progress, there is not enough evidence across studies to show that study abroad is consistently a better learning environment than study at home (Ecke, 2014; Kinginger, 2015; Vande Berg et al., 2012).

This does not mean that study abroad is not beneficial; however, it does show that many approaches to study-abroad research in the past have not been able to tell us enough about the actual study-abroad experience. Not enough is known about what students do outside of class, and it may be "the nature of the interactions, the quality of the experiences, and the efforts made to use the L2 that render one [setting] superior to another with respect to language gain" (Freed et al., 2004: 298). As early as 1990 researchers argued for a more finely tuned analysis that can capture interaction outside of class (Freed, 1990).

This tendency to focus on quantifiable measures (e.g., oral proficiency as tested by widely used assessments, such as the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and to analyze study-abroad students as a single, homogeneous population (or study abroad as a single, monolithic variable that may impact L2 acquisition) that is contrastable with other populations has led to criticism. For example, this view of study abroad as a single variable has been referred to as treating the study-abroad experience as a 'black box,' without digging into what actually occurs during the program itself (Taguchi, 2011, 2015a). Also, in recent years it has become clear that the results from one study cannot be generalized for all study-abroad programs, or sometimes even from student to student within a single program (Ecke, 2014; Kinginger, 2015; Vande Berg et al., 2012). Available assessment instruments do not always meet the needs of researchers (Anderson, 2012), and not all programs incorporate the same methods (e.g., pre- and post-program measures; Czerwionka, Artamonova, & Barbosa, 2014).

In response, many scholars have begun to open that black box with new approaches to study-abroad research that do not treat study-abroad students as one homogeneous population. For example, Elola and Oskoz (2008) investigated how mediating tools, such as blogs, can give researchers and instructors more insight into students' interactions outside of class. Others have solicited logs of behavior, language use and

even social network use (e.g., Isabelli-García, 2006) from students during study abroad. Approaches that incorporate online interaction may be especially relevant as students have more access to home and their home language than ever before, while also studying abroad for shorter times on average than in the past (especially students from North America) (Diao, 2014; Kinginger, 2008; Martinsen, 2010). Many have also suggested exploring new approaches that combine quantitative and qualitative methods (Czerwionka et al., 2014; Kinginger, 2008; Magnan & Lafford, 2012). Overall, there has been an increased focus on the interaction of individual variation with settings of development in the TL (e.g., Anderson, 2012; Dings, 2014; Ecke, 2014; Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker, 2015; Hassall, 2015a; Jin, 2012; Taguchi, 2011, 2015a; Shively, 2015). Taguchi (2015a) noted that the field is moving towards a more “ecologically-oriented approach,” more focused on individual experiences, as it has become evident that the study-abroad experience is not uniform for all learners.

As the individual experience gains more attention, so do the settings in which these experiences occur. Exposure to the TL over time abroad has been shown to be, at the very least, a factor that can significantly impact students’ L2 development (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011; Du, 2013; Freed, 1995; Ranta & Meckelborg, 2013). As with other areas of study-abroad research, these effects often vary across studies. This focus on exposure has been particularly relevant for scholars interested in L2 IC. The study-abroad setting may be an ideal intersection of the study of language and the settings in which it is used by L2 learners; however, students “may not always avail themselves” of opportunities to interact in the TL (Segalowitz & Freed, 2004: 174; see also Bown, Dewey, & Belnap, 2015). In fact, students may need preparation and instructional support in order to take advantage of these opportunities (Wilkinson, 2002). For the most part, study-abroad students do return showing evidence of some gains in linguistic ability, in performance or in communicative ability or flexibility (Kinger, 2009; Taguchi, 2015a). In order to understand students’ experiences abroad, we must know more about what they do outside of the classroom of their own accord.

From Pragmatic Competence to IC

One somewhat consistent result in study-abroad research has been the positive impact of study abroad on L2 abilities related to social interactive settings. In other words, students studying abroad seem to make greater gains “in speech rate, the ability to use formulaic language, and fluency” (however fluency is defined) with some individual differences in the results (Kinger, 2009: 31). As Kinger argues, this makes sense when considering the many settings of language use available to a study-abroad student. It therefore follows that as the field of study-abroad research has

developed, interest in these settings themselves has increased, leading to questions regarding what students do with the language outside of class and how such activities differ from student to student.

Research on IC in study abroad may seem, on the surface, to have much in common with research on the development of pragmatic competence. The empirical focus is often similar in these studies: interactions with other speakers of the L2. What often differs is the theoretical approach to interaction adopted by the researchers, especially in terms of the definition of language as contextualized and of interaction as co-constructed (Carter & McCarthy, 2004; Dings, 2014). For pragmatic competence, research tends to focus more on an individual's abilities to do things with language in different situations (i.e., speech acts), or to make relevant linguistic choices for different settings or contexts and different interlocutors. For research on IC, the focus is instead on students' abilities to participate in co-constructed interactions between two or more people, and to make relevant and fitting contributions to an ongoing conversation in an orderly way (Betz & Huth, 2014). The materials used in these studies range accordingly from the more decontextualized or non-interactive tasks often used to assess pragmatic competence (e.g., simulations of conversation, discourse completion tasks (DCTs)) to the more contextualized approaches used in studies on IC, including analysis of participants' recordings of various L2 interactions (e.g., service encounters, conversations with friends). It is this variety of theoretical approaches that drives differences in methodology and variations in the understanding of competence.

As discussed above, there are certain common approaches to study-abroad research that are also common for studies that focus on pragmatic competence: measuring gains, contrasting settings and isolating performance in specific settings (see Kinginger, 2009; Schauer, 2009). For example, Bardovi-Harlig and Bastos (2011) explored the effects of study abroad on the recognition and production of conventional expressions using DCTs. Time abroad and self-reported exposure to the L2 outside of class were included as variables, and the overall impact of 'exposure' was measured against L2 pragmatic performance in the quantitative analysis. Similarly, Taguchi (2008) found a significant correlation between exposure to the L2 outside of class and pragmatic comprehension gains and called for more reliable measures of exposure.

Félix-Brasdefer and Hasler-Barker (2015) and Matsumura (2003) agree that individual variation in pragmatic ability deserves more attention, as well as the type and amount of input learners are exposed to while abroad. Amount and type of exposure to the L2 has been a focus for many other pragmatic studies (Diao, 2014; Kinginger, 2015; Matsumura, 2003; Matsumura, 2007; Schauer, 2007; Shively, 2011; Shively, 2013b; for a review, see Taguchi, 2015a; Xiao, 2015). For example, Matsumura (2003) followed a group of students abroad for one year

and measured gains in pragmatic ability. The results demonstrate that amount of exposure may potentially have a great effect on pragmatic development, though Matsumura recognized that it was difficult to truly understand and qualify that exposure without reliable instruments for measuring it.

Other areas of focus within pragmatic competence include the following: greeting others (dialogue construction task: Hoffman-Hicks, 1999); giving advice (multiple-choice questionnaire: Matsumura, 2001; Matsumura, 2003); making requests (role plays: Magnan & Back, 2007; Owen, 2001; DCTs: Barron, 2003, 2006; pedagogical intervention and DCTs: Cohen & Shively, 2007; Shively & Cohen, 2008); apologizing (dialogue completion questionnaire: Shardakova, 2005; DCTs: Kondo, 1997; Warga & Schölmlberger, 2007); using forms of address (role plays: Kinginger, 2008); comprehending indirect speech acts (computerized recognition task: Taguchi, 2008); paying compliments (DCTs: Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker, 2015; Shimizu, 2009); using conventional expressions (DCTs: Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011; Taguchi, Li, & Xiao, 2013); using pragmatic markers (i.e., fillers, response tokens, openings and closings; Oral Proficiency Interviews (OPI): Lafford, 1995; external modifiers: Schauer, 2007); and using discursive strategies (interviews: Bracke & Aguerre, 2015); among others. Studies have also investigated how relevant variables interact with the development of pragmatic competence, including explicit classroom instruction (targeted discussions: Hassall, 2015b) and proficiency level (Athanasopoulos et al., 2015; Bardovi-Harlig & Bastos, 2011; Taguchi, 2011). Some found overall improvements in pragmatic competence, while others found greater variation among individuals. For example, Hassall (2015a) investigated the issue of individual variation in more depth and asserted that development in L2 pragmatic ability is linked to development of L2 identity while abroad.

Kinger (2008) found that as learners' linguistic competence increases, so does their pragmatic competence, which is demonstrated by their awareness of not only the linguistic forms, but their contexts of use. Learners develop corresponding uncertainty about contexts of use as they become aware of the many possibilities for use in interaction. Bardovi-Harlig (2014) defines the development of pragmatic competence as "the development of alternatives" (p. 137). Becoming competent in the L2 includes the ability to do the same action or express the same concept in a variety of ways; this concept of choice among alternatives "is one of the basic principles of pragmatics" as speakers "make choices among available linguistic forms to convey social meanings" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2014: 137). It is the existence of alternatives that gives meaning to the use of one form and not another. Study abroad seems to serve as a good opportunity for students to expand and refine their repertoires of alternatives "beyond the characteristically pedagogic forms of classroom language use" (Kinger, 2009: 111).

As it has become clearer that individual experience must be given more attention, researchers have also begun to focus more on the situations in which individuals' interactions occur. This is also a result of growing interest in IC across fields. For study-abroad research, the crucial difference between pragmatic competence, as defined above, and IC is that the former focuses on a single speaker's ability to use alternatives, while the latter refers to a speaker's ability to participate in co-constructed interaction in a variety of settings using a repertoire of systematic interactional practices (Betz & Huth, 2014). As Magnan and Lafford (2012) argue, "the crucial nature of the interaction between individual and situational variables is becoming evident as research demonstrates repeatedly how different students shape experience in unique and personal ways" (p. 526). Also, typical measures of pragmatic ability such as DCTs do not necessarily produce the same results as participation in co-constructed interaction (Golato, 2003).

As a result, some researchers have begun to consider pragmatic development abroad as just one aspect of the development of IC, and to focus on co-constructed interactional practices rather than on individual speech acts (e.g., Dings, 2007; Dings, 2014; Elola & Oskoz, 2008; Ishida, 2009, 2011; Shively, 2015; Taguchi, 2015b). Where pragmatic-based studies might focus on how learners handle their own gaps in communicative ability (Lafford, 1995, 2004) or abilities to repair (Smartt & Scudder, 2004), IC-based studies will focus on learners' ability to co-construct meaning, manage turn-taking, sequentially organize turns, use listener responses, etc. Others have also explored these issues within a socio-cultural framework (e.g., Dewaele & Regan, 2002; Howard, Lemée, & Regan, 2006; Jackson, 2008; Kinginger, 2008; Regan, 1995, 1997; Regan, Howard, & Lemée, 2009).

Much of the existing research on pragmatic competence and related topics continues to focus on the monologic abilities of one speaker, even when the data are taken from an interaction between two or more speakers (Kinger, 2009). These monologic abilities are typically judged against a native speaker model. Overall, research that focuses only on the pragmatic abilities of one speaker may not take into account personal choice, self-expression and the wide range of possibilities in interaction that cannot be categorized simply as attempts to copy native norms.

Study-Abroad Research and IC

When IC is investigated, language ability is understood "as a dialogic construct, locally situated and jointly constructed by participants in discourse"; such research generally takes a sociocognitive approach rather than a cognitive approach, expecting L2 learning to occur through "participation in social practices" (Taguchi, 2015b: 1). This requires speakers to use (and learn to use) both linguistic (i.e., vocabulary, grammar,

pronunciation, etc.) and interactional (i.e., speech acts, turn-taking, repair, sequence organization, etc.) resources in order to co-construct meaning in collaboration with other speakers. These resources can also serve as targets for study-abroad research.

Most researchers concerned with study abroad agree that what happens for students outside of class is vital to their L2 development while abroad. Interactions that occur outside of the classroom would also seem to be an ideal area for studying students' developing IC. However, as established in this chapter, it can be difficult to study these experiences due to individual variation and other issues. For the most part, research on exposure to the L2 abroad has often focused on homestay interactions and service encounters, as well as on other situation-based contact with TL speakers. Many of a student's interactions outside of class will involve the negotiation of access to goods and services (Pellegrino Aveni, 2005), which often drives this focus on service encounters. Such studies, including those discussed below, often take an ethnographic approach and focus on smaller groups of students, allowing a deeper look at their individual experiences abroad. Online communication in both the home language and the TL is also a more recent focus that is becoming increasingly relevant (see Taleghani-Nikazm, this volume).

Interaction outside of class has been explored using a variety of methods. For studies that investigate specific settings of language use, such as service encounters, the focus can vary from analyses of interactional abilities via recordings, to self-reports of students' perceptions of these interactions, to attempts to connect an analysis of these interactions with language development and L2 proficiency. As Kinginger (2009) points out, many researchers pursue recordings of or reflections on these interactions because they see within them an answer to the question of the impact of extracurricular activities on language development (or IC development).

Researchers have therefore developed a variety of instruments that elicit reflections on L2 use. However, it may be the case that it is possible to catalogue what students do outside of class without capturing the impact or quality of these activities for L2 development or IC (Bown et al., 2015; Kinginger, 2009; Shively, 2017; Taguchi, 2015b). In other words, simply having a list of how a student spent time outside of class is not the same as knowing what happened in those interactions, or to what degree students were invested in those communities (Taguchi, 2015b). In an effort to investigate the quality of these interactions, many have incorporated more than one measure of students' experience (e.g., Brecht & Robinson, 1993; Gautier & Chevrot, 2015; Pellegrino Aveni, 2005; Shively, 2017; Trentman, 2013).

For example, Bown et al. (2015) incorporated surveys, weekly speaking journals and interviews. The journals in particular allowed them "to better understand students' perspectives on their interactions" (p. 206),

with many variables and strategies arising as significant to the participants' experiences. Shively (2017) collected audio recordings of interactions, background and language contact questionnaires, weekly journals, and interviews with participants and host families. As Shively asserts, research has not solved this challenge of treating social interaction as an experimental variable, but instruments (such as journals, calendar diaries and the Language Contact Profile; Freed, Dewey, Segalowitz, & Halter, 2004) have succeeded in revealing the nature of participants' social networks and the role of identity and intercultural competence within them, among other outcomes.

This need to analyze interaction in context has also been realized through the framework of communities of practice, which is a specific level of analysis focused on the participation of an individual with various communities of speakers. A community of practice is a group of people with a common interest that interacts regularly (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and language learning thus becomes a process of participation in social practices with such groups (Bracke & Aguerre, 2015). This research explores how interactional abilities are taught and learned within these communities and is often conceptualized through the lens of language socialization and identity (e.g., Bracke & Aguerre, 2015; Cook, 2006, 2008; Diao, 2014; DuFon, 2010; Jin, 2012; Kinginger, 2013; McMeekin, 2011; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1994, 2017; Plews, 2015; Shively, 2011, 2013b, 2017; Trentman, 2015). It is often the case that the availability of opportunities to engage drives students' interactions within a community, and students' participation may be blocked for a variety of reasons, both internal and external (e.g., contact with home and home language, living arrangements, discrimination, assignment of in-group vs. out-group identities, etc.) (Taguchi, 2015b).

In the few studies where IC has been the main focus, researchers are more likely to gather audio or video recordings of students' interactions in the TL. In most of these studies the students are not provided with a topic of conversation, but simply asked to record conversations with TL speakers. Past research that has investigated IC development during study abroad has focused on topics such as the following: listener responses (e.g., Shively, 2015); alignment activity and topic management (e.g., Dings, 2007, 2014); word searches and intersubjectivity (e.g., Chiarenza, 2010; David, 2011; McMeekin, 2017); politeness and speech styles (e.g., Taguchi, 2015b); storytelling (e.g., Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2016); and interactional particles (e.g., Diao, 2014; Ishida, 2009; Masuda, 2011). Others have incorporated similar methods without an explicit focus on IC (which in some cases was incorporated by the same researchers in later studies): humor and irony (e.g., Shively, 2013a, 2017; Shively, Menke, & Manzón-Omundson, 2008); compliments (e.g., Jin, 2012); politeness forms (e.g., McMeekin, 2011); and service encounters (e.g., Shively, 2011, 2013b, 2017). Some have explicitly considered

pragmatic development as a single aspect of IC (e.g., Dings, 2007; Dings, 2014; Ishida, 2009, 2011; Shively, 2015; Taguchi, 2015b).

In an example of a study focused on IC, McMeekin (2017) explored the interactions of three L2 speakers of Japanese with their host families in Japan. She collected recordings of naturally occurring TL conversations over three weeks around the midpoint of their eight weeks abroad and used conversation analytic (CA) methods to explore the communication strategies used by the participants to resolve word searches and maintain intersubjectivity. She found that L2 learners “are not deficient language users, but interactants that co-negotiate meaning with their L1 speaker interlocutors, and they are seen as such by these interlocutors” (p. 286). McMeekin argues that her study shows the importance of analyzing these types of interactions, as it may be the best way to investigate study-abroad participants’ abilities to “resolve difficulties in authentic conversation” (p. 286).

Dings (2014) followed a single student through her academic year abroad in Spain and analyzed six interactions with the same speaker for alignment activity. In this case, the alignment activities of interest were assessment, collaborative completion and collaborative contribution. The student also completed journals about her TL exposure and oral proficiency tests. The recorded interactions were analyzed using modified CA methods. Dings found that the student’s participation in alignment activities increased over her time abroad. She began to play a more active role in the co-construction of the interactions—for example, initially the student provided elaborate assessments only for her own contributions, and by the end of her sojourn she was able to provide elaborate assessments for her interlocutor’s. However, Dings was not able to show that the student was able to diversify her resources for doing a given interactional practice over time. Shively (2015) explored learners’ use of listener responses over a semester abroad in Spain and, using modified CA methods, did find that learners gained new interactional resources and were able to use them to diversify their interactional practices over time. Data included students’ recordings of conversations with host families or friends, journals and interviews.

Pekarek Doehler and Berger (2016) also took a longitudinal approach to the development of IC, with a focus on storytelling. While this study is not explicitly about study abroad, the participant (L1 German) is engaged in similar activities: working as an au pair in France, living with a host family and attending French classes once a week. As with the other studies mentioned here, the researchers collected audio recordings, in this case mealtime conversations, at regular intervals throughout the participant’s nine-month stay. The participant was asked to record conversations during “ordinary family routines” (p. 5); these conversations were analyzed using CA methods. Like Shively (2015), Pekarek Doehler and Berger found that, over time, the participant was able to use new interactional

practices, diversifying her resources for story opening (i.e., displaying relatedness to prior talk, securing reciprocity and establishing the tell-worthiness of her stories), and thereby aligning her co-participants as story recipients in varied ways. The participant also showed “increased use of grammatical constructions that are suited for getting exactly these interactional jobs accomplished” (p. 20). Their findings suggest that for advanced L2 speakers, their ability to use known grammatical forms for new interactional purposes grows over time.

In another longitudinal example, Taguchi (2015b) recruited students studying abroad in Japan and collected TL conversational data (focus: politeness and speech styles via recordings of peer-to-peer and peer-to-instructor conversations), semi-structured interview data (focus: individual experience, perception of study abroad, self-reported exposure to TL, metalinguistic reflection) and surveys on motivation. From an analysis of the conversational data using modified CA methods, she found that the students gradually expanded their repertoires of interactional resources, specifically for speech styles (politeness) and the marking of speaker boundaries in discourse. Students also developed their ability to use discourse particles and conjunctions that signal incomplete sentences in Japanese, a typical interactional practice that is often left out of textbooks and that is usually followed sequentially by joint turn completion or a topic shift.

Taguchi concludes that “as speakers, the learners became able to produce incomplete sentences as turn allocation devices; as listeners, they came to understand their use as signaling a turn transition point, and learned to react to this resource appropriately,” thereby performing a range of social functions relevant in interaction (2015b: 149). However, the data were still characterized by a range of individual differences in outcomes, and individual results were not generalizable across the group. Taguchi was also able to establish the students’ involvement in TL communities through results from the semi-structured interview data and concludes that social contact must be “systematic, sustainable, and enduring for learners to establish and maintain membership in the community” (2015b: 154). However, she acknowledges that drawing clear connections between this engagement and IC outcomes from the conversational data, especially as related to individual differences, remains difficult without more qualitative information and clearer methods of drawing such connections.

A common thread in studies on IC is the use of (sometimes modified) CA methods to analyze recordings and transcripts of naturally occurring TL conversations. As previous studies have shown, study abroad seems to encourage conversational or communicative competence (see Kinginger, 2009; Lafford, 1995; Taguchi, 2015b), but it may be very difficult to demonstrate an empirical effect of the external setting on IC development with an analysis of IC using CA methods. The external setting, in

this case study abroad, cannot be assumed to be relevant in CA unless it is oriented to by the participants themselves in their interactions. This is not necessarily a drawback, but it does set this sort of analysis apart from other typical approaches in study-abroad research, where TL gains have long been the most common focus. As Pekarek Doehler and Berger (2016) state, “this is not a problem of analysis, but a problem of interpreting the findings, that is, relating the documentable change in the speaker’s practices to issues of development and competence” (p. 575).

As the research by Taguchi (2015b), Dings (2014), McMeekin (2017), Pekarek Doehler and Berger (2016) and Shively (2015) has shown, it is possible either to use CA methods in one part of an overall analysis of learners’ IC abilities, or to focus on one participant’s abilities in depth using CA methods. It may be beneficial to gather information about participants’ abilities using a variety of methods, even within a single study. This would likely require that more data be collected detailing students’ experiences, which may allow connections to be made between the results of various analyses. In the future, it will also be important to consider how these interactions outside of class intersect with what students are learning in class.

Conclusion: Pedagogical and Programmatic Implications

Given the overall interest among study-abroad researchers in understanding what students do outside of class, IC and CA methods may provide a way of investigating those experiences that have thus far been explored mainly through self-reports and assessments of a speaker’s individual abilities. It may also be possible to gain a better understanding of students’ development as members of communities and social networks, as improving L2 IC requires the development of L2 interactional practices. In order to explore how relevant variables and areas of interaction are interrelated, it may be necessary to incorporate an analysis of instruction, or even to take an interventionist approach, as many have suggested.

For example, Hassall (2015b) investigated the effect of explicit focus on L2 pragmatic features in classroom discussions during study abroad. He found that these discussions positively impacted the students’ pragmatic development and ability to identify L2 pragmatic features as produced by native speakers. However, this study does not incorporate an analysis of students’ performance outside of class. Shively (2013b) suggests making short conversations with native speakers in various settings a mandatory part of study-abroad programs, as participation in a variety of conversations is crucial to IC development.

Taguchi (2015b) similarly suggests that providing many “opportunities to observe and practice language in diverse social settings” contributes to L2 learning (p. 155). She argues that learners must gain experience in a variety of “domains of practice,” in which learners must participate

and cultivate membership in order to develop IC. In fact, this idea of “domains of practice” (which have typified memberships, activities, linguistic features and patterns of interactions) may be useful as a reference for study-abroad instruction. Instructors could develop targeted units based on certain domains in order to direct learners’ attention to certain aspects of interaction, and students’ participation in those domains outside of class could be incorporated through recordings of conversations.

Researchers have also suggested targets for instruction. Shively (2015) identified certain targets in her study on listener responses. McMeekin (2017) similarly argues that instructors could help learners use communication strategies more effectively through targeted instruction and practice in class. She provides examples of instructional targets such as demonstratives in Japanese and formulaic phrases; she also recommends communicative practice in resolving production difficulties through interaction. Taguchi (2015b) argues that students’ abilities could be measured against the “yardstick” of “typical linguistic [or interactional] features” for a given domain, possibly revealing “meaningful interpretations about the connection between a study abroad experience and language development” (p. 155).

As with other areas of SLA, it may be the case that IC development can be ‘sped up’ through targeted instruction, which has been shown to encourage learning in various ways. Betz and Huth (2014) suggest that this type of intervention can be realized as guided analysis within a ‘cycle of instruction.’ In these cycles, students reflect on interactional practices, practice through guided analysis and other activities, receive feedback and engage in self-reflection. The conversations suggested by Shively (2013b) and Taguchi (2015b) could be recorded and used in class as the target of this guided analysis. The reflection stage may also be particularly important as a window into learners’ awareness of interactional practices and identity negotiation, which in previous studies have been revealed through journals and interviews (Iwasaki, 2011; Shively, 2013b).

This approach is not solely applicable to study-abroad learning. In fact, Dings (2014) argues that learners should be encouraged to interact with local speech communities at home or with TL speakers online, possibly through community-based projects or other relationships. Instructors could also seek language partners in order to facilitate a similar cycle of instruction at home. Such interaction outside of class has also been explored in studies on communication ‘in the wild’ (see Lilja & Piirainen-Marsh, this volume).

While much about study abroad remains unproven or unknown, L2 learners who go abroad can clearly benefit from the experience, perhaps especially in terms of their communicative and interactional abilities. It is also clear that students may not take advantage of opportunities for communication and interaction of their own accord, particularly when their participation in TL communities is barred or somehow blocked,

or without additional encouragement or instruction (Wilkinson, 2002). Recent research on student success in four-year universities in the United States has shown that the most successful extracurricular organizations have “regular encounters, mandatory attendance, and a shared topic for conversation” (Chambliss & Takacs, 2014: 31). This echoes Taguchi’s (2015b) assertion that social contact must be “systematic, sustainable, and enduring” in order for learners abroad to become members of a TL community (p. 154). Perhaps study-abroad programs can consider these characteristics of successful organizations and patterns of social contact when creating opportunities for students to engage with the TL. It may be necessary to intervene at the instructional and programmatic levels in order to encourage students to take advantage of more, if not all, opportunities for engagement during study abroad.

References

- Anderson, S. L. (2012). Differential gains in oral proficiency during study abroad: The role of language learning aptitudes (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Georgetown University, Washington.
- Athanasopoulos, P., Damjanovic, L., Burnand, J., & Bylund, E. (2015). Learning to think in a second language: Effects of proficiency and length of exposure in English learners of German. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(S1), 138–153.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2014). Documenting interlanguage development. In Z. Han & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Interlanguage: Forty years later* (pp. 127–46). John Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Bastos, M.-T. (2011). Proficiency, length of stay, and intensity of interaction and the acquisition of conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 8(3), 347–384.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Barron, A. (2006). Learning to say ‘you’ in German: The acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in a study abroad context. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 59–88). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Betz, E., & Huth, T. (2014). Beyond grammar: Teaching interaction in the German language classroom. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 47, 140–163.
- Bown, J., Dewey, D. P., & Belnap, R. K. (2015). Student interactions during study abroad in Jordan. In R. Mitchell, N. Tracy-Ventura, & K. McManus (Eds.), *Social interaction, identity and language learning during residence abroad* (pp. 199–222). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Bracke, A., & Aguerre, S. (2015). Erasmus community: From a community of practice to a learning community. In R. Mitchell, N. Tracy-Ventura, & K. McManus (Eds.), *Social interaction, identity and language learning during residence abroad* (pp. 139–168). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Brecht, R., Davidson, D., & Ginsberg, R. (1995). Predictors of foreign language gain during study abroad. In B. F. Freed & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 37–66). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Brecht, R. D., & Robinson, J. L. (1993). *Qualitative analysis of second language acquisition in study abroad: The ACTR/NFLC project*. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2004). Talking, creating: Interactional language, creativity, and context. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(1), 62–88.
- Chambliss, D. F., & Takacs, C. G. (2014). *How college works*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Chiarenza, A. C. (2010). *Word searches in L1 and L2 Italian conversation: Re-establishing intersubjectivity* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Churchill, E. (2009). Gender and language learning at home and abroad. *JALT Journal*, 31, 141–158.
- Cohen, A. D., & Shively, R. L. (2007). Acquisition of requests and apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of study abroad and strategy-building intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(2), 189–212.
- Cook, C. E. (2008). Study abroad for Chinese university presidents: How China is reforming higher education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 40(3), 32–39.
- Cook, H. M. (2006). Joint construction of folk beliefs by JFL learners and Japanese host families. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 120–150). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Czerwionka, L., Artamonova, T., & Barbosa, M. (2014). Intercultural competence during short-term study abroad: A focus on knowledge. In B. Dupuy & L. Waugh (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the fourth international conference on the development and assessment of intercultural competence* (Vol. 3, pp. 46–77). Tucson: Center for Educational Resources in Culture, Language and Literacy, University of Arizona.
- David, V. (2011). *Nonnative speakers' communication strategies in word searches from a conversation analytic perspective* (Unpublished MA thesis). University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Davidson, D. E. (2010). Study abroad: When, how long, and with what results? New data from the Russian front. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(1), 6–26.
- Dewaele, J. M., & Regan, V. (2002). Maîtriser la norme sociolinguistique en interlangue française: Le cas de l'omission variable de 'ne.' *Journal of French Language Studies*, 12, 123–148.
- Diao, W. (2014). Peer socialization into gendered L2 Mandarin practices in a study abroad context: Talk in the dorm. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(5), 599–620.
- Dings, A. (2007). *Developing interactional competence in a second language: A case study of a Spanish language learner* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Texas, Austin.
- Dings, A. (2014). Interactional competence and the development of alignment activity. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 742–756.
- Di Silvio, F., Donovan, A., & Malone, M. E. (2014). The effect of study abroad homestay placements: Participant perspectives and oral proficiency gains. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(1), 168–188.
- Du, H. (2013). The development of Chinese fluency during study abroad in China. *Modern Language Journal*, 97(1), 131–143.
- DuFon, Margaret A., (2010). The acquisition of terms of address in a second language. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (pp. 309–331). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

- Ecke, P. (2014). The effects of study abroad in the German-speaking world: A research review. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 47(2), 121–139.
- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2008). Blogging: Fostering intercultural competence development in foreign language and study abroad contexts. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(3), 454–477.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C., & Hasler-Barker, M. (2015). Complimenting in Spanish in a short-term study abroad context. *System*, 48, 75–85.
- Freed, B. F. (1990). Language learning in a study abroad context: The effects of interactive and noninteractive out-of-class contact on grammatical achievement and oral proficiency. In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Linguistics, language teaching, and language acquisition: The interdependence of theory, practice, and research* (pp. 459–477). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Freed, B. F. (Ed.). (1995). *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Freed, B. F., Dewey, D. P., Segalowitz, N., & Halter, R. (2004). The language contact profile. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 349–356.
- Freed, B. F., Segalowitz, N., & Dewey, D. P. (2004). Context of learning and second language fluency in French: Comparing regular classroom, study abroad, and intensive domestic immersion programs. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(02), 275–301.
- García-Amaya, L. J. (2012). *Second language fluency and cognition: The study of Spanish second language development in an overseas immersion program and an at-home foreign language classroom* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Gautier, R., & Chevrot, J.-P. (2015). Acquisition of sociolinguistic variation in a study abroad context: The impact of social network. In R. Mitchell, N. Tracy-Ventura, & K. McManus (Eds.), *Social interaction, identity and language learning during residence abroad* (pp. 169–184). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Golato, A. (2003). Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(2), 90–121.
- Hassall, T. (2015a). Individual variation in L2 study-abroad outcomes: A case study from Indonesian pragmatics. *Multilingual*, 34(1), 33–59.
- Hassall, T. (2015b). Influence of fellow L2 learners on pragmatic development during study abroad. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 12(4), 415–442.
- Hernández, T. A. (2010). The relationship among motivation, interaction, and the development of second language oral proficiency in a study-abroad context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(4), 600–617.
- Hoffman-Hicks, S. (1999). *The longitudinal development of French foreign language pragmatic competence: Evidence from study abroad participants* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Howard, M., Lemée, I., & Regan, V. (2006). The acquisition of a phonological variable: The case of /l/ deletion in French. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 16, 1–24.
- Isabelli-García, C. (2010). Acquisition of Spanish gender agreement in two learning contexts: Study abroad and at home. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(2), 289–303.
- Isabelli-García, C. (2006). SA social networks, motivations, and attitudes: Implications for SLA. In M. A. DuFon & M. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 231–258). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ishida, M. (2009). Development of interactional competence: Changes in the use of ‘ne’ in L2 Japanese during study abroad. In H. T. Nguyen & G. Kasper

- (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 351–385). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Ishida, M. (2011). Engaging in another person's telling as a recipient in L2 Japanese: Development of interactional competence during one-year study abroad. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 45–85). Manoa: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Iwasaki, N. (2011). Learning L2 Japanese 'politeness' and 'impoliteness': Young American men's dilemmas during study abroad. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 45, 67–106.
- Jackson, J. (2008). *Language, identity, and study abroad: Sociocultural perspectives*. London: Equinox.
- Jin, L. (2012). When in China, do as the Chinese do? Learning compliment responding in a study abroad program. *Chinese as a Second Language Research*, 1(2), 211–240.
- Kinginger, C. (2008). Language learning in study abroad: Case studies of Americans in France. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(s1), 1–124.
- Kinginger, C. (2009). *Language learning and study abroad: A critical reading of research*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Kinginger, C. (2013). Language socialization in study abroad. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. New York: Blackwell.
- Kinginger, C. (2015). Language socialization in the homestay: American high school students in China. In R. Mitchell, N. Tracy-Ventura, & K. McManus (Eds.), *Social interaction, identity and language learning during residence abroad* (pp. 53–74). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Kondo, S. (1997). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English: Longitudinal study on interlanguage apologies. *Sophia Linguistica*, 41, 265–284.
- Lafford, B. (1995). Getting into, through, and out of a survival situation: A comparison of communicative strategies used by students studying Spanish abroad and 'at home.' In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 97–121). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lafford, B. (2004). The effect of context of learning on the use of communication strategies by learners of Spanish as a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 201–226.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Llanes, À. (2011). The many faces of study abroad: An update on the research on L2 gains emerged during a study abroad experience. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 8(3), 189–215.
- Llanes, À., & Muñoz, C. (2009). A short stay abroad: Does it make a difference? *System*, 37(3), 353–365.
- Magnan, S. S., & Back, M. (2007). Social interaction and linguistic gain during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40, 43–61.
- Magnan, S. S., & Lafford, B. A. (2012). Learning through immersion during study abroad. In S. M. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 525–540). New York: Routledge.
- Martinsen, R. A. (2010). Short-term study abroad: Predicting changes in oral skills. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(3), 504–530.

- Masuda, K. (2011). Acquiring interactional competence in a study abroad context: Japanese language learners' use of the interactional particle *ne*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(4), 519–540.
- Matsumura, S. (2003). Modeling the relationships among interlanguage pragmatic development, L2 proficiency, and exposure to L2. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(4), 465–491.
- Matsumura, S. (2007). Exploring the aftereffects of study abroad on interlanguage pragmatic development. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 4(2), 167–192.
- McMeekin, A. L. (2011, March). *Japanese L2 learners' use and acquisition of the plain form during study abroad*. Paper presented at the conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Chicago, USA.
- McMeekin, A. L. (2017). L1-L2 speaker interaction in a study abroad setting: Communication strategies, word searches, and intersubjectivity. *Study Abroad Research in Second Language Acquisition and International Education*, 2(2), 263–294.
- Mora, J. C., & Valls-Ferrer, M. (2012). Oral fluency, accuracy, and complexity in formal instruction and study abroad learning contexts. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(4), 610–641.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization. *Culture theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*, 276–320.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (2017). Language socialization: An historical overview. *Language Socialization*, 1–14.
- Owen, J. (2001). Interlanguage pragmatics in Russian: A study of the effects of study abroad and proficiency levels on request strategies (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2016). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(4), 555–578. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw021>
- Pellegrino Aveni, V. A. (2005). *Study abroad and second language use: Constructing the self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plews, J. (2015). Intercultural identity-alignment in second language study abroad, or the more-or-less Canadians. In R. Mitchell, N. Tracy-Ventura, & K. McManus (Eds.), *Social interaction, identity and language learning during residence abroad* (pp. 281–304). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Ranta, L., & Meckelborg, A. (2013). How much exposure to English do international graduate students really get? Measuring language use in a naturalistic setting. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 69(1), 1–33.
- Regan, V. (1995). The acquisition of sociolinguistic native speech norms: Effects of a year abroad on second language learners of French. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 245–267). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Regan, V. (1997). Les apprenants avancés, la lexicalisation et l'acquisition de la compétence sociolinguistique: Une approche variationniste. *AILE*, 9, 193–210.
- Regan, V., Howard, M., & Lemée, I. (2009). *The acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in a study abroad context*. Cleveland: Multilingual Matters.
- Schauer, G. A. (2007). Finding the right words in the study abroad context: The development of German learners' use of external modifiers in English. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 4(2), 193–220.

- Schauer, G. A. (2009). *Interlanguage pragmatic development: The study abroad context*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Segalowitz, N. (2010). *The cognitive bases of second language fluency*. New York: Routledge.
- Segalowitz, N., & Freed, B. F. (2004). Context, contact, and cognition in oral fluency acquisition: Learning Spanish in at home and study abroad contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(02), 173–199.
- Shardakova, M. (2005). Intercultural pragmatics in the speech of American L2 learners of Russian: Apologies offered by Americans in Russian. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(4), 423–454.
- Shimizu, T. (2009). Influence of learning context on L2 pragmatic realization: A comparison between JSL and JFL learners' compliment responses. *Pragmatic Competence*, 167–198.
- Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2010). The incidental acquisition of English plural 's' by Japanese children in comprehension-based and production-based lessons. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(04), 607–637.
- Shively, R. L. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6), 1818–1835.
- Shively, R. L. (2013a). Learning to be funny in Spanish during study abroad: L2 humor development. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(4), 930–946.
- Shively, R. L. (2013b). Out-of-class interaction during study abroad: Service encounters in Spain. *Spanish in Context*, 10(1), 53–91.
- Shively, R. L. (2015). Developing interactional competence during study abroad: Listener responses in L2 Spanish. *System*, 48, 86–98.
- Shively, R. L. (2017). Language socialisation during study abroad: Researching social interaction outside the classroom. In S. Coffey & U. Wingate (Eds.), *New directions for research in foreign language education* (pp. 109–124). New York: Routledge.
- Shively, R. L., & Cohen, A. D. (2008). Development of Spanish requests and apologies during study abroad. *Ikala, Revista de Lenguaje Y Cultura*, 13(20), 57–118.
- Shively, R. L., Menke, M. R., & Manzón-Omundson, S. M. (2008). Perception of irony by L2 learners of Spanish. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 101–132.
- Smartt, J. T., & Scudder, R. R. (2004). Immersion study abroad in Mexico: Using repair behavior to assess proficiency changes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(4), 592–601.
- Taguchi, N. (2008). Cognition, language contact, and the development of pragmatic comprehension in a study-abroad context. *Language Learning*, 58(1), 33–71.
- Taguchi, N. (2011). The effect of L2 proficiency and study-abroad experience on pragmatic comprehension. *Language Learning*, 61(3), 904–939.
- Taguchi, N. (2015a). 'Contextually' speaking: A survey of pragmatic learning abroad, in class, and online. *System*, 48, 3–20.
- Taguchi, N. (2015b). *Developing interactional competence in a Japanese study abroad context* (Vol. 88). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Taguchi, N., Li, S., & Xiao, F. (2013). Production of formulaic expressions in L2 Chinese: A developmental investigation in a study abroad context. *Chinese as a Second Language Research*, 2(1), 23–58.
- Takahashi, S. (2015). The effects of learner profiles on pragmalinguistic awareness and learning. *System*, 48, 48–61.

- Trentman, E. (2013). Arabic and English during study abroad in Cairo, Egypt: Issues of access and use. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(2), 457–473.
- Trentman, E. (2015). Negotiating gendered identities and access to social networks during study abroad in Egypt. In R. Mitchell, N. Tracy-Ventura, & K. McManus (Eds.), *Social interaction, identity and language learning during residence abroad* (pp. 263–280). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Tschirner, E. (2007). The development of oral proficiency in a four-week intensive immersion program in German. *Die Unterrichtspraxis: Teaching German*, 40(2), 111–117.
- Vande Berg, M., Paige, R. M., & Lou, K. H. (2012). *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it*. Sterling: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Warga, M., & Schölmlberger, U. (2007). The acquisition of French apologetic behavior in a study abroad context. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 4(2), 221–251.
- Wilkinson, S. (2002). The omnipresent classroom during summer study abroad: American students in conversation with their French hosts. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(2), 157–173.
- Xiao, F. (2015). Adult second language learners' pragmatic development in the study-abroad context: A review. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 25, 132–149.
- Yang, J.-S. (2016). The effectiveness of study abroad on second language learning: A meta-analysis. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 72(1), 66–94.
- Yates, L., & Major, G. (2015). 'Quick-chatting,' 'smart dogs,' and how to 'say without saying': Small talk and pragmatic learning in the community. *System*, 48, 141–152.

Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Section III

Research-Informed Pedagogy

Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

8 Developing Interactional Competence With Limited Linguistic Resources

Hansun Zhang Waring

Introduction

An issue of great interest for scholars in interlanguage pragmatics has been the complex relationship between grammatical and pragmatic competence (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996; Rose & Kasper, 2001), where weaker grammatical competence does not automatically imply weaker pragmatic competence. The same may be true for the relationship between linguistic proficiency and interactional competence. Pekarek Doehler (2017) posits that the development of interactional competence entails increasing diversification and efficiency in the deployment of methods for action (e.g., doing a request) and grammar-for-interaction. At least one interpretation of this claim (although not its main thrust) is that interactional competence is not out of reach for lower-level learners although their methods may be less diverse and their delivery less efficient. The purpose of this chapter is to argue, from a conversation analytic (CA) perspective, that interactional competence can and should be developed from the outset in tandem with one's linguistic competence. In line with the practical aim of this volume, it is worth emphasizing from the outset that this is not a CA study on any particular interactional phenomenon, but an attempt to showcase how knowledge of CA may be applied to language teaching. To that end, I demonstrate how, in a short phone conversation between two proficient speakers of English, one can find a rich array of evidence of interactional competence despite the fact that only a limited set of linguistic resources are drawn upon. I then show, by sharing the design, implementation and outcome of an intervention class, how that same conversation can be used as material for helping lower-level learners develop their interactional competence.

Background

Since my entire argument rests on such foundational constructs as interactional competence and lower-level learners, before we move on, it is necessary to establish what I mean by *interactional competence* and *lower-level learners* respectively, at least for the purpose of this chapter.

From Competence to Practices

Interactional competence has been defined in myriad ways since its inception (e.g., Hall, 1999; Kramsch, 1986; Markee, 2000; Young, 2011). The notion of *competence*, however, is rife with controversies (Markee, this volume). It was originally conceptualized as the opposite of *performance* in the sense of Chomsky (1965)—the actual use of language. Presumably, what we attempt to capture with the term *interactional competence* is precisely such actual use, not at all the opposite of ‘performance.’ *Competence* is also a value-laden construct in education and perhaps in a wide range of workplace environments more broadly, where an individual can be located on an assessment rubric as more or less competent. This gradient view of competence is somewhat at odds with the focus of Conversation Analysis on explicating, rather than evaluating, the methods and procedures “on which speakers rely to produce utterances and by which they make sense of other speakers’ talk” (Hutchy & Wooffitt, 1998: 1).

One way to sidestep the conundrum of *competence* is to shift from a discussion that focuses on competence to one that focuses on *practices*—the methods of interaction that are the observable manifestations of one’s interactional competence. After all, if at its core interactional competence is about one’s ability to participate in interactions, CA work has been addressed to exactly that—the various practices participants deploy in interactions, which have been encapsulated in a model of interactional practices in Wong and Waring (2010). The model synthesizes decades of accumulative and robust CA findings on the nature of ordinary conversations with regard to turn-taking, sequencing, overall structuring and repair (see Figure 8.1).

The model begins with turn-taking practices at its base—the foundation of interactional competence. In order to participate in any conversation, one must know when and how to construct a turn, take a turn, and yield a turn. Still, one does not take a turn for the sake of taking a turn. Turns are taken to get things done, or, in CA terms, to formulate actions, such

Figure 8.1 Model of interactional practices (Wong & Waring, 2010)

as fishing, offering, advising or threatening. Such action formation is the realm of sequence—the next component of interactional practices as we move up the diagram. A sequence is a course of action, and sequencing practices are the methods through which actions are implemented. The action of responding to a compliment in American English, for example, can be implemented through such methods as ‘praise downgrade’ (e.g., *Not very solid though.* in response to *Good shot!*) or ‘reference shift’ (e.g., *So are you.* in response to *You’re looking good.*) (Pomerantz, 1978). Knowing how to get things done with the turns in hand is, therefore, a major component of one’s interactional competence, although not the only one. In addition, one cannot begin a conversation without an opening or end a conversation without a closing. These overall structuring practices are integral to one’s interactional competence, as represented as encasing turn-taking and sequencing further up the diagram. The final component is the repair practices designed to manage the breakdown of operations at various levels of the system, as indicated by the penetrating arrow in the diagram. Such breakdowns would involve trouble in speaking, hearing or understanding. Each repair practice can involve ‘self’ or the ‘other’ vis-à-vis whose talk is being repaired, and each practice contains such elements as the trouble source, repair initiation and repair solution.

Learners With Limited Linguistic Resources

For the purpose of this chapter, *lower-level learners* with limited linguistic resources are understood to be those roughly corresponding to the ‘basic’ (as opposed to ‘independent’ or ‘proficient’) users in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (see Table 8.1).

Table 8.1 Vocabulary range and grammatical accuracy for Basic Users in the CEFR

Vocabulary range		
BASIC USER	A2	<i>Has sufficient vocabulary to conduct routine, everyday transaction involving familiar situations and topics.</i> <i>Has a sufficient vocabulary for the expression of basic communicative needs. Has a sufficient vocabulary for coping with simple survival needs.</i>
	A1	<i>Has a basic vocabulary repertoire of isolated words and phrases related to particular concrete situations.</i>
Grammatical accuracy		
BASIC USER	A2	<i>Uses some simple structures correctly, but still systematically makes basic mistakes—for example tends to mix up tenses and forget to mark agreement; nevertheless, it is usually clear what he/she is trying to say.</i>
	A1	<i>Shows only limited control of a few simple grammatical structures and sentence patterns in a learnt repertoire.</i>

Source: Council of Europe (2001, pp. 27, 28).

In the next section, I show how Basic Users may be able to develop a certain amount of interactional competence despite their limited vocabulary range and grammatical accuracy.

Interactional Practices Implemented With Limited Linguistic Resources: An Exemplar

In this section, using what is referred to in the classic CA literature as the ‘stalled tape’—an audio recording of a phone conversation between two speakers of English where one participant reports on the problem of his car being ‘stalled’ (Schegloff, 2007), I demonstrate that despite its limited linguistic demands, the execution of this phone conversation calls for deployment of a full range of interactional practices. Donny is calling Marcia to seek help because of his stalled car.

As noted earlier, this is not a CA study aimed at discovering interactional practices, and what follows is simply a demonstration of how a range of existing findings in the literature can be located in a short conversation that calls for a limited range of linguistic resources. To that end, when I refer to a ‘rule’ such as ‘gaps are minimized’ in what follows, re-demonstrating its robustness is not the point of this chapter. In a similar vein, when showing how the participants in this particular interaction employ a specific method of doing requesting or rejection, it is far from my intention to claim that this is the *only* method speakers of English deploy to accomplish these actions.

(1) Stalled tape: Entire

01		1 + rings
02	Marcia:	Hello?
03	Donny:	Hello Marcia,
04	Marcia:	Yea [: h]
05	Donny:	[(‘t’s) Do]nny.
06	Marcia:	Hi Donny.
07	Donny:	Guess what. hh
08	Marcia:	What.
09	Donny:	hh my car is sta::lled.
10		(0.2)
11		(‘n) I’m up here in the Glen?
12	Marcia:	Oh::.
13		(0.4)
14	Donny:	hhh
15		A:nd.hhh
16		(0.2)
17		I don’ know if it’s po:ssible, but hhh (0.2)
18		see I have to open up the ba:nk.hh
19		(0.3)
20		a:t uh: (.) in Brentwood? hh=
21	Marcia:	=Yeah:—and I know you want- (.) and I w- (.)

- 22 and I would, but—except I’ve gotta leave in
 23 about five min(h)utes. [(h)ehh]
 24 Donny: [Okay then I gotta call
 25 somebody else.right away.
 26 (.)
 27 Okay?=
 28 Marcia: =Okay [Don.]
 29 Donny: [Thanks] a lot.=Bye-.
 30 Marcia: Bye:

As can be seen, the conversation entails mostly one-syllable words (e.g., *hi*, *guess*, *here*, *know*, *right*, *car*, *five*, *bye*), three two-syllable words (i.e., *hello*, *minutes*, *away*) and one three-syllable word (somebody). The conversational turns are mostly composed of single lexical (*hello?*), phrasal (*Guess what?*) or clausal (*My car is stalled.*) units or TCUs (turn-construction units; in Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), with the only multi-unit turn found in lines 17–20 (i.e., *I don’t know if it’s possible but . . .*). It is perhaps safe to say that the vocabulary of this conversation falls within the realm of “everyday transactions” and “familiar situations and topics,” and the grammar does not go far beyond “simple structures”—at least roughly fitting the description of the Basic User in the CEFR.

Notably, knowing words and phrases like *hello*, *goodbye*, *guess what* or even *I don’t know if it’s possible but* does not enable a conversation. These linguistic resources would need to be dispatched in particular ways at particular moments for this particular conversation to happen. They would require, in other words, the assembling of interactional practices. As will be demonstrated, despite this limited range of linguistic resources, Marcia and Donny’s conversation showcases a sophisticated level of interactional competence that involves a full range of turn-taking, sequencing, overall structuring and repair practices. We now take a second look at this conversation in four installments, beginning with the telephone opening.

Telephone Opening

(2) Stalled tape: Opening

- 01 1 + rings
 02 Marcia: Hello?
 03 Donny: Hello Marcia,
 04 Marcia: Yea [: h]
 05 Donny: [(‘t’s) Do]nny.
 06 Marcia: Hi Donny.

The first observation to be made within these first six lines is that this conversation is mostly composed of short turns with one or two lexical

items. It is important, therefore, to recognize, especially for lower-level learners, that conversations (especially daily conversations) can and do indeed proceed with short turns that do not require complex linguistic materials. A second observation is that there is no gap between these short turns. Neither Marcia nor Donny waits for the other person to come to a full stop and for silence to emerge before starting to talk. In fact, their turns even overlap sometimes as seen in lines 04–05, which demonstrates the participants' orientation towards minimizing gaps or silences in English conversation (Sacks et al., 1974).

With regard to sequencing, we see how conversation turns organize themselves into sequences such as summons-answer (lines 01–02) and greeting-greeting (lines 03 and 06). Moreover, recognizing another and greeting can be done within a single turn as in *hello Marcia* (line 03). In addition, we can note that self-identification is done with *it's Donny*, not *I'm Donny* (line 05). Further observations can be made of how Marcia's return greeting, *Hi Donny*, is not done earlier in line 04 and how exactly the participants do recognition and identification in the first few lines. Finally, and perhaps most obviously, these first few lines instantiate the overall structuring practice of a telephone conversation opening, where the phone rings and is answered, the participants identify and recognize each other, and the participants greet each other.

Pre-Sequence

The next three lines present an example of a pre-sequence—the sequence launched before a base sequence such as an invitation, offer or announcement to gauge the viability of proceeding with the base sequence. A pre-invitation such as *Are you free this Saturday?* can be done, for example, to give the potential invitee an opportunity to block or 'green-light' the upcoming invitation. Here, instead of going directly into announcing his trouble *My car is stalled* (line 09), Donny begins with *Guess what?* (line 07) and proceeds with telling his troubles only after Marcia's go ahead *What* (line 08).

(3) Stalled tape: Pre-sequence

- 07 Donny: Guess what. hh
- 08 Marcia: What.
- 09 Donny: hh my ca:r is sta::lled.

While beginning with *My car is stalled* might sound abrupt, beginning with a pre-announcement *Guess what?* can prepare the recipient for what is coming up and is in fact a routine way of making announcements—a sequencing practice that evidences one's interactional competence and is easily teachable to lower-level learners.

Request-Reject

The next portion of the transcript constitutes the main business of this phone conversation or its base sequence—the reason Donny made the call in the first place.

(4) Stalled tape: Request-reject

- 09 Donny: hh my ca:r is sta::lled.
 10 (0.2)
 11 ('n) I'm up here in the Glen?
 12 Marcia: Oh::.
 13 (0.4)
 14 Donny: hhh
 15 A:nd.hh
 16 (0.2)
 17 I don' know if it's po:ssible, but hhh (0.2)
 18 see I have to open up the ba:nk.hh
 19 (0.3)
 20 a:t uh: (.) in Brentwood? hh=
 21 Marcia: =Yeah:. and I know you want- (.) and I w- (.)
 22 and I would, but- except I've gotta leave in
 23 about five min(h)utes. [(hheh)
 24 Donny: [Okay then I gotta call
 25 somebody else.right away.

As can be seen, Donny fishes for help, and Marcia withholds the offering of that help, but neither makes their intent explicit. The request-reject adjacency pair plays out in interesting ways (Schegloff, 2007): Donny never says, *Please do x for me*, and neither does Marcia say, *No, I can't*. This brief segment presents valuable teachable materials for lower-level learners with regard to both sequencing and repair practices. First, assistance may be recruited by reporting on trouble (line 09) (Kendrick & Drew, 2016) in lieu of a direct appeal, and when that assistance is not forthcoming, silence is allowed to emerge (lines 10, 13, 16 and 19), or further talk in the form of an increment can be produced to invite or facilitate the offer (lines 11, 14–15, 17–18 and 20). By the same token, rejection can be done through an expression of willingness followed by an account for inability (e.g., *I gotta leave in about five minutes*) in lieu of any explicit format.

Second, given the earlier turn-taking 'rule' of minimizing gaps, it becomes clear in this segment that silence indicates trouble and, in this particular case, the absence of an 'appropriate' response to the report of trouble, or a conditionally relevant second pair part (e.g., expression of sympathy, offer of help) for the first pair part of telling of troubles. This discussion of silence can also lead to the introduction of the CA notion of 'preference' (Sacks, 1987); i.e., a 'preferred' or expected action tends to be done without any delay, mitigation or account, while a 'dispreferred'

or unexpected action is done *with* these features. In this case, Donny is doing the dispreferred action of requesting, and Marcia, that of rejecting. Aside from the silences, delay is implemented to such an extent that neither the request nor the refusal gets explicitly stated, and for Donny, the most extensive mitigation comes in the form of *I don't know if it's possible, but* (lines 17–18).

Third, note that when Marcia finally takes a substantive turn in lines 21–23, it is peppered with self-repairs such as cut-offs, pauses and restarts that indicate her difficulty in fully articulating the rejection. Given lower-level learners' limited linguistic proficiency, repair—practices of addressing trouble in speaking, hearing or understanding—is a particularly useful and important interactional resource. Exposure to transcripts of actual conversations is a good way of assuring lower-level learners that self-repair (or 'stutter') is a normal part of speaking and that talking involves building and fixing an ongoing conversational turn bit by bit rather than delivering complete, ready-made sentences. Finally, it would be worthwhile to point out that the request-rejection sequence is brought to its completion with Donny's rejection finalizer (Davidson, 1990) in lines 24–25, which also opens up the closing of this phone conversation. Rejection finalizers such as *okay* or *alright* are easily teachable as short two-syllable words and can be immensely useful for ending a request-rejection sequence.

Telephone Closing

The final lines of this phone conversation present useful materials for teaching telephone closing—another overall structuring practice.

(5) Stalled tape: Closing

24	Donny:	[Okay then I gotta call
25		somebody else.right away.
26		(.)
27		Okay?=
=Okay [Don.]
28	Marcia:	
29	Donny:	[Thanks] a lot.=Bye-.
30	Marcia:	Bye:

It would be useful, for example, to point out that phone conversations in English do not come to an abrupt close such as *bye-bye*. Instead, participants collaboratively bring a conversation to a close with a pre-closing pair composed of *Okay*'s (lines 27–28), and other pre-closing elements may include appreciation (*Thanks a lot* in line 29) or announced closing (*I gotta call somebody else* in lines 24–25).

So far, I have catalogued the range of interactional practices that are *potentially* teachable to lower-level learners with limited linguistic

resources, but the question remains: are they *actually* teachable? To begin obtaining an answer, I report on an intervention class designed specifically to teach these practices required to carry out the ‘stalled tape’ conversation.

A CA Intervention Class

A one-hour intervention class was designed for a group of beginning-level students in a community English program—a lab school for an applied linguistics and TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) graduate program. The class was advertised as an opportunity to learn real conversation and was taught to a group of ten volunteers by an experienced ESL instructor and a doctoral student in applied linguistics with a specialty in Conversation Analysis. The first language (L1) backgrounds of the ten volunteers ranged from Japanese, Spanish and Korean to Thai, Russian and Hebrew. Based on the recording and transcript of the ‘stalled tape,’ the goal of the lesson was for the students to develop the ability to:

- self-identify and recognize another in the context of a phone opening;
- give and return greetings as part of call openings;
- take turns in the sequences above with appropriate timing;
- recognize that conversation turns can be short and simple;
- recognize that silence and disfluency can mean trouble;
- recognize that requests can be made and rejected indirectly; and
- end a phone conversation.

The video-recorded lesson began with a discussion of ‘conversation myths,’ such as that native speakers always use complete sentences when they speak, are always direct when they ask for help, and never have problems with speaking. The ‘stalled tape’ was then introduced as an example of a real conversation between real people, and the goal of the lesson was explained. Next, students were invited to listen to the audio recording along with the transcript. After an initial listening, the teacher called attention to a few ‘special things’ about how this conversation was written down (unlike a paragraph): its display as a series of turns, the duration of silence as represented by numbers, and talking at the same time as indicated by aligning brackets.

For the bulk of the lesson, with the transcript along with its recording divided into four segments as shown in the above section, the students were led through a close reading and listening of each segment as the teacher explained and invited discussions on various practices in terms rendered relatable to the students (e.g., a conversation being composed of little pairs, previewing one’s news delivery). At the same time, the students were also invited to role-play as Marcia and Donny along with

various segments of the audio recordings custom-made to replace bits of talk in the transcript with silence (as ‘blanks’ to be filled in). The students were fully engaged during the one-hour lesson: they laughed at their own failure to keep up at times and congratulated themselves and each other with applause.

Immediately after the lesson, the students were asked to fill out a survey that reported on their experiences and comments, which included circling ‘yes’ or ‘no’ with reference to a set of statements (see Table 8.2).

Eight of the 10 students circled ‘yes’ in response to all the statements above. One Spanish L1 speaker circled ‘no’ with regard to waiting for silence to start talking, and one Japanese L1 speaker circled ‘no’ for requesting without asking, and rejecting without saying *no*. The students were also asked to rate the usefulness of the lesson on a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 indicating the most useful. Seven out of the 10 students chose the rating of 5, and none chose 1. In answering the question of what they had learned from the lesson, the pre-sequence, indirect rejection and ‘quick responses’ were highlighted. The students also expressed an interest in more individual and group practice, playing the roles of both Donny and Marcia without any prompts, and learning about other situations in conversation.

Overall, the students found the lesson useful, were able to articulate what they learned, and expressed an interest in more lessons of a similar nature. This outcome, I hope, offers some (albeit limited) evidence that it is indeed possible to teach and learn interactional practices at the lower level, and that, by extension, it is indeed possible to help learners with limited linguistic resources develop their interactional competence.

Table 8.2 Post-intervention student survey

I understand that conversation turns can be short.	YES	NO
I understand that I should not wait for silence to start talking.	YES	NO
I understand that silence can mean a problem (for example, difficulty in offering or asking for help).	YES	NO
I can identify myself (“It’s Donny”) on the phone.	YES	NO
I can show that I recognize the other person (“Hello, Marcia”) on the phone.	YES	NO
I can give and return greetings (“Hello”) on the phone.	YES	NO
I can end a phone conversation.	YES	NO
I understand that I can make a request without asking for help (for example, by describing a problem).	YES	NO
I understand that I can say ‘no’ to a request without using the word <i>no</i> (for example, by being silent or giving a reason).	YES	NO

Discussion

Using Conversation Analysis to effectuate change in various professional contexts is not new (e.g., Stokoe, 2014); the above is simply an example of this endeavor in the language classroom on a very small scale. Admittedly, a broader range of materials could have been included to demonstrate a wider range of methods of doing opening, closing, requesting, rejecting, etc. It is also possible to design intervention classes such as the above with greater rigor—a direction that I assume would be of interest to colleagues with aspirations to quantify learning outcomes. My goal for this particular chapter, however, has been to offer a simple demo of how teaching interactional competence *to lower-level learners* is indeed a possibility. As such, it is beyond the scope of this project to explicate methods of selecting recordings for teaching interactional competence or of creating rubrics for measuring interactional competence. For the various complexities involved in calibrating learning objects and establishing standards in the teaching of interactional competence, see Waring (2018).

In closing, it would be instructive to consider what has been discussed and demonstrated so far vis-à-vis the CEFR description of the Basic User with respect to spoken production and interaction (see Table 8.3)

The descriptors in this rubric strike me as being more transactional than interactional, although describing and exchanging simple information is certainly an integral part of interaction. I can't help but wonder if the Basic User can and should be able to do more, and whether, in a rubric such as this one, there is room for specifying systematically what it means for a lower-level learner to be interactionally competent. This is

Table 8.3 Description of the Basic User in the CEFR: Spoken production and interaction

BASIC USER	A2	Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g., very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.
	A1	Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.

Source: Council of Europe (2001, p. 5).

Table 8.4 Interactional competence with limited linguistic resources

Turn-taking
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I understand that conversation turns can be simple and short.• I can listen for and build turns with single words, phrases or clauses.• I understand that I should not wait for silence to start talking.• I can time my talk in simple exchanges to minimize silence.
Sequencing
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I can answer the phone.• I can identify myself and do recognition of another.• I can initiate and return greetings.• I can do announcements with pre-announcements.• I understand that silence means trouble (e.g., difficulty in asking for help).• I can make a request without actually asking—through telling of troubles.• I can reject a request without saying ‘no’—by remaining silent, simply listening (e.g., <i>Oh</i>) or giving a reason.
Overall structuring
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I can open and close a conversation.
Repair
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I can, and feel free to, start, stop, retract, correct and leave a sentence incomplete as I talk.

an open-ended question, and I am tempted to at least start the conversation with a set of initial notes (see Table 8.4)—notes that our assessment colleagues can perhaps take into consideration in conceptualizing and creating rubrics for assessing interactional competence. For further discussions on the assessment of interactional competence, see Chapters 11–13 in this volume.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank M. Rafael Salaberry and Silvia Kunitz for inviting me to the symposium on interactional competence at Rice University, which became the impetus for what turned out to be, for me, a rather unconventional project—one that could not have been completed without a group of incredible women at Teachers College, Columbia University: Vivian Lindhardsen introduced me to the CEFR framework and patiently answered all my naive queries about language assessment, Elizabeth Reddington designed and taught the intervention class, Di Yu created various audio clips for the lesson and operated one of the video cameras, Nadja Tadic managed the scheduling of this rather ‘irregular’ endeavor, and Michelle Stabler-Havener facilitated the recruitment of her class of beginning-level students. I am a lucky beneficiary of all their generosity, efficiency and expertise. Thank you also to the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback. Last but not least, to the ten ESL students who volunteered for the intervention class, thank you for being willing and curious and for making everything we do worthwhile.

References

- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning*, 49(4), 677–713.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, UK: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Davidson, J. (1990). Modifications of invitations, offers and rejections. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Interaction competence* (pp. 149–179). Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Hall, J. K. (1999). A prosaics of interaction: The development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 137–151). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 149–169.
- Kendrick, K. H., & Drew, P. (2016). Recruitment: Offers, requests, and the organization of assistance in interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 49(1), 1–19.
- Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(4), 367–372.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2017, March). *The development of L2 interactional competence: 'Methods' for action and grammar-for-interaction*. Plenary talk given at the conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Portland, USA.
- Pomerantz, A. (1978). Compliment responses: Notes on the co-operation of multiple constraints. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 79–112). New York: Academic Press.
- Rose, K., & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 54–69). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stokoe, E. (2014). The Conversation-Analytic Role-Play Method (CARM): A method for training communication skills as an alternative to simulated role-play. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 47, 255–265.
- Waring, H. Z. (2018). Teaching L2 interactional competence: Problems and possibilities. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 57–67.
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. New York: Routledge.
- Young, R. F. (2011). Interactional competence in language learning, teaching, and testing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2) (pp. 426–443). New York, London: Routledge.

9 Instructed L2 Interactional Competence in the First Year

Silvia Kunitz and Meng Yeh

Introduction

The present study illustrates the outcomes of the first two semesters of university language instruction targeting the development of interactional competence (IC) in Chinese as a Foreign Language (CFL), with a specific focus on active listenership and topic management. The originality of the study lies in the collaboration between a language teacher and a conversation analyst who worked together in order to identify potential learning objectives inspired by conversation analytic findings and then to design pedagogical materials targeting such objectives. This collaboration emerged in the context of a professional development program for language teachers at a US research university which had IC as an institutional goal of instruction. Overall, this study aims to: (1) illustrate how pedagogical materials inspired by Conversation Analysis (CA) can be designed (a) by a language teacher who is not a CA specialist and (b) for a language, Chinese, for which there is not a wealth of CA findings; and (2) describe the students' ability at active listenership and topic management after two semesters of instruction in the CFL program.

From a CA perspective, IC can be defined as the ability to recipient-design one's turns in order to accomplish recognizable social actions and adequately respond to the actions produced by co-participants in the local and emergent circumstances of interaction as it unfolds (Eskildsen, 2018; Hall, 2018; Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Hauser, this volume; Markee, this volume; Pekarek Doehler, 2018, this volume). Such ability is based on the appropriate use of the mechanisms organizing talk-in-interaction (such as turn-taking, repair, sequence organization and preference organization),¹ coupled with the use of various linguistic and embodied resources (Markee, 2008; Pekarek Doehler & Fasel Lauzon, 2015). IC is therefore a crucial ability for both L1 and L2 speakers. However, attempts at formally teaching IC in the L2 classroom have so far been rather scant and, to our knowledge, have been limited to the efforts of conversation analysts involved in L2 programs (Barraja-Rohan, 1997, 2011; Huth, 2006, 2010; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; see also

Carroll, 2011a, 2011b; Olsher, 2011a, 2011b; Wong, 2011a, 2011b) who have designed IC instructional materials informed by CA findings. Overall, there is evidence for the effectiveness of CA-based instruction even at the elementary level (Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Huth, 2006; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006), and students seem to react well to and be motivated by this type of instruction (Fujii, 2012; Waring, this volume). Nevertheless, IC-based instruction is not common, and, so far, it has not involved language teachers who are not familiar with CA. This study therefore responds to a call issued by Carroll (2010), who argued for the need to expose teachers to CA research on interactional mechanisms and practices (see also Wong & Waring, 2010).

At the same time, this study reports on another challenge; that is, the creation of CA-inspired pedagogical materials in the face of a limited availability of CA findings for the target language. The belief at the root of this pedagogical experience is, in fact, that even when there are not many (or no) CA findings for the target language (as is the case for Chinese), both teachers and students can benefit from a general, CA-inspired awareness of the sequential unfolding of interaction and of the interactional affordances that each turn opens. This study therefore illustrates how CA-inspired learning outcomes for L2-Chinese have been identified and how the instructional materials have been structured following the IC pedagogical cycle suggested by Barraja-Rohan (1997, 2011) and elaborated by Betz and Huth (2014). Moreover, the data presented here show how students develop their ability at active listenership and topic management, which were the target of instruction. Overall, the study contributes to CA research on IC-based instruction and to research on L2 IC (see Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015, for an overview), while also presenting implications for teacher education, for the diffusion of curricular innovation (Markee, 1997), for syllabus and curriculum design and for a reconsideration of assessment descriptors (see also Huth, forthcoming).

CA and L2 Instruction

Conversation analysts are becoming increasingly concerned with the pedagogical implications of their findings (see the contributions in this volume and in Kunitz, Markee, & Sert, forthcoming). As a matter of fact, the CA understanding of language as social action has already inspired pedagogical interventions that aim to provide “social infrastructures for second language learning” (Wagner, 2015: 91) and thus include a component of *language learning in the wild* in the curriculum (for a rich collection of studies on language learning in the wild see: Hellermann et al., in press). This type of intervention requires students to prepare for, conduct and reflect on interactions that take place outside the classroom (see Clark & Lindemalm, 2011; Lilja & Piirainen-Marsh, 2018, this volume) and engages students in a pedagogical loop that brings them in and

out of the classroom. At the same time, other researchers have engaged in the design of teaching units targeting specific interactional practices that have been identified through CA studies (what we call here *CA-inspired IC instruction*). Since the intervention reported here is framed within this latest line of pedagogical applications, we now turn to a more detailed description of CA-inspired IC-based instruction.

As mentioned in the introduction, consensus is emerging as to the teachability of IC and to the effectiveness of IC-based instruction, as evidenced by the success of pedagogical experiments such as those conducted by Barraja-Rohan (2011), Huth (2006) and Huth and Taleghani-Nikazm (2006). IC-based instruction, as envisioned by conversation analysts, consists of using CA findings to identify teaching objectives and learning outcomes. The rationale behind this practice is that “teaching materials should be informed by systematic, empirical research to produce reliable learning targets” (Betz & Huth, 2014: 146).

So far, conversation analysts have developed teaching materials concerning, for example, the sequential organization of: telephone conversation openings (Wong, 2011a, for English; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006, for German) and closings (Wong, 2011b), compliments (Huth, 2006, for German), requests (Huth, 2010, for German) and rejections (Carroll, 2011b, for English). Other researchers have focused on more general mechanisms of talk-in-interaction, such as turn-taking (Carroll, 2011a, for English), or on the ability to display active listenership through continuers (Olsher, 2011a, for English) and other responses (Olsher, 2011b, for English; Foster, 2012, for French).

Once the target of instruction has been selected, a specific pedagogical cycle can be followed (Barraja-Rohan, 1997, 2011; further elaborated by Betz & Huth, 2014). This cycle consists of five instructional phases: (1) engaging students in in-class reflection about conversational practices; (2) conducting a contrastive analysis of sequences of talk in the L1 and in the L2 with examples of the specific learning target; (3) analyzing clips of naturally occurring talk in the L2 with examples of the learning target; (4) having students practice within a communicative context both in speaking and in writing; and (5) guiding students in a reflection on the cultural import of what they have just learned. These phases of the pedagogical intervention can help students to raise their awareness of conversational practices (see also Fujii, 2012; Liddicoat & Crozet, 2001; Sayer, 2005), while also giving them a chance to engage in such practices and to reflect on their own interactional skills. The reflective component of the pedagogical cycle is in line with the idea that ‘debriefing’ their experiences with the L2 is crucial for L2 users (see Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017; Wagner, 2015; on the importance of evidence-based reflection, albeit applied to teacher education, see also Li, 2017; Mann & Walsh, 2013; Sert, 2015).

As mentioned earlier, the instructional targets that were addressed in the pedagogical intervention reported here were active listenership and topic management.² In what follows, we therefore outline what these

interactional skills involve from a CA perspective and briefly summarize studies on Chinese that were available to the teacher before designing the teaching units; we then describe the setting and the participants, in order to better understand the choices that led the teacher to select active listenership and topic management as the teaching objectives for the first year of CFL instruction.

Active Listenership and Topic Management

Active listenership can be defined as the ability to display attentiveness and engagement in conversation by producing turns that are well fit to the prior talk (see, for example, Bolden, 2006; Gardner, 2001). Studies on the development of active listenership in L2 speakers have focused on the ability to produce information receipts and assessments in a timely manner and to elaborate on prior talk (Brower & Wagner, 2004; Dings, 2014; Ishida, 2011). The teaching of the use of change-of-state tokens (such as *oh* in English; see Heritage, 1984) or acknowledgment tokens (such as *mh mh* and *yeah* in English) might seem trivial for advanced speakers; however, the observable absence of such tokens in the talk of speakers at low levels of proficiency can be striking.

On the other hand, topic management concerns the ability to initiate new topics, to elaborate on current topics, to shift gradually from topic to topic and to signal abrupt topic changes (see, for example, Button & Casey, 1984, 1985; Jefferson, 1984; Maynard, 1980). Prior studies on L2 IC have investigated speakers' ability to engage in topical talk (Nguyen, 2011) by responding extensively to and launching topic proffers (see also Lee, Park, & Sohn, 2011, for the production of more expanded responses by advanced test takers during oral proficiency interviews). The importance of engaging in topical talk by elaborating on prior topics (both self- and other-initiated) and by shifting to new ones has, for example, been highlighted in studies focusing on paired oral exams, in which the lowest-scoring students produce the so-called parallel pattern of interaction by mostly developing self-initiated topics without any significant engagement with prior talk (Galaczi, 2008, 2014).

In terms of active listenership in Chinese conversation, Clancy, Thompson, Suzuki, and Tao (1996) have investigated the use of reactive or response tokens (RTs). These authors analyzed eight face-to-face brief conversations between friends and identified five types of RTs: backchannel³ vocalic devices (or continuers such as *uhm*, *en*, *hum*, etc., roughly equivalent to English *uh huh*, *mh mh* and *mh*), reactive expressions (including acknowledgment tokens such as *dui*, 'yeah', and assessments such as *hao*, 'good'), repetitions of a prior speaker's talk, resumptive openers (which acknowledge the prior turn with tokens such as *o*, 'oh,' and subsequently expand upon it) and collaborative completions (Lerner, 1996). Clancy et al. (1996) found that RTs are used less in Chinese than in English and appear at complex transition relevance places (TRPs;

i.e., places where a turn is complete in terms of grammar and intonation). In other words, it appears that Chinese listeners avoid using RTs in the middle of the co-participant's turn space. The authors speculate that this behavior might imply a cultural orientation to respect the speakers' right to produce their talk without interruption.

While the study by Clancy et al. (1996) is essentially quantitative, Xu (2016) conducted qualitative sequential analyses of the use of various RTs in Chinese conversations. The study demonstrates that both backchannels and reactive expressions in Chinese can be deployed as acknowledgment tokens and continuers, depending on their position. For example, an *uhm* occurring after a TRP acknowledges prior talk, while an *uhm* placed at non-TRP positions (i.e., while another speaker is taking their turn) orients to the ongoing conversation prospectively and encourages the current speaker to talk more. Xu (2016) also shows that Chinese speakers repeat lexical items containing salient information for confirmation; the majority of these repeats occur at TRPs.

Regarding topic management, Tao (2001) explored both self-initiated and other-initiated topics. Specifically, he has studied how new topics can be self-initiated, for example, through news announcements that report speaker-related activities (see Button & Casey, 1985, for the same practice used in English). Tao (2001) has also investigated how other-initiated topics are co-constructed in conversation with a specific interactional practice; that is, after a topic is nominated by a speaker (e.g., by saying *How was your weekend?*), the next speaker repeats a lexical item produced in the prior turn as a way of acknowledging the proposed topic and then elaborates on it (e.g., *Weekend? I didn't do much.*).

Finally, studies on topic management have also investigated several discourse particles that can be used to initiate and shift topics in Chinese. For example, *na* and *ei* are particles used in turn-initial position. Specifically, *na* ('in that case') followed by a brief pause can be used to initiate a topic (Xu, 2008); if it is followed by a question, it can preface topic transition (Biq, 1990), indicating a shift to a different aspect of the topic. On the other hand, the particle *ei* ('by the way') can be deployed to shift the current topic to a related one with an unanticipated inquiry (Tsai, 2008). Finally, both *danshi* ('but'; see Wang & Tsai, 2007) and *qishi* ('actually'; see Wang, Tsai, & Yang, 2010) mark a shift from the focused topic and signal disalignment from prior talk (Lindström & Sorjonen, 2012).

Most of the findings on active listenership in Chinese became teaching objectives for the first-year IC curriculum, with the exclusion of collaborative completions (see Figure 9.1). Similarly, most of the findings on topic management were included (see Figure 9.2), except for *danshi* ('but'; see Wang & Tsai, 2007). At the same time, the findings from Tao (2001) were integrated with findings concerning topic-initiation methods in English as reported in Wong and Waring (2010); according to the teacher, in fact, these methods can be used in Chinese as well. Specifically, the students

were introduced to: (1) topic-initial elicitors (e.g., *ni zuijin zenme yang?*, 'how have you been recently?'); (2) news announcements, reporting on speaker-related activities (e.g., *wo mingtian you yige da kao*, 'I have a big test tomorrow'); (3) pre-topical sequences, asking personal questions about the recipient's identity or activity (e.g., *ni de zhuan ye shi shenme?*, 'what is your major?'); and (4) setting talk, pointing to the immediate environment of the interaction (e.g., *wo zui bu xihuan xiayutian*, 'I hate rainy days').

Setting and Participants

As mentioned in the introduction, the study was conducted in the language center of a US research university which had adopted IC as one of the institutional goals of instruction. The center offered a teacher professional development program which included CA workshops with a variety of aims: introducing basic CA concepts and findings with examples from English conversations; analyzing recordings of student interactions that had been collected by the teachers as regular class assignments; and discussing the feasibility of teaching and testing L2 IC with CA-inspired materials in light of what students enrolled in a two-year language program should be able to do. The CFL teacher involved in the pedagogical intervention reported here attended these workshops and actively participated in the discussion concerning realistic teachable (and learnable) objectives for students in the first year of L2 instruction.

The participants in the present study were 19 college students who were enrolled in first-year CFL courses at the center; these students first took Chinese 141 (a first-semester course) and then Chinese 142 (a second-semester course). The participants were non-heritage students, in that they had neither studied Chinese before nor used Chinese at home. The students met three hours a week in class with the teacher who developed the IC units for this study and had one-hour weekly mandatory group sessions with tutors.

The Process of Identifying Interactional Teaching Objectives

Identifying teachable objectives was the first step in developing the IC curriculum for the first year of CFL instruction. Various resources were explored in order to establish the objectives for beginning students: (a) previous research on L1-Chinese; (b) CA research on English; (c) interactional data collected by the teacher (interactions among L1 speakers and student interactions with L1 speakers); and (d) the guidelines of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR; see Council of Europe, 2001) for oral skills. Moreover, the teacher relied on her own experience regarding the interactional skills of students with low proficiency levels and her view of what lower-level students should be able to do.

In order to find more evidence concerning the use of RTs and other interactional practices in L1-Chinese and in order to have an idea of how interactions among young Chinese speakers are conducted, the teacher recorded two conversations (for a total of 1.5 hours) between two Chinese students (from the same university where the study was conducted) who had not met before; they were invited to have lunch together and were instructed to chat so that they could get to know each other. Note that this task was very similar to what the students had to do in their first conversation with an L1 speaker. Excerpts of these conversations between L1-speaking students were later included in the teaching units (see below). In these data, other RTs that have not been explored in previous studies were found to be frequently used. For example, the teacher observed the use of reactive expressions such as *shi ma* ('is that so?') and *zhende* ('really?'), together with assessments such as *hen hao* ('very good') and *tai hao le* ('great').

Furthermore, the teacher analyzed the interactions that previous first-semester students had with L1 speakers (this interaction was a mandatory assignment for all students). These L1-L2 speaker data helped us identify areas of improvement in first-semester students' interactional skills, which in turn contributed to the identification of realistic teachables (for the concept of teachables, see Eskildsen & Majlesi, 2018).

At the same time, the CEFR guidelines about the interactional objectives for A1 level students were consulted and critically analyzed. It was found that the CEFR does not provide descriptors at the A1 level for the following abilities: taking the floor, indicating when one is following the current speaker's talk, producing thematic development and engaging in informal discussion. This indicates that beginning students are not expected to be able to accomplish these actions/activities. However, we think it is important that beginning students learn how to take a turn, and how to participate in a conversation as active listeners who can minimally expand on current topics.

We therefore decided to target these abilities in the first-year curriculum, and in light of our knowledge of CA research, we operationalized them as: (1) active listenership (i.e., the ability to receipt the prior speaker's turn with acknowledgment tokens, continuers or assessments); and (2) topic management (i.e., the ability to initiate, extend and shift a topic). In fact, as CA research has shown, these skills are crucial to engage in talk-in-interaction.

The IC objectives were illustrated to students at the beginning of each semester and were formulated in plain and understandable language. A detailed list of the IC objectives was given to students (see Figure 9.1 for active listenership objectives at the end of the first semester and Figure 9.2 for topic management objectives at the end of the second semester) as a reminder of the interactional skills they were expected to show during their graded conversations (see below).⁴

Be an engaging conversational partner

- 1) Able to be an active listener providing comments, such as 嗯 (*en*, *ng*, *mh*), 哦 (*o*), 对 (*dui*, 'yes'), or repeating the key words that my partner says.
- 2) Able to be an active listener making assessment to respond to my partner's talk, such as 是吗? (*shi ma?*, 'is that so?'), 很好 (*hen hao*, 'very good'), 太好了 (*tai hao le*, 'great'), 真的 (*zhende*, 'really').
- 3) Able to invite my partner to talk, using 你呢? (*ni ne?*, 'and you?') to reciprocate a question.
- 4) Able to use the markers 啊 (*a*) or 呀 (*ya*) to soften a question.
- 5) Able to use the markers 啊 (*a*) or 呀 (*ya*) to show 'surprise or excitement.'
- 6) Able to use non-verbal behaviors, such as nodding, hand gestures, and eye contact.
- 7) Able to use different ways to express "agreement" such as 好 (*hao*), 好啊 (*hao a*), 好的 (*hao de*, all meaning 'ok').
- 8) Able to use the key words I understand in my partner's talk in order to ask further questions or make comments.
- 9) Able to display affiliation with what my partner says, such as 我知道... (*wo zhidao*, 'I know...'), 我也有... (*wo ye you*, 'I also have...')

Figure 9.1 Descriptors for active listenership (first semester)

Topic Development

- 1) Able to initiate a topic (via information-seeking questions, or news announcements).
- 2) Able to expand a topic (by asking further questions, providing comments/suggestions, or referring to similar experiences).
- 3) Able to use the key words I understand in my partner's talk in order to ask further questions or make comments.
- 4) Able to converse with my partner without long pauses in between turns.
- 5) Able to shift topics gradually, using 那 (*na*, 'in that case') to initiate a turn.
- 6) Able to shift topics gradually, inspired by words with semantic relations.
- 7) Able to shift to a different aspect of a topic, using 诶 (*ei*, 'by the way'), 但是/可是 (*danshi/keshi*, 'but'), 其实 (*qishi*, 'actually').

Figure 9.2 Descriptors for topic management (second semester)

IC Curriculum for First-Year CFL Courses

The following sections illustrate the articulation of the IC curriculum for the first year of CFL instruction and the assessment procedures that the teacher adopted to verify the students' learning of the target interactional skills.

Teaching Materials and Instruction

The instructional materials designed for the first year of CFL instruction have the dual goal of targeting IC and responding to Tao's (2005) call for the use of authentic materials. Tao (2005), in fact, pointed out that the scripted dialogues presented in the Chinese textbooks he reviewed lack authenticity, and encouraged materials developers to include context-based language from spoken corpora. To this day, however, none of the current Chinese textbooks has incorporated examples from naturally occurring conversations. Therefore, for the purposes of IC instruction, we

recorded the two conversations mentioned before and used parts of them to create eight teaching units (four units per semester; see Table 9.1). The conversation excerpts (from 30 seconds to 2 minutes long) were selected based on the students' proficiency level and on the relevance of the topics for the students' college life.

The design of the IC instructional materials took place over a period of one year. During Fall 2015, the units for first-semester students were designed and implemented; for these initial units, recordings of the same students enrolled in the course were used in the analytical tasks (see Phase 2 described below). During Spring 2016, new units were designed and implemented for second-semester students. Table 9.1 shows the content of the teaching units per semester.

Table 9.1 IC teaching units per semester

<i>FIRST SEMESTER</i>	<i>SECOND SEMESTER</i>
Unit 1: Meeting a new friend (1) IC objectives: active listenership, repair	Unit 1: Times and Dates IC objectives: active listenership, repair
Unit 2: Meeting a new friend (2) IC objectives: active listenership, repair	Unit 2: Hobbies IC objectives: topic development
Unit 3: Family IC objectives: active listenership, repair	Unit 3: Majors and jobs IC objectives: topic development
Unit 4: Meeting on campus IC objectives: active listenership, repair	Unit 4: Travel IC objectives: topic development

Units 1 and 2 were used to introduce new practices and/or new linguistic resources to achieve specific actions, while in units 3 and 4 the same practices and resources were revisited and analyzed in longer excerpts. As the table shows, the first-semester units targeted active listenership and repair. In the second semester, the focus shifted to topic management.

Each IC unit was designed to cover three to four class periods and was organized in the instructional phases illustrated in Table 9.2 (for a more detailed description of the units on active listenership, see Yeh, 2018; for the units on topic development, see Yeh, forthcoming).

Table 9.2 IC teaching units: Instructional phases

Phase 1:	Analysis of interaction between L1 speakers
Phase 2:	Analysis of interaction between L1-L2 speakers
Phase 3:	Guided written production (fill-in-the-blank activities), guided analyses
Phase 4:	Guided oral production (role plays)

Phase 1 aimed to introduce students to an action-based view of language that is typical of CA. After viewing a short clip and completing a comprehension task, the students were given a transcript of the clip

and engaged in an analytical task that focused on identifying the action accomplished by each turn and on describing how that action was linguistically achieved. Phase 2 focused on excerpts of conversations between L1 speakers and L2 speakers (i.e., CFL students enrolled in the same program; this means that the participants in this study watched clips of the conversations recorded by students enrolled in previous years) and consisted of the same steps as Phase 1. The analysis revolved around the identification of problematic or awkward moments in the interaction and was followed by a reflection concerning the skills that would have helped the L2 speakers to avoid such moments. In Phase 3, the students engaged in written production exercises (e.g., fill-in-the-gap exercises targeting the use of RTs) and in the analysis of short conversation excerpts. Then, in Phase 4, the students, divided in pairs, were asked to role-play given scenarios.

Assessment

To evaluate the students' learning outcomes, both formative and summative tasks were designed. Formative assessment tasks included written quizzes and conversations with another student after each IC unit. The written quizzes comprised, for example, short analyses of excerpts of naturally occurring conversations and the writing of dialogues based on given prompts. These written quizzes were designed to assess the students' awareness of the interactional practices discussed in class. The students, however, were also required to demonstrate their ability to employ the targeted interactional practices, and, for this reason, they had to engage in two to three mandatory conversations with a peer; these conversations were all recorded and uploaded to the online course management system, and feedback was provided for each conversation.

For summative assessment purposes, the students engaged in two mandatory conversations, one in mid-semester and one at the end of the semester (see Table 9.3). First-semester students interacted with L1 speakers in both their graded conversations, while second-semester students interacted with a peer in mid-semester⁵ and with an L1 speaker (abbreviated as L1S in Table 9.3) at the end of the semester. These conversations were graded based on a rubric consisting of a set of IC descriptors that reflected the teaching objectives and learning outcomes for the course in terms of active listenership (see Figure 9.1), topic management (see Figure 9.2) and repair. The assessment was conducted in a qualitative way that is attentive to the sequential unfolding of the interaction. More specifically, the teacher considered the sequential positions in which active listenership could have been manifested and where current topics⁶ could have been elaborated or changed, and points were assigned accordingly.⁶ Each conversation was weighted as 6% of the final grade for the course.

Table 9.3 Timeline of teaching units and assessment tasks

FIRST SEMESTER	SECOND SEMESTER
Unit 1	Unit 1
Unit 2	Unit 2
➤ Conversation 1 (graded, with L1S)	Unit 3
Unit 3	➤ Conversation 3 (graded, with a peer)
Unit 4	Unit 4
➤ Conversation 2 (graded, with L1S)	➤ Conversation 4 (graded, with L1S)

After each conversation, the students were required to write evidence-based, guided reflections in which they had to report on specific moments of their own interactions that went well and other moments that they perceived as problematic. These tasks aimed to raise the students’ awareness of their learning experience and of the development of their own skills and were meant to highlight both the students’ abilities and potential areas for improvement. Each reflection task was weighted as 4% of the final grade for the course.⁷

Data and Method

The data set comprises four graded conversations per student (two conversations per semester). The conversations held in the first semester lasted 5–7 minutes, while the second-semester conversations lasted 7–10 minutes; the data set consists of 9 hours of conversation. All conversations were videotaped and transcribed.

Once the courses were completed and the grades assigned, the teacher reviewed all the conversations again, read the transcripts and made preliminary longitudinal observations. The findings of this overall examination of the data indicate that, after receiving explicit IC instruction, at the end of the second semester, students were able to accomplish actions such as receipting prior talk in more elaborate ways. Specifically, students’ responsive turns became longer and more linguistically elaborate, characterized by the use of more discourse markers and by the display of various stances in assessments. Students also improved in their ability to manage topical talk, by initiating new topics and expanding on current ones; however, the action of shifting from topic to topic remained a challenge for some of the students, and the use of particles for topic management was rather problematic.

For the purposes of this chapter, we selected four extracts that involved two students: Eric and Yoon.⁸ Detailed transcripts were developed for these excerpts, following standard CA conventions (Jefferson, 2004; see the appendix for a list of the abbreviations we used for specific particles

in Chinese). We marked embodied actions in the transcripts only when relevant for the focal interactional practices; a plus sign indicates the occurrence of embodied actions simultaneously with talk or silence. A theoretical and methodological caveat is in order at this point: in our analysis, we essentially use CA as a methodological tool that allows us to add more detailed insights to the teacher's observations.

We chose to focus on Eric and Yoon since they both passed the course but received different grades. More specifically, Eric received B- in Conversation 1 and B+ in Conversation 4, while Yoon received A- for Conversation 1 and A for Conversation 4. These data allow us to see the differences between the two students, while also showing their individual interactional development.

For comparability purposes, we have selected two excerpts from Conversation 1 (Excerpts 1 and 2) where the students initiate an information-seeking sequence about their co-participant's family; the sequence is embedded within a larger presentational sequence that accomplishes the activity of getting acquainted (Svennevig, 1999); in both cases, the 'family' topic is introduced through an abrupt topic change by the student. For Conversation 4, we have selected two excerpts (Excerpts 3 and 4) that originate from a similar sequential trajectory. Specifically, both excerpts occur at the end of an extended how-are-you sequence in which the participants discuss their level of tiredness in relation to how busy they are; this leads the students to initiate a new information-seeking sequence in which they talk about their school commitments (i.e., their major in Excerpt 3, and the courses they are taking in Excerpt 4). The comparability of Conversation 1 and Conversation 4 therefore lies in the fact that all excerpts represent information-seeking sequences initiated by the students (for issues of comparability in CA, see Sidnell, 2009). Furthermore, it should be noted that all the excerpts are representative of the students' interactional behaviors in the entire conversations.

Analysis

In the analysis below, we first provide a description of Eric's and Yoon's responsive behaviors and of their topic management practices during Conversation 1;⁹ we then illustrate these behaviors and practices in Conversation 4.

Conversation 1: Eric and Yoon

Excerpts 1 and 2 illustrate the different interactional skills displayed by Eric and Yoon in Conversation 1. As the analysis will show, Yoon is more active in her responsive behaviors and manages to engage in topic elaboration more than Eric.

Excerpt 1 picks up the talk after the introduction sequence, in which the participants greet each other, introduce themselves and mention

where they are from. Overall, the analysis shows that Eric is not a very active listener, in that he does not always provide RTs. In terms of topic management, Eric is very active in initiating topics through questions issued to his co-participant; however, he does not engage in topic elaboration.

Excerpt 1: Eric (Conversation 1, 00:31-1:05)

- 1 ERIC: u::hm:::: (0.6) ni: jia you ji kou ren,
uhm you family have how-many C people
u::hm:::: (0.6) how many people are in your family,
- 2 WEN: wo jia you::: san kou ren.
I family have three C people
my family has::: three people.
- 3 (0.4)
- 4 WEN: wo: >baba mama:,< he wo.
I dad mom and I
my: >dad mom:,< and me.
- 5 .h ni jia:: you ji kou ren.
.h you family have how-many C people
.h how many people are in your family::.
- 6 (0.3)
- 7 ERIC: uh wo ji- (.) wo jia you::: s:i +kou ren. #u:h#
uh my fa- (.) my family have four +C people. uh
uh my fa- (.) my family has::: f:our +people. #u:h#
+((Wen nods))
- 8
- 9 (0.2)
- 10 ERIC: uh wo (0.3) baba, wo (0.2) mama::, (0.7)
uh my (0.3) dad, my (0.2) mom::, (0.7)
- 11 wo: mei+mei (0.4) he wo.
my: sis+ter (0.4) and me.
+((Wen nods))
- 12
- 13 +(0.5)
- 14 +((Wen nods))
- 15 ERIC: .hhh °uh.°
- 16 (0.3)
- 17 ERIC: ni:: uh (0.2) ni baba zuo shenme?
you uh you dad do what
your:: uh (0.2) what does your dad do?
- 18 WEN: wo baba shi daxue laoshi.
I dad is university teacher
my dad is a university teacher.

- 19 (0.5)
- 20 WEN: [ni ba]ba neɿ
[you da]d RQ
[and your da]dɿ
- 21 ERIC: [°o:::°]
[°o:::h.°]
- 22 (0.4)
- 23 ERIC: uh wo (0.4) wo ↑wo (0.7) papa (0.2) ↑baba s::hi::^[10]
uh I I I dad dad i::s::
uh my (0.4) my ↑my (0.7) dad (0.2) dad i::s::
- 24 (0.3) daxue lao[shi,]
university tea[cher,]
(0.3) a university tea[cher,]
- 25 WEN: [+uh] hu. uh(h) (h)hu.
26 +((nods))
- 27 ERIC: u::h.
28 +(0.5)
29 +((Eric and Wen nod))
- 30 +(0.2)
31 +((Eric points at Wen))
- 32 ERIC: uh wo (1.1) uh ni ↑ma
uh I uh you mom
uh I (1.1) uh your ↑mom
- 33 WEN: wo mama: shi:: (.) laoshi.
I mom is teacher
my mom: is:: (.) a teacher.
- 34 ERIC: o o o:,
oh oh o:h,
- 35 WEN: ng.
mh.
- 36 ERIC: o:. wo (0.3) <wo m- mama shi:> (0.2) kuai[jishi.]
oh I I- m- mom is acco[untant.]
o:h. my (0.3) <m- m- mom is:> (0.2) an acco[untant.]
- 37 WEN: [mh mh.]
[mh mh.]
- 38 +(1.3)
39 +((Wen nods))
- 40 ERIC: +okay.
41 +((nods))
42 (1.1)

In line 1 Eric initiates a new topic by asking Wen how many people there are in his family. After Wen's response (line 2), Eric does not provide any RT (see the 0.4 second pause in line 3), nor does he acknowledge Wen's turn with a head nod. Wen then volunteers more information about his family by listing the members (line 4) and reciprocates Eric's question (line 5). After a short pause (line 6), Eric provides an answer (line 7), which is receipted by Wen with head nods (line 8). Without being further prompted by Wen, Eric lists the members of his family (lines 10–11); Wen again receipts his co-participant's answer with head nods (lines 12–14), and in line 15 Eric seems to be using *°uh.°* to confirm the information he has just provided.

In line 17 Eric shifts to another aspect of the 'family' topic by asking about the profession of Wen's father. After Wen's reply (line 18), Eric produces a delayed RT (*°o:::°*; *°o:::h,* line 21),¹¹ in overlap with Wen's turn (line 20) that reciprocates Eric's question. Note that *o* was one of the RTs that were explicit targets of instruction (see the first item in the descriptors for active listenership in Figure 9.1). After a short pause (line 22), Eric provides a response (lines 23–24): his father is a university teacher. Wen responds to this piece of information with acknowledgment tokens interspersed with laughter (line 25), and Eric seems to confirm the information with *u::b.* (line 27); both participants then nod as they look at each other (lines 28–29), while Eric points at Wen (lines 30–31), possibly to indicate his understanding that their fathers have the same job.

Eric then starts asking Wen about his mother (line 32); Wen, however, does not wait for Eric to complete his turn and responds: his mother is a teacher (line 33). Eric receipts Wen's turn with a series of *o* ('oh,' line 34), and Wen produces the confirmation token *ng* ('mh,' line 35). Eric then prefaces his next turn (line 36) with another *o*: ('o:h') before volunteering information about his mother's job: she is an accountant. This piece of information is receipted by Wen both verbally (with *mh mh*,¹² line 37) and with a nod (lines 38–39). Eric then closes the sequence concerning the 'family' topic with English *okay* (line 40) and head nods (line 41).

As mentioned before, the excerpt shows that Eric's responsive behavior is rather limited. For example, no response is provided to Wen's turn about the number of his family members (see the silence in line 3). A delayed token *o* ('oh') receipts the information about Wen's father's profession (lines 19 and 21), and a series of *o* (line 34) responds to the information about Wen's mother's job. However, Eric's responsive turns can also be more elaborate, like the turn in line 36, where Eric volunteers information about his mother's profession without being asked about it; the turn is prefaced by *o*, which links it back to Wen's turn concerning

his mother. Note that this was a practice taught during instruction: the teacher instructed the students to add some information about themselves in their responsive turns, without waiting for a question from the co-participant (this was hinted at during the first semester: see point 8 in Figure 9.1; more detailed instructions were provided during the second semester). Finally, regarding topic management, which was not an explicit learning outcome in the first semester, Eric actively initiates and shifts topics; for example, Excerpt 1 starts with Eric launching the ‘family’ topic, which he shifts from the number of family members (line 1) to their profession (lines 17 and 32). However, no topic elaboration is visible here.

Excerpt 2 occurs within the presentational sequence between Yoon and Ling; in this case, however, the participants had already covered various topics (names, nationalities, major, food) before abruptly shifting to the ‘family’ topic. The analysis shows that Yoon’s responsive turns, despite often being delayed, are more articulate than Eric’s turns.

Excerpt 2 starts with Yoon asking Ling about the number of members in her family (note the pronunciation issue with *ji*, ‘how many,’ initially pronounced as *si*, ‘four,’ in line 1). Ling’s response is received with a delayed turn (see the 0.2 second pause in line 5) in which Yoon produces a partial repeat of Ling’s response (*san kou ren*, ‘three people’) and elaborates on the matter by asking who these members are (line 6); this was a practice that was explicitly taught in the classroom. Ling’s response is met with a delayed O::::::::: (‘o:::::::::h,’ lines 8–9).¹⁴ Ling’s subsequent reciprocation question (*ni ne*, ‘and you,’ line 10) is responded to by Yoon, who provides information about her own family members (lines 11–12). In lines omitted in the transcript, Ling

Excerpt 2: Yoon (Conversation 1, 3:55–4:44)

- 1 YOON: .hhhh u:::h (0.4) .hh ni::: jia you: si u:::h (0.8)
 .hhhh uh .hh you family has four uh
 .hhhh u:::h (0.4) .hh you:::r family has: four u:::h (0.8)
- 2 ji kou ren?
 how-many C people
 how many people?
- 3 (0.4)
- 4 LING: san, (.) wo jia you san kou ren.
 san I family has three C people
 three, (.) my family has three people.
- 5 (0.2)
- 6 YOON: san [kou ren you shei?]
 three [C people have who]
 three [people who are they?]

- 7 LING: [you:: wo baba::,] mama, haiyou wo.
 [has I dad] mom also I.
 [it has:: my dad::,] mom and me.
- 8 (0.2)
- 9 YOON: O::::::::::::.
 O::::::::::::h.
- 10 LING: ni ne₂
 you RQ
 and you₂
- 11 YOON: .hh wo jia you si ge ren.
 .hh I family has four C people
 .hh my family has four people.
- 12 wo mama ↑baba:::, (0.4) didi he wo.
 I mum, dad, younger-brother and I
 my mum, ↑da:::d, (0.4) younger brother and me.
- 13 (0.2)
- . . .
 ((10 lines omitted))
 . . .
- 24 YOON: ni duo-da?
 you how-old
 how old are you?
- 25 (0.7)
- 26 LING: wo:: shijiu sui.
 I nineteen years-old
 I:: am nineteen years old.
- 27 (0.4)
- 28 YOON: °shijiu sui.°
 nineteen years-old
 °nineteen years old.°
- 29 .hh O::::::::::::! (.) wo shi:: .hhh ershi^[13] sui.=
 .hh oh I am .hhh twenty years-old
 .hh O::::::::::::h! (.) I am:: .hhh twenty years old.=
- 30 =ERshi /f/ui (0.2) sui.
 twenty years-old years-old
 =TWENTY years old (0.2) years old.
- 31 (0.3)

32 LING: o:::., suoyi ni bi wo da yi sui(h)=
 oh, so you compare I big one years-old
 o:::.,h, so you are one year older than me(h)=
 33 =HH hh [hh]
 34 YOON: [ng]::.,.
 [mh]
 [m:]:::.,h.
 35 LING: HH hh .hh
 36 (0.8)
 37 YOON: [u:::h]
 38 LING: [u:::h]m:::
 39 (.)
 40 YOON: ((*sniffs*))
 41 uh ni baba zuo shenme gongzuo?
 uh you dad do what job
 uh what does your dad do?
 42 (0.3)
 43 LING: wo baba:: zai kai gongsi::,
 I dad PROG open company
 my da::d runs his own busine:ss,
 44 (0.3)
 45 YOON: kai gongsi:: sh::enme yi[si,]
 kai gongsi what mea[ning]
 wha::t does kai gongsi:: [mean,]
 46 LING: [zai] ru::n his own business.=
 [PROG]
 47 YOON: =.hhh a::: tai+haole.
 .hhh ah won+derful
 =.hhh a:::h won+derful.
 48 +((claps))

shifts the topic to the age of Yoon's younger brother. Yoon then shifts the topic by asking Ling's age (line 24) and receives her response with a delayed repetition (lines 27–28) followed by an emphatic *O:::./* (line 29). She then spontaneously volunteers information concerning her own age: she is 20 (lines 29–30); as mentioned before, this practice was explicitly taught in the classroom. Ling then provides the upshot of this piece of information: Yoon is one year older than she is (line 32); Yoon confirms with the token *ng:::* ('m:::.,h,' line 34). The topic is then shifted by Yoon to the profession of Ling's father (line 41).

She then initiates repair on Ling's answer, addressing an understanding issue (Yoon does not know the meaning of *kai gongsi*, equivalent to 'running one's own business'). Once the repair sequence is completed with a translation of Ling's response into English (line 46), Yoon receipts the information with the token *a:::* ('a:::h,' line 47), followed by a positive assessment (*taihaole*, 'wonderful,' line 47) and clapping (line 48). Note that the students were instructed to use assessments in their responsive turns.

Overall, the analysis of this excerpt has shown that Yoon's responsive behavior is rather diversified, though her responsive turns may be slightly delayed (see the pauses in lines 5, 8, 27 and 44). She produces tokens such as *o* (lines 9 and 29) and *a* (line 47), responds through partial repeats of the previous turn (lines 6 and 28) and in one case provides an assessment (line 47); at the same time, she also responds by volunteering information about herself (lines 29–30). These kinds of responses were the object of instruction (see Figure 9.1). Regarding topic management, Yoon initiates and shifts to new topics through question-formatted turns (lines 1–2, 24 and 41) and is also able to ask topic elaboration questions (line 6).

Conversation 4: Eric and Yoon

Excerpts 3 and 4 show Eric's and Yoon's responsive behaviors and topic management practices during Conversation 4. The analysis will show that both students improve in their interactional skills in these areas, though the differences between Conversation 1 and Conversation 4 seem more visible in Eric's interactions.

Excerpt 3 picks up the talk after an extended how-are-you sequence in Conversation 4. Overall, the excerpt shows that Eric's responsive turns have become more articulate and that his topic management practices are not limited to topic initiations and shifts but can also achieve topic elaborations.

Excerpt 3: Eric (Conversation 4, 00:49-01:20)

- 1 ERIC: nide zhuanye shi shenme?
 your major is what
 what is your major?
- 2 (1.1)
- 3 JIN: en::: (0.2) wode zhuanye shi (.) jixiegongcheng.
 u:::h (0.2) my major is (.) mechanical engineering.
- 4 +(0.7)
- 5 +((Eric looks up))
- 6 ERIC: oh, mec e:.
- 7 +(0.9)

- 8 +((Jin nods))
 9 JIN: dui.
 correct
 yes.
 10 (0.5)
 11 ERIC: mh.
 mh.
 (1.4)
 13 ERIC: uh ↑ni::, (0.3) zhege <xueqi sha:ng> ji men ke.
 uh you this semester take how-many C course
 uh ↑you::, (0.3) how many courses do you ta:ke this semester.
 14 (1.7)
 15 JIN: wo:: zhege xueqi shang wu men ke.
 I this semester take five C courses
 I:: take five courses this semester.
 16 (0.4)
 17 ERIC: wu men ke,
 five C courses
 five courses,
 18 (0.3)
 19 JIN: [°mh.°]
 [°mh.°]
 20 ERIC: [u:]:::h (2.3) d- duo (0.2) xuefen?
 [u:]:::h (2.3) h- how many (0.2) credits?
 21 (1.0)
 22 JIN: shiliu.
 sixteen.
 23 (0.3)
 24 ERIC: shiliu. +o.
 sixteen. +oh.
 25 +((Jin nods))
 26 wo sh::i↑ba::= +.hhhhhhhhh uh=.hh (0.3) taiduale.
 I ei::gh↑teen::=+.hhhhhhhhh uh=.hh (0.3) too many.
 27 +((Jin nods))
 28 JIN: ng. ni yiding hen lei ba.
 mh you must very tired PART
 mh. you must be very tired right.
 29 (0.2)
 30 ERIC: yeah. hhh[hhhh]hh
 31 JIN: [°hu hu°]

The information-seeking sequence is initiated by Eric, who abruptly changes the topic (after an initial how-are-you inquiry the participants have been discussing how tired they are and why) by asking Jin what his major is (line 1). After Jin's response (line 3), Eric looks up (line 5) and then receipts the previous turn with *oh* and a candidate translation for *jixiegongcheng* ('mechanical engineering'); that is, *mec e*: (line 6). Jin confirms Eric's understanding with head nods in lines 7–8 and verbally with *dui*, 'yes,' in line 9. Eric responds with the token *mh* ('mh,' line 11)¹⁵ that effectively closes the sequence.

After a 1.4-second pause (line 12), Eric shifts topic and asks Jin how many courses he is taking (line 13). He receipts Jin's response (line 15) with a delayed partial repetition of Jin's answer: *wu men ke* ('five courses,' line 17); this is a practice that was also an object of instruction, in that students were taught to use repetitions as a way to acknowledge the prior turn and get confirmation of their hearing (see Xu, 2016). Jin indeed confirms Eric's hearing with *°mh.°* (line 19) as Eric asks an elaboration question concerning the number of credits that Jin is getting for his courses (line 20). Jin replies (line 22), and after a short silence (line 23), in lines 24–26 Eric responds by repeating Jin's answer, receipting it with the token *o* ('oh'),¹⁶ and volunteering information about the credits he gets. He ends his turn with an assessment of 18 credits as too many (line 26). Finally, Jin offers an assessment of the situation by asserting that Eric must be very tired (line 28); Eric confirms with English *yeah* and laughter tokens (line 30).

Overall, the analysis of this excerpt has shown that Eric's responsive behavior has become more complex. Specifically, while his responses are still delayed (lines 4, 16 and 23), and the range of his RTs is limited to *o* (line 6) and *mh* (line 11), his responsive turns accomplish a wider range of actions, especially in terms of practices used to get confirmation of his co-participant's responses; that is, he provides a candidate understanding (though this is done in English: see line 6) and produces partial repeats of the prior turn (lines 17 and 24); the latter practice was explicitly taught in the classroom. Finally, regarding topic management, Eric's main technique to initiate, shift and change topics is still questioning. However, he now also produces questions that elaborate on the current topic (line 20), as instructed in the classroom (see Figure 9.2).

Excerpt 4 illustrates Yoon's responsive behavior and topic management practices during Conversation 4. The analysis will show that her responsive turns are becoming more precisely timed to the co-participant's turns; she also significantly manages to develop the current topic.

Excerpt 4: Yoon (Conversation 4, 00:39–1:30)

- 1 YOON: u::hm .hh ni: zhe ge: xueqi::: you ji men ke?
uhm .hh you this C semester have how-many C course
u::hm .hh how many courses do you have this semeste:::r?
(0.2)
- 2
- 3 LING: mtch- .h wo zhe xueqi you liu men ke.
mtch- .h I this semester have six C courses
mtch- .h this semester I am taking six courses.
- 4 YOON: mch- .Hhhha tai m- u:h tai:: (0.3) o:. .h hen duo:.
mch- .Hhhha too b- uh too oh .h very lot
mch- .Hhhha too b- u:h too:: (0.3) o:h. .h many:.
- 5 LING: .hh hai hao. hhh
.hh still okay hhh
.hh it's okay. hhh

6 (0.2)

7 YOON: u:::h (.) ji: men uh ni you:: (.) ji:: men (.)
 uh how-many C uh you have how-many C
 u:::h (.) how many: do you have:: (.) how many:: (.)

8 .hh zhuanke ke.
 .hh major course
 .hh courses for your major.

9 LING: .hhh u:::h wo you: liang jie: diannao ke,
 .hhh uh I have two C computer course
 .hhh u:::h I have: two: computer classes,
 10 +(0.3)
 11 +((Yoon nods))

12 LING: haiyou liang jie shuxue ke.
 also two C math course
 and also two math classes.

13 YOON: °.hh ha:::°. .hhh

14 LING: °mh mh.° suoyi DOU SHI ZHUANYE K(H)E(H) HU
 mh mh so all are major course
 °mh mh.° so THEY ARE ALL FOR MY MA(H)JOR(H) HU
 15 (0.3)

16 YOON: .hh hen duo:, hen duo:,
 .hh very lot very lot,
 .hh many:, many:,
 17 .hh ni you: shi:yan (0.2) ke ma?
 .hh you have lab course Q
 .hh do you have: la:b (0.2) classes?
 18 (0.2)

19 LING: .hhh m:::~::~:h YOU. d- diannao you shiyan [ke.]
 .hhh mh have c- computer have lab [classes]
 .hhh m:::~::~:h I DO. c- computer has lab [classes.]

20 YOON: [°dian]nao,°
 [°computer,°

21 LING: ng.=
 mh.=

22 YOON: =°shiyan.° (.) o:::~::~.
 =°lab.° (.) o:::~::~h.

23 LING: mei zhou::s:an.
 every wednesday
 every We::dne:sday.
 . . .
 ((11 lines omitted))
 . . .

35 YOON: .hh mei xingqi?
 .hh every week?

36 (0.3)

37 LING: >mei ge xingqisan you +liang< ge shiyan ke.
 every C wednesday have +two C lab classes
 > every Wednesday I have +two lab classes.<
 38 +(shows 2 fingers with left hand)
 39 +(0.4)
 40 +((Yoon looks at Ling and shows 2 fingers with left hand))

41 YOON: a=.hhh
 ah=.hhh
 42 (0.3)

43 LING: suoyi wo bu xihuan xingqisa(h)n(h)
 so I not like wednesday
 so I do not like Wednesd(h)ay(h)
 44 YOON: hehe hehe he hh hh .HHHHHHHH
 45 .hh u:h (.) .h zhe ge xingqi wo::::: (.) uh you wu men ke,
 .hh uh .h this C week I uh have five C course
 .hh u:h (.) .h this week I::::: (.) uh have 5 classes,

Excerpt 4 picks up the talk as Yoon initiates an information-seeking sequence concerning the number of courses that her co-participant, Ling, is taking (line 1). Yoon receipts Ling's response (she is taking six courses: see line 3) with an emphatic token *.Hhha* (which seems idiosyncratic) and then assesses the import of such information: Ling is taking many courses (note the problematic and heavily repaired formulation of the assessment in line 4). After Ling's reassurance that her situation is okay (line 5), Yoon elaborates on the current topic by asking how many courses Ling is taking for her major (lines 7–8). Yoon receipts the first part of Ling's answer (line 9) with head nods (lines 10–11), and after Ling completes her answer, Yoon produces the idiosyncratic token *ha::::* (line 13). In line 14 Ling provides the upshot of her situation: the four courses she has mentioned are all for her major; a sense of exasperation is conveyed by the high volume and by the laughter tokens that intersperse the final part of her turn. Yoon affiliates with Ling's stance with the assessment *hen duo*; *hen duo*: ('many'; 'many:' in line 16). She then shifts the topic by asking Ling if she has any labs (line 17). Once again Yoon displays active listenership of Ling's turns, since she responds to the information that Ling has a lab with her computer course with a partial repeat in low volume ('*diannao shiyan*°, 'computer lab,' lines 20 and 22), followed by an elongated *o::::::* ('*o::::::h*,' line 22).¹⁷ Ling's increment *mei zhou::s:an* ('every Wednesday,' line 23) leads to a repair sequence concerning the word *zhousan* (lines omitted in the transcript). Once its meaning is clarified, Yoon asks for confirmation that Ling indeed has labs every week (line 35). Ling confirms by specifying that every week she has two lab classes (line 37) and accompanies the delivery of the word *liang* ('two') with the embodied action of lifting two fingers (line 38), thereby adding embodied emphasis to the content of her turn. Yoon receipts this information in an embodied fashion, by also lifting two fingers and by producing the token that we have tentatively transcribed as *a=.hhh* (line 41). Ling's negative assessment of Wednesdays (line 43) is met by a series of laughter tokens by Yoon (line 44), who then volunteers information about her own courses (line 45–46). With the delivery of this piece of news, Yoon seems to affiliate with Ling's situation: Yoon too is taking many courses.

Overall, Yoon shows a very active responsive behavior. The tokens she uses are both idiosyncratic (lines 4, 13, and 41) and conforming to what she was taught in class (see the use of *o* in line 22). Her responses seem to be more swiftly timed: while there are still some delays (see line 15), she seems to be reacting more promptly to her co-participant's turns. At the same time, she also uses silent embodied actions to convey her receipt of the prior turn (see the nods in line 11 and the lifting of her fingers in line 38). She also uses assessments (lines 4 and 16) to show not only her receipt, but also her understanding of the prior turn, her evaluation of its propositional content, and her affiliation with her co-participant's stance. Finally, her volunteering of information about herself seems to achieve affiliation with the co-participant by mentioning similar experiences (see Figure 9.2). As for topic management, which is one of the learning goals in the second semester, it is still essentially managed through question-formatted turns that are used to initiate new topics and elaborate on previous ones. Yoon, nevertheless, seems quite resourceful in terms of staying on the larger topic of 'courses' with her elaboration and confirmation questions that achieve gradual topic shifts.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study has illustrated the design and the outcomes of units of IC-based instruction for students enrolled in the first year of CFL. Specifically, the study has shown the potential of introducing CA to teachers, so that they can adopt a view of language as a way to accomplish actions in interaction (see also Betz & Huth, 2014; Carroll, 2010; Wong & Waring, 2010) and design pedagogical materials that target the interactional skills that are needed to participate in the unfolding interaction in fitting and socially recognizable ways. Ideally, teachers can design IC units on the basis of CA findings for the target language. We claim, however, that, in the absence (or in the paucity) of such findings, teachers should not give up the goal of teaching IC.

In terms of the effectiveness of IC-based instruction, our preliminary findings on the entire group of participants indicate that, at the end of the second semester of IC-based instruction, the students use the RTs taught in the classroom and are able to initiate new topics and elaborate on prior topics. Some difficulties, however, still remain for topic changes and topic shifts, and for the use of specific discourse markers. More specifically, in our analysis we have zoomed in on the interactional practices of active listenership and topic development achieved by two focal students, Eric and Yoon. Eric, who received grades in the B range, seems to have become more active in terms of both listenership

and topic management: in Conversation 4 he is able not only to produce relevant RTs, but also to ask for confirmation and elaborate on prior topics by asking follow-up questions of his co-participant. On the other hand, Yoon, whose grades are in the A range, manifests a more complex and active interactional behavior already in Conversation 1. However, her interaction in Conversation 4 shows that her responsive turns have become more precisely timed to the co-participant's turns and are more diversified (see also the idiosyncratic tokens she produces); she also displays her ability to stay on the main topic while asking confirmation and elaboration questions.

It is of course difficult to determine whether these changes in the students' interactional skills can be attributed exclusively to instruction. For example, we do not have information about their contact with Chinese outside the classroom. It is true, though, that when comparing the interactional skills of students who received IC instruction with those of students who received regular instruction, the IC-instructed students seemed to be realizing the targeted practices more consistently and with more diversified linguistic resources.

At the same time, it should be noted that these skills were observable in a summative assessment task, where the students knew that they were going to be graded for their use of specific interactional practices and linguistic resources to achieve such practices. The question then remains as to whether these students would be able to show the same interactional skills in a more spontaneous (and non-graded) interaction. However, this is a problem concerning the assessment of L2 oral proficiency in general and is not specific to the assessment of L2 IC. Regarding the latter, our analysis of the CEFR descriptors for A1 speakers has demonstrated the importance of grounding such descriptors in empirical data and the need to reconceptualize interactional skills accordingly (see also Huth & Betz, this volume; Huth, forthcoming).

In conclusion, we maintain that the design and implementation of IC teaching units is a valuable endeavor that can make both students and teachers aware of interactional practices and skills. To achieve this, it is crucial that teachers are given the necessary resources, ranging from the availability of professional development programs to the time that is needed to develop this kind of unit. At the same time, it is important that conversation analysts develop the necessary skills that are required to expose teachers to CA in a way that is accessible to them. This means: (a) adjusting the level of sophistication of CA findings; and (b) accepting that not all the pedagogical materials can be entirely research-based but will at least be research-inspired. Clearly, the attempt to bridge theory and practice, research and language education, is not for the purists, but for those who are willing to embrace the unavoidable tension between the need for research-based pedagogy that is grounded in empirical data and

the need for innovations in teaching that call for the prompt availability of instructional materials to be tested and revised through multiple iterations.

Notes

- 1 For seminal CA work in these areas see Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) for turn-taking; Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) and Schegloff (2000, 2013) for repair; Schegloff (2007) for sequence and preference organization.
- 2 Repair was another goal of instruction, but the implementation and the outcomes of teaching repair practices will not be reported in this chapter.
- 3 This is the term used by Clancy et al. (1996). In CA, however, the term is not used anymore, because it portrays listeners as having a passive role in interaction (versus the CA view that interaction is inherently co-constructed by all the participants).
- 4 The transliterations and translations in Figures 9.1 and 9.2 were not included in the original document given to students.
- 5 The decision to have second-semester students interact with a peer is merely due to time management issues. That is, by having two students interact with each other, the teacher managed to assess two students with one conversation.
- 6 Although assessment is not the focus of the present chapter, a brief description of how it was conducted has been included in order to provide a complete description of the IC curriculum. For a discussion of the issues that are related to IC assessment, the reader is invited to consult the chapters in the testing section of the present volume (see also Huth, forthcoming; Walters, forthcoming).
- 7 In total, IC-related skills (as tested in the two graded conversations, in the reflection tasks and in other assignments completed in class or at home) were weighted as 25% of the final grade.
- 8 All the names used in the transcripts are pseudonyms.
- 9 It should be mentioned that Eric interacted with two different L1 speakers in the two conversations.
- 10 Here Eric repairs the tone as well: second tone ba²ba is repaired with fourth tone ba⁴ba.
- 11 We take this token to be produced in Chinese here and in lines 34 and 36.
- 12 We take this token to be produced in Chinese.
- 13 The first *ershi* (line 29) is produced with the wrong tone, which is then repaired (line 30).
- 14 We take this token to be produced in Chinese here and in line 29.
- 15 We take this token to be produced in Chinese.
- 16 We take this token to be produced in Chinese.
- 17 We take this token to be produced in Chinese.

References

- Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (1997). Teaching conversation and sociocultural norms with conversation analysis. In A. J. Liddicoat & C. Crozet (Eds.), *Teaching language, teaching culture* (pp. 71–88). Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, Series S, 14.

- Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research*, 15, 479–507.
- Betz, E., & Huth, T. (2014). Beyond grammar: Teaching interactional in the German language classroom. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 47, 140–163.
- Biq, Y.-O. (1990). Conversation, continuation, and connectives. *Text & Talk*, 10(3), 187–208.
- Bolden, G. B. (2006). Little words that matter: Discourse markers “so” and “oh” and the doing of other-attentiveness in social interaction. *Journal of Communication*, 56, 661–688.
- Brower, C., & Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 29–47.
- Button, G., & Casey, N. (1984). Generating topic: The use of topic initial elicitors. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 167–190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Button, G., & Casey, N. (1985). Topic nomination and topic pursuit. *Human Studies*, 8, 3–55.
- Carroll, D. (2010). Conversation analysis and language teaching: A call to action. In T. Greer (Ed.), *Observing talk: Analytic studies of second language interaction* (pp. 7–22). The JALT Pragmatics SIG.
- Carroll, D. (2011a). Taking turns and talking naturally: Teaching conversational turn-taking. In N. R. Houck & D. H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation* (pp. 91–103). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.
- Carroll, D. (2011b). Teaching preference organization: Learning how to say ‘no.’ In N. R. Houck & D. H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation* (pp. 105–118). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.
- Clancy, P., Thompson, S., Suzuki, R., & Tao, H. (1996). The conversational use of reactive tokens in English, Japanese, and Mandarin. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 355–287.
- Clark, B., & Lindemalm, K. (2011). *Språkskap. Swedish as a social language*. Malmö: Folkuniversitetet & Interactive Institute.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning and teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dings, A. (2014). Interactional competence and the development of alignment activity. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 742–756.
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2018). Building a semiotic repertoire for social action: interactional competence as biographical discovery. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 68–76.
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Majlesi, A. R. (2018). Learnables and teachables in second language talk: Advancing a social reconceptualization of central SLA tenets. Introduction to the Special Issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102 (Supplement 2018), 3–10.
- 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. DOI: 10.1093/applin/amv010
- Foster, M. (2012). *Third position responses in French native and non native-speaker interaction* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

- Fujii, Y. (2012). Raising awareness of interactional practices in L2 conversations: Insights from conversation analysis. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 6(3), 99–126.
- Galaczi, E. (2008). Peer-peer interaction in a speaking test: The case of the First Certificate in English examination. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 5(2), 89–119.
- Galaczi, E. (2014). Interactional competence across proficiency levels: How do learners manage interaction in paired speaking tests? *Applied Linguistics*, 35, 553–574.
- Gardner, R. (2001). *When listeners talk: Response tokens and listener stance*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hall, J. K. (2018). From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires: Reconceptualising the objects of L2 learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 25–39.
- Hall, J. K., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). L2 interactional competence and development. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 1–15). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, J., Eskildsen, S., Pekarek-Doehler, S. & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (Eds.). (In press). *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of second language interaction 'in the wild'*. Berlin: Springer.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299–345). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Huth, T. (2006). Negotiating structure and culture: L2 learners' realization of L2 compliment-response sequences in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 2025–2050.
- Huth, T. (2010). Intercultural competency in conversation: teaching German requests. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 43(2), 154–164.
- Huth, T. (forthcoming). Conceptualizing interactional learning targets for the second language curriculum. In S. Kunitz, N. Markee, & O. Sert (Eds.), *Classroom-based conversation analytic research: Theoretical and applied perspectives on pedagogy*. Heidelberg: Springer (Educational Linguistics series).
- Huth, T., & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research*, 10, 53–79.
- Ishida, M. (2011). Engaging in another person's telling as a recipient in L2 Japanese: Development of interactional competence during one-year study abroad. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 45–85). Manoa: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Jefferson, G. (1984). On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 191–222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kunitz, S., Markee, N., & Sert, O. (Eds.) (forthcoming). *Classroom-based conversation analytic research: Theoretical and applied perspectives on pedagogy*. Heidelberg: Springer (Educational Linguistics series).

- Lee, S. H., Park, J. E., & Sohn, S. O. (2011). Expanded responses of English-speaking Korean heritage speakers during oral interviews. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 87–104). Manoa: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Lerner, G. H. (1996). On the semi-permeable character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 238–276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, L. (2017). *Social interaction and teacher cognition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Crozet, C. (2001). Acquiring French interactional norms through instruction. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 125–144). Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lilja, N., & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2018). Connecting the language classroom and the wild: Reenactments of language use experiences. *Applied Linguistics*, 39 (5), 694–717.
- Lindström, A., & Sorjonen, M. L. (2012). Affiliation in conversation. In T. Stivers & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 350–369). Chichester, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2013). RP or 'RIP': A critical perspective on reflective practice. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(2), 291–315.
- Markee, N. (1997). *Managing curricular innovation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(3), 404–427.
- Maynard, D. W. (1980). Placement of topic changes in conversation. *Semiotica*, 30(3/4), 263–290.
- Nguyen, H. T. (2011). A longitudinal microanalysis of a second language learner's participation. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 17–44). Manoa: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Olsher, D. (2011a). Responders: Continuers. In N. R. Houck & D. H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation* (pp. 153–170). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.
- Olsher, D. (2011b). Responders: Change-of-state tokens, news markers, and assessments. In N. R. Houck & D. H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation* (pp. 171–192). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Elaborations on L2 interactional competence: The development of L2 grammar for interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 3–24.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Fasel Lauzon, V. (2015). Documenting change across time: Longitudinal and cross-sectional CA studies of classroom interaction. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 409–424). Boston: Wiley.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–268). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.
- Sayer, P. (2005). An intensive approach to building conversation skills. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 14–22.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When others initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 205–243.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2013). Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding* (pp. 41–70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361–382.
- Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2009). *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Svennevig, J. (1999). *Getting acquainted in conversation: A study of initial interactions*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tao, H. (2001). Some interactive functions of topic constructions in Mandarin conversation. In Z. Wu (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Joint Meetings of the 10th International Association for Chinese Linguistics and the 13th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics* (pp. 317–331). Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Tao, H. (2005). The gap between natural speech and spoken Chinese teaching material: Discourse perspective on Chinese pedagogy. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association*, 40(2), 1–24.
- Tsai, I. (2008). Projecting the unanticipated: The Mandarin particle 'ei' and its projectability in daily conversation. In M. K. M. Chan & H. Kang (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics* (pp. 1023–1040). Columbus: Ohio State University.
- Wagner, J. (2015). Designing for language learning in the wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 75–101). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Walters, F. S. (forthcoming). CA-informed testing: An exploratory intersection of norms. In S. Kunitz, N. Markee, & O. Sert (Eds.), *Classroom-based conversation analytic research: Theoretical and applied perspectives on pedagogy*. Heidelberg: Springer (Educational Linguistics series).
- Wang, Y. F., & Tsai, P. H. (2007). Textual and contextual contrast connection: A study of Chinese contrastive markers across different text types. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 1775–1815.
- Wang, Y. F., Tsai, P. H., & Yang, Y. T. (2010). Objectivity, subjectivity and intersubjectivity: Evidence from qishi ('actually') and shishishang ('in fact') in spoken Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 705–727.
- Wong, J. (2011a). Pragmatic competency in telephone conversation openings. In N. R. Houck & D. H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation* (pp. 119–134). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.

- Wong, J. (2011b). Pragmatic competency in telephone conversation openings. In N. R. Houck & D. H. Tatsuki (Eds.), *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation* (pp. 135–152). Annapolis Junction: TESOL Classroom Practice Series.
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. New York: Routledge.
- Xu, Jiajin. (2008). Hanyu Ziran huihua zhong huayu biaoji ‘na(ge)’ de gongneng fenxi [Analysis of the function of the discourse marker ‘na(ge)’ in Chinese conversation], *Yuyan Kexue [Science of Language]*, 7(1), 49–57.
- Xu, Jun. (2016). *Displaying reciprocity: Reactive tokens in Mandarin task-oriented interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yeh, M. (2018). Active listenership: Developing beginners’ interactional competence. *Chinese as a Second Language Research*, 7(1), 47–77.
- Yeh, M. (forthcoming). Teaching beginners topic development: Using naturally occurring conversation. *Taiwan Journal of Chinese as a Second Language*.

Appendix

Abbreviations for Chinese Particles

C	classifier
PART	utterance-final particle
PROG	progressive
Q	question
RQ	reciprocal question marker

10 Making Sense of Interactional Trouble Through Mobile-Supported Sharing Activities

Niina Lilja and Arja Piirainen-Marsh

Introduction

This chapter examines how second language (L2) speakers (learners of Finnish) use a mobile phone as a resource to focus on and make sense of moments of interactional trouble that they have experienced in their own prior interactions outside the classroom, thus making such moments available as the focus of joint learning activity. The analysis builds on conversation analytic research on L2 learning as a situated social activity, which has demonstrated how L2 users create moments of learning while maintaining or restoring intersubjectivity (e.g., Eskildsen & Theodorsdottir, 2017; Gardner & Wagner, 2004; Hall, Hellermann, & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Lilja, 2014; Wagner, 2015). By establishing and sustaining a focus on some aspect of L2 use in their interactions, L2 speakers work towards developing the linguistic and interactional resources that they need to be able to accomplish meaningful social actions in the L2. In this sense, L2 learning is best captured in the notion of interactional competence (Hall et al., 2011; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon Berger, 2015). The development of L2 interactional competence involves building a repertoire of interactional practices to perform recognizable actions in a context-sensitive way in different language use situations. In order to adopt specific practices as part of their interactional repertoire, L2 speakers need to apply and develop their ability to analyze how utterances can be heard and understood in their interactional context.

Focusing on a single case drawn from two complementary data sets—the students' self-recorded service interactions and classroom discussions in which the participants share their videos and discuss them—this chapter analyzes the interactional methods that the participants employ to identify a moment of trouble in a prior interaction, create shared access to the event by using the mobile phone and then jointly scrutinize how the problematic interactional moment occurred and unfolded. The analysis shows that situated use of the mobile phone augments the resources available for participants in collectively analyzing the moment of trouble and building joint learning activity. The phone allows them to provide

shared epistemic access to a referent that would otherwise be inaccessible and thereby provides opportunities for collaborative action (see also Raclaw, Robles, & DiDomenico, 2016). The findings contribute to the study of L2 learners' interactional competences as co-constructed and sensitive to the contingencies and material ecologies of different types of social activities (e.g., Hall et al., 2011; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2015). They also shed new light on the interconnectedness of different learning contexts inside and outside classrooms.

The data come from experientially based pedagogical activities that involve participation in real-life service encounters as part of a research-based pedagogical initiative that aimed to connect classroom learning with students' experiences of interactions in their daily life (Lilja et al., in press; Piirainen-Marsh & Lilja, in press; see also Wagner, 2015). The data were collected during courses of Finnish as an L2 aimed at novice learners and focused on conversational language use. The course curriculum was based on experiential pedagogy and recent pedagogical initiatives focusing on developing a curricular infrastructure for L2 learning outside the classroom (Clark & Lindemalm, 2011; Wagner, 2015; see also Lilja & Piirainen-Marsh, 2018). The teachers, in collaboration with the researchers, designed learning activities that centered on students' experiences outside the classroom and reflective peer discussions on these outside experiences in the classroom. The students prepared themselves in the classroom for everyday service encounters 'in the wild'¹ and then participated in the encounters in pairs and video-recorded them. The use of a mobile device was part of the task design: mobile phones were used by students for the purpose of documenting and retrieving their interactions outside the classroom so that they could be discussed and analyzed in debriefing discussions in the classroom.

The data for this chapter are drawn from the complementary data sets of (1) the actual service encounters (41 encounters in total) and (2) the retrospective discussions about these encounters back in the classroom (c. 21 hours in total). The analysis focuses on an extended case in which the students report problems of understanding related to interpreting the responsive behavior of the interlocutor. They use the debriefing discussion as an occasion to analyze and develop a new understanding of the prior interaction, exploiting the specific affordances of the mobile phone. The phone enables the participants to share access to video as a document of the prior interaction and establish watching of the video as a focal point in the discussion. We examine how the use of the phone in the group discussions is occasioned and made relevant in talk, and how it is handled and used to share the video and search for specific moments to scrutinize. Prompted watching of the video creates affordances for joint analysis of the moments of trouble and generates learning activity; in other words, moments where the participants jointly create an interactional space for learning and orient to some aspect of L2 use as an object

of learning (Kasper & Burch, 2016). The analysis details the methods that participants employ in seeking and establishing new understandings of trouble in their prior interactions. Thus, it sheds light on the reflection phase of the pedagogical task as a site for instruction and learning.

Understanding and Learning in Action

Conversation analytic research has powerfully demonstrated that understanding is not a private but an interactive phenomenon: each utterance in interaction “displays a hearing or analysis of a preceding one and, thus, the very organization of talk provides a means by which intersubjective understanding can not only be continually demonstrated, but also checked, and where found wanting, repaired” (Sidnell, 2010: 12; see also Heritage, 1984; Schegloff, 1992). Thus, the sequential organization of interaction itself is the context where intersubjective understanding is negotiated and continuously updated. Understanding is a collective achievement, and it is oriented to “in the production and monitoring of action” (Mondada, 2011: 542); it involves the use of multiple semi-otic resources and embodied displays through which participants exhibit how they perceive and orient to prior actions. Participants in interaction can claim or demonstrate understanding (Sacks, 1992: 141–142; Koole, 2010) by providing the relevant next action—or indicate a problem of understanding by initiating repair.

Problems of understanding and different forms of repair through which these are resolved have been widely studied also in L2 interaction. Studies of word searches (Brouwer, 2003; Greer, 2013; Hosoda, 2006; Koshik & Seo, 2012) and other forms of repair (Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017; Kurhila, 2006; Lilja, 2014) have also shown how repair activities create opportunities for learning as local, socially displayed activity. Instances of trouble and epistemic discrepancies occasion sequences that lead the participants to attend to features of the L2 as objects of learning or orient to something as newly understood or recently learned (e.g., Majlesi & Broth, 2012; Markee, 2008; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Pekarek Doehler, 2010). Such sequences are typically initiated by noticing some feature of language use (e.g., a lexical item, grammatical feature or interactional practice) in preceding interaction or in the environment and paying attention to it, for instance, by repeating or voicing it (e.g., Greer, 2013, *in press*). The phenomenon targeted in talk can then become the focus of (sometimes extended) learning activity, where the participants analyze, reuse and develop new understandings of it (see also Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017). Participants draw on a wide range of resources in initiating and sustaining orientation to learning: recent studies show how features of prosody, gaze, gesture, material objects and other features of the environment are used in a coordinated and layered manner to accomplish noticings and maintain focus on the objects under scrutiny (e.g.,

Greer, in press; Kasper & Burch, 2016; Lilja & Piirainen-Marsh, 2018; Piirainen-Marsh & Lilja, in press). Building on earlier work on learning as a locally occasioned, social and interactively organized phenomenon, this study analyzes how the participants create spaces for learning locally through their verbal and embodied actions. More specifically, it investigates how a mobile device is used as a resource in a learning activity: the analysis focuses on the ways in which instances of trouble experienced in prior interactions are discussed and understood retrospectively through locally constructed mobile-supported sharing activities. The analysis thus looks beyond the local by exploring the interconnectedness of L2 speakers' prior interactions in out-of-classroom settings and the local interactional procedures through which these interactions are recontextualized and changed into occasions for learning.

While problems of understanding are sometimes made explicit in interaction, they may also be oriented to implicitly or treated as 'non-fatal' and allowed to pass, as shown by Firth (1996) in his study of lingua franca interaction. In this regard, the analysis of the debriefing sessions in which the participants report on their prior L2 interactions is particularly valuable. Our data show that in these debriefing sessions in the classroom the participants sometimes address a problem that was not made explicit in their interactions in the service settings. Detailed analyses of the debriefing discussions thus shed new light on ways in which interactional trouble may be 'noticed' and analyzed retrospectively, and on the affordances this creates for noticing objects of learning, discovering new practices and developing new understandings to be carried over to future interactions. The analysis thus elucidates how the combination of interactional data both from 'primary interactions' and from participants' retrospective discussions about these interactions opens up possibilities to notice and analyze phenomena that would otherwise be difficult to observe. In what follows, we show how the situated use of the phone and collective watching of the video afford additional resources for noticing and making sense of interactional trouble, and sustaining focus on learning.

The Mobile Phone as a Situated Resource

A growing body of research describes how the mobile phone as a complex, yet commonplace, technological and cultural artifact, creates new kinds of communicative spaces and affordances for social action. The technological affordances (Gibson, 1977; Hutchby, 2001) of mobile phones structure social interaction: the resources that they make available (e.g., digital images or message exchange) are used in coordination with other semiotic resources in organizing participation. Licoppe (2004) and Arminen and Weilenmann (2009) have argued that the phone impacts the coordination of social action by interweaving co-present interactions and mediated distant interactions into a single web of activities. Raclaw

et al. (2016) observe how mobile phones transform the participants' ability to gain access to knowledge and experiences. They "provide a mediated form of experiential and epistemic access in contexts where this access would otherwise be lacking, thereby accommodating new forms of participation across these sequences" (Raclaw et al. 2016: 364).

In our data, the participants use the unique affordances of mobile phones in sharing the self-made video and treating it as a focal point of activity in their discussion. In peer discussions in the classroom the video is established as an object of shared attention to be scrutinized in convergent interaction (Brown et al., 2013, 2014; Hellermann, Thorne, & Fodor, 2017). In spite of its small size, the smartphone as a material object affords an easy reconfiguration of a limited number of participants around a screen and enables shared focus on a single course of action (Brown, McGregor, & McMillan, 2015). Detailed analysis of the participants' interactional and bodily conduct reveals their alignments with regard to the phone, for example, when and how the phone becomes an object of mutual orientation, and how its use shapes the participation framework. The analysis to follow illustrates how situated use of the mobile phone augments the available resources for action (Raclaw et al., 2016) and demonstrates how occasioned sharing of the video creates affordances for noticing and analyzing objects of learning.

Mark's Interaction at the University Café

In the following sections, we will first focus on Mark's interaction in a university café. The analysis illustrates that during the focal turns of the interaction Mark does not orient to trouble in understanding in any observable way. However, these focal turns will be retrospectively treated as problematic in the reflection discussion in the classroom. The analysis will show how this is accomplished and how the video recording of the service encounter is used to give the other participants access to the events that took place. The data have been transcribed according to the conventions of Conversation Analysis and the conventions for multimodal transcription developed by Mondada (2014). Still photos (frame grabs) from the videos illustrate the changes in the body postures and gestures of the participants when relevant for the analysis.

Excerpt 1 shows the focal turns of Mark's interaction in the university café. During these turns Mark inquires whether he will get his hot chocolate for free, as his visit to the café is part of a course assignment (lines 3–4). Mark smiles broadly throughout the whole sequence (see Figures 1, 2, 3.) which signals that he treats the situation as somehow humorous.² His question is also treated as funny by the clerk, who displays affective alignment through her facial expressions: before reacting to Mark's question verbally, she smiles and moves her gaze from left to right (see Figure 2.).

Excerpt 1: Mark in the university café

01 CLE: **^(noin) >ole ^*hyvä<**
 (like this) here you are
 ^>>walks towards the till with hot chocolate in hands
 ^stops and puts the hot chocolate on the counter
 mar:
 *reaches right hand towards the hot chocolate ->

02 (.)

03 MAR: ***ehΔ: +#(.) eihän se: *maksa mitään (.)**
 eh: (.) it doesn't cost anything (.)
 *smiles -> end of excerpt
 ->*retrieves hand from hot chocolate
 +gaze to CLE ->
 cle: Δgaze to MAR ->
 fig: #fig.1

04 **koska: mä ftule:n suomen (.) kurssilta?**
 because I come from the Finnish (.) course does it?

05 (0.6) Δ^(.) Δ#
 cle: Δgaze first to left and then to right Δgaze to MAR ->
 cle: ^smiles -> 1.10
 fig: #fig.2

```

06      (.) ^*(3.4) ^*(0.6) ^
cle:    ^steps back and walks to
        kitchen behind her ^walks back to till, nods twice^
mar:    *turns upper body towards the camera person and
        then back to till, smiles

07 CLE:  Δfokei (.) maksaaΔ
        okay it costs
        ->Δgaze down ->

08 MAR:  Δjoooh+ *>joo joo<Δ#
        yeah yeah yeah
        ->+gaze down ->
        *starts to handle wallet

fig:    #fig.3

```

```

09 JOH:      en(-)
10 CLE:      opiskeliijaΔ^+?
              student
              ->Δgaze to MAR->
              -> ^
mar:         ->+gazes quickly toward the clerk ->
11 MAR:      +*joo (.) olenΔ
              yeah      I am
              -> +gaze down
              *nods twice, takes a card out of purse ->
cle:         -> Δgaze towards Mark's hands ->

12           (1.2)

13 MAR:      *täs se on      (.) (tämä on) opiskeliija(kortti)
              here it is      (.) (this is) the student card
              ->*shows the card to the clerk
14 CLE:      kii:tosΔ
              thank you
              ->Δgaze to cash machine

```

After having reacted to Mark's question with a wide smile and by rolling her eyes noticeably from right to left (line 5, Figure 2), the clerk walks to a kitchen behind her to consult her colleagues. When she comes back, she produces an answer that will later be treated as a source of trouble in the classroom discussion (line 7).

In order to understand the interactional implications of the clerk's response, it is necessary to analyze Mark's question in more detail. In the overall structure of the service encounter, Mark's question takes place towards the end of the encounter. The clerk has just prepared the hot chocolate and handed it to Mark (line 1). The next relevant activity in the encounter is the payment sequence. Mark's question is produced at this juncture, before the clerk has announced the price of the hot chocolate. Thus, it initiates an insert sequence which puts the progressivity of the business 'on hold.' The question turn (lines 3–4) is grammatically designed as an interrogative: it begins with the negation verb *ei*, to which the clitic particle *-hän* is added (*eihän*). The clitic *-hän* in Finnish bears many connotations, but one of its central functions is to mark the information presented in the utterance as shared and known by all the participants. In some cases interrogatives including the clitic can be interpreted as confirmation checks. (See VISK, 2004, § 830; Lehtinen, 2012.) Here the interrogative suggests a shared assumption that the hot chocolate is free of charge and seeks confirmation for it. The closest translation of the question in English would be a declarative sentence with a tag question (*The hot chocolate does not cost anything, does it?*). Already the linguistic form of the question shows that the question is designed to invite a response showing agreement (see also VISK, 2004, § 830). Mark's embodied conduct also works towards getting the clerk to confirm that the hot chocolate does not cost anything: he invites the clerk to respond by gazing directly at her while uttering his question. At the same time, his broad smile and slight chuckle display a playful orientation towards the situation. All in all, his conduct indicates that the inquiry could be interpreted as a playful attempt at negotiating or bargaining.

A preferred answer to a question designed in this way could be accomplished by repeating the negation verb *ei* or by producing a combination of the negation verb and the stem of the main verb cost: *ei maksaa* (see also Laury, 2017). However, after her short visit to the kitchen, the clerk answers Mark's question by smiling and saying *okei (.) maksaa* ('okay (.) it does cost'). While this answer is phonetically quite close to the preferred answer *ei maksaa*, its meaning is the opposite: it clearly disagrees with the question's presupposition of the hot chocolate being free of charge. The clerk begins her turn with the particle *okay*, which in this case cannot be heard as a direct reaction to Mark's question. Instead, the particle marks a change in the activity context: it serves to signal that the just preceding conversation in the kitchen has finished, the confusion caused by Mark's question is resolved, and the clerk is now ready to move towards the next

activity, which in this case is paying (see also Beach, 1993). The turn-initial *okay* is followed by a short gap after which the clerk repeats the main verb in Mark's question in the third person singular (*maksaa*, 'it costs'). This repetition itself is a sufficient disagreeing answer to Mark's question.³

In the next turn, Mark reacts to the clerk's response by repeating the affirmative particle *joo* three times, by turning his gaze down and starting to handle his wallet (line 8, Figure 3). The physical activity indicates that Mark is orienting to paying as the next relevant activity. He thus demonstrates understanding of the practical implications of the clerk's response. The multiple use of the affirmative particle (*joo joo joo*) also suggests that the turn displays understanding of the sequential implications of the clerk's response in relation to the whole activity, even if Mark had not understood the specific meaning of the turn (see also Stivers, 2004). Next, the participants move on to the payment sequence, after which the service encounter is closed.

Revisiting Mark's Encounter in the Debriefing Activity

Co-Constructing the Problem and Establishing the Relevance of the Mobile Phone

Mark went to the university café together with his fellow student John, who video-recorded the interaction. In the classroom, the students worked in small groups of four to five and were instructed to watch the videos and share their experiences of the interactions they had participated in in the wild. Their discussions were guided by a list of questions (see Appendix 2). One of the questions invited the students to discuss whether anything surprising happened during the encounter. The discussions were typically organized as a series of tellings that occasioned mobile-supported sharing activities, which enabled the students to give others access to the videos as records of their interactions in the service encounters. At the same time, the video recordings were also used as evidence for the reflective discussion (Raclaw et al., 2016). This section focuses on the sharing activity that was occasioned by Mark's telling about his experiences during the service interaction.

Prior to Excerpt 2, Mark has explained that he found it surprising that the clerk (whom he refers to as 'one girl') did not know how to answer his inquiry about whether the hot chocolate was free. This topic was evoked by one of the questions guiding the group discussion (see Appendix 2). In lines 1–4, John elaborates on the topic. His turn is the first one in the discussion that focuses on what the clerk actually said in the situation and establishes a puzzle to be solved: according to John, the clerk⁴

said that the hot chocolate was free, and yet Mark paid for it. John's turn is followed by interpretations presented by the other participants. By formulating their versions of the events, the participants co-construct a story. During the telling, the participants, Mark, John and the teacher establish joint orientation to a problem of understanding by focusing on the meaning of the clerk's answer and considering what kind of reactions would have been warranted in the situation.

Excerpt 2: Co-constructing a puzzle to be solved⁵

```

01 JOH:  ajattelen Δ^ (.)+ umm: aa, (0.6) ^ (0.6) ΔI think the other girl
        I think          umm: aa, (0.6) (0.6)
                        ^touches the recorder ^points backwards over the shoulder->
        mar:          Δgaze towards recorder Δgaze toward MAR-> 1.15
                        +gaze down towards John's hand on table->

02      said it was free

03      (0.2) ^ (0.2)+
        joh:  -> ^moves hand from shoulder and points forwards->
        mar:  ->+gaze follows JOH'S pointing gesture and
                then turns towards JOH->

04 JOH:  but then you pay

05      (.)

06 MAR:  maybe

07      (0.4)

08 TEA:  ^ai ↑jaa
        oh
        joh: ->^moves hand to chin-> until end of excerpt

09 MAR:  mutta +mutta  hān (0.4) hān sanoi +*hān (.)
        but  but      she      she said  she
                        *points toward own chest with RH->
        ->+turns gaze towards phone  +gazes towards JOH->

10      +*th- this girl, like the first one, +*(.)
        ->*points to the phone on the table  *puts hand on phone->
        ->+gaze back towards phone  +gaze towards JOH->

11      han sanoi, (0.8) ma ei maksa: +*(.)
                        I  NEG pay-STEM / cost-STEM
        she said  (0.8) I don't pay  ->+gaze back to phone->

12 JOH  hm=

13 MAR:  *=>I think< like she said ei
                        NEG (negation word)
        ->*starts swiping the phone with RH index->

14      and then she say maksa (.) like pay*+
                        pay/cost  ->*points towards the TEA->
                        ->+gazes toward tea, gaze then
                        back to phone->

15 JOH:  yeah [but it *[me- Δit could also be (.) ei maksa
                        NEG cost/pay
                        ->Δgaze towards the teacher->1.19
        mar:  ->*hand back on phone->1.20

```

- 16 MAR: [(-)
- 17 MAR: **ye:ah**
- 18 TEA: **niim mut se voi olla +ei maksa, Ø (1.0) Ø doesn't cost**
 yeah but it can be NEG cost/pay (1.0)
 Øhorizontal gesture with RHØ
 mar: ->+gaze towards teacher->
- 19 JOH: **Δye[ah**
 ->Δgaze down towards the phone ->
- 20 MAR: **[+yeah *le- ee:,***
 ->*raises hand over phone, points to phone
 *starts handling the phone with RH index->
 ->+gaze towards phone-> 1.

Excerpt 2 shows that while the participants try to figure out how the clerk reacted in the situation, they also seek to resolve a larger problem of understanding: whether the act of paying was necessary. Their focus is thus not only on the language used by the clerk, but also on whether Mark's actions in the situation were appropriate or not. John's turn builds a contrast between his interpretation and Mark's actions in the situation: John had understood that the hot chocolate was free (lines 1–3), but Mark had paid for it nevertheless (line 4). This puzzle establishes the clerk's answer as the focus of talk.

Mark reacts by first giving a partly aligning answer “maybe” (line 6); he thus treats John's interpretation as possibly right. The teacher, on the other hand, treats John's description of the situation as newsworthy and receives it with a change-of-state token *ai jaa* (see Koivisto, 2016). In the next turn, Mark continues to explicate his understanding of the situation. The turn-initial particle ‘but’ (*mutta*, line 9) projects that he is about to add something that contrasts with the interpretation presented by John. He produces the reporting clause *hän sanoi* twice and then reports that the clerk said, “*ma ei maksa*,” which can be heard as meaning ‘I don't pay’ (lines 9–11). In his pronunciation, Mark does not make a clear difference between the sounds *a* and *ä*, and therefore, in his turn, the first person pronoun *mä* (I) is not standard-like but sounds like *ma* and could also be interpreted as the beginning of the verb *maksaa*. However, the word is not cut off, nor is it followed by a pause which might indicate the need for self-repair. Instead, Mark immediately continues the turn with the negation verb *ei* and the main verb *maksa* (‘cost/pay’). Thus, his turn in this context is hearable as indirect reported speech communicating that the clerk had said that he does not have to pay for the hot chocolate. After this, however, Mark continues in English with the hedge *I think* (see Kärkkäinen, 2003) and begins to unpack the clerk's turn on which he is reporting. He details that in his hearing the clerk uttered the negation verb *ei* (‘no,’ line 13) and then repeated

the stem of the main verb *maksa*, which he also translates into English as ‘pay’ (line 14). The stem *maksa* is also the imperative form of the verb. Segmented this way into two separate intonation units, the clerk’s answer could also be understood as negating Mark’s assumption about the hot chocolate being free and performing a request to pay for it. By hedging and segmenting the response (as he heard it) into two lexicogrammatical units, Mark thus orients to the possibility that he had not heard or understood the clerk correctly.

While producing his turn, Mark shifts his orientation to his phone by both gazing and pointing towards it (lines 9–10). As he starts to detail what he thinks the clerk answered (lines 13–14), he touches the phone and starts swiping the display with his right-hand index finger. This orientation to the phone establishes its relevance to the telling in progress. The pointing gestures coordinated with verbal references to the actors in the reported events also invoke the relevance of the video as a record of the past interaction. All in all, Mark’s embodied behavior establishes the recording as an important resource for the activity of making sense of the clerk’s answer and its implications.

John continues the problem-solving sequence by constructing a turn that seems to present an alternative to Mark’s hearing (line 15). The turn-initial particle chain *yeah but* projects disagreement. The interpretation offered by John is *ei maksa* with an emphasis on the negation (*ei*). This interpretation is different from the previously presented one in that both elements of the verb construction are presented in the same intonation unit. This kind of an answer would have been heard as confirming the presuppositions of Mark’s question in the situation and thus saying that the hot chocolate is indeed free of charge.

John’s turn gets an affirmative response from Mark (line 17), after which the teacher also joins the conversation and presents her understanding. She also constructs her turn as an alternative to the previously presented interpretations by signaling contrast (‘yeah but’). While reproducing the same verbal construction as John in his previous turn (*ei maksa*), she highlights the ambiguity of the verb by translating it into English as ‘doesn’t cost’ (line 18). Thus, her interpretation of the meaning of the utterance is also that the hot chocolate does not cost anything.

At this point all three participants have provided their interpretations of the clerk’s answer. In light of the data from the actual service encounter (Excerpt 1), it is, however, possible to observe that none of the interpretations presented so far capture what was actually said by the clerk. By framing the turns as alternatives to each other, the participants show that they orient to the discussion as a problem-solving activity. They set out to find a solution to a situation that puzzles them all and work to co-construct an understanding of the clerk’s answer that could be shared by all the participants. At the end of Excerpt 2, John sustains orientation to

28 (1.2)

29 TEA: **fai maksamisesta**
 about paying
 pho: fphone starts making noise

30 (.)

31 TEA: **about paying**

32 ^ (.) ^
 joh: ^nods^

33 TEA: **I don't think so huh huh huh**

34 *Δ # (0.4) (0.6) #
 mar: ->*puts the phone on the table so that it is visible to everyone,
 leans towards it->
 joh: ->Δgaze towards phone->

fig: #fig 4 #fig 5

35 VID: **(ok)ei maksaa?**
Okey it costs

36 JOH: Δ^ei [**maksa**
 not cost
 ^points towards the teacher^
 -> Δgaze towards the teacher->

37 MAR: [****ei maksaa?**
 not cost
 ->*raises position->
 ->+gaze towards teacher->

While Mark handles the phone, John engages in a short side sequence with the teacher about a possible agreement between the researchers (who are referred to as 'they' in John's turn in line 27) and the café concerning payment. With his inquiry (lines 26–27) John entertains the possibility that the researchers had made an agreement with the café about the products being free of charge for the students video-recording their

interactions. This inquiry by John shows that the problem-solving activity is focused not only on what the clerk said, but also on whether Mark should have paid or not. After checking whether John's question was meant to refer to the issue of payment (lines 29, 31), the teacher answers indicating there was no agreement (line 33).

Following the teacher's answer, the video starts playing, and all the participants lean towards the phone and start watching it attentively (see Figure. 4). Through their bodily actions the participants thus establish the video as a focal object in the joint problem-solving activity. As soon as the clerk's answer is hearable on the video, both John and Mark articulate their hearings of it (lines 36, 37). At the same time, both raise their gaze towards the teacher as if seeking her confirmation. In this way, they construct their turns as candidate hearings (see Schegloff, 1997: 527; Koshik, 2005) of the target utterance and treat the teacher as an expert who is able to assess whether their hearings were correct or not. The teacher, however, does not raise her gaze from the video, and both Mark and John also immediately re-engage with watching the video (lines 40, 41).

Excerpt 4: Watching the video

36 JOH: Δ^{ei} [maksa
NEG cost-STEM/pay-STEM
^points towards the teacher^
Δqaze towards the teacher->

37 MAR: [+ei maksa?
 NEG cost-STEM/pay-STEM
->*raises position->
->+gaze towards teacher->

38 VID: **opiskeliija?**
student?

39 JOH: see?

```
40      +(.)
      mar: ->+gaze towards phone->
```

41 JOH: Δ^put it a little bit back^
 ->Δgaze towards the phone ->
 ^points towards the phone^

```
42      * (.)
mar:    *leans towards phone, handles phone and rewinds the video ->
```

43 CLA: ei maksaa >maybe<
NEG cost-INF / pay-INF

- 44 MAR: we- we'll see when she goes [back, (.)
- 45 TEA: [ah:
- 46 se oli ehkä <ei> (.) maksaa:
 NEG cost-INF/pay-INF
 it was maybe no (.) it costs
- 47 (.)
- 48 CLA: aah
- 49 MAR: *now she goes back (.) to ask
 ->*point towards phone->

John asks Mark to put the video a “little bit back,” i.e., to show the clerk’s answer again (line 41, excerpt 4). As Mark handles the phone, Claire provides another alternative hearing (line 43). According to her, the clerk answered *ei maksaa*. Although ambiguous, this version addresses the possibility that the hot chocolate had to be paid for. This meaning is conveyed by the repetition of the main verb (see note 1). At this point Mark has identified the relevant part of the video and now guides the collective watching by verbalizing what is about to be seen on the video: the clerk goes back to the kitchen to consult her colleagues (lines 44, 49). The teacher, on the other hand, orients to Claire’s turn by producing a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984) (line 45) and by sharing an understanding of the clerk’s turn that aligns with Claire’s turn and differs from the ones presented previously. She highlights the stress on the negation verb and the pause between the negation verb and the third person singular of the main verb. Produced in this way, the answer would have first negated the presupposition of Mark’s question and then communicated that the hot chocolate indeed has a cost and is not free.

After the teacher’s interpretation, the watching of the video continues. Excerpt 5 shows how Mark points to the phone and draws everyone’s attention to the clerk’s reaction to his question (line 62).

Excerpt 5: Observing the reaction of the clerk and making sense of the answer

- 49 MAR: *now she goes back (.) to ask
->*point towards phone->
- ((7 lines omitted, participants watch video, Mark comments))
- 57 MAR: *>yea yeah< thi:s now*[((I) go and ask)
->*points towards phone*
- 58 TEA: [>no niin joo<
- 59 (0.8)
- 60 VID: Mark: Eihän se maksa mitää koska mä tule: suomen (kurssilta)
It does not cost anything because I come from the Finnish course,
does it?
- 61 (0.8)
- 62 MAR: eh hah*[hah he heh *heh
*points towards the phone*hand back to chin->
- 63 TEA: [hh hehh hehh
- 65 JOH: fI go and askf hh hh hh
- 66 (~3.0) ((the video continues))
- 67 VID: Clerk: okei maksaa?
- 68 VID: Mark: joo, (.) joo joo
- 69 TEA: α Δ+#okei (.) maksaa
okey (.) it costs
α raises gaze towards John and Mark ->
joh: ->Δgaze towards teacher->
mar ->+gaze toward teacher->

- 70 MAR: **yea (.) >okei?<**
- 71 TEA: **joo [okei maksaa ni,**
 yeah okay it costs
- 72 MAR: **[ah:+**
 ->+gaze back towards phone->
- 73 CLA: **[(-)maksaa +means pay?**
 (-)cost means pay
- mar: ->+gaze to CLA and then back towards phone->
- 74 JOH: **ye[ah**
- 75 TEA: **[joo**
 yeah
- 76 JOH: **Δokay pay [heh heh heh**
 ->Δgazes towards MAR, then down->
- 77 TEA: **[niih eh heh hhh hhh**
 yeahh eh heh hhh hhh
- 78 MAR: **yeah: ^**
 joh: ^turns towards a bottle on left and starts handling it

Mark's question on the video is followed by a pause which is also oriented to during this group discussion (line 61). Mark starts to laugh after the pause and points towards the phone (line 62). In the service encounter, Mark's question was followed by the clerk's embodied display of affect: she smiled and moved her gaze from left to right before stepping back and walking to the kitchen behind her. Here, Mark's pointing gesture thus draws everyone's attention to the clerk's reaction that is now observable on the video. Subsequently, both the teacher and John start to laugh (lines 63, 64). The other participants also smile but do not laugh aloud. As the participants continue watching, Mark again verbalizes what is going on with a comment that re-enacts what the clerk might have said to account for her visit to the kitchen but did not ("I go and ask," line 65). As soon as the clerk's response and Marks reaction to it are heard again (lines 67–68), the teacher repeats it (line 69). She articulates her repetition quite slowly and clearly, which indicates that she is certain about her hearing this time. She also simultaneously raises her gaze from the phone towards John and Mark. By the repetition the teacher thus confirms the correct hearing of the clerk's answer. Mark then also repeats the particle *okei* (line 70), which was the part of the clerk's turn that he previously did not hear correctly. This repetition, which is preceded by the affirmative particle *yea*, thus shows that he has also arrived at a new understanding of the clerk's answer. Next, Claire seeks confirmation for her understanding that *maksaa* means 'pay' (line 73), which the teacher confirms (line 75). John

78 MAR: yeah: ^
joh: ^turns towards a bottle on left and starts handling it->
79 (.)
80 JOH: oh: I thought it was Δei maksa+
NEG cost-STEM / pay-STEM
->Δgaze toward MAR->
mar: ->+gaze to JOH
81 TEA: tai sit Δor +[or then it was ei maksa
or then NEG cost-INF / pay-INF
joh: ->Δgaze toward teacher->
mar: ->+gaze towards teacher
82 MAR: [or *ei (.) *maksa+
NEG cost-INF / pay-INF
-> *point to left*point to right
->+gaze towards JOH->
83 CLA: [(- -)
84 TEA: [so no (.) it does cost
85 JOH: Δ+°okey° hm:
->Δgaze down->
mar: ->+gaze towards phone->
mar: *reaches for the phone, starts smiling->
86 (2.4)

- 87 JOH: [^]*[°]fh- heh heh[°]
 [^]smiles ->
 mar: ->*handles the phone, smiles->
- 88 TEA: o:kei
- 89 JOH: [^]Δnice try eh?
 >[^]taps MAR on shoulder, smiles->
 ->Δgaze towards MAR->
- 90 MAR: +hyvää (.) hyvää yrittää
 nice (.) nice to try
 ->+gaze towards teacher->
- 91 TEA: hyvä yritys
 nice try
- 92 MAR: hyvä yritys
 nice try

The participants work towards closing the sequence focused on Mark's interaction by showing how their understanding has changed. John orients to a new understanding with his turn that begins with a change-of-state token and continues with the framing "I thought," followed by his earlier hearing of the clerk's answer (line 80). The teacher then presents her new interpretation by explaining that the answer could also have been *ei maksaa* ('no it does cost') produced as two intonation units (lines 81, 84). Mark presents a similar view in overlap (line 82). After this conclusion, the participants evaluate Mark's actions in the café as a "nice try." With this they playfully reframe his actions as an intentional attempt to get the hot chocolate for free. This evaluation also frames the whole episode as humorous and shows that even if the participants have put a lot of effort into understanding what happened in the situation and what the clerk actually answered, their overall orientation to the situation is also playful (see also Lilja & Piirainen-Marsh, 2018).

Discussion

This chapter has analyzed how the situated use of a video recorded on a mobile phone creates affordances for joint problem-solving activity through which L2 learners share access to details of their prior interactions and establish these as the focus of joint learning activity. The analysis demonstrated that while the focal participant, Mark, did not observably orient to problems of understanding during his service encounter outside the classroom, in the retrospective discussion all the participants—including Mark—had trouble understanding what the clerk's response to his inquiry was, how it could be interpreted and what kind of actions by

Mark would have been appropriate in the situation. The retrospective discussion was made relevant by the pedagogical context: the students' task was to video-record their service interactions outside the class and to talk about these interactions and the language use experiences gained in them back in the classroom. The analysis showed how the focal participants' tellings of their experiences created a space for a problem-solving activity and how they used the unique affordances of the mobile phone to give others access to the video as a record of the previously experienced interaction. This allowed those participants who had not witnessed the talked-about interactions to also see, hear and analyze key moments in the interactions in order to solve the problem.

The analysis illustrated how Mark orients towards his phone as a relevant object throughout the whole activity. Three (distinct) phases can be identified in the problem-solving activity. In the first phase, Mark's retelling occasions alternative interpretations of the prior interaction, through which the participants orient to the clerk's response as a problem. Mark and John's embodied alignments towards the phone as a material object indicate that they treat the video as a crucial resource for resolving the problem. In the next phase, Mark disengages from talk and initiates a sharing activity by placing the phone on the table so that the screen is visible to all participants in the group. This allows the participants to engage in collective watching of the video. The video recording on the phone thus serves as a means to provide a "mediated form of experiential and epistemic access" (Raclaw et al., 2016: 364) to the discussed events for those participants who did not witness or participate in the interaction in the café. As the video recording provides access to the details of the interaction, it can be used as the basis for finding a solution to the co-constructed puzzle. The participants closely attend to details of talk on the video and engage in joint action as they search for evidence of different hearings of the clerk's response and for the correct interpretation of the situation. The third phase takes place after the problem has been resolved: the participants disengage from the sharing activity, comment on the newly established understanding and co-construct a playful and humorous stance on the actions that were initially treated as problematic.

The data for the chapter come from experiential learning activities that aimed to connect the language use environments inside and outside the classroom. The learning activities were assigned by the teachers, who gave instructions for planning the out-of-classroom task and provided the students with questions guiding the debriefing discussion. However, the teachers did not participate in the interactions in the wild, and, apart from designing the general questions guiding the classroom discussion, they had no influence on what the students paid attention to in their retrospective discussions. The students' discussions were centered around linguistic and interactional phenomena that had caught their attention in the encounters. In this sense, the discussions were built on learners' own experiences and interests. Our analysis demonstrates how the students

paid attention to details of the interaction and performed quite sophisticated analyses of prosodic and lexico-semantic features of the focal turn while collectively searching for a shared understanding of its meaning. This level of detail in their analysis of the interaction could not have been achieved without the video recording and repeated listening. The video recording was a crucial resource for the students first to remember exactly how the interaction unfolded and then to provide others access to it and enable all participants to view and listen to the focal turns repeatedly. This made it possible to first identify the focal turn which was treated as the source of trouble and then understand what it meant in the context in which it was used. The ability to analyze how utterances can be heard and understood in their interactional context is a crucial part of interactional competence. The analysis showed that the mobile phone augments the students' resources for resolving interactional troubles and engaging in joint analysis of previously experienced interaction. In addition, the students were enthusiastic and attentive throughout the discussion. We believe that this is because the task is related to their own real-life experiences that are meaningful, relevant and also consequential for them (see also Piirainen-Marsh & Lilja, in press).

One of the cornerstones of experiential pedagogy is reflection (see Knutson, 2003; Kohonen, Jaatinen, Kaikkonen, & Lehtovaara, 2011). Reflection can be defined as an activity "in which individuals engage to explore their experiences in order to lead to new understandings and appreciation" (Boud, Keogh, & Walker, 1985: 3). In this sense, the problem-solving activity analyzed in this chapter could also be referred to as reflection. However, as Walsh and Mann (2015) point out, our understanding of what reflection in interactional terms looks like is still limited. Walsh and Mann (2015) also make a case for more data and evidence-based reflection in teacher training. Our analysis shows that data-driven exploration of one's own language use practices is also useful for L2 learners; it can generate noticing of interactional practices and provide opportunities for gaining a deeper understanding of language use in situated interaction.

We hope to have shown that for the study of L2 learning in interaction, the combination of data from the same participants interacting inside and outside the classroom is valuable. As language users, we often think back on our previous interactions and try to understand why the interactions unfolded as they did or why the co-participants acted in certain specific ways. For language learning, sharing these thoughts can be valuable, as the analysis presented here illustrates. For researchers of language learning in interaction, video recordings of such retrospective discussions provide fruitful data because they open up possibilities for observing what language learners notice and treat as worthy of attention. They also make it possible to trace how the participants analyze their own prior interactions in their own terms. To unravel the mysteries of language learning, it is useful to have data from the same participants' interactions in situations

characterized by different material ecologies and to be able to understand what meaning the participants themselves attribute to their own past interactions.

Notes

- 1 We use the notion of ‘the wild’ (Hutchins, 1995) as a metaphor to refer to the complex and contingent nature of L2 speakers’ social interactions outside the classroom (see also Hellermann et al., in press; Wagner, 2015).
- 2 Smiling and laughter have been shown to have varied functions in interaction. In addition to humor, they can also be connected, e.g., to marking interactional trouble (Haakana, 1999; Petitjean & González-Martínez, 2015; Sert & Jacknick, 2015). In Excerpt 1, however, it is clearly observable that the participants treat the situation as funny and are enjoying the conversation.
- 3 A dispreferred answer can thus be produced by a sole repetition of the main verb (*maksaa*, ‘it does cost’). Another way to produce it would be a combination of a dialogue particle *kyllä*, which would oppose the implication of the previous turn (see also Keevallik & Hakulinen, 2017), and a repetition of the main verb (*kyllä maksaa*, ‘Yes, it does cost’).
- 4 John refers to the clerk as “the other girl.” We take this to refer to Mark’s earlier turn in which he refers to the clerk as “one girl” in Finnish. The use of the word *other* in this context is puzzling since they seem to be speaking of the same person the whole time. This is evident in the content of John’s turn, which makes it clear that he is talking about the clerk who was present when Mark paid for the hot chocolate.
- 5 The participants focus on the verb *maksaa* in their discussion. In Finnish, this verb means both ‘cost’ and ‘pay.’ Since it is not always possible to interpret which of these meanings the participants are referring to, we have decided not to translate the verb in the transcript. Instead, the transcript includes a gloss that indicates whether the verb has been used in the infinitive (INF) or in some other form (the gloss STEM refers to the stem of the word, which is also used as the imperative form). The reader is advised to pay attention to the original line because the participants use both English and Finnish in their discussion, and also details of embodied conduct are important in constructing meaning.

References

- Arminen, I., & Weilenmann, A. (2009). Mobile presence and intimacy: Reshaping social actions in mobile contextual configuration. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(10), 1905–1923.
- Beach, W. A. (1993). Transitional regularities for ‘casual’ ‘okay’ usages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 325–352.
- Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (1985). What is reflection in learning? In D. Boud, R. Keough, & D. Walker (Eds.), *Reflection: Turning experience into learning* (pp. 7–17) London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Brown, B., McGregor, M., & Laurier, E. (2013). *iPhone in vivo: Video analysis of mobile device use*. Proceedings of CHI ’13, Paris, France, ACM Press, 1031–1040. DOI: 10.1145/2470654.2466132.

- Brown, B., McGregor, M., & McMillan, D. (2014). 100 days of iPhone use: Understanding the details of mobile device use. *Proceedings of Mobile HCI 2014*, 2335–2340. DOI: 10.1145/2628363.2628377.
- Brown, B., McGregor, M., & McMillan, D. (2015). Searchable objects: Search in everyday conversation. *Proceedings of CSCW 2015*, 508–517. DOI: 10.1145/2675133.2675206.
- Brouwer, C. E. (2003). Word searches in NNS—NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(4), 534–545.
- Clark, B., & Lindemalm, K. (2011). *Språkskap. Swedish as a social language*. Malmö: Folkuniversitetet & Interactive Institute.
- 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. DOI: 10.1093/applin/amv010
- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On ‘lingua franca’ English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(2), 237–259.
- Gardner, R., & Wagner, J. (2004). *Second language conversations*. London: Continuum.
- Gibson, J. J. (1977). The theory of affordances. In R. Shaw & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Perceiving, acting, and knowing* (pp. 67–82). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Greer, T. (2013). Codeswitching and embodied orientation toward shifting participant constellations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 57, 100–117.
- Greer, T. (in press). Noticing words in the wild. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Haakana, M. (1999). *Laughing matters. A conversation analytical study of laughter in doctor patient interaction* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Helsinki, Helsinki.
- Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). *L2 interactional competence and development*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, J., Eskildsen, S. W., Pekarek Doehler, S., & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (in press). *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Hellermann, J., Thorne, S. L., & Fodor, P. (2017). Mobile reading as social and embodied practice. *Classroom Discourse*, 8(2), 99–121.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change of state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 299–345) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 25–50.
- Hutchby, I. (2001). Technologies, texts and affordances. *Sociology*, 35, 441–456.
- Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Kärkkäinen, E. (2003). *Epistemic stance in English conversation: A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on I think*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kasper, G., & Burch, A. R. (2016). Focus on form in the wild. In R. A. van Compernelle & J. McGregor (Eds.), *Authenticity, language, and interaction in second language contexts* (pp. 198–232). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Keevallik, L., & Hakulinen, A. (2017). Epistemically reinforced kyl(lä)/küll-responses in Estonian and Finnish: Word order and social action. *Journal of Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.01.003>
- Knutson, S. (2003). Experiential learning in second-language classrooms. *TESL Canada Journal*, 20(2), 55–64.
- Kohonen, V., Jaatinen, R., Kaikkonen, P., & Lehtovaara, J. (2011). *Experiential learning in foreign language education*. New York: Routledge.
- Koivisto, A. (2016). Receipting information as newsworthy vs. responding to redirection: Finnish news receipts 'aijaa' and 'aha(a)'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 104, 163–179.
- Koshik, I. (2005). Alternative questions used in conversational repair. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 193–211.
- Koshik, I., & Seo, M. (2012). Word (and other) search sequences initiated by language learners. *Text and Talk*, 32(2), 167–189.
- Koole, T. (2010). Displays of epistemic access: Student responses to teacher explanations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(2), 183–209.
- Kurhila, S. (2006). *Second Language Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Laury, R. (2017). The Finnish verb repeat response: Its emergence and its nature as a formulaic expression. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 123, 139–150.
- Lehtinen, M. (2012). *Episteesen auktoriteetin ja yhteisen ymmärryksen konstruointi kokouskeskustelussa: fokuksessa -hAn-lausumat* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Aalto University, Helsinki.
- Licoppe, C. (2004). Connected presence: The emergence of a new repertoire for managing social relationships in a changing communication technoscape. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 22(1), 135–156.
- Lilja, N. (2014). Partial repetitions as other-initiations of repair in second language talk: Re-establishing understanding and doing learning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 71, 98–116. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2014.07.011
- Lilja, N., & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2018). Connecting the language classroom and the wild: Re-enactments of language use experiences. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(5), 694–717.
- Lilja, N., Piirainen-Marsh, A., Clark, B., & Torretta, N. (in press). The Rally Course: Learners as co-designers of out-of-classroom language learning tasks. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Majlesi, A. R., & Broth, M. (2012). Emergent learnables in second language classroom interaction. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 1(3–4), 193–207. DOI: 10.1016/j.lcsi.2012.08.004
- Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behaviour tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(3), 404–427. DOI: 10.1093/applin/amm052
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 491–500.
- Mondada, L. (2011). Understanding as an embodied, situated and sequential achievement in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), 542–552.
- Mondada, L. (2014). Conventions for multimodal transcription. Retrieved from https://franz.unibas.ch/fileadmin/franz/user_upload/redaktion/Mondada_conv_multimodality.pdf

- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising 'learning' in applied linguistics* (pp. 105–126). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–270). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Petitjean, C., & González-Martínez, E. (2015). Laughing and smiling to manage trouble in French-language classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 6(2), 89–106.
- Piirainen-Marsh, A., & Lilja, N. (in press). How wild can it get? In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Raclaw, J., Robles, J. S., & DiDomenico, S. M. (2016). Providing epistemic support for assessments through mobile-supported sharing activities. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 49(4), 362–379. DOI: 10.1080/08351813.2016.1199089
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*, Vol. 2, Ed. Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(5), 1295–1345.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes*, 23(3), 499–547.
- Sert, O., & Jacknick, C. (2015). Student smiles and the negotiation of epistemics in L2 classrooms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 77, 97–112.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stevanovic, M. (2013). Managing participation in interaction: The case of humming. *Text and Talk*, 33(1), 113–137.
- Stivers, T. (2004). ‘No no no’ and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 30(2), 260–293.
- VISK (2004). *Iso suomen kielioppi* (The descriptive grammar of Finnish). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Retrieved from <http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk>.
- Wagner, J. (2015). Designing for language learning in the wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 75–102). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Walsh, S., & Mann, S. (2015). Doing reflective practice: A data-led way forward. *ELT Journal*, 69(4), 351–362.

Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Appendix 1

Transcription Symbols

Multimodal transcription follows the conventions developed by Mondada that are available at https://mainly.sciencesconf.org/conference/mainly/pages/Mondada2013_conv_multimodality_copie.pdf

The following symbols are used to indicate the multimodal conduct by the participants:

In excerpt 1

- * * Mark's embodied actions
- + + Mark's gaze
- ^ ^ Clerk's embodied actions
- Δ Δ Clerk's gaze

In other excerpts

- * * Mark's embodied actions
- + + Mark's gaze
- ^ ^ John's embodied actions
- Δ Δ John's gaze
- ◇ ◇ Teacher's embodied actions
- α α Teacher's gaze
- □ Embodied actions by other students
- f* Phone making noise

Appendix 2

Questions Guiding the Debriefing Discussion

- What did you order/ask?
- How did the situation go? You can watch the video while talking.
 - What went well? Why?
 - Did anything surprising happen?
 - Did you experience any trouble (e.g., in understanding, or with the vocabulary)? How did you solve these problems?
 - How did it feel?
- What do you want to share with other students?
 - Think about three things that you learned from this and want to share with other learners of Finnish.

Section IV

Testing

Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

11 What Counts as Evidence for Interactional Competence? Developing Rating Criteria for a German Classroom-Based Paired Speaking Test

Katharina Kley

Introduction

As early as 1986, Claire Kramsch argued that the goal of L2 teaching and learning should shift from grammatical accuracy to interactional competence (IC), that is, the skills and knowledge that individuals employ to engage in interaction (Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011).¹ For the past few years, efforts have been made to incorporate IC into second language (L2) curricula; that is, teaching principles (Wong & Waring, 2010), sets of instructional phases (Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Betz & Huth, 2014) and research-based teaching materials for the teaching of interactional phenomena (e.g., Drake & Drake, 2015; Huth, 2014; Robinson, 2014) appeared.

As IC has found its way into L2 classrooms, teachers are faced with the challenge of assessing students' IC, that is, creating appropriate test tasks and rubrics. For the development of rubrics in classroom-based IC speaking tests, I argue that teachers should consider a data-driven approach. To be precise, I encourage teachers to first analyze students' test discourse from an emic (participant-based) perspective before creating etic (instructor-based) rating categories for rubrics. In this chapter, I show how this can be done. I first present the findings from a conversation analysis conducted on beginning German learners' speaking test data and then discuss the development of a rubric, which is based on the emically derived findings of the data analysis and the teacher's curricular goals.

Assessing IC

Despite all the work that has been done to understand what constitutes IC and how to teach it, we still struggle with how IC can best be assessed in the classroom. The limited number of efforts to assess IC undertaken in recent years (e.g., Ikeda, 2017; Youn, 2015) points to the extent of the challenge. Assessing IC is not as straightforward as simply choosing

which interactional practices to focus on and designing a rubric. This is due to the fact that on an epistemological level a model of IC based on Conversation Analysis (CA) is incommensurable with language testing. While CA is *emic* in perspective, language testing is *etic*. That is, CA is concerned with how participants themselves use language and orient to it as a resource to accomplish social actions (Pekarek Doehler, 2013). Language testers, however, set standards of what is correct or incorrect, or signals high ability or low ability, and judge a participant's performance against these standards. Such standards, which are a hallmark of language testing, can hardly be included in CA, which considers every interaction as being unique. Because every new utterance is understood to fit the context created by the previous utterance, and to create the context for the next utterance, talk becomes a dynamic entity that is constantly changing and renewing itself (Heritage, 1984).

Despite the incommensurable epistemological differences between CA and language testing, instructors often aim towards their students being able to interact in the target language. If IC is emphasized in the classroom and interactional practices are even taught, teachers have to also assess their students' IC. Testing is an inescapable part of language teaching; students, parents and administrators expect it. For the rating scale development of IC speaking tests, I suggest that teachers take a data-driven approach. Such an approach is not new. A number of language testers favor a data-based methodology (e.g., Chalhoub-Deville, 1995; Fulcher, 1996; Fulcher, Davidson, & Kemp, 2011; Upshur & Turner, 1995). In comparison to an *a priori* approach that language experts use to conceptualize language based on their knowledge and experience, a data-based approach includes the close analysis (e.g., by means of discourse analysis or CA) of performance samples from learners engaging in the test's tasks and the isolation of key performance features evolving from the analysis. Observing and describing students' language performance in detail is considered necessary to generate rich descriptors that come as close as possible to the original observations of language use in the specified domains. Fulcher et al. (2011) also emphasize that a richer description of contextually based performance strengthens the validity of inferences made based on assigned scores.

To be able to arrive at a rubric after the micro-level analysis of students' interactions has been conducted, teachers, in a second step, have to take into account the learning objectives and goals that they had compiled for the group of students whose IC they intend to assess. From an IC perspective, such learning objectives could be participants' preference for progressivity (advancement of talk within turns and sequences) (Schegloff, 2007), maintaining intersubjectivity (Schegloff, 1992) or the diversification of the resources used by participants to accomplish a given action (Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015).

Previous Research on Topic Management

In this chapter, the conversation analysis focuses on students' topic development. Knowing how to initiate, shift and exit a topic is crucial in order to participate in conversations effectively (Wong & Waring, 2010). However, from a CA perspective, it is problematic to determine what the topic for a given unit of talk even is, given that topics may also shift in interaction (Sidnell, 2010). According to Atkinson and Heritage (1984), topic management may be one of the most complex conversational phenomena to be investigated. Here, I am going to briefly summarize major findings on how conversationalists initiate topics, and how they shift between topics.

A new topic that is unrelated to a previous topic is initiated at the beginning or closing of a conversation, after a series of silences or after a topic has been closed (Wong & Waring, 2010). In terms of the topic-initiation methods, Button and Casey (1984), for example, found that topic-initial elicitors (for English, e.g., *What's new?*) are used to introduce a new topic. To start a new topic, participants may also bring up a specific newsworthy item related to the recipient (itemized news inquiry) or report on speaker-related activities (news announcement) (Button & Casey, 1985). In their data set of English speakers, Maynard and Zimmerman (1984) revealed that topics may also be initiated by pointing to the immediate environment of the interaction (e.g., *Nice day, isn't it? That's a cool bag.*) (setting talk). They also found that personal questions about each other's identity or activity serve unacquainted participants as topic initiators (e.g., *Are you freshman? Do you live on campus?*) (pre-topical questions) (Maynard and Zimmerman, 1984).

When interacting, participants also shift into a new topic or a new focus of the same topic. Participants may do so in a disjunctive fashion (Wong & Waring, 2010). Disjunctive markers such as *actually* or *by the way* in English can be used to mark such abrupt and unexpected moves into a new topic (Wong & Waring, 2010). By means of pre-shift tokens, that is, acknowledgment tokens, assessments (Jefferson, 1993) and figurative expressions (Holt & Drew, 2005), participants may also terminate a topic before they initiate a new topic.

However, Sacks (1992b) points out that it is more natural for conversationalists to move from topic to topic in a stepwise manner, that is, a gradual fashion (also referred to as topic shading; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). In a lecture from 1972, Sacks argues:

It's a general feature for topical organization in conversation that the best way to move from topic to topic is not by a topic close followed by a topic beginning, but by what we call a stepwise move. Such a move involves connecting what we've just been talking about to what we're now talking about, though they are different. I link up whatever I'm now introducing as a new topic to what we've just been talking about.

Now, this stepwise thing is a really serious feature of topical organization, and it's my rough suspicion that the difference between what's thought to be a good conversation and what's thought to be a lousy conversation can be characterized that way, i.e., a lousy conversation is marked by the occurrence of a large number of specific new topic starts as compared to such a conversation in which, so far as anybody knows we've never had to start a new topic, though we're far from wherever we began and haven't talked on just a single topic, it flowed.

(Sacks, 1992b: 566)

This stepwise movement into a new topic may be accomplished with the following devices: a pivotal utterance or item that connects the previous and the next topic (Sacks, 1992b: 300); invoking semantic relationships between items, e.g., co-class membership (Sacks, 1992a: 757); moving from a categorical to a particularized statement (from *You* to *I*) (Maynard, 1980); and a summary of the prior topic following by ancillary matters (Jefferson, 1984).

In this chapter, I present the findings from a conversation analysis conducted on beginning German learners' topic management in a peer–peer classroom-based speaking test. Based on the insights on students' topic management gained from the conversation analysis and the instructor's curricular goals for this course, a rubric was derived to be used in this particular classroom test setting.

Data

The speaking test data that are presented in this chapter stem from learners enrolled in a second-semester German course at a language center of a private research university in the United States. These learners have been part of an innovative and experimental pedagogical effort to explicitly teach IC already in the beginning semesters of German language instruction. A number of interactional practices such as sequencing, overall structuring and repair practices have been incorporated into the curriculum of the German program. In the first-year German classes, for example, learners are made aware that every first pair part requires an appropriate second pair part. They are taught ways of opening and closing conversations in German, ways of expanding on topics and ways of accomplishing common social actions such as requesting, inviting and making arrangements. Students also learn ways to indicate that they have encountered a problem of hearing or understanding talk. Instructors raise students' awareness of these interactional practices by means of a number of in-class activities following Betz and Huth's (2014) instructional phases. This includes an initial reflection phase, the contrastive analysis of L1 and L2 interactional structures, working with authentic data to discover and explore interaction patterns, interactive practice in speaking and in writing, and a final translingual/transcultural discussion.

The speaking test data from seven student pairs (14 students total) were included for data analysis. All participants were enrolled in the same section of second-semester German. The students self-selected their conversational partner, a peer, for the test. While acquaintance effects were controlled for because all participants knew each other from class, other interlocutor characteristics, for example, overall proficiency, were not taken into consideration for pairing students. The students were also not trained as to how to interact with their peer.

From a language testing perspective, the way the students were paired for the speaking test is not unproblematic. Language testers have stated repeatedly that test-taker oral performance is influenced by a number of different factors in the testing context such as the interlocutor, the rater and the test setting (e.g., McNamara, 1996/2009). That is, interlocutor characteristics such as proficiency, gender, familiarity with the test taker and native/nonnative speaker status have an impact on the test discourse and scores, thus compromising the validity of the test. Therefore, language testers attempt to control for interlocutor characteristics, for example, assigning test-taker pairs based on proficiency.

Interlocutor characteristics were not controlled for in the present speaking test for two main reasons: (1) Interlocutor characteristics are not taken into account for practice activities in the classroom and corresponding speaking tests because of practical reasons. (2) Interlocutor categories, which are understood to have an effect on test-taker discourse and scores, are usually determined top-down and considered stable. However, from a CA perspective that some language testers take (Brown & McNamara, 2004; Lazaraton & Davis, 2008), participant roles such as proficiency, gender and native/nonnative speaker status are understood to be constructed and displayed in the discourse itself. Therefore, they are relevant only if the participants themselves orient to them in interaction (e.g., Goodwin, 1987; Schegloff, 1997). From that perspective, it is questionable if interlocutor characteristics have to be taken into consideration when pairing students for speaking tests.

The students took an end-of-semester speaking test, which was worth 7.5% of the final grade for the course. The test consisted of one task, an open-topic task where the members of the pair converse for five to ten minutes about a number of topics of their choice. The students took the test outside of class and audio-recorded their conversation through the university's classroom management system. The instructions for the students were as follows:

Find a partner and talk with him/her for about 5 to 10 minutes. You can talk about whatever you like. Here are some ideas: your summer plans; the courses and things you want to do next semester; something interesting or fun you did last week, last weekend, yesterday; your hobbies; family and friends; etc. Do not write out your interaction. Just talk. Record and submit your interaction through [the course management system].

Clearly, the fact that the task is not standardized is an issue from a language tester's perspective. The students were not presented with an actual prompt. They could select their own topics and were free to produce whatever social actions they pleased or were able to produce. The problem with such a task is that some pairs may produce certain social actions, and others may produce other kinds of actions. Also, some pairs may bring up more difficult topics, whereas others may talk about comparatively easy topics. The discourse that the student pairs produce may therefore hardly be comparable.

The instructor's goal was to present her students with a reasonably authentic task for the test. Chatting with a peer is an everyday-like activity that students will most likely encounter when studying, living or working in the target culture. Such an activity requires learners to be able to select topics on their own and to spontaneously accomplish social actions in whatever situation arises during the conversation. With the present test task, the instructor attempted to imitate such an activity.

Data Analysis

The conversation analysis revealed that the student pairs included in this study manage topics differently. Based on excerpts of the interactions of three student pairs (Amanda and Gary; Andrea and Nancy; and Justin and Will), the salient differences with regard to topic management are going to be discussed below.

Striking about Amanda and Gary, for example, is that they shift between topics mostly in a disjunctive fashion. That is, they close a topic and then launch a new topic that is not related to the previous topic.

Amanda and Gary

- 01 A: *hallo Gary.
 hello
 hello Gary.*
- 02 G: *hallo Amanda.
 hello
 hello Amanda.*
- 03 A: *wie geht's?
 how goes it
 how are you?*
- 04 G: *es geht mir gut.
 it goes me good
 I am well.*

- 05 und dir?
 and you
 and you?
- 06 (0.3)
- 07 A: ah es könn- kenn- (0.2) es geht mir gut.
 uh it can know it goes me good
 it can know I am well.
- 08 ahm °ja° ich auch,
 uhm yes me too
 yes me too,
- 09 .h ahm hast du: eine:: (0.3) ah kleines oder ah ahm großes
 uhm have you a uh small or uh uhm big
 do you have a small or big
- 10 Familie?
 family
 family?
- 11 (0.6)
- 12 G: ah ich habe: (0.5) eine (0.5) kleine Familie.
 uh I have a small family
 I have a small family.
- 13 A: ah
 uh
- 14 G: ich habe: fünf (0.2) Mitgilder,
 I have five members
 I have five members,
- 15 A: °hm hm°
- 16 G: in meine Familie? (0.8) und ah: (0.6) ich habe (0.7) einen
 in my family and uh I have a
 in my family and I have a
- 17 Va^{ter}: eine Mu^{tt}ter (0.2) eine Mu^{tt}ter,
 father a mother a mother
 father a mother a mother,
- 18 A: hm hm
- 19 G: Entschuldigung .h (0.2) und zwei Schwestern.
 sorry and two sisters
 sorry and two sisters.
- 20 A: ah=
 uh
- 21 G: =und dir?
 and you
 =and you?
- 22 (0.6)
- 23 A: ah ich habe ein Vater (0.2) or einen Va^{ter}: (0.5) ein (0.2)
 uh I have a father or a father a
 I have a father or a father a
- 24 ahm eine Mu^{tt}ter: <und einen Bruder.> (0.4) ah (.) und ahm (0.3)
 uhm a mother and a brother uh and uhm
 a mother and a brother. and

- 25 zwei: °Ka°tzen.
 two cats
 two cats.
- 26 G: zwei [Katzen?]
 two cats
 two cats?
- 27 A: [ja] <hast du:> ahm ein Haustier?
 yes have you uhm a pet
 yes do you have a pet?
- 28 (0.6)
- 29 G: ja ich habe: (.) einen Hund.
 yes I have a dog
 yes I have a dog.
- 30 A: ah
 uh
- 31 G: er is >sehr kleine und sehr niedlich.<
 he is very small and very cute
 he is very small and very cute.
- 32 (0.3)
- 33 A: ah (0.2) [ich] mag °Ka°tzen aber,
 uh I like cats but
 I like cates but,
- 34 G: [ja]
 yes
- 35 G: ja=
 yes
- 36 A: =ah (0.2) [Hunde s-]
 uh dogs
 dogs
- 37 G: [hast du] AUCH h- ah (0.2) °Hunde°?
 have you also uh dogs
 do you also have dogs?
- 38 A: ah nein nein (0.3) ahm (0.4) Katzen °ja°.
 uh no no uhm cats yes
 no no cats yes.
- 39 (0.3)
- 40 G: okay=

- 41 A: =ahm
uhm
- 42 (2.0)
- 43 G: und [ah]
and uh
and
- 44 A: [wann] (0.2)
when
when
- 45 A: hm
- 46 G: wait try to go
- 47 ah [un]d ah spielst du (1.1) ein Instrument?
uh and uh play you an instrument
and do you play an instrument?
- 48 A: [hm]
- 49 (0.3)
- 50 A: <ah nein aber (.) ich habe ah:m (0.9) die <Geige?> ah gespielt>
uh no but I have uhm the violin uh played
no but I played the violin?
- 51 ja in (0.4) in Gynab- Gymnasium und Schule ja.
yes in in high school and school yes
yes in high school and school yes.
- 52 (0.5)
- 53 G: okay=
- 54 A: =ah (0.3) spielst du °ein Instrument? (.) ja°?
uh play you an instrument yes
=do you play an instrument yes?
- 55 (0.4)
- 56 G: ja ah (0.4) ich ich habe: (0.4) das Klavier gespie[lt].
yes uh I I have the piano played
yes I played the piano.
- 57 A: [hm]
- 58 (0.6)
- 59 G: <aber (0.2) das is (.) sehr viele (.) Jahre (.) voll (0.5) ah
but that is very many years full uh
but that is very many years full
- 60 ah vor,>
uh ago
ago,

- 61 (0.3)
- 62 A: °ja°
yes
- 63 (0.4)
- 64 G: und ah ich (.) ich kann nicht mehr (0.4) das Klavier gespielt.
and uh I I can not more the piano played
and I cannot play the piano no more.
- 65 A: ja
yes
- 66 A: [ich]
I
- 67 G: [(wir dürf-)]
we may
- 68 G: ja
yes
- 69 A: ich habe vergessen (0.3) ahm (0.2) ja die Geige ja.
I have forgotten uhm yes the violin yes
I have forgotten yes the violin yes.
- 70 (0.7)
- 71 G: hm hm
- 72 (0.8)
- 73 G: und ah <was is> (.) deine (.) no (0.8) uh was ist dein (.)
and uh what is your no uh what is your
and what is your no what is your
- 74 Hauptfach?
major
major?

Amanda and Gary open the conversation by greeting each other (lines 1–2). This basic greeting sequence is followed by a bilateral how-are-you sequence (lines 3–8). Immediately after this sequence is closed in line 8, Amanda initiates the first action sequence and thus the first topic, asking Gary about the size of his family (lines 9–10). Important to note is that Amanda's information-seeking question comes unexpectedly. It is not tied to any previous talk; rather, it transitions immediately out of Amanda's greeting response. A 0.6-second pause occurs before Gary responds to Amanda's yes-no question. Gary may have delayed his participation because he considers the unexpected question as problematic. In his response in line 12, Gary says that his family is small. Then he expands on his contribution by listing the members of his family (lines 14–19). By providing acknowledgment tokens, Amanda displays that she is listening

and encourages Gary to continue talking. After Gary stops talking, and Amanda produces another acknowledgment token, Gary considers the sequence closed and initiates a return sequence in line 21 (“=und dir?”) (Schegloff, 2007), now eliciting from Amanda the members of her family (lines 23–25).

Both Amanda and Gary expand on the current topic some more by asking follow-up questions and adding more information on the topic (lines 26–38). When Amanda says that two cats belong to her family, Gary repeats “zwei [Katzen?]” with rising intonation (line 26), indicating surprise or disbelief. He may also question the relevance of including cats in the category device family. Overlapping with Gary, Amanda confirms that she has two cats and then asks Gary if he has pets (line 27), which, after a 0.6-second pause, he confirms by saying that he has a dog (line 29). Gary then takes the floor and expands on his contribution, adding that the dog is small and cute (line 31). In the following turn, Amanda takes the floor and adds that she likes cats. The coordinating conjunction *aber* (‘but’) at the end of her turn suggests that she wants to add another thought that contrasts with the statement she has just made. However, at the time when Amanda wants to deliver that contrasting statement, Gary produces another follow-up question (“[hast du] AUCH h- ah (.2) °Hunde°?”) asking if Amanda also has dogs (line 37). Gary interrupts Amanda as he has not paid attention to the ‘but’ at the end of her turn indicating that more was supposed to be coming from Amanda. Because of their overlapping talk, Amanda stops talking, and Gary is able to complete his question. Amanda answers Gary’s question, saying that she only has cats. After a 0.3-second pause, Gary utters “okay” to acknowledge Amanda’s response. The “okay” may also indicate an upcoming shift in activity or topic (Beach, 1993).

Before Gary proffers a new topic on playing instruments by asking an information-seeking question (“ah [un]d ah spielst du (1.1) ein Instrument?,” line 47), non-lexical speech perturbations (“ahm”) and a longer 2.0-second pause occur (lines 41–42). These disfluencies indicate that a search for what to say (Hasegawa, 2017) may be in progress. In the two following turns, Gary and Amanda simultaneously try to initiate a new topic, but because of their overlapping talk, they both stop talking. By uttering $\uparrow$ hm, an open-class repair initiator, Amanda wants to elicit from Gary what he was trying to say. She thus offers him the floor. Interestingly, in order to be able to proffer his topic, Gary changes to English and asks Amanda not to talk as he is in the process of phrasing his question (line 46). In her response to Gary’s question whether she plays an instrument, Amanda answers that she does not play any instruments but that she used to play the violin in school (lines 50–51). Following her response, a 0.5-second pause occurs, which may again

indicate a search for what-to-say. Using "okay," Gary acknowledges Amanda's response.

Similar to Gary earlier, Amanda now produces a reciprocation question ("=ah (0.3) spielst du °ein Instrument? (.) ja°?", line 54) asking Gary if he plays an instrument. The sequence that Gary has initially launched is reciprocated; that is, Amanda initiates the same action sequence. Gary responds by saying that he used to play the piano and that he does not know how to play it any more (lines 56, 59–60, 64). In line 69, Amanda brings the focus to herself, adding to Gary's contribution that she also forgot how to play the violin. Gary produces an acknowledgment token ("hm hm"). Prior to and after the acknowledgment token, the two students produce longer pauses (0.7 and 0.8 seconds long), which may indicate that they do not have anything else to add at this point, leaving them to search for what-to-say. The acknowledgment token "hm hm" may serve as a pre-shift token (Jefferson, 1993); that is, it signals that a topic shift is about to occur. Then Gary introduces a new topic, again by means of an information-seeking question ("und ah <was is> (.) deine (.) no (.8) uh was ist dein (.)Hauptfach?") (lines 73–74).

In sum, it becomes apparent that Amanda and Gary move between topics mostly in a disjunctive fashion; that is, they terminate a topic and initiate a new one. The topics are not tied to one another in any way. The students do not make use of any pivotal utterances to help them connect the previous and the new topic; there is also no semantic relationship between the topics. However, the student pair produces activity boundary markers (e.g., *okay*) and acknowledgment tokens (e.g., *hm hm*) to indicate that they are going to shift to a new topic. Interesting to note is also that Amanda and Gary use only one method to initiate new topics, that is, by asking an information-seeking question. Salient further is that their interaction is characterized by reciprocal sequences. In the analysis, I showed that the two students reciprocate each action sequence by asking the original question or "und du?" ('and you?'). They thus recycle the initial question that was used to launch a new topic. In a reciprocal sequence, the speaker-recipient roles are reversed. Now the interlocutor, who has introduced the topic, answers his or her initial question. Finally, Amanda and Gary expand on their own and their interlocutor's contributions and ask follow-up questions. Using these resources, the student pair is able to stay on one topic for a little while.

Student pairs, however, also shift from one topic to the next in a step-wise fashion. Nancy and Andrea, for example, move between topics gradually. In addition, they tend to launch fewer reciprocal sequences than Amanda and Gary.

Andrea and Nancy

- 01 A: ah (0.3) hallo.
uh hello
hello.
- 02 N: hallo,
hello
hello,
- 03 A: ah wie geht's.
uh how goes it
how are you.
- 04 N: gut danke.
good thank you
good thank you.
- 05 wie geht's?
how goes it
how are you?
- 06 (0.5)
- 07 A: uhm (0.3) gut auch.
uhm good too
good too.
- 08 (0.7)
- 09 N: °cool°
cool
- 10 (1.2)
- 11 N: [ahm] (0.2) hast du: (0.4) Sommerferien?
uhm have you summer vacation
do you have summer vacation?
- 12 A: [so]
so
- 13 (1.3)
- 14 A: ah ja uhm (0.2) ich habe (0.3) ein Job (0.4) [in] Austin.
uh yes uhm I have a job in
yes I have a job in Austin.
- 15 N: [oh]
oh
- 16 N: oh ↑cool
- 17 [ich liebe] Austin.
I love
I love Austin.
- 18 A: [uhm]
- 19 (0.6)
- 20 A: ja ich liebe Austin.
yes I love
yes I love Austin.

21 uhm (0.2) ich (0.5) habe gearbeitet (0.5) dort (.) uhm letzte
uhm I have worked there uhm last
I worked there last

22 Sommer.
summer
summer.

23 N: hm hm

24 A: °ja°
yes

25 N: uhm und was machst du?
uhm and what do you
and what do you do?

26 (0.6)

27 A: uhm (1.2) isch: (0.7) mache S- (0.2) Software?
uhm I make make software
uhm I make software?

28 N: o:kay
okay

29 A: [ja]
yes

30 N: [co]ol.
cool

31 uhm (.) mein (0.5) Miann hehe (.) geht (0.3) uhm nach Seattle
uhm my man goes uhm to
my man goes to Seattle

32 für Software (0.2) zu machen (0.2) auch.
for software to make also
for software to make also.

33 (1.4)

34 ? °°ah°°

35 (1.4)

36 N: uhm

37 A: ahm
uhm

38 (0.5)

39 N: un[d]
and

40 A: [ha]st du (0.3) uh was machst du? (.) dieses [So]mmer?
have you uh what do you this summer
have you what do you do this summer?

41 N: [oh]
oh

42 N: uhm (0.3) ich muss (0.6) zwei: Klasse (0.4) uh mit Rice (0.7)
uhm I must two classes uh with
I must two classes with Rice

43 uh (0.5) machen,
uh do
do,

44 so ich (0.4) bleibe hier für zwei Monate?
so I stay here for two months
so I stay here for two months?

- 45 (0.5)
- 46 N: uhm und dann ich habe: zwei oder vier (.) Woche (0.9) uhm
 uhm and then I have two or four weeks uhm
 and then I have two or four weeks
- 47 zu: (0.9) or für mein Schwester besuchen. (.) uhm (0.9)
 to or for my sister visit uhm
 to or for my sister visit.
- 48 mein Mann in Se|attle besuchen? (0.4) uh und
 my man in visit uh and
 my man in Seattle visit? and
- 49 ah mit meine Freundin (0.7) von (0.3) San Antonio (.) zu (0.9)
 uh with my friend from to
 with my friend from San Antonio to
- 50 sehen.
 see
 see.
- 51 (0.9)
- 52 N: ja (0.7) uhm ich bin nicht (0.2) so: (0.3) uh (0.6) glücklich
 yes uhm I am not so uh happy
 yes I am not so happy
- 53 über das uh (.) die zwei Klasse
 about that uh the two classes
 about that the two classes
- 54 aber (0.5) uhm (0.7) ich muss (0.5) uhm
 but I must
 but I must
- 55 wenn ich (1.6) engineering (0.2) n:ächstes Semester? (0.5)
 when I next semester
 when I engineering next semester?
- 56 machen so,
 do so
 do so,
- 57 (3.5)
- 58 A: uh isch uhm (1.1) ich bin gereist. (0.3) nach Seattle.
 uh I uhm I am traveled to
 I have traveled to Seattle.
- 59 N: hm hm
- 60 (0.3)
- 61 A: uh[m] (0.4) yes
- 62 N: [cool]
 cool
- 63 (1.9)
- 64 N: mit Freunde o|de[r: (ganz allein)]
 with friends or all alone
 with friends or all alone
- 65 A: [.hh vier Mona]t
 four month
 four month

- 66 A: uhm (1.0) ah allein.
uhm uh alone
alone.
- 67 N: hm hm=
- 68 A: =für uhm (0.6) ein Interview?
for uhm an interview
for an interview?
- 69 N: ʔoh (0.2) [cool]
oh cool
- 70 A: [mit Mi]crosoft
with
with Microsoft
- 71 (0.7)
- 72 N: co[ʔol]
cool
- 73 A: [ja]
yes
- 74 N: °cool°=
cool
- 75 A: =ja ich liebe Seattle.
yes I love
=yes I love Seattle.
- 76 (0.6)
- 77 A: es is (.) [se]hr schön.
it is very pretty
it is very pretty.
- 78 N: [ja]
yes
- 79 N: ahm es regnet viel,
uhm it rains a lot
it rains a lot,
- 80 (1.0)
- 81 A: j[a]
yes
- 82 N: [ich] dʔenke.
I think
I think.
- 83 (0.6)
- 84 A: ja
yes
- 85 N: a(h)ber es regnet viel hier.=
but it rains a lot here
but it rains a lot here.=
- 86 A: =ja(h)
Yes

After an opening sequence (greetings and how-are-you exchange) in lines 1–9, Nancy initiates the first topic, asking Andrea about her summer (“[ahm] (0.2) hast du: (0.4) Sommerferien?,” line 11). The longer pause of 1.2 seconds prior to Nancy’s information-seeking question and the brief overlapping talk of the two speakers suggest that both Nancy and Andrea may have searched for what-to-say (Hasegawa, 2017). In her response, Andrea aligns with Nancy’s yes-no question and confirms that she is on summer vacation (line 14). She also adds that she is going to have a job in Austin this summer. Her response is followed by a change-of-state token (“oh”) and an assessment (“↑cool”) (line 16), both delivered by Nancy.

After this short exchange of information, both Andrea and Nancy expand on the Austin topic that they have established at this point. That is, Nancy exclaims that she loves Austin. Andrea also says that she loves the city, adding that she already worked there last summer (lines 17–22). After Nancy asks Andrea a follow-up question about what she was working on in Austin (line 25), which was developing software (line 27), the two students have moved on to a new topic, namely, developing software. In lines 31–32, Nancy adds that her “man” is also going to develop software this summer, but in Seattle. This pivotal utterance connects the previous topic, developing software, with a new topic, which is Seattle.

However, Andrea does not develop this new topic any further; instead, she launches a new sequence by asking a reciprocation question (“was machst du? (.) dieses [So]mmer?,” line 40). Prior to her initiating the return sequence (Schegloff, 2007), the speech perturbations and the pauses (lines 33–38) may suggest that both members of the pair search for what-to-say. Then Andrea and Nancy take the floor almost at the same time (line 39–40), but Andrea puts through her question. She elicits from Nancy what her plans are for the summer. As can be seen in the following turns (lines 42–56), Nancy provides an extended response over several turns. During Nancy’s response, several opportunities arise for Andrea to take the floor at transition relevance places (TRP), for example, where pauses of 0.5- and 0.9-second length occur (lines 45, 51). After Nancy stops talking, and a long 3.5-second pause occurs (line 57), Andrea takes the floor (line 58). That the pause is long may again be due to the fact that Andrea needs time to search for what-to-say.

In her contribution, Andrea takes up the Seattle topic, which Nancy has brought up earlier and just now again, and points out that she has been to Seattle. Nancy, who asks a follow-up question (“mit Freunde o↑de[r: (ganz allein)],” line 64), elicits more information from Andrea about her trip to Seattle (line 66), but Andrea also volunteers some information that she was there for four months for an interview (she might have meant to say an internship) with Microsoft (lines 65, 68, 70). Finally, Andrea provides an assessment; she says that she loves Seattle and that the city is pretty (lines 75–77).

In line 79, Nancy takes the floor and expands on the Seattle topic by saying that it rains a lot there. She thus brings in a new aspect of the topic. She then uses the rain as a connector between Seattle and their current location. In both places, Seattle and the place where Nancy and Andrea are currently staying, it rains a lot (line 85).

As we have seen in this excerpt, Andrea and Nancy gradually move between a number of different topics (summer plans, Austin, developing software, Seattle, rain) by using pivotal utterances. In comparison to Amanda and Gary's interaction, reciprocal sequences are much less dominant in Andrea and Nancy's conversation. However, during their interaction, it also seems that Nancy is a more active participant than Andrea. This may be due to the fact that Nancy, in comparison to Andrea, initiates new topics (line 11), asks more follow-up questions (lines 25, 64) and expands more on her own and her partner's contributions (lines 17, 31–32, 42–56, 79, 85).

Justin and Will's conversation, which we turn to next, is also characterized by a stepwise transition between topics, even though the beginning of their conversation is rather disjunctive in fashion, but in comparison to Andrea and Nancy, the two participants appear similarly active in the conversation.

Justin and Will

- 01 W: ah Justin ha|llo.
 uh hello
 Justin hello.
- 02 J: hallo?
 hello
 hello?
- 03 wie geht's?
 how goes it
 how are you?
- 04 W: gut.
 good
 good.
- 05 (0.7)
- 06 W: wir haben heute eine sehr schlecht (0.4) Wetter? (0.2) nicht?
 we have today a very bad weather no
 we have very bad weather today no?
- 07 (0.4)
- 08 J: ja uhm (.) es gibt ah |viele regnet ah diese Tage.
 yes uhm there is uh many rain uh these days
 yes there is many rain these days.
- 09 W: also:: was habt was |hast du gemacht.
 so what have what have you done
 so what have what have you done.
- 10 (1.3)

- 11 J: ah heute?
uh today
today?
- 12 W: †ja
yes
- 13 J: ah ich habe: ah viele Hausaufgaben (.) gema:cht.
uh I have uh lots of homework done
I did lots of homework.
- 14 und ah: ich bi:n zum Unterricht gega:ng.
and uh I am to class gone
and I went to class.
- 15 und ah und du?
and uh and you
and and you?
- 16 (0.8)
- 17 W: also <ich habe> Fußball gespielt.
so I have soccer played
so I played soccer.
- 18 J: pt .h Fußball gespielt? (.) für (0.5) der das das Wetter is
soccer played for the the the weather is
played soccer? for the the the weather is
- 19 schle(h)cht,
bad
bad,
- 20 (0.5)
- 21 W: ich spiele hm in die Zimmer.
I play hm in the room
I play in the room.
- 22 (0.3)
- 23 J: okay okay.
- 24 (0.9)
- 25 W: also .h >diese Semester< is ganz fertig (.) is schon fertig,
so this semester is all done is already done
so this semester is all done is already done,
- 26 (0.5)
- 28 ah:: (0.2) wie viele Kurse hast du?
uh how many courses have you
how many courses do you have?
- 29 (1.5)
- 30 W: dieses †Semester.
this semester
this semester.
- 31 (0.4)

32 J: ahm ich habe:: (0.5) ich habe: zw|ei: Informatikkurs Kurse.
 uhm I have I have two computer science course courses
 I have I have two computer science course courses.

33 (0.6)

34 ah ein Deutschkurs (0.3) und ein Elektrotechnikkurs.
 uh a German course and an electrical engineering course
 a German course and an electrical engineering course.

35 (0.8)

36 und du?
 and you
 and you?

(39 lines left out)

75 J: okay? (0.2) ahm (1.0) was (.) machst du: (.) in August?
 okay uhm what do you in August
 okay? what do you do in August?

76 (0.8)

77 W: also:: (0.6) ich: will nach Kalifornien reisen.
 so I want to California travel
 so I want to travel to California.

78 (1.0)

79 W: und du?
 and you
 and you?

80 (0.8)

81 J: ah ich möchte:: mh (0.2) nach (0.3) nach Deutschland ah
 uh I would like to to Germany uh
 I would like to Germany

82 reisen.
 travel
 travel.

83 (0.5)

84 W: und wo? (.) wohin?
 and where where to
 and where where to?

85 (1.3)

86 J: ahm (0.9) ich möchte in: (0.2) in Stuttgart (0.3) ah in
 uhm I would like in in uh in
 I would like in in Stuttgart in

87 Stuttgart (.) gehen.
 go
 Stuttgart go.

88 (0.6)

89 W: also ist Stuttgar- sch- sch- Stuttgart eine große Stadt?
 so is a big city
 so is Stuttgar- Stuttgart a big city?

- 90 (0.5)
- 91 J: ja natürlich.
yes of course
yes of course.
- 92 (0.5)
- 93 J: ahm (0.2) Stuttgart is ah der Hauptsitz (0.4) vo:n Mercedes
uhm is uh the headquarters of
Stuttgart is the headquarters of Mercedes
- 94 Benz (.) un:d Porsche.
and
Benz and Porsche.
- 95 (0.9)
- 96 J: und ah es gibt ah viele Auto in Stuttgart.
and uh there is uh many cars in
and there is many cars in Stuttgart.
- 97 (0.3)
- 98 J: magst du:: ahm (0.2) magst du Autos?
like you uhm like you cars
do you do you like cars?
- 99 (0.5)
- 100 W: nein aber ich finde (0.4) die deutsche Fußball sehr
no but I find the German soccer very
no but I find the German soccer very
- 101 interessant.
interesting
interesting.
- 102 (0.5)
- 103 W: also: (0.2) uh (0.7) also ich m- i- ich möchte nach München
so uh so I I would like to Munich
I would like to Munich
- 104 gehen.
go
go.
- 105 (0.5)
- 106 J: warum?
why
why?
- 107 (0.4)
- 108 W: also es gibt ah gute Essen: gute Trinken
so there is uh good food good drinks
so there is good food good drinks
- 109 und es gibt meine f- uh f- (0.5) Lieblingsfußballclub.
and there is my uh favorite soccer club
and there is my favorite soccer club.

- 110 (0.8)
- 111 J: o:ɿkay:
okay
- 112 was ist (0.2) dein uhm Lieblings (0.4) Fußballclub?
what is your uhm favorite soccer club
what is your favorite soccer club?
- 113 (0.6)
- 114 W: also er ist FC Bayern
so it is
so it is FC Bayern München
- 115 (0.4)
- 116 W: spielst du: Fußball auch?
play you soccer too
do you also play soccer?
- 117 (0.6)
- 118 J: ahm (.) nei(h)n lei(h)der nich(h)t.
uhm no unfortunately not
no unfortunately not.
- 119 W: schade.
that is a pity
that is a pity.
- 120 (1.2)
- 121 J: <ja: (0.8) aɿber: (0.3) es gibt (.) uhm (.) viele: (.) Essen in
yes but there is uhm many food in
yes but there is many food in
- 122 München.>
Munich
Munich.
- 123 (0.7)
- 124 J: <was is (0.2) was is dei:n (.) Lieblingsessen?> (.)
what is what is your favorite food
what is what is your favorite food?
- 125 was is deine Lieblingsessen?
what is your favorite food
what is your favorite food?

Like the other two student pairs, Will and Justin begin their conversation with an exchange of greetings (lines 1–2) and a how-are-you sequence (lines 3–4). It becomes apparent that Will does not return the how-are-you sequence. Unilateral how-are-you sequences, however, are common among German speakers (Huth, 2014), and the students included in this study learned about ‘German-style’ how-are-you sequences in a lesson on German conversation openings. The 0.7-second pause that occurs in between the how-are-you sequence and Will launching the first topic may be an indication that the members of the pair are searching for

what-to-say (Hasegawa, 2017). As can be seen in line 6, Will brings up the weather as the first topic. Here, Will asks Justin to confirm his assessment of today's weather. Justin's response aligns with Will's perspective: he first agrees and then adds that it has been raining a lot these days (line 8). Starting a topic by referring to the immediate setting or environment of the interaction such as talking about the weather has been found in L1 English data and is referred to as setting talk (Maynard & Zimmerman, 1984). In the present data set, this method of topic initiation is very rare. The most common method to initiate a topic is asking an information-seeking question, as Will does next in line 9.

Will initiates a new action sequence by asking Justin what he did ("also:: was habt was ↑hast du gemacht,," line 9). Justin, who is not sure whether or not Will means today, first delays his participation, so that a 1.3-second pause occurs (line 10). He then initiates a repair and produces a candidate understanding ("ah heute?," line 11), which Will confirms in the following turn. After this short repair sequence, Justin responds to Will's initial question with what he has been doing today (lines 13–14).

Immediately after his response is complete, he initiates a reciprocal sequence (Schegloff, 2007) by asking "und ah und du?" (line 15), thus eliciting from Will what he has done all day. With a little bit of delay, Will responds by saying that he played soccer ("also <ich habe> Fußball gespielt,," line 17). What follows is a short expansion sequence where Justin repeats a part of Will's original contribution with rising intonation ("Fußball gespielt?," line 18), suggesting that he finds it hard to believe that Will played soccer in the rain. In the same turn, he adds that he thinks the weather is bad, thus justifying his disbelief. After Will clarifies that he played soccer indoors, Justin acknowledges Will's response ("okay okay," line 23), which also closes this sequence.

After this sequence has been closed, a 0.9-second pause occurs, which may indicate that a search for what-to-say may be in progress. Will takes the floor in line 25 and launches a new topic, stating that the semester is almost over. Justin does not respond to this statement; rather, the student pair produces a 0.5-second pause. Will takes the floor again, this time asking Justin how many courses he is taking (line 28). The longer pause of 1.5 seconds that follows suggests that Justin may have encountered a problem of hearing or understanding. Will, who seems to anticipate that an understanding problem has occurred, self-repairs and adds "dieses ↑Semester." (line 30) to clarify the context of the question so that Justin can answer. Justin responds to Will's question (lines 32–34). After his response is complete and Will does not take the floor, Justin produces a reciprocation question ("und du?").

Thus far, we have seen Will initiating new action sequences and topics, whereas Justin reciprocates these sequences. Striking also is that the two students shift between topics in a disjunctive manner. The weather, today's activities and the classes being enrolled in this semester are topics

that are not semantically related. They also have not been connected by any pivotal utterances. In the course of their interaction, Will and Justin move between topics more smoothly, as we will see in the second part of the excerpt.

In line 75, Justin produces a topic boundary marker (“okay?”) (Beach, 1993), which suggests that he is closing the current topic and moving on to a new topic. He initiates a new topic by asking Will an information-seeking question (“was (.) machst du: (.) in August?”). Will answers that he wants to travel to California. A 1-second pause occurs because Justin does not take the floor and respond to Will’s contribution. Will then reciprocates Justin’s original question (“und du?”), namely, what will he be doing in August (lines 79). Justin provides an answer to his initial question, saying that he wants to travel to Germany (line 81–82). What follows in the next few turns (lines 84–91) are two follow-up questions from Will and corresponding second pair parts from Justin. Will asks where exactly Justin is going to travel in Germany, which Justin replies is Stuttgart. Will’s other question is whether Stuttgart is a big city, which Justin confirms. The follow-up questions help the two students to establish a new topic, namely, Stuttgart.

In lines 93–94, Justin expands on the topic; he provides more information on the city Stuttgart, namely, that the headquarters of Mercedes Benz and Porsche are there. As Will does not take the floor after Justin provided this piece of information, Justin continues talking. He mentions that there are lots of cars (line 96). He thus adds a new focus to the Stuttgart topic, namely, that it is a car city. In line 98, he directs a question at Will, asking him if he likes cars, to which Will replies that he does not, but by adding immediately that he finds German soccer interesting and would therefore like to see Munich (lines 100–104), he brings up two new topics (soccer and Munich), which Justin and Will build on next.

It becomes apparent that Justin does not understand the connection between German soccer and Munich that Will draws because he does not immediately comment on Will’s contribution; a pause of 0.5 seconds occurs. He then also asks for an explanation as to why (“warum?,” line 106) Will wants to visit Munich. Before he replies that his favorite soccer club is from Munich (line 109), Will points out that the food and drinks are good there (line 108). By adding that he thinks that the food and drinks are good in Munich, Will has thus brought in another aspect of the Munich topic. After a 0.8-second pause, Justin acknowledges Will’s response, but Justin’s “o:↑kay:” (line 111) is elongated and produced with a high pitch, suggesting that Justin may find Will’s appreciation for Munich because of a soccer club somewhat obscure. In the next few turns, Justin asks Will what his favorite soccer club is, and Will responds (lines 112–114). Then Will asks Justin in line 116 if he also plays soccer, which Justin negates, laughing (line 118). Will produces an assessment, “schade.” (line 119).

The last few turns of this excerpt are particularly interesting. A longer pause (1.2 seconds) occurs in line 120, which may be the time that Justin needs to search for what-to-say. In lines 121–122, Justin first confirms Will's assessment from the previous turn that it is a pity that he, Justin, does not play any soccer. The 0.8-second pause that occurs in the same turn may indicate that Justin is searching for what-to-say. The "a↑ber:" that follows suggests that he is about to bring a contrasting statement or a new aspect to their conversation. Justin, who cannot add anything about soccer that would be meaningful because, as he said, he does not play the sport and may therefore have no interest in soccer, adds other details, namely, that there is lots of food in Munich. He has thus found a way to tie the turn to a previous turn where Will has brought up food and drinks in Munich. Justin was able to move the conversation away from a topic that he was unable to expand on and instead move on to a topic that has been introduced by Will earlier. Justin's contribution about the food in Munich is a pivotal utterance to connect to a new topical aspect, namely, favorite foods (lines 124–125).

Similar to Nancy and Andrea, Justin and Will move between topics in a stepwise fashion for a given unit of talk. They introduce a new topical aspect or a new topic by connecting the previous topic to the new topic. At the beginning of their conversation, however, they shift between topics in a disjunctive manner. It seems that the way students transition from one topic to the next may change in the course of a conversation. Interesting to note is also that Justin and Will initiate topics not only by means of information-seeking questions; I showed that this student pair uses another method of topic initiation, which is setting talk. Finally, in comparison to Nancy and Andrea, both Justin and Will elaborate on their topics; that is, they ask follow-up questions and add new information on a topic. They both come across as active participants.

Discussion

Earlier in this chapter, I emphasized the importance of a data-driven approach for the development of rubrics in classroom-based IC speaking tests. Teachers are encouraged to first analyze students' test discourse from an emic (participant-based) perspective before they develop etic (instructor-based) rating categories for rubrics. I presented the findings from a conversation analysis that was conducted on beginning German learners' peer–peer speaking test data and focused on the students' topic management. In the data analysis, I showed how three student pairs differ in the ways they manage topics in their interactions. With regard to topic management, the four most salient actions that the students accomplish differently in their conversations are the following: initiating new topics; reciprocating the interlocutor's topic-initiating questions; expanding on topics; and shifting between topics. Based on the CA findings and the IC

learning objectives for the course, which are preference for progressivity (Schegloff, 2007), intersubjectivity or mutual understanding (Schegloff, 1992) and a diversification of interactional resources (Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015), rating descriptors can be developed and placed on a 3-point rating scale.

In CA, both progressivity and intersubjectivity are major principles of organizing talk. Progressivity refers to the advancement of talk, not only within turns, but also within sequences. Schegloff (2007: 14–15) puts it as follows:

Among the most pervasively relevant features in the organization of talk-and-other-conduct-in-interaction is the relationship of adjacency or ‘nextness.’ The default relationship between the components of most kinds of organization is that each should come next after the prior. . . . Moving from one element to a hearably-next-one with nothing intervening is the embodiment of, and the measure of, progressivity.

A loss of progressivity or a delay can happen when something occurs next that was not due next, such as a repair initiation or the display of difficulty in responding to a question. In addition, the term *diversification of resources* stems from the research literature on L2 interactional development. In that area, scholars study participants’ changing resources for accomplishing a given action, for example, taking turns, initiating repair or telling a story. Their understanding is that these resources diversify and become more complex as they develop when used recurrently (e.g., Hellerman, 2008; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011). Diversified resources allow participants “to deploy more locally adapted and interactionally accepted conduct” (Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015: 262).

Regarding the methods used to launch new topics, the conversation analysis conducted in this chapter showed that the participants initiate new topics predominantly by asking information-seeking questions, which is not a commonly used technique to initiate new topics among German speakers. However, students were found to also make use of setting talk (Maynard & Zimmerman, 1984), a topic-initiation method found in L1 English conversations, where a participant starts a topic that refers to the immediate setting or environment of the interaction (e.g., talking about the weather). This method of topic initiation, however, is rarely used by students in this data set. However, if students are able to launch new topics by methods other than information-seeking questions, then that may be an indication that the students’ resources to initiate topics have become diversified, which should be rewarded in a test.

The analysis also revealed that students such as Amanda and Gary tend to produce a number of reciprocation questions. While reciprocation questions are common in certain settings such as the how-are-you exchange among English speakers (Schegloff, 2007), they are not a common resource in everyday chats between peers. With reciprocal sequences, the participants merely recycle the interlocutor's initial question and do not contribute new actions or new topical aspects to the conversation. It can therefore be argued that students who rely solely on reciprocal sequences delay topical progressivity and thus might have to receive a lower score on the test.

In addition, the three student pairs in this study were found to expand on topics, in which some students were more active (e.g., Nancy, Justin, Will) than others (e.g., Andrea). We saw in the analysis that students may expand on their own contribution, add to the conversational partner's contribution and ask follow-up questions. All of these practices contribute to an ongoing topic and thus help achieve topical progressivity. Students who are able to expand on topics repeatedly by using one or another of these resources in an interaction should therefore be awarded a higher score than students who hardly expand on topics.

Finally, in terms of topic shifts, the analysis showed that student pairs may predominantly move between topics in a disjunctive fashion (e.g., Amanda and Gary). That is, they close a topic and then open a new topic, but the previous and the new topic are not tied to one another. Some student pairs (e.g., Andrea and Nancy; Justin and Will), however, are able to shift between topics in a stepwise or gradual manner for a given unit of talk as they use pivotal utterances to create a link between topics. Sacks (1992b) argues that a stepwise transition between topics is the best way to move from one topic to the next. It facilitates the progress of the interaction and can also be considered a diversified resource of topic development.

The rubric that evolved from this discussion can be found in Table 11.1. One point still needs to be made with regard to the rating process in this test: the actions of one partner (if closing a sequence, initiating a new topic, shifting topics) influence the actions of the other partner; the two members of the pair co-construct the interaction. It may therefore be difficult to disentangle which of the participants is responsible for what actions. Hence, language testers have suggested assigning scores to pairs rather than individual students (Chalhoub-Deville & Deville, 2005; Taylor & Wigglesworth, 2009). Teasing apart individual students' contributions to topic shifts may be particularly difficult for raters. The score for topic shifts could therefore be assigned to both members of the pair rather than an individual student in the present test. This option has been built into the rubric (see Table 11.1).

Table 11.1 Rubric

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Improvement needed (1 point)</i>	<i>Fair (2 points)</i>	<i>Good (3 points)</i>	<i>Score for individual student or pair?</i>
Initiating new topics	Student does not initiate new topics (conversational partner initiates all new topics)	Student initiates new topics, but only by asking information- seeking questions	Student initiates new topics by asking information- seeking questions but also by using other techniques, e.g., setting talk	<i>Individual</i>
Reciprocating the interlocutor's topic- initiating questions	Participant reciprocates <i>all</i> of the interlocutor's topic-initiating questions	Participant reciprocates <i>some</i> of the interlocutor's topic-initiating questions	Participant reciprocates <i>none</i> of the interlocutor's topic-initiating questions	<i>Individual</i>
Shifting between topics	Disjunctive shifts in topic	Disjunctive topic shifts, but for a given unit of talk participants move smoothly between topics	Mostly stepwise shifts between topics	<i>Pair</i>
Expanding on topics	Student hardly expands on own and/ or partner's contributions; student asks no follow-up questions	Student adds some information on own and/ or partner's contributions; student asks some follow-up questions	Student frequently adds information on own and partner's contributions; students asks a number of follow-up questions	<i>Individual</i>

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to the volume editors and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this manuscript. I am also deeply indebted to Rue Burch for his valuable suggestions.

Note

1 IC has largely drawn upon a conversation analytic (CA) perspective. For detailed descriptions of CA and IC, the reader is referred to the theoretical chapters of this volume.

References

- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research*, 15, 479–507.
- Beach, W. A. (1993). Transitional regularities for ‘casual’ ‘Okay’ usages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 325–352.
- Betz, E., & Huth, T. (2014). Beyond grammar: Teaching interaction in the German language classroom. *Unterrichtspraxis*, 47, 140–163.
- Brown, A., & McNamara, T. F. (2004). ‘The devil is in the detail’: Researching gender issues in language assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, 524–538.
- Button, G., & Casey, N. (1984). Generating topic: The use of topic initial elicitors. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 167–190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Button, G., & Casey, N. (1985). Topic nomination and topic pursuit. *Human Studies*, 8, 3–55.
- Chalhoub-Deville, M. (1995). Deriving oral assessment scales across different tests and rater groups. *Language Testing*, 12, 16–33.
- Chalhoub-Deville, M., & Deville, C. (2005). A look back at and forward to what language testers measure. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 815–831). Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Drake, D., & Drake, V. (2015). ‘Tags are easy, ne?’: How to teach the use of tags in the German language classroom. *Unterrichtspraxis*, 48, 146–161.
- Fulcher, G. (1996). Does thick description lead to smart tests? A data-based approach to rating scale construction. *Language Testing*, 13, 208–238.
- Fulcher, G., Davidson, F., & Kemp, J. (2011). Effective rating scale development for speaking tests: Performance decision trees. *Language Testing*, 28, 5–29.
- Goodwin, C. (1987). Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50, 115–130.
- Hall, J. K., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). L2 interactional competence and development. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 1–15). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hasegawa, A. (2017). Collaborative orientation to the ‘search for what-to-say’ in pair work interactions. In T. Greer, M. Ishida & Y. Tateyama, *Interactional competence in Japanese as an additional language* (pp. 175–210). Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Hellerman, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Holt, E., & Drew, P. (2005). Figurative pivots: The use of figurative expressions in pivotal topic transitions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38, 35–61.

- Huth, T. (2014). 'When in Berlin. . .': Teaching German telephone openings. *Unterrichtspraxis* 47, 164–179.
- Ikeda, N. (2017). *Measuring L2 oral pragmatic abilities for use in social contexts: Development and validation of an assessment instrument for L2 pragmatics performance in university settings* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Melbourne, Melbourne.
- Jefferson, G. (1984). On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 191–222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1993). Caveat speaker: Preliminary notes on recipient topic-shift implicature. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26, 1–30.
- Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70, 366–372.
- Lazaraton, A., & Davis, L. (2008). A microanalytic perspective on discourse, proficiency, and identity in paired oral assessment. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 5, 313–335.
- Maynard, D. W. (1980). Placement of topic changes in conversation. *Semiotica*, 30, 263–290.
- Maynard, D. W., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1984). Topical talk, ritual and the social organization of relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 47, 301–316.
- McNamara, T. F. (1996/2009). *Measuring second language performance*. London: Longman.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2013). Social-interactional approaches to SLA: A state of the art and some future perspectives. *Language, Interaction and Acquisition*, 4, 134–160.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2011). Developing 'methods' for interaction: A cross-sectional study of disagreement sequences in French L2. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 206–243). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–268). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Robinson, C. K. (2014). "i've got to go now. bis dann": Teaching closing sequences. *Unterrichtspraxis*, 47, 180–192.
- Sacks, H. (1992a). *Lectures on conversation, vol. 1*, G. Jefferson (Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H. (1992b). *Lectures on conversation, vol. 2*, G. Jefferson (Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1295–1345.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society*, 8, 165–187.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8, 189–327.

- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Taylor, L., & Wigglesworth, G. (2009). Are two heads better than one? Pair work in L2 assessment contexts. *Language Testing*, 26, 325–339.
- Upshur, J., & Turner, C. (1995). Constructing rating scales for second language tests. *ELT Journal*, 49, 3–12.
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
- Youn, S. J. (2015). Validity argument for assessing L2 pragmatics in interaction using mixed methods. *Language Testing*, 32, 199–225.

12 Testing Interactional Competence in Second Language Classrooms

Goals, Formats and Caveats

Thorsten Huth and Emma Betz

Introduction

Some 20 years ago, second language (L2) teaching started to investigate the place of L2 pragmatics in instructed language learning settings (Kasper, 1997), advancing an action-oriented view of what language is and how it works (Alcón Soler & Martínez-Flor, 2005; Kasper & Rose, 2003; Rose & Kasper, 2001; Taguchi & Roever, 2017). The field has since diversified its scope and perspective. At present, investigations into interactional competence (IC) (Hall, 2018; Hall, Hellerman, & Pekarek-Doehler, 2011; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2015, 2018; Young, 2011) analyze how language is used in talk-in-interaction and how L2 interactional patterns and practices emerge, that is, how speakers' methods for action diversify over time.

The IC of competent speakers includes knowledge and abilities that are situated in, and negotiate, the sequentiality of interaction (Schegloff, 2007). For example, IC enables participants in interaction to recognize a given turn for what it does and meet it with a relevant next action (or depart from the expectations conveyed by a first turn, for a social-interactional purpose). It enables speakers to recognize a turn containing a question as a request for information and to meet that question with an appropriate informative answer (or to resist the epistemic stance encoded in the question with a claim of no knowledge). Moreover, it enables a speaker to realize that a request for information such as "What are you doing tonight?" regularly constitutes a pre-invitation, and that an informative and appropriate response is one that addresses availability for a common activity.

Insight into the sequentiality of interaction and the range of options speakers have to index, negotiate and build intersubjectivity relies on research in Conversation Analysis (CA) (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013). Language teachers and teacher educators have started to incorporate the results from CA research into L2 teaching by turning CA findings into tangible classroom learning targets (Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Barraja-Rohan & Pritchard, 1997; Betz & Huth, 2014; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006).

Research shows that such learning targets in IC can indeed be taught and learned successfully in L2 classrooms (Huth, 2006).

We take the learnability, teachability and overall utility of IC in instructed language learning as given. This chapter focuses on presenting and discussing practical testing formats for specific learning targets in IC that are consistent with the pedagogy and teaching materials that are currently available. Building on teaching materials on German (Betz & Huth, 2014–16), we here discuss written testing formats rather than oral testing (as, for instance, explored in Ross & Kasper, 2013). Written test tasks are currently rarely used in IC testing. As an indirect measure of L2 learner knowledge and ability, written formats impose some constraints compared to oral testing. But written test tasks avoid some of the difficulties that arise from social aspects and the interactional architecture of the here and now of the oral testing situation (Johnson & Tyler, 1998; Walters, 2013; Young, 2012; cf. Kasper & Youn, 2017). As we illustrate, written testing that is based on explicit, CA-informed IC instruction and that draws from a wide range of analysis and projection task formats can effectively target specific tokens of IC, especially those that can be considered generic practices (Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015; Waring, 2018; Wong & Waring, 2010).

It is worth emphasizing that testing in the context of this chapter is not understood as a tool for assessing the general interactional abilities of an L2 learner. It is also not our goal to suggest an assessment instrument with which sample L2 learner language production can be directly connected to a level within a graded scale of relative language proficiency (as offered in, e.g., Council of Europe, 2001, 2018). Rather, our focus is on the micro-context of testing in individual L2 instructional units. These were designed to teach specific aspects of IC and are based on findings from empirical CA research. As a contribution to this volume, our aim is to demonstrate that, just as pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar or transcultural awareness can be taught and tested in instructed language learning settings, IC also provides learnable and testable instructional targets. The formats we propose here do not limit IC testing to purely verbal action; the targets of CA-informed instruction (and testing) are instead conceptualized as multimodal resources (Mondada & Traverso, 2015; Streeck, Goodwin, & LeBaron, 2011).

To develop this line of argument, we proceed as follows. First, we delineate how language, language use in context, and multimodal interaction relate and what IC must mean if we take its disciplinary origins seriously. Second, we consider how a view of language through the lens of interaction research provides some challenges when related to the normative, prescriptive assessment frameworks geared towards examining the language production of individuals (rather than co-constructed interaction) which we commonly find in instructed language learning contexts. Third, we argue that this tension suggests the use of a variety of testing formats,

including written test tasks. Written tasks, while naturally providing some constraints of their own, allow elements of IC to be tested vis-à-vis a key condition of language as it is deployed in interaction: in the matrix that reaches across speakers and across turns.

Language-in-Interaction and IC

It is useful to consider how the term *interaction* is situated and understood in disciplinary terms. Broadly conceived, interaction research may be viewed in relation to a variety of frameworks examining language use and the actions such language amounts to in a social and cultural context (Levinson, 1983; Mey, 1993). These frameworks were shaped by larger models of language and communication, both in terms of theorizing and in terms of the ensuing empirical research, notably by the philosophical-linguistic traditions of Grice (1975), Searle (1969) and Austin (1962), as well as the generative notions developed by Chomsky (1963) and others. These lines of inquiry share one basic assumption with interaction research, namely, that language use *achieves* something, that is, that we *do* something whenever we say something in a specific social context. How can it be that “I’m sorry” may get an apology done without the lexical content reflecting the action it performs? What is it, exactly, that allows a “How are you” to amount to a greeting? In that sense, interaction research proceeds on the assumption that words and grammar strung together are not an end in and of themselves, but rather a means to a larger (social) end, namely, to achieve some action (e.g., “Hello” gets a greeting done). Lexical and morpho-syntactic principles are thus seen as a vehicle for achieving salient social conduct.

As interaction research has shown, words and grammar are only part of the resources used in this process. An isolated “hello” does not make a greeting, and “how are you” can implement other actions. An apology needs to be recognized as one by the person at whom it is directed. Interaction research thus expands the notion of language by the proverbial power of two: two interlocutors, two turns, each related to the other by and through an investigative focus that highlights what is negotiated: intersubjectivity. As Streeck’s (1980) critique of Searle’s speech act model highlights, speakers do not produce inherently salient and predictable message packages that are delivered and, once uttered, are automatically understood. Instead, interactants primarily focus on producing temporally adjacent turns that relate to one another, in and through which information, knowledge and affect are negotiated and relationships are built. Questions make relevant answers, and if a question does not get answered, or is not answered in the way or the format ‘expected’ by the question, we know that there is meaning in this as well.

The key, then, to understanding interaction in real life is recognizing the importance of turn-format/composition and positioning within

sequences and larger courses of action (cf. Drew, 2018). A “hello” becomes a greeting when uttered at the initiation of an interaction, not in the middle, and not at the end of it. In order for any human social action to be successfully transported in and through verbal and embodied conduct, it has to happen in the space between two interactants who are producing two temporally successive turns. Historically, the notion of pragmatics was instrumental in revealing that ‘words and grammar’ exist because they achieve human, social action. By now, interaction research, and specifically work in ethnomethodology and CA (EMCA), has shown that one key factor in understanding what any lexical and morpho-syntactic linguistic materials may mean in terms of the action they do is to consider *where* precisely in the back and forth of conversation something was said (and thereby done) in the context of what was said (and thereby done) in the immediately preceding and following turns-at-talk. Interaction research clearly demonstrates that social action is achieved collaboratively by two or more speakers who produce language and embodied conduct (1) across at least two turns, (2) in the context of larger courses of action and (3) in a specific setting and within a history of interaction, thus relying on common ground (Clark, 1996; Enfield, 2006).

Understanding interaction as essentially co-constructed and describing it from a member’s perspective and through members’ methods (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984) grounds the conceptualization of IC in current CA second language acquisition work. The notion of IC, broadly conceived, would describe the capacity of a participant to engage in verbal and non-verbal conduct with other language community members in normatively expected, appropriate ways, inasmuch as such conduct is embedded in the temporal succession of turns. The IC of L2 learners in particular is their capacity to engage in locally efficient (i.e., context-sensitive, recipient-designed; Pekarek-Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015) ways in the specific interactional practices of the communities whose language they are learning in an instructed or immersion setting. Given that the realities of what we historically know as pragmatic transfer (Jaworski, 1994; Kasper, 1992) demonstrably apply to mechanisms underlying interaction as well (Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006), IC has two dimensions for language learners: what they already know, including the basic mechanisms of connecting actions and the sociocultural framework and practices for *doing* interaction as L1 (first language) speakers, and the relevant practices in the L2 (cf. Kecskes, Sanders, & Pomerantz, 2018; Stivers, Sidnell, & Bergen, 2018).

If IC indeed includes a native speaker’s or an L2 learner’s capacity to meet a given contribution to an interaction with a relevant and fitting ‘next’ action, then IC may be described as focusing on the vertical succession of turns-at-talk and the actions that the turns implement. IC thus sharpens and broadens the focus of understanding social (inter-)

action at the same time: it assumes that, on the one hand, we parse the stringing together of sounds, words, grammar and paralinguistic items horizontally as speakers who construct turns. Turns thus become the specific focus of our analysis. The widening (i.e., addition) through insight from interaction research lies in taking the form, content and placement of a turn and considering what possible ‘next turns’ are relevant. This process is not restricted to purely linguistic items (i.e., sounds, words and grammar) but includes embodied resources for meaning making at the disposal of the interactants.

Hence, IC does not focus primarily on the social context in the socio-linguistic sense (who says what to whom in demographic or institutional terms), but rather on the interactional context in the sense that utterances form turns, that some turns are typed and that some turns occur in predictable sequences forming pairs (or essentially three-part structures; Kevoe-Feldman & Robinson, 2012). A central part of IC includes the insight that interactants are constantly engaged in projecting the potential meaning and impact of a given turn forwards and backwards in time.

Now, looking at ‘language’ and its achievements as located in the matrix across speakers and across turns has a number of consequences for L2 teachers and L2 learners. For one, the overall view of what language is and how human communication works needs to be adjusted. Second, a number of normative-prescriptive notions firmly entrenched in institutional language teaching (such as correct vs. incorrect, for example, or individual performance as a proficiency metric) become problematic for the purposes of teaching. These, in turn, directly affect testing and assessment in instructed settings, which is a primary concern of this chapter. The next section will discuss these consequences in order to contextualize the testing formats for IC learning targets that we propose here.

The Nature of Testing, Interactional Learning Targets and Some Constraints

Testing is a central consideration in instructed language learning settings. It offers a useful mechanism for the planning and implementation of curricula and helps set specific goals concerning the scope, coverage and overall content of a language program. Through the setting of benchmarks through tests, curricular content and/or course content is structured ‘backwards’ and provides a time frame in which set goals may be reached. Furthermore, tests and exams can be viewed as practice items along the forwards trajectory of language learning.

Setting instructional goals and deciding on suitable testing formats for interactional learning targets would follow similar principles. However, a number of important caveats are involved when we test L2 interactional learning targets. To appreciate these fully, it is useful to consider first that all institutional testing, including language testing, is primarily

a function of, and indeed fundamentally shaped by, the specific context of institutionalized education. Successful language learning occurs in the world independent of institutional settings, outside of the classroom, unencumbered, as it were, by systematic testing. In the context of language education, however, testing provides the procedural backbone of the curriculum and satisfies a central institutional requirement: ascertaining an individual's L2 proficiency against normative-prescriptive assessment frameworks.

It is useful to note that the doing of testing itself shapes how the very nature of language is conceptualized in and through the process. For example, in Europe, North America and large parts of the English-speaking world, ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2012) and the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001, 2018) offer widely applied normative frameworks for conceptualizing and assessing the relative L2 proficiency of learners. Even a superficial perusal of these frameworks reveals that, as a result, language itself becomes conceptualized in terms of the purpose of the institution, i.e., (1) as an assessable item of learning over time, (2) as measurable against normative, prescriptive frameworks of correct/incorrect language and (3) as a measure at which we arrive based on language production and language comprehension by individual L2 learners. Tokens of either or both are occasioned in controlled, replicable contexts.

It is important to realize that every language test or exam is built on the fundamental principle of prescriptive normativity. L2 words mean what they do and have to be used accurately in context. Even if an L2 word has multiple meanings, these relevantly apply to some specific contexts and not to others. Therefore, words can be misused, or their meanings mistaken. Such 'mistakes' are recognizable, and teachers mark them as correctibles. These can and do occur on all levels of language learners' structural knowledge and performance because grammaticality in a language (or, rather, a standard variety) is overwhelmingly non-negotiable. Inflectional morphology follows normatively binding rules, as does syntax. Prefixes belong at the beginning of a word (not in the middle), and English unmarked word order is SVO (not the other way around). Sounds, words and grammar can be and are relevantly viewed in terms of overall correctness (or 'grammaticality,' a categorical notion), and language testing ascertains to what extent the language production of one individual L2 learner conforms to the normative-prescriptive notions of the L2. Clearly, language testing on the level of pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar, relevantly and suitably, knows right vs. wrong, correct vs. incorrect.

However, when teaching and testing L2 interactional learning targets, a number of important caveats apply (see Betz & Huth, 2014: 152). The normative-prescriptive framework for language teaching that works well

when we teach words and grammar reaches its limits when we teach and test L2 interactional patterns as learning targets, because human social behavior is highly context-sensitive, co-constructed and culturally grounded. Thus, human interaction entails normative elements but is also subject to negotiation, ambiguity and choice. We discuss all three and their consequences for testing below.

First, all social action, including interactional structures situated and embedded in a sequential context, is culturally grounded. The search for language universals is an ongoing endeavor (see Evans & Levinson, 2009, for a critical review of research); we know that some aspects of language appear to be universal, while others are culturally specific. To what extent are interaction patterns universal? There are some indications that certain fundamentals, such as aspects of turn-taking and repair (Dingemanse, Torreira, & Enfield, 2013; Stivers et al., 2009), are universal, but empirical research also shows that we structure actions and larger sequences differently in similar social contexts across language communities (see, for example, Floyd, Rossi, & Enfield, accepted; Flöck, 2016; Zinken, 2016, on requests and on recruitment in interaction). If empirical research on requesting or on compliment responses produces insights into systematic interactional patterns, and cross-cultural differences in patterns, we assume these to be part of a speaker's IC.

However, finding recurrent patterns in the construction and sequencing of actions within one culture does not mean that these patterns are always and invariably applied. As a social convention, we can of course normatively expect a question to make relevant (or: project) an answer. However, not every question is in fact met with an answer. Consider that using contextually fitting words or supplying an obligatory direct object in the wake of a transitive verb is hardly a matter of choice. Answering a question, however, is. Just as we can ignore a traffic light or cut others off in traffic, we can ignore a question leveled at us, choose not to respond to an invitation, forgo a greeting or engage in self-praise. All of these actions are possible, and daily life shows us that normatively expectable behaviors can be, and regularly are, not supplied by others or ourselves. We break convention when we, for example, wish to be rude or indicate a problem with a prior action. Of course, breaking social convention has consequences, and the absence of an expected next action in response to some prior first can be truly life-altering, as in Example 1.

Example 1 (constructed)

- 1 A: Would you marry me?
- 2 B: ((says nothing))

Or it can at least impact how others view us. Consider the following exchange (Example 2), in which D, a guest at C's for breakfast, compliments C on the tea she prepared:

Example 2 (adapted from Golato, 2002a:567)

- 1 D: that's the best tea (.) i've- i think i've ever had=
- 2 C: ==>great,* right?<
- *D gazes at C with puzzled look*
- 3 (.)
- 4 D: uh- that lemonny kinda yeah. it's quite nice

As Golato (2002a) argues, C's response in line 2 "is a compliment response atypical of American conversations . . . since, when Americans give second assessments, they usually downgrade" (p. 567). Embodied features of D's reciprocity (line 2) and the expansion of the sequence in line 4 make visible that there is interactional misalignment (C is not doing the expected action). A consequence of deviating from the expected in this context may be that C is taken by D to engage in self-praise.

We note and emphasize: when engaging in conversation, interlocutors are burdened with choice. There is always a choice in how we advance the present interaction, always a choice in what we say and thus do next. However, this does not mean that interactional patterns are unpredictable or do not have normative qualities. On the contrary: while the interactional structures that surround us are thus an important context to make sense of one another's conduct, there is choice in how we 'fill' these contexts, and whatever we do (and don't do) will be read against normative expectations. Therefore, interaction research that focuses on how actions are formed, what they make relevant and how interactants jointly forward action can indeed provide us with findings that tap into the normative frameworks of specific language communities, inasmuch as these affect the orderly succession of turns in interaction. Hence, at its core, the IC of an L1 or an L2 speaker reflects their underlying normative, socioculturally shaped procedures for making sense of others' actions.

However, and this is a different yet directly related constraint, actions as they are produced in interaction are not always completely salient to interlocutors. Just as word classes can be ambiguous (*dive* is both noun and verb, *left/right* are both directions and political positions), and just as syntax can be ambiguous ("While Anna dressed the baby spit up on

the bed.”; Ferreira, Christianson, & Hollingworth, 2001, p. 3), there is potential ambiguity in anything we say and do in interaction. The relation between words and action is never fully predetermined (Enfield & Sidnell, 2017); if that were the case, there would be no misunderstanding in interaction, and we would always, predictably and precisely, know what anyone meant (or did) by saying what they just said. Context is a constitutive part of action, and misunderstanding and misattribution of meaning, or communicative intent, are a common, indeed frequent, daily phenomenon. Misattribution rests on, and at the same time makes visible, how we understand others’ multimodal conduct, i.e., action ascription (Levinson, 2013; Schegloff, 2007). Whatever we say when we produce a turn in interaction, whatever we may intend when we say (and thus do) something, we are at the whim of our interlocutors to understand what we intended. This understanding happens by way of conscious interpretation—by way of ascribing an action to that which was just said vis-à-vis our shared history and our knowledge of common, expectable, normative social and interactional behaviors, including our knowledge of linguistic structures, turns, sequential patterns and body language as these are deployed and emerge in real time. Some turns may instantiate several possible actions at once, and with each turn we take, we gauge as recipients what these may be and display our understanding of the kind of action the prior speaker produced by doing what we understand as having been made relevant.

An example from the CA literature on pre-announcements illustrates this mechanism (Example 3). Here, a mother is talking to her children. Both line 06 and line 10 can be heard as prefacing (and thus projecting) a display of knowledge by the same speaker, and we can see in the respective next turns (lines 07 and 11) that both are indeed treated as such: in both cases, a go ahead for an information display is produced (*where* and *who*).

Example 3: [KR:2] (from Terasaki, 2004, cited in Heritage, 2013:553)

- 01 Mom: Daddy ‘n I have t- both go in different directions,
 02 en I wanna talk t’you about where I’m going (t’night).
 03 Rus: (Mkay,)
 04 Gar: Is it about u:s?
 05 Mom: (Uh) huh,
 => 06 Rus: <I know where yer goin’,
 07 Mom: Wh†ere.
 08 Rus: To thuh eh (eight grade)=

- 09 Mom: =Yeah. Right.
- => 10 Do you know who's going to that meeting?
- 11 Rus: Who.
- 12 Mom: I don't know.
- 13 (0.2)
- 14 Rus: .hh Oh:: Prob'ly .h Missiz Mc Owen ('n Dad said)
- 15 prob'ly Missiz Cadry and some of the teachers.

However, in only one case (lines 06–07) is the action ascription correct. In the second case, it results in a misattribution: instead of projecting that she knows and is prepared to share the knowledge she has (=a pre-announcement), Mom was formulating a true request for information in line 10. This becomes clear in line 12. The circumstance that a given turn (format) may provide several options for action ascription at the same time may also be used for *deliberate* misattribution or misunderstanding for effect, as in Example 4.

Example 4 (constructed)

- 1 A: Excuse me, do you know what time it is?
- 2 B: Yes. ((and walks on))

We see that an (indirect) request for information (line 1) is post-hoc turned into a request for the state of knowledge of the addressed person (line 2). The humor results from the mismatch of A's likely intention and its ensuing interpretation by B.

In sum, patterns in interaction provide central meaning-bearing contexts for members of a language community to understand each other's conduct. Positioning and embedding a given action in the flow of conversation requires knowledge of how a given turn projects forwards, and this knowledge is structured and can be described as 'normative' in the sense that it provides for a *positionally sensitive grammar* of talk-in-interaction (Schegloff, 1996). This conceptualization of normativity, however, rests on a fundamentally dynamic view of language, one in which the meaning of a linguistic item is inseparable from its conversational context and in which it is important to recognize that interlocutors have choice in

whether and how they produce next relevant actions. And interlocutors are called upon to ascribe meaning to anything that is being said, on the fly, turn by turn, at remarkable speed. In the process, interlocutors may ascribe unintended actions and meaning, resulting in misunderstandings which range from those that go unnoticed to those that are overtly addressed, either quickly or in more extended negotiations of meaning, implications and communicative intent.

Teaching interaction patterns comes with a number of caveats (normativity, ambiguity, action ascription, choice) that the teaching of words or grammar rarely has to address. How do these affect testing and assessment? Language testing that targets words or grammar proceeds on the assumption that language production in the context of the test shares a relationship with language production outside of such testing contexts. In other words, doing testing fundamentally assumes that whatever actual L2 learner performance a test elicits and eventually produces will allow insights into what the L2 learner would likely produce outside of the testing context (Chaloub-Deville & Deville, 2005; Lowenberg, 1993; Messick, 1989; Norris, 2008).

Interactional behavior, however, is ‘competence-in-action’ (Pekarek-Doehler, 2010), situated in the local context and navigating the social relationship between interlocutors in the very moment in which they are interacting (Young, 2012). The kinds of actions instructors and learners are orienting to when they talk to one another in, for example, an oral exam are strongly shaped by their roles and their institutional and cultural context in that moment, making testing of IC a difficult undertaking, because actions such as complimenting and related cultural patterns (i.e., what to say and do in a compliment turn as well as in a compliment response; cf. Golato, 2002a) may simply not suit the institutional realities of language testing. If misattribution of intended meaning and action is common, then expecting the kind of social-interactional behavior consistent with L2 cultural behavior among instructors and L2 learners in their institutional setting, where all of the above potentially mix and/or overlap, would be a challenge. To confound matters, and to reiterate a point made above, L2 learners have been shown to transfer (Jaworski, 1994; Kasper, 1992; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2002) the relevant socio-pragmatic and interactional knowledge they have from their L1 culture and enact these while using the sounds, words and grammar of the L2. Hence, the concurrent relevance of potentially conflicting social, cultural and institutional contexts for examiners and examinees in addition to the relevant potential for language transfer is not only a methodological problem for assessing language proficiency in instructed language learning settings (see Youn, 2015), but also one besetting empirical research that strives to ascertain what pragmatic competence and IC within and across languages may look like and how to characterize them (Pekarek-Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015; Ross & Kasper, 2013; Sert, Kunitz, & Markee, 2018).

We therefore propose to test interactional L2 knowledge by primarily targeting generic practices, such as sequence organization or repair, and by doing so in the written format. This may help us circumvent some of the potential difficulties that arise from/in a dyadic oral testing situation based on the institutional context and the predictable constraints these impose on the respective roles and interactional behaviors of both examiner and examinee (but see Kasper & Youn, 2017; Youn, 2015, for a different perspective on role plays). On paper or in online environments, written test items can model and illustrate the interaction between two hypothetical interlocutors that are clearly situated in the cultural and interactional context of the L2. A test taker would then be positioned to ‘read’ the interaction in question in such a way as to identify relevant L2 ways of progressing the conversation through the kind of typed turns that are relevantly and fittingly embedded in the sequential context. This can be done by providing actual linguistic tokens of relevant actions in relevant positions. Examinees can also be prompted to provide metalinguistic reasoning when confronted with examples of L2 interactional behavior, say, as evidenced in a transcript (or a model based on transcripts).

Thus, written test items have the power to reproduce precise interactional contexts modeled after the very empirical research that supplies the basis for teaching materials on L2 interactional patterns to begin with. They allow for students to identify (or reason about) the options they have for moving a given conversation forwards and the kinds of choices they might make. Thus, both an examinee’s understanding of normative expectations regarding L2 interaction and room for reasoning about available choices can be worked into a test item, while avoiding some of the challenges of oral tests that emerge from the co-constructed nature of interaction and variability based on context and interlocutor. In this way, we target L2 learners’ *understanding* of how to achieve intersubjectivity and mutual understanding in terms of the interactional architecture of the L2, in terms of how two or more people produce socially and culturally appropriate actions across two or more turns. As essentially indirect tasks, written tasks have various downsides, which teachers/testers should keep in mind when selecting a test format (or combination of written and oral formats). The next section illustrates concretely what such testing items could look like.

Examples of Written Testing Formats That Illustrate Language Across Turns and Speakers

In this section, we discuss three specific interactional learning targets and suggest concrete testing formats, including multiple-choice completion tasks, ‘unscramble-the-sequence,’ data analysis with multiple-choice and open-ended questions, and peer discovery learning.¹ These

are familiar testing and practice formats in L2 classrooms and are used here to work for interaction. The selection of the testing targets themselves—or the tokens of understanding “methods for action” (Pekarek-Doehler & Berger, 2018)—complement the teaching targets in Betz and Huth (2014–2016). They also heed a call for studying, teaching and testing generic practices in interaction (Pekarek-Doehler & Berger, 2018; Wong & Waring, 2010), that is, basic practices of turn construction and turn-taking, repair, sequence organization and overall structuring.

Sequence Organization and Overall Structuring in Interaction: Conversation Closings

In this section, we focus on sequencing in interaction, specifically in telephone closings, and we suggest an ‘unscramble-the-sequence’ format for testing.

Turns in conversation are embedded in sequences, and sequences contribute to larger courses of action. The sequential and larger action context is indispensable when we determine what certain words and phrases mean (that is, what kind of action they amount to right here, right now) and what constitutes a relevant response. This is particularly clear in highly ritualized contexts such as in conversation opening (cf. House, 1982; Schegloff, 1979; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2002) and closing phases (cf. Button, 1987; Harren & Raitaniemi, 2008; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Selting, 2007) on the phone. In these, a range of actions are accomplished through typed turns in quick succession, illustrating the basic ‘sequence grammar’ that underlies and structures verbal interaction. The following testing item targets essential features of sequentiality: paired action, nextness and temporality, as seen in conversation closings in German.

Conversation closings are important phases in encounters, and they rely on routinized patterns. What is viewed as established, expectable patterns for closing a conversation differs across cultures (cf. Bolden, 2017; Grancea, 2008; Pavlidou, 1998), and this can be seen in the structures for closings in American English and German (Table 12.1).² The result is a focus on completing closings more quickly in English, while the move from the beginning to the end of a closing is more gradual in German (cf. Harren & Raitaniemi, 2008).

As paired and reciprocal moves are crucial in accomplishing closings, a test item should target learners’ ability to (1) identify important elements of German closings (typical actions such as reiterating plans, and also linguistic items such as *dann*), and (2) recognize the ordering of different phases through which closings progress towards the point of hanging up the phone. It thus targets an understanding of closing sequences as

highly structured and ritualized and of individual moves as contingent. The features of such sequences that have been described in detail and are testable include:

- Actions are paired (e.g., the reciprocal *Tschüss—Tschüss* ‘Bye—Bye’ as terminal greetings).
- The larger sequence includes recurrent moves (pre-closing, reference to future plans, *bis dann*, terminal exchange).
- Moves are ordered (e.g., reiterating arrangements is done at the beginning of the closing sequence, not at the very end), and they are increasingly ritualizing and minimized towards the end of the closing sequence.
- Certain lexical items or grammatical constructions recur in closings and make closings recognizable as under way.

Table 12.1 Features of telephone closing sequences in American English and German

<i>Closing sequences in American English</i>	<i>Closing sequences in German</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steps to a successful closing sequence: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Main topic of conversation is complete. 2. Participant 1 suggests a closing with a possible pre-closing (Ex.: <i>Okay?</i>). 3. Participant 2 ratifies closing (Ex.: <i>Okay.</i>). • Alternatively: At step 3, Participant 2 brings up something else to talk about. • Closing sequences in English tend to be short (Ex.: <i>Okay? Okay. Bye. Bye.</i>). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consist of two negotiation sequences—participants first negotiate when they are ready for the conversation to end; then they negotiate when to say their good-byes (terminal greetings). • Interpersonal relationship affirmation is important in the closing sequence. This can be seen in its length, references to future plans and efforts at consolidation. • The word <i>dann</i> ‘then’ plays an important role in the closing sequence.

(adapted from Kampen Robinson, 2014: 182–183)

For this item (and similar teaching targets, for example, openings; see Huth, 2014) we suggest ‘unscramble the sequence’ as a testing format (Table 12.2): learners order given turns in a manner consistent with what they have learned about the structure of closing sequences in German. Such a format is suggested by Kampen Robinson (2014: 187) as a possible task format in teaching the sequence itself—we apply this idea to testing and suggest an item with increasingly complex sequences.³

Table 12.2 Testing format for closings in German: ‘Unscramble the sequence’

How to Close a Conversation

(A) Order the given ‘building blocks’ of a larger closing sequence in a way that results in a coherent German phone conversation closing. Use all elements provided and number the lines in the resulting closing exchange.

<p>Kathie: tschüss, bye, Silas: tschüss, bye,</p>	<p>Silas: also, ich komm dann irgendwann vorbei so then I'll come by sometime wenn ich ähm in richtung uni fahre. when I'm uhm on my way to university. (.) Kathie: Okay. Okay.</p>
<p>Silas: bis dann. see you then.</p>	<p>Kathie: danke schön. thank you.</p>
<p>(0.8) Kathie: gut. dann bis mo:rgen. good. see you tomo:row then. Silas: dann bis mo:rgen. see you tomo:row. einen schönen abend noch. have a nice evening.</p>	<p>p á ä as: so gegen halb eins, eins oder so. like about half past noon, one or so. (0.2) bist du dann da. will you be there then. (0.2) Kathie: ja. yeah. Silas: GUT. GOOD.</p>

Closing: „Silas und Kathie“

01
.
.
.
xx Silas:

- (B) Order the given turns so that the result is a coherent German phone conversation closing. Use all turns provided. Note that one turn has already been placed.

tschüss. bye.	okay, bis dann. okay see you then.	bis dann, ne? see you then, right?
montag, genau. monday, exactly.	also dann sehen wir so then we'll see each other uns spätestens montag wieder. again monday at the latest.	tschüss. bye.

Closing: „Fanny und Anja“

- 01 Fanny:
02 Anja:
03 Fanny: okay.
04 Anja:
05 Fanny:
06 Anja:
07 Fanny:

A third step in this ‘unscramble-the-sequence’ task would be similar in design to step (B), but the exchange presented should be longer and more complex. It could include additional elements besides the core building blocks of phone conversation closings, for example, shared laughter or the writing down of arrangements (for a suitable example, see Harren & Raitaniemi, 2008: 207–208; Kampen-Robinson, 2014: 191, *Dialog 2*).

Turn Construction and Projection: Formats for Quoting Others’ Words and Actions

In this section, we focus on forward projection as a fundamental mechanism in real-time interaction. We illustrate projection mechanisms in quoting patterns, and we suggest a multiple-choice completion task as a testing format.

Actions unfold in time, and projection is a core concept in understanding the temporality of syntactic *as well as* action projection. Projection describes

the fact that an individual action or part of it foreshadows another. In order to understand what is projected, interactants need some kind of knowledge about how actions (or action components) are . . . sequenced, i.e. how they follow each other in time.

(Auer, 2005: 8; cf. Deppermann & Günthner, 2015; Goodwin, 2002)

In other words, what has already been said/done sets up expectations about what is to come next. This allows speakers to coordinate their actions—to recognize what a certain lexical construction, syntactic format or prosodic pattern ‘says’ about what is under way and what will likely be next, and to prepare a relevant response. Teaching IC includes developing L2 learners’ ability to recognize and project syntactic and action patterns.

We use interactional patterns for reporting discourse to illustrate projection. Speakers of German have a range of lexical, syntactic and prosodic resources available for reporting what others have said/done, and CA research (e.g., Betz, 2013; Golato, 2000, 2002b, 2002c; Günthner, 1997) has shown that the selection of quoting form(at)—the ‘quotative’—is sensitive to the local interactional context (e.g., what is being reported, what is the function of the reported speech in the larger context). Put differently, how we announce and ‘package’ a quote communicates important aspects of what or why we are quoting.

Burkert and Roitsch (2014) present a teaching unit on quotatives. One aspect of quotatives is forward projection, and the German quotative format *und ich/sie so* ‘and I’m/she’s like’ projects forward in a particular way, making expectable a specific next.⁴ In storytellings in particular, *und ich/sie so* systematically frames the delivery of the climax of the story and projects a performance or reenactment of what happened (including voice and language shifts, quoted gestures and vocalizations other than speech). In Example 5, Ricki is telling the story of how she was stopped by a police car in the United States. Her husband, Tobias, who was present for the event, continues her turn (and quote) in line 02 by imitating the police siren. The quotative in this instance is shortened to *so* ‘like.’

Example 5: polizeisirene ‘police siren’

- 01 R: **auf einmal so +hinter mir so (.)+**
 suddenly like behind me like (.)
 +index finger extended, circles
 hand at wrist, big grin+
- 02 T: **tolle lightschow *düüüü düüüü***
 great light show dooii dooii
 quietly, imitating police siren

(adapted from Golato, 2000: 5)

Burkert and Roitsch (2014) suggest that explicitly teaching quotatives

enables the learner to introduce verbal and non-verbal quotes into the story climax. By connecting form . . . and context (peaks of story tellings, including jokes), students also understand that linguistic choices are not primarily individual or idiosyncratic but are rather connected to recurrent, describable communicative functions.

(pp. 195–196)

The testing item below is designed to be used in connection with an IC teaching unit on quoting in German (such as Burkert & Roitsch, 2014), in which learners analyzed and practiced different quotation formats.

In order to assess a learner's abilities to project what current talk makes expectable next, we propose a multiple-choice/matching format in which the interactional context (the basis for grammatical and pragmatic projection) is given and students are asked to choose among different possible continuations. Table 12.3 illustrates this format. After an item targeting syntactic forward projection more generally ('forward projection'), the main task ('quoting') is not to produce a quote but to select the one quote that best fits with what the quotative within its larger context projects. In addition to the matching task, learners are asked to provide meta-comments to justify their choice, thereby articulating—and displaying for inspection by the tester—which context features in the interaction between the participants in the dialogue they used to arrive at the best fit between quotative and quote.

Table 12.3 Testing format for quoting in German: matching context and focus structure^{5,6}

Forward Projection in Grammar and in Actions

For each of the turns on the left, pick the most fitting/appropriate continuation from the options given on the right. Then explain your choices.

Example 1, taken from a job interview. INT-1 is asking a second interviewer to begin the interview:

01	INT-1: ich würde sie dann vielleicht bitten, I would then ask you perhaps to,	... die erste Frage zu stellen. to ask the first question.
02	(0.2) bitten ... (0.2) ask (you) ...	... die erste Frage. the first question.

Example 2, taken from the same job interview. INT-2

is now addressing the job candidate, Mr. Lohmann:

		... hier gesehen?
01	INT-1: herr <u>lohm</u> ann äh (0.2)	here seen?
	mr lohmann eh (0.2)	
	ich hab mich natürlich	... hier?
	of course I have	here?
02	mit ihren unterlagen ...	
	with your application ...	... beschäftigt?
		engaged?

Example 3, from a phone conversation between an insurance company representative (V) and a client.

In 01-02 and 03, V frames her response to a request by KD: Fulfilling the request is possible but not straightforward.

		... das ist mit einem
		finanziellen
		Aufwand verbunden.
01	V: das ist also eigentlich KEIN (0.2)	it involves costs.
	that's not really a (0.2)	
	KEIN problem was man nicht lösen könnte;	... morgen ginge das.
02	a problem that can't be resolved	tomorrow it would work.
03	KD: mhm,	
04	V: NUR; ...	... können wir das nicht
	(only/it's just); ...	für Sie übernehmen.
		we can't do it for you.

Explain your choices: _____

Quoting in Interaction

- (A) Ricki is telling Sara the story of how she was stopped by a police car while on vacation in the United States. Her husband, Tobias, was also in the car. Pick the most appropriate quote to complete the transcribed face-to-face interaction. Then explain your choice.

01 Ri: **+polizei, ich so+ (.)**
police, i'm like (.)
+smile voice----+

02 **+ohhh tobias:as [he he+ he he**
ohhh tobias:as [he he he he
+covers mouth with left hand,
reaches over w/right, as if shaking To+

03 Sa: **[ha ha hehehe**
[ha ha hehehe

04 Ri: **[wach auf**
[wake up

05 To: **[*und ich lach da so**
[and I was lying there like
puts head back-----

.....*

.....*

[schlief
[slept

07 Sa: **[hehehe**
[hehehe

Which of these three quotes fits best in line 05? (Note: Tobias's turn continues in line 06.)

...
 "war total im tiefschlaf,"
was totally asleep

...
 "chchch"
zzz

...
 "laute schnarchgeräusche,"
loud snoring noises

Explain your choice: _____

- (B) In the context of talking about financial problems, Kirsten complains to Rita about a dilapidated fence on her lot. In line 4, she announces the decision she and her husband arrived at regarding the fence (=the solution to the reported problem). Pick the most appropriate quote to complete this phone conversation. Then explain your choice.

- 01 Kir: jedes wochenende repariert er ein zaunfeld
each weekend he repairs an area of the fence
- 02 und dann fällt's nächste wieder ei(h)n, weißte.
and then the next one colla(h)pses, you know
- 03 Rit: [a:ch gott! hhhe]
[o:h god! hhhe]
- 04 Kir: [hhhhe ham wir] gesucht _____
[hhhhe we] said _____
- 06 (.)
- 07 Kir: is immer sowas blödes,
it's always something stupid

Which of the three quotes below fits best in line 04?

... "müssen wir im herbst mal sehn, dass wir das ding ersetzen."
we'll have to see to it in the fall that we replace the thing

... "OH verDAMMT nochmal!"
OH DARN it all

... "warum passiert das denn jedes einzelne wochenende."
why does this happen every single weekend

Explain your choice: _____

- (C) Melanie is telling Rebecca about her activities last weekend. She reconstructs for Rebecca her decision process around going/not going to a school party (note that it is not her prom). Pick the most appropriate quote to complete the face-to-face interaction. Then explain your choice.

- 01 Mel: >was hab ich am wochenende gemacht;<=
what did I do on the weekend
- 02 =FREItag, oah. (0.4) freitag; gell?
friday man (0.4) friday right
- 03 sitze ich so daheim wollte eigentlich nix machen, .hh (.)
I'm just sitting at home wanted to do nothing really .hh (.)
- 04 hab +überlegt+ aufn abiball zu geh:n,
was thinking about going to the prom
+looks up and to left+
- 05 (0.1) haben gesagt _____
 (0.1) ((my friends who went later)) told me _____
- 06 Mel: naja auf jeden fall_ *.hhh* mm
PRT (anyway/in any case) .hhh mm
eats a spoon of yoghurt
- 07 Reb: wieso bist du denn jetzt nich gegangen?
(so) why did you end up not going

Which of the three quotes below fits best in line 05?

... "wär voll geil gewesen aufm abiball,"
prom was totally awesome

... "OAH! so total geil war's da,"

DUDE it was so totally awesome there

... +(0.4)+ "warum gehst du denn nich. is doch blöd"

(0.4) why don't you (want to) go. that's (just) stupid

+index finger to forehead, raised eyebrows+

Explain your choice: _____

Syntax-for-Interaction and Repair: Two Uses of Connectors in German

In this section, we focus on syntax-for-interaction, specifically the use of the German connector *obwohl*, and we suggest a ‘data analysis/peer discovery’ testing format.

Language-in-use research has repeatedly shown that linguistic form and social action shape each other (cf. Couper-Kuhlen, 2014; Fox, 2007). For example, recognizing that turns in conversation are designed to have recognizable beginnings and ends, and that things once said/done cannot be ‘erased’ or ‘taken back’ (and that we therefore need systematic repair mechanisms), helps us see that the syntax of turns goes beyond the syntax of sentences and is fitted to speakers’ communicative needs.⁷

This understanding of syntax is indispensable to teaching and testing IC. The following testing item is based on teaching materials that illustrate the connection between syntax and interaction in the use of the German connectors *obwohl* ‘although/except’ and *weil* ‘because’ (Bendig, Betz, & Huth, 2016). We focus here on *obwohl*. If we look at the use of *obwohl* in its sequential context, we see that not only does it operate as a concessive connector on the sentence level; it can also link turns that carry out different actions. The two uses correspond to two different syntactic patterns: final placement of the conjugated verb in the clause (V_f) and verb-second (V_2) ordering. Thus, in the use of *obwohl*, syntactic variation is interactionally meaningful (Günthner, 1996, 2000, 2008), as Examples 6 and 7 illustrate.⁸

Example 6: *obwohl* with V_f

Ich nehm noch ein Stück Kuchen, obwohl ich schon zwei gegessen hab.
I'll take another piece of cake, although I already had two.

Example 7: *obwohl* with V_2

Ich nehm noch ein Stück Kuchen. (-) Obwohl (-) ich hab schon zwei gegessen.
I'll take another piece of cake, except I already had two.

Obwohl in Example 6 connects two utterances by showing dissonance or contradiction in their relationship (Günthner, 1996: 337): The speaker elects to eat a third piece of cake, although this is not what she would normally do. The main action of the whole turn is still a request for another piece of cake. Example 7, by contrast, connects two different actions. The second utterance corrects and thus replaces the first in a way that the ultimate outcome is the decision not to eat another piece of cake. This *obwohl* does not operate as a concessive conjunction but instead as a discourse marker that initiates a self-correction.

Following Bendig et al. (2016), we suggest a data analysis/discovery learning ‘quiz’ with a peer as a combined teaching and testing format for *obwohl*. This testing item guides students through the analysis of transcribed data extracts selected to illustrate and contrast both uses of *obwohl*. It is designed for learners who have some experience with reading transcripts and who have ideally already been taught a similar structure in German: *weil*+V₂ (see Bendig et al., 2016).

Table 12.4 Testing format for syntax-in-interaction: Data analysis/peer discovery learning⁹

Discovering New Language Structures

(A) Analyzing data: Read dialogues (1)–(4) and answer the corresponding questions.

<p>(1) Nora ist visiting Willi, and they are sitting on the floor in his living room:</p> <p>01 Wi: brauchst du noch en <u>kissen</u>? do you need another pillow?</p> <p>02 No: hm nee das reicht. hm no this is enough.</p> <p>03 (0.5)</p> <p>04 No: obwohl (.) das is <u>doch</u> unbequem. except (.) it <u>is</u> uncomfortable (here)</p> <p>05 Wi: ((throws a pillow over to Nora)) ((end of sequence and topic))</p>	<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you label Willi's action in line 01 (e.g., requesting, complimenting, apologizing)? • Does Nora take another pillow to sit on in the end? Why (not)? • How would you label the action Nora performs in line 04?
<p>(2) Two doctoral students, Maria und Eva, are talking about a fellow student:</p> <p>01 Ma: die hat schon <u>zwei</u> artikel 02 veröffentlicht; she has already published to articles;</p> <p>03 obwohl [sie] grad erst= although she only just</p> <p>04 Ev: [hoh] [wow]</p> <p>05 Ma: =mit ihrer diss angefangen hat. with her doctoral work.</p> <p>06 Ev: wo denn- wo hat sie die denn where where did she</p> <p>07 untergebracht? get them accepted?</p>	<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is Maria's position on their fellow student: She has published a lot / very little so far. • What can you glean from the exchange: Is having published two articles at the beginning of one's doctoral work normal? • How would you label the action Nora performs in lines 06-07?

<p>(3) Eva is drinking tea:</p> <p>01 Ev: willst mal probieren? <i>wanna try?</i></p> <p>02 Ha: hm ich mag keinen grünen tee. <i>hm I don't like green tea.</i></p> <p>03 (0.5)</p> <p>04 Ha: obwohl (0.2) gib mir doch mal <i>actually (0.2) why don't you give me</i></p> <p>05 ne (0.2) h- halbe tasse voll. <i>a (0.2) h- half a cup of it.</i></p>	<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How would you label the action Eva performs in line 01?• Does Hans like green tea?• Does Hans get a cup of tea in the end?• How would you label the action Hans performs in lines 04-05?
<p>(4) "summer heat": Klaus and Hans are having a beer. Klaus is drinking a beer made by the brewery Krombacher.</p> <p>01 Kl: das is echt 's beste bier. <i>this beer really is the best.</i></p> <p>02 (0.2)</p> <p>03 ich mein von den alkoholfreien. <i>I mean of the non-alcoholic ones.</i></p> <p>04 (0.2)</p> <p>05 Ha: hmm. obwohl es gibt schon bessere. <i>hmm except there are some better ones.</i></p> <p>06 zum Beispiel becks. das ist viel <i>for example ((name)). that one's much</i></p> <p>07 trinkbarer. <i>more drinkable.</i></p>	<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How would you label the action Klaus performs in line 01?• Which non-alcoholic beer does Klaus favor?• Does Hans agree?• How would you label the action Hans performs in line 05?

(B) Structure and meaning, syntax-in-interaction: Contrasting actions

- Read sentence pairs 1–3 and the actions that would logically follow each.
- What is the *structural* difference between sentence pairs 1a + 1b, 2a + 2b and 3a + 3b?
- What is the *communicative* or ‘meaning’ difference between the sentence pairs?
- Then read sentences 4a + 4b and answer the questions below them.

- 1a. Ich nehm noch ein Stück Kuchen, obwohl ich schon zwei gegessen hab.

I'll take another piece of cake, although I already had two.

(. . . and then she takes a piece of cake.)

- 1b. Ich nehm noch ein Stück Kuchen, (-) obwohl (-) ich hab schon zwei gegessen.

I'll take another piece of cake, (-) except (-) I already had two.

(. . . and she doesn't take another piece of cake.)

- 2a. Ich mach mal das Licht an, obwohl dann wahrscheinlich die Mücken reinkommen.

I'll turn the light on, even though that'll likely invite the bugs.

(. . . and she turns on the light.)

- 2b. Ich mach mal das Licht an, (-) obwohl dann kommen wahrscheinlich die Mücken rein.

I'll turn the light on, (-) except that'll likely invite the bugs.

(. . . and she doesn't turn the light on.)

- 3a. Zum Valentinstag will ich ihm was schenken, obwohl wir uns gestritten haben.

For Valentine's day I wanted to get him something, even though we had a fight.

(. . . and she buys something for him.)

- 3b. Zum Valentinstag will ich ihm was schenken, obwohl (-) wir haben uns gestritten und ich bin eigentlich immer noch sauer.

For Valentine's day I wanted to get him something, although (-) we had a fight and I'm still angry.

(. . . and she doesn't buy anything for him.)

- 4a. Ich bleibe noch ein wenig, obwohl ich eigentlich sehr müde bin.

I'll stay a little longer, even though I'm actually pretty tired.

Does she stay for another hour after saying this? ☐ yes ☐ no

- 4b. Ich bleibe noch ein wenig, obwohl (-) ich bin eigentlich sehr müde.

I'll stay a little longer, although (-) I'm actually pretty tired.

Does she stay for another hour after saying this? ☐ yes ☐ no

(C) Structure and meaning, syntax-in-interaction: Formulating hypotheses

With a partner, formulate hypotheses based on the examples in (B): when does *obwohl* require the verb in final position, and when does *obwohl* require the verb in second position? How is the communicative difference conveyed in English?

Discussion: Using IC Testing Formats

Following the presentation of testing targets and formats, we want to highlight a few important considerations for using them. This includes the connection to interaction research and its basic tenets, as well as the benefits and potential challenges of (a) working with transcripts and (b) using written testing formats more generally.

It is important that teachers/testers use learning and testing targets that are based on robust CA and interactional linguistic research into recurrent conversation patterns. One of the goals of CA-based IC testing—and the goal of the tasks we presented in this section—is to see evidence of learners' *understanding* that language is a resource for action and that there are unmarked (typical) and marked uses of discursive formats. Consequently, IC testing formats do not aim for the right answers but highlight systematicity, context sensitivity and diversification of speakers' methods (Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015). For example, while none of the quotes given in Table 12.3, part B, could be said to be grammatically/structurally ill-fitted to the quotative, there are several context features that point to the first quote as the best fit: first, research shows that *hab ich gesagt* 'I said' plus a direct quote typically introduces the solution to a reported past problem (Golato, 2002b), and this renders the third quote a less good fit. Second, embodied quotes and reenactments are typically associated with an (*und ich*) *so* '(and I'm) like' format in German, and this renders the second quote a less good fit. A similar observation can be made for the materials in Table 12.2: a key feature of closings is that they include key building blocks but also vary in length, content and types of additional actions included. In teaching and testing the structure of closing sequences, we help learners understand that variation conveys meaning: that rather than having to follow a (culturally determined) script, they make choices and can play with patterns in interaction, while still orienting to normativity (that is, expected, unmarked patterns).

Presenting learners with written testing formats, specifically with transcripts of naturally occurring interaction, presents challenges and advantages. On the one hand, learners need to be somewhat familiar with basic transcription conventions and transcript presentation, and they need to understand that linguistic variation is conceptualized as meaningful for action formation and ascription (Couper-Kuhlen, 2014; Drew, 2013; cf. discussion in Betz & Huth, 2014). The testing formats suggested here can thus only be meaningfully used in combination with CA-based IC instruction. On the other hand, transcript-based testing formats enable testers to integrate aspects of IC that are often neglected and/or are notoriously difficult to capture: gesture and other non-verbal moves, and their integration with speech in building recognizable action. In understanding

projection in interactional quoting in particular (see Table 12.3), multimodality emerges as one crucial dimension: reenacting the multimodal conduct of others in German is typically framed with quotatives that differ from those used for reporting others' words (only). Using transcripts that go beyond the single turn or sequence also allows learners to inspect the original context (rather than a secondary description of the context), which provides extensive input and thus crucial contextual/interactional resources.¹⁰

In presenting transcripts to students for inspection at their own pace, all of the specific testing items suggested here also test students' more general ability to work with transcripts and to pay attention to interactional context when trying to understand the connection between form and action. They demonstrate their ability to do this by considering what comes before and after the turns/actions that are in focus in each testing item. Explorative data analysis as assessment, as suggested above, is well suited for targeting both specific structures and general language awareness. Having students formulate hypotheses based on transcribed instances of the practice in focus allows them to integrate what they have already learned and apply it to new contexts. This part of the assessment (and a following discussion of learners' hypotheses) also encourages reflection on how real-time interaction works: in Table 12.4, part C, for example, one may ask why *obwohl* + V_2 is a spoken-language phenomenon, found in conversation and more recently in conceptually oral texts in new media (e.g., Twitter; Moraldo, 2012). Through working with interaction data in a peer quiz, learners discover that temporality is at the core of interaction: the function of *obwohl* as a repair initiator is fitted to oral, real-time interaction, in which words and utterances cannot, once spoken, be taken back or erased.

Summary and Conclusion

We set out to introduce, contextualize and describe some general testing considerations before suggesting specific testing formats suitable for CA-informed IC instruction. We situated IC in the larger context of action-based views of language and sought to demonstrate that if we teach IC based on CA research, we put front and center a dynamic view of language that has at its core how sounds, words, grammar and extralinguistic semiotic and embodied resources form turns; how turns implement particular actions (or a range of actions); and how actions are coordinated across turns and sequences as interactants engage in joint projects.

We discussed a number of caveats that accompany the testing of IC. For one, we suggested that prescriptive normativity, a basic principle in language testing, has only limited utility when we consider the teaching and testing of L2 interaction patterns. When we enter the world of dynamic and co-constructed discourse, when we teach (and endeavor

to test) principles such as forward projection, special consideration has to be paid to the inherent context dependence (and thus ambiguity) of social action, the concordant complexities of action ascription, and, ultimately, the importance of individual choice and its consequences. Second, we emphasized the social dimension of language testing: language performance in interaction varies across tasks and interlocutors in instructed settings, and this presents difficulties for generalizing from a speaker's participation in specific contexts to some more general IC. Current efforts to address these challenges in testing and/or assessing IC do exist and may yield practical results (e.g., Ross & Kasper, 2013). This may involve expanding speaking test formats to include, e.g., open role plays (Youn, 2015). What we have proposed here is that IC testing formats can and should also include written tasks. Specifically, we proposed written tasks that target language-specific realizations of generic practices, such as overall structuring (e.g., phone conversation closings), and that test learners' *understanding* of interaction patterns through analysis of the conduct of others. Written tests can capture an important dimension of IC, can be used in conjunction with oral formats and can thus offer testers/teachers additional options for documenting and assessing aspects of L2 speakers' ability to participate in interaction in locally efficient ways.

The testing formats we suggest here work hand in hand with existing teaching materials. This includes utilizing the test formats we present as a way to set curricular goals on scales small and large, which, in turn, may aid in structuring the specific instructional path towards reaching them. These tests also have instructional import in the sense that they can be used as teaching tools, inasmuch as they amount to activities for language practice for L2 learners. Our test items require L2 learners to consider language production in its temporally unfolding sequential context and require test takers to actively and consciously reason about what is said in what temporal succession, and about what is thereby *done* or achieved by the interactants involved. The formats themselves are familiar testing and practice formats in L2 classrooms. However, we hope to have shown that the central adjustment in making them work for testing interactional learning targets is to regard the options interactants have in moving an interaction forwards not as 'right or wrong' but rather as 'better or less fitting' to particular sequential positions. This reflects a view of social action that is at the heart of IC as we deploy it here: interactants' efforts to achieve intersubjectivity include basic procedures for structuring social interaction, such as turn-taking and repair, but they crucially include practices: alternative formats for accomplishing a specific action, designed for specific recipients, situations and contexts, and encompassing all available multimodal resources at the interactants' disposal.

Notes

- 1 Some of the tasks may resemble discourse completion tasks (DCTs) in format, but they are not DCTs. The formats we propose are not designed to elicit a test taker's own response in a hypothetical context or stimulate recall of actual past action. Instead, they guide *analysis* of the conduct of others and thus target test takers' understanding of the interplay of context, linguistic form(at) and action. Cf. Golato (2003: 92–93) on the use of DCTs as an instrument suitable for eliciting symbolic action (i.e., accumulated experience, beliefs and intuitions *about* action) rather than real-time conduct in co-constructed interaction.
- 2 Closings have been shown to be “crucial in establishing and re-affirming interpersonal relationships between participants, and we rely on the patterns we know being followed in order to feel that those social relationships are being affirmed” (Kampen Robinson, 2014, p. 180). Differences in how openings and closings are managed have been explained in terms of relationship management. In German, there is a stronger focus on interpersonal relationship management in closings, while this work is done in opening sequences in English (cf. Harren & Raitaniemi, 2008).
- 3 Data is adapted from Harren and Raitaniemi (2008). Translations are provided for this presentation and would not be provided as part of the task for students. (.) represents a micro pause, (0.8) a timed pause of 0.8 seconds.
- 4 See Golato (2000, 2002c) for further detail on what different quotation formats in German project.
- 5 Translations would be omitted when using the item in German language classes, and instructions could be given in the target language.
- 6 The data in Table 12.3 are adapted from Auer (2005: 17, 30), Golato (2000: 45), Golato (2002c: 43–44) and the authors' own collections. Learning/testing targets: quoting one's own past decision, specifically a solution to a problem (B); quoting a third party (C) while distancing oneself from the quoted assessment; and quoting something embodied, thus reenacting it (A).
- 7 For an introduction into the topic, see also Ochs et al. (1996); Pekarek Doehler et al. (2015).
- 8 Contrasting Examples 6 and 7 are adapted from Günthner (2008: 114); cf. (Bendig et al., 2016: 216). Note that (-) in Example 7 denotes a short pause. This reflects the finding that the use of *obwohl* as a discourse marker is systematically associated with prosodic disintegration (e.g., pausing before and/or after *obwohl*) in addition to V_2 word ordering.
- 9 Data examples are based on Günthner (2000).
- 10 The testing materials suggested here could of course all be complemented with original recordings, so that learners receive a written as well as oral presentation of the original context.

References

- ACTFL (2012). (2017, August 29). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines*. Retrieved from actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012_FINAL.pdf
- Alcón Soler, E., & Martínez-Flor, E. (Eds.). (2005). Special Issue “Pragmatics in instructed language learning.” *System*, 33.

- Auer, P. (2005). Projection in interaction and projection in grammar. *Text*, 25(1), 7–36.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barraja-Rohan, A.-M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(4), 479–507.
- Barraja-Rohan, A.-M., & Pritchard, C. R. (1997). *Beyond talk: A course in communication and conversation skills for intermediate adult learners of English*. Melbourne: Western Melbourne Institute of TAFE (now Victoria University).
- Bendig, I., Betz, E., & Huth, T. (2016). “Weil—das ist eben doch richtig so.” Teaching variant types of ‘weil-’ and ‘obwohl-’ structures in German. *Unterrichtspraxis*, 49(2), 214–227.
- Betz, E. (2013). Quote—unquote in one variety of German: Two interactional functions of pivot constructions used as frames for quotation in Siebenbürger Sächsisch. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 54, 16–34.
- Betz, E., & Huth, T. (2014). Beyond grammar: Teaching interaction in the German classroom. *Unterrichtspraxis*, 47(2), 140–163.
- Betz, E., & Huth, T. (Eds.) (2014–2016). Special Focus Issue Series: “Beyond Grammar: Teaching Interaction in the German Language Classroom.” *Unterrichtspraxis*.
- Bolden, G. (2017). Opening up closings in Russian. In G. Raymond, G. H. Lerner, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Enabling human conduct: Studies of talk-in-interaction in honor of Emanuel A. Schegloff* (pp. 231–272). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Burkert, A., & Roitsch, J. (2014). “Und ich so: Nee, oder?”: Teaching two formats for reported discourse in German interaction. *Unterrichtspraxis*, 47(2), 193–207.
- Button, G. (1987). Moving out of closings. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 101–151). Clevedon, OH: Multilingual.
- Chaloub-Deville, M., & Deville, C. (2005). A look back at and forward to what language testers measure. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 815–832). Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Chomsky, N. (1963). Formal properties of grammars. In R. D. Luce, R. R. Bush, & E. Galanter (Eds.), *Handbook of mathematical psychology, Volume II*. (pp. 323–418). New York: Wiley.
- Clark, H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. See coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf
- Council of Europe (2018). *CEFR companion volume with new descriptors*. <https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989>
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2014). What does grammar tell us about action? *Pragmatics*, 24(3), 623–647.
- Deppermann, A., & Günthner, S. (2015). *Temporality in interaction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dingemanse, M., Torreira, F., & Enfield, N. J. (2013). Is ‘huh?’ a universal word? Conversational infrastructure and the convergent evolution of linguistic items. *PloS ONE* 8(11), e78273. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0078273

- Drew, P. (2013). Conversation analysis and social action. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, 37(3), 1–20.
- Drew, P. (2018). The interface between pragmatics and conversation analysis. In C. Illie & N. Norrick (Eds.), *Pragmatics and its interfaces* (pp. 59–84). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Enfield, N. (2006). Social consequences of common ground. In N. Enfield & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction* (pp. 399–430). Oxford: Berg.
- Enfield, N., & Sidnell, J. (2017). *The concept of action*. Cambridge: CUP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139025928>
- Evans, N., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32(5), 429–448.
- Ferreira, F., Christianson, K., & Hollingworth, A. (2001). Misinterpretations of garden-path sentences: Implications for models of sentence processing and reanalysis. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 30(1), 3–20.
- Flöck, I. (2016). *Requests in American and British English. A contrastive multi-method analysis*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Floyd, S., Rossi, G., & Enfield, N. J. (Eds.) (in press). *Getting others to do things: A pragmatic typology of recruitments*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Fox, B. A. (2007). Principles shaping grammatical practices: an exploration. *Discourse Studies*, 9, 299–318.
- Golato, A. (2000). An innovative German quotative for reporting on embodied actions: *Und ich so/und er so* ‘and I’m like/and he’s like.’ *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 29–54.
- Golato, A. (2002a). German compliment responses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(5), 547–571.
- Golato, A. (2002b). Self-quotation in German: Reporting on past decisions. In T. Güldemann & M. von Roncador (Eds.), *Reported discourse: A meeting ground for different linguistic domains* (pp. 49–70). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Golato, A. (2002c). Grammar and interaction: Reported discourse and subjunctive in German. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, 22(1), 24–55.
- Golato, A. (2003). Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics*, 24, 90–121.
- Goodwin, C. (2002). Time in action. *Current Anthropology*, 43, 19–35.
- Grancea, E. L. (2008). *Aspects of sequence and preference organization in Romanian telephone conversations* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.
- Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics, Vol. 3, Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
- Günthner, S. (1996). From subordination to coordination? Verb-second position in German causal and concessive constructions. *Pragmatics*, 6(3), 323–356.
- Günthner, S. (1997). Direkte und indirekte Rede in Alltagsgesprächen. In P. Schlobinski (Ed.), *Syntax des gesprochenen Deutsch* (pp. 227–262). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Günthner, S. (2000). From concessive connector to discourse marker: The use of ‘obwohl’ in everyday German interaction. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & B.

- Kortmann (Eds.), *Cause, condition, concession, contrast. Cognitive and discourse perspectives* (pp. 439–468). Berlin: deGruyter.
- Günthner, S. (2008). “Weil—es ist zu spät.” Geht die Nebensatzstellung im Deutschen verloren? In M. Denkler, S. Günthner, & W. Imo (Eds.), *Frischwärts und Unkaputtbar. Sprachverfall oder Sprachwandel im Deutschen* (pp. 103–128). Münster: Aschendorf.
- Hall, J. K. (2018). From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires: Reconceptualizing the objects of L2 learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 8(1), 25–39.
- Hall, J. K., Hellerman, J., & Pekarek-Doehler, S. (Eds.) (2011). *L2 interactional competence and development*. Clevedon: Multilingual.
- Harren, I., & Raitaniemi, M. (2008). The sequential structure of closings in private German phone calls. *Gesprächsforschung*, 9, 198–223.
- Heritage, J. (2013). Action formation and its epistemic (and other) backgrounds. *Discourse Studies*, 15(5), 551–578.
- Heritage, J., & Atkinson, J. M. (Eds.) (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- House, J. (1982). Opening and closing phases in German and English dialogues. *Grazer Linguistische Studien*, 16, 52–82.
- Huth, T. (2006). Negotiating structure and culture: L2 learners’ realization of L2 compliment-response sequences in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 2025–2050.
- Huth, T. (2014). ‘When in Berlin. . .’: Teaching German telephone openings. *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 47(2), 164–179.
- Huth, T., & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research*, 10, 53–79.
- Jaworski, A. (1994). Pragmatic failure in a second language: Greeting responses in English by Polish students. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 41–55.
- Johnson, M., & Tyler, A. (1998). Re-analyzing the OPI: How much does it look like natural conversation? In R. F. Young & A. W. He (Eds.), *Taking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 27–51). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kampen Robinson, C. (2014). “I’ve got to go now. bis dann.” Teaching closing sequences. *Unterrichtspraxis*, 47(2), 180–192.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research*, 8, 201–231.
- Kasper, G. (1997). The role of pragmatics in language teaching education. In K. Bardovi-Harlig (Ed.), *Beyond methods: Components of second language education* (pp. 113–36). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (2003). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Youn, S. (2017). Transforming instruction to activity: Roleplay in language assessment. *Applied Linguistics Review*. Retrieved 31 October 2018 from doi:10.1515/applirev-2017-0020
- Kecskes, I., Sanders, R. E., & Pomerantz, A. (2018). The basic interactional competence of language learners. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 124, 88–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.10.019>
- Kevoe-Feldman, H., & Robinson, J. D. (2012). Exploring essentially three-turn courses of action: An institutional case study with implications for ordinary talk. *Discourse Studies*, 14(2), 217–241.

- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (2013). Action formation and ascription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 103–130). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lowenberg, P. H. (1993). Issues of validity in tests of English as a world language: Whose standards? *World Englishes*, 12, 95–106.
- Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (pp. 13–104). New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan.
- Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mondada, L., & Traverso, V. (2015). Beyond orality: Interaction and multimodality. In S. Detey, J. Durand, B. Laks, & C. Lyche (Eds.), *Varieties of spoken French: A source book* (pp. 108–119). Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Moraldo, S. (2012). ‘Obwohl . . . Korrektur: Polizei HAT Gebäude im coolen Duisburger Innenhafen.’ Die Kommunikationsplattform Twitter an der Schnittstelle zwischen Sprechsprachlichkeit und medial bedingter Schriftlichkeit. In S. Günthner, W. Imo & D. Meer (Ed.), *Kommunikation und Öffentlichkeit* (pp. 179–204). Berlin: deGruyter.
- Norris, J. M. (2008). *Validity evaluation in language assessment*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A., & Thompson, S. (Eds.). (1996). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pavlidou, T. (1998). Greek and German telephone closings: Patterns of confirmation and agreement. *Pragmatics*, 8(1), 79–94.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: on language, learning and documenting learning in conversation analytic SLA research. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualizing ‘learning’ in applied linguistics* (pp. 105–126). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2018). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(4), 555–578. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw021>
- Pekarek Doehler, S., De Stefani, E., & Horlacher, A.-S. (2015). *Time and emergence in grammar-in-interaction: Dislocation, topicalization and hanging topic in French talk-in-interaction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–270). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Rose, K., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, S., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (2013). *Assessing second language pragmatics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 23–78). New York: Irvington.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52–133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 189–327.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selting, M. (2007). Beendigung(en) als interaktive Leistung. In H. Hausendorf (Ed.), *Gespräch als Prozess* (pp. 307–337). Tübingen: Narr.
- Sert, O., Kunitz, S., & Markee, N. (Eds.) (2018). Thematic issue on “Interactional Competence in a second/foreign/additional language.” *Classroom Discourse* 9(1).
- Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (2013). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T., Hoymann, G., Rossano, F., de Ruiter, J. P., Yoon, K.-E., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *PNAS*, 106(26), 10587–10592.
- Stivers, T., Sidnell, J., & Bergen, C. (2018). Children’s responses to questions in peer interaction: A window into the ontogenesis of interactional competence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 124, 14–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.11.013>
- Streeck, J. (1980). Speech acts in interaction. A critique of Searle. *Discourse Processes*, 3, 133–154.
- Streeck, J., Goodwin, C., & LeBaron, C. (Eds.). (2011). *Embodied interaction: Language and body in the material world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taguchi, N., & Roever, C. (2017). *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2002). A conversation analytical study of telephone conversation openings between native and non-native speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1807–1832.
- Walters, F. S. (2013). Interfaces between a discourse completion test and a conversation-analysis-informed test of L2 pragmatic competence. In S. Ross & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Assessing second language pragmatics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Waring, H. Z. (2018). Teaching L2 interactional competence: problems and possibilities. *Classroom Discourse*, 8(1), 57–67.
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
- Youn, S. J. (2015). Validity argument for assessing L2 pragmatics in interaction using mixed methods. *Language Testing*, 32(2), 199–225.
- Young, R. F. (2011). Interactional competence in learning, teaching, and testing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, Vol. II (pp. 426–443). London: Routledge.
- Young, R. F. (2012). Social dimensions of language testing. In G. Fulcher & F. Davidson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language testing* (pp. 178–193). New York.
- Zinken, J. (2016). *Requesting responsibility. The morality of grammar in Polish and English family interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

13 Doing Versus Assessing Interactional Competence

Erica Sandlund and Pia Sundqvist

Introduction

The question of what counts as competent participation in interaction in a second language (L2) presents challenges for language assessment research and practice. Specifying features of talk and conduct that constitute such ‘interactional competence’ (IC) (Kasper & Ross, 2013; Kramsch, 1986; Pekarek Doehler & Petitjean, 2017; Young, 2011) involves determining *which* “methods of interaction” (Waring, 2018: 58) are indices of IC in an L2. Additionally, can these methods be specified to the extent that they can be taught and tested? Theoretically, as Hall (2018) argues, the interdisciplinary roots of the IC concept have led to a conflation of ideas from two approaches—conversation analytic (CA) investigations into the interactional organization of human sociality, and studies relating to the objects of L2 learning.

While L2 scholars struggle with the specification and operationalization of IC, practitioners (teachers and raters) also struggle with the assessment of L2 interaction. In a study of how trained raters interpreted interaction in a paired speaking test, May (2009) noted that they incorporated everything from body language to assertiveness and cooperativeness in their IC ratings, which “attests to the complexity of the decisions they have to make, and the lack of meaningful descriptors guiding them to this decision” (p. 416). May’s observation brings an essential aspect of testing and assessing IC to the table—namely, raters’ understandings of rating criteria for interaction. While studies examining learner discourse in search of patterns indicative of changes in participation in L2 interactions (cf. Pekarek Doehler, 2018) have been crucial to our understanding of practices displayed at various levels of L2 proficiency, the local, situated context of assessment can also provide insights into how IC is conceptualized in relation to specific conduct. While L2 learners in interaction draw on L2 resources acquired over time, they also draw on a range of abilities “developed since infancy to deal with generic features of social interaction” (Pekarek Doehler, 2018: 6). Accordingly, the conflation of ideas Hall (2018) observed in scholarly conceptualizations of IC

may well have its counterpart in raters' practices: raters (and test developers) are faced with the challenge of determining whether an oral assessment task captures what has been taught/learned in an L2, or whether the assessment also pertains to a "universal interactional competence that L2 users and learners . . . orient to as human beings to do the cooperative work of human sociality" (Hall, 2018: 31).

In this chapter, we target raters' perceptions of learners' IC, but in contrast to much previous work on rater interpretations of learner performance and scoring rubrics (e.g., Ducasse & Brown, 2009), we approach raters' understandings in situated assessment talk. With a CA approach, we examine how groups of L2 English teachers participating in a training program for the assessment of L2 oral proficiency and interaction collaboratively assess learners' IC in a paired L2 speaking test, the high-stakes national test of English for ninth-graders in Sweden. In addition, we examine how teachers (as raters) discuss particular learner (test-taker) contributions in presenting arguments for their scoring in relation to rubrics. Such reported speech (RS) turns can give an insight into the kinds of interactional conduct that raters perceive as salient to IC. Furthermore, we examine the sequences in which the reported turns were originally produced in the paired test interaction, and analyze the interactional work accomplished *in situ*. The opportunity to see how particular actions in test interaction are re-situated for assessment purposes can inform test constructs and assessment criteria and, additionally, yield knowledge on the interactional basis for RS (Clift & Holt, 2007). An overreaching aim of the study is to illuminate IC assessment as a social practice and, through this lens, obtain insights into the kinds of conduct that raters treat as competent participation in L2 interaction. Furthermore, by working backwards from raters' identification of IC-relevant conduct and locating the turns made relevant in the learner interaction assessed by raters, the study also sheds light on divergences between learners' orientation to situated test interaction, on the one hand, and raters' subsequent recontextualization of these actions in assessment talk, on the other.

The analyses of rater interaction and learner interaction respectively serve two purposes: (1) to uncover whether raters' reconstruction and interpretation of particular turns play a role in positive or negative assessment of IC, and (2) to uncover what interactional work the actions reported on served *in situ* for the learners. Findings have relevance not only to research on IC for L2 teaching and testing, but also for understanding the complexity of assessing social interaction, which in turn can yield important knowledge for developing rater training for the assessment of L2 interaction.

In what follows, we situate our study in conceptualizations of and empirical work on IC in first language (L1) and L2 contexts. We then review relevant work on the testing and assessment of L2 interaction.

Next, we turn to assessment and examine studies on rater perceptions of L2 IC, assessment moderation and rater agreement in assessing speaking. We subsequently present the study design, the data and our analytic approach. The analysis is presented in two parts. First, we present findings regarding raters' collaborative construction of learners' IC, including a focus on their reports of a particular action in the learners' interaction. Then, we turn to the learner test interaction and examine interactional work accomplished in the sequence that raters report on in their assessment discussions. Finally, we contrast and discuss the findings from the analyses of rater and learner interaction, respectively. We conclude by discussing some implications of contrasting assessment talk with learner interaction.

Assessing L2 IC

Competent Participation in Social Interaction

Current applications of the concept of L2 IC have grown out of influences from several sources, such as Hymes's ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1972; see also a recent review by Hall, 2018), Canale and Swain's (1980) model of communicative competence (see also Bachman, 1990) and second language acquisition (SLA) studies of language socialization (e.g., Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984), but also from a large body of CA work on social organization (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977; Sidnell & Stivers, 2013) and L2 interactional development (Waring, 2018; Young, 2011). Hall (2018: 25) notes that the term *IC* is frequently used to refer to two rather different things, namely, "the underlying competence of learners on which they draw to participate in their interactions, their interactional competence," as well as "the diverse language-specific linguistic forms and other resources that learners develop from their participation in diverse social contexts over time." In teaching and assessing L2 IC, this argument is particularly important, as test constructors and raters face the task of deciding whether a particular assessment format captures a kind of general human knowledge of social organization and interaction along with L2-specific practices that learners have acquired.

In what Kasper and Ross (2013) refer to as a "rather obvious paraphrase," IC is, simply, the "competence to participate in interaction" (p. 9). When participating in interactional events, people "coordinate their actions, make these recognizable to each other and continuously adapt them according to the needs of the moment" (Pekarek Doehler & Petitjean, 2017: 6). Since adaptation to the setting, the current activities and the local context are central to 'competent' participation, interactional practices are both "context-independent . . . and context-sensitive" (Pekarek Doehler & Petitjean, 2017: 7). If IC is viewed from a CA perspective on the orderliness and normativity of interactional organization,

IC represents the “the ability to use the context-free interactional organizations . . . in a context-sensitive manner to participate in social activities” (Kasper & Ross, 2013: 24). Consequently, IC development, whether in an L1 or L2, means the application of a universal competence, and the context-sensitive deployment of practices in particular settings. For professionals in institutional interactions, becoming an expert means learning to manage and adapt to the specifics of a particular discursive practice (Ngyuen, 2012: 4–5), and for young people, the path between school and work requires the acquisition of “a growing degree of interactional flexibility” (Pekarek Doehler & Petitjean, 2017: 14) and an ability to revise their conduct in relation to particular institutional practices. This also applies to the transfer of knowledge of interaction into L2 contexts, or as Pekarek-Doehler (2018: 6) puts it, L2 learners “draw on interactional abilities . . . developed since infancy to deal with generic features of social interaction, yet they also recalibrate these in the course of L2 development.”

The IC concept thus has its challenges for teaching and assessment, such as (1) how IC can be defined scientifically¹ (see Hall, 2018), (2) what L2 IC entails in practice in terms of its teachability (Waring, 2018) and (3) what L2 IC entails in practice for the testing of L2 interaction, as it is difficult to separate L2 IC from a general (L1 or ‘social’) competence in creating assessment tasks and scoring rubrics. Many promising attempts to define and specify IC-relevant conduct for testing purposes have been made, some of which we examine next.

Testing L2 IC

L2 speaking is often referred to as one of the ‘complex’ language abilities because of the “individualized uniqueness and complexity” (Wang, 2010: 108) of the tasks and performances to be assessed. While there are a number of empirical studies on L2 IC in non-testing contexts, such as classrooms, institutions or study-abroad contexts (Gramkow, 2000; Hall, 1995; Masuda, 2011; Walsh, 2012), research on L2 IC in testing contexts has grown steadily since Young and He’s (1998) seminal collection on interaction in language proficiency interviews. Expanding on Canale and Swain’s (1980) concept of communicative competence, He and Young (1998) emphasized the joint management of communication as central to IC, underlining that IC is *not* “a trait that is independent of the interactive practice in which it is (or is not) constituted” (p. 7), and called for an approach to oral testing based on how test participants display their understanding of the situated practices in which they participate.

In the context of formal educational assessment of oral proficiency, interactional abilities usually constitute part of the assessment construct (see, e.g., Kasper & Ross, 2013; Kramsch, 1986; Young & He, 1998). IC forms “an integral aspect of test-taking, especially with regard to

oral tests of language abilities” (van Compernelle, 2013: 327). This is also evident in the large bulk of studies on L2 speaking tests informed by CA, which, to different degrees, deal with how test takers display L2 interactional skills in assessment contexts (see, e.g., Greer & Potter, 2008; Kasper & Ross, 2013). CA-based research on L2 tests of interaction covers different assessment formats, from well-known L2 tests like the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) and the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) to unique, national or course-specific test formats (for a recent review, see Sandlund, Sundqvist, & Nyroos, 2016). Not all test constructs emphasize the same aspects; for instance, some focus on L2 pragmatics (Kasper & Ross, 2013), others on oral proficiency (Seedhouse, 2013) and oral production and interaction (Sandlund & Sundqvist, 2017).

As all common L2 oral test formats—oral proficiency interviews, paired tests and small-group tests—involve at least two interlocutors, the issue of co-constructed interaction and individual assessment has long been a concern for research on L2 IC testing (Chalhoub-Deville & Deville, 2005; Young, 2011). It has even been argued that since IC is not “an attribute of an individual participant . . . we cannot say that an individual is interactionally competent; rather we talk of interactional competence as something that is jointly constructed by all participants” (He & Young, 1998: 7). In this view, IC is how linguistic and interactional resources are “employed mutually and reciprocally by all participants in a particular discursive practice” (Young, 2011: 428). Along these lines, it has also been suggested that “the awarding of shared scores for interactional competence is one way of acknowledging the inherently co-constructed nature of interaction in a paired speaking test” (May, 2009: 397).

Tests of L2 IC generally aim to provide a measure of competence that can be transferred to other, non-testing contexts, along the lines of what Waring (2018: 58) refers to as “capturing and foregrounding what enables successful interaction in the real-world.” However, studies of test interaction have shown how the testing context entails domain-specific demands on talk, and, consequently, on the IC that test takers *can* display in particular test formats (cf. van Compernelle, 2011). Depending on the similarities between non-testing (target competence) contexts and the “discursive architecture of language testing practices” (Young, 2011: 440), the IC tested may be considered as transferable to, or distinctly different from, other contexts. It has also been argued that while L2 oral tests are designed for obtaining assessable output, there is no requirement to accomplish intersubjectivity in, for example, oral proficiency interviews (Seedhouse, 2013), whereas participants in everyday conversation are persistent in maintaining understanding through practices like repair (Hayashi, Raymond, & Sidnell, 2013).

Studies on L2 test interaction have examined the kinds of conduct that learners display in tests that can be said to constitute evidence of L2 IC

or IC development (Butler & Zeng, 2014; Gan, 2010; van Compernelle, 2011). Aside from examining how learners orient to the interlocutor, questions, tasks, turn-taking and mutuality (e.g., Kasper & Ross, 2007; Nakatsuhara, 2008; Okada & Greer, 2013; Sandlund & Sundqvist, 2013), a common approach is to compare scores with interaction and look for interactional features surfacing at different proficiency levels (Davis, 2009; Ducasse & Brown, 2009; Galaczi, 2014; May, 2009; Sandlund & Sundqvist, 2011).

Last, it is worth noting that while constructs and rubrics may be based on specific definitions of L2 IC, participants in situated test interaction deal with contingencies arising within particular moments. As such, studies on authentic L2 test interactions, together with the bulk of knowledge on interactional organization (e.g., Sidnell & Stivers, 2013), are well suited for contributing to test construction and the development of IC assessment criteria (cf. Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, & Olsher, 2002: 15). However, the real-life consequences for test takers—their scores—are highly dependent on how raters construe IC from scoring rubrics and how the rubrics are applied to actual learner performances. Next, we address some rater aspects of L2 IC assessment.

Assessing L2 Interaction: Rater Interpretations

Assessing broad language abilities such as oral proficiency and interaction in an L2 is no straightforward task, and raters' (or teachers') professional judgments "will inevitably be complex and involve acts of interpretation on the part of the rater, and thus be subject to disagreement" (McNamara, 1996: 117). Therefore, Ducasse and Brown (2009) argue for studies of raters' perceptions of L2 test interactions:

While it is important to understand the impact that peer-to-peer tests have on the language performance of the learners, it is also important to investigate what language experts—teachers and assessors—value while rating pairs, because it is their view of interaction which finds its reflection in the test scores.

(Ducasse & Brown, 2009: 425)

In the context of paired tests of Spanish, Ducasse and Brown (2009) asked teachers/raters to view video recordings of tests in full and record their impression of the interaction. In a second viewing, raters were asked to pause the test recording and record their own comments on particular aspects of the interaction (i.e., a think-aloud protocol). The raters' views were then coded, yielding three categories salient to the raters: non-verbal interpersonal communication (gaze and body language), interactive listening (supportive and comprehension-oriented) and interactional management (topics and turn-taking). Ducasse and Brown (2009)

recommend that their findings on what raters perceive as proficient conduct in interaction be considered in constructs for paired tests.

Ducasse and Brown's (2009) findings on the saliency of embodied action align with those of May (2009, 2011), who admits that in terms of rating scales, there would have to be agreement on what exactly constitutes effective body language, and that perhaps "this Pandora's box has remained closed for very good reasons" (May, 2011: 140). May's studies (2009, 2011) also aimed to identify features of IC salient to raters and to inform the development of IC rating scales. In May's (2009) study, it was evident that raters struggled with individual assessment of IC in asymmetric interactions, where it became difficult to "unravel the impact of the dominant candidate on her partner's opportunity to display his interactional competence" (p. 404). It was also concluded that as raters perceived many aspects of the interaction as mutual achievements, it seems "counter-intuitive" (p. 417) to rate candidates individually on these. Additionally, May (2011) observed that raters tended to compare candidates relative to each other rather than against rating scales in their assessment (cf. also Sandlund & Sundqvist, 2016).

Other studies dealing with the development of rating scales for interaction include, for example, Youn's (2015) analysis of raters' application of data-driven rating criteria on role-play assessments, and Walters's (2007) pilot study of CA-trained raters' assessment of L2 pragmatic competence, which included post-rating "hermeneutic dialogues" (p. 169) between raters, aiming to uncover their grounds for assessment and to resolve rating differences. These studies are part of construct development efforts, whereas the study presented here aims at uncovering the *interactional* accomplishment of collaborative L2 IC assessment (*moderation*; cf. Sadler, 2013), using fixed rating criteria in a high-stakes national test.

Nevertheless, the studies of raters and the rating of IC reviewed above show the value of examining not only test interaction data but also rater data in understanding IC assessment. To our knowledge, no studies of L2 IC to date have approached raters' situated cognition in rater moderation group discussions—a practice for educational assessment often recommended, but seldom researched (Jönsson & Thornberg, 2014).

Assessment Practices: Moderation and Collaboration

Research on educational assessment has repeatedly emphasized issues of rater variability as a problem for assessment equity (cf. Meadows & Billington, 2005; Wang, 2010). A remedy often brought forth is rater collaboration through collegial discussions, so-called *collaborative assessment* practices (see, e.g., Erickson, 2009; Swedish Schools Inspectorate, 2013) or *consensus moderation* (Sadler, 2013). In a review of collaborative assessment research, Jönsson and Thornberg (2014) account for reasons why teachers/raters should work together on assessment: for

increased rater consistency and equity, for increased agreement on what assessment criteria mean, for professional development purposes and for formative assessment in the classroom (pp. 390–394). Through negotiations about authentic student performances, a space for reaching a shared understanding of assessment criteria opens up (Jönsson & Thornberg, 2014: 392).

As Sadler (2013: 5) notes, for moderation to be productive, “delving below the marks to find the reasons for the differences” is key to understanding and leveling rater inconsistencies. As such, rater discussions on selected student performances may function as teacher learning communities (Wiliam, 2007) where extreme positions can be smoothed out, and where raters have to account clearly for ‘evidence’ underlying their assessment decisions (Adie, Klenowski, & Wyatt-Smith, 2012). Empirical research on rater moderation, or *collaborative assessment* (henceforth CASS) practices as a social, interactional process, is scarce. As with any type of institutional group decision-making process, we can expect that CASS interactions contain agreement and disagreement, negotiations of what to base decisions on, and the supporting of arguments with evidence (cf., e.g., Halvorsen & Sarangi, 2015). The current study is one attempt to access raters’ orientations to learner performance, displayed in such negotiations.

Data, Design and Methodology

The current study is informed by research on L2 test interaction and rater perceptions of interaction. We adopt a CA approach to rater interaction (i.e., the CASS moderation) and learners’ test interaction. The study treats IC in L2 oral tests as members’ accomplishment in rater interactions and the learner test interaction respectively, and specifically aims to uncover (a) differences in how particular social actions in test talk are oriented to by different raters and rater groups and (b) the function of these actions in the test sequence. Research questions guiding the study are:

1. In what ways do teachers participating in CASS meetings collaboratively construct IC when reporting on particular learner turns as arguments in their assessments?
2. What interactional work was accomplished by the turns reported in the original paired test interaction?
3. What can a comparison between the IC constructed by raters and an analysis of the turns in situated talk reveal about raters’ perception of competent interactional conduct in an L2 test?

The study draws upon two data sets: video-recorded interactions between groups of teachers as raters (CASS groups) assessing L2 interaction and an audio-recorded L2 speaking test featuring two learners that the teacher groups discuss. Figure 13.1 shows the study design and the data we analyze.

Figure 13.1 Study design and data

In what follows, we detail the study participants; the test of L2 oral production and interaction that the teachers are collaboratively assessing, i.e., the National English Speaking Test (NEST) in Sweden (Sundqvist, Wikström, Sandlund, & Nyroos, 2018; Swedish National Agency for Education, 2013); and the analytic procedures. As the analysis will demonstrate, IC as constructed by raters instructed to ground their decisions in given assessment criteria becomes delimited to learners' paired talk. This results in negative evaluations of learner IC with reference to the learners' interaction with the co-present *teacher* (who is an active participant in this particular test). Furthermore, the rater groups' constructions of IC are restricted by their attempts to stay close to the descriptors in the scoring rubrics, which leave room for interpretation.

Data and Participants

The principal data set consists of four video recordings of L2 English teachers doing CASS of a paired speaking test (the NEST). The teachers were attendees at a professional development day for English teachers organized by a university research center. The teachers had volunteered for a workshop on CASS of L2 speaking. All ($N = 13$) had a teacher degree in English and worked at different schools. All had been working for more than four years, except for one, who had only worked as an English teacher for six months (range 6 months–25 years, mean number of working years = 13). All were familiar with the NEST—only one teacher stated that she had *not* graded the NEST previously. Participants had not received any formal training on interaction or IC prior to the workshop, but most were familiar with the test construct. They were also provided with the NEST assessment materials, including tasks and assessment instructions.

Table 13.1 Participants in the CASS groups

CASS group	Participants (pseudonyms)	Recording length
Group 1	Brianna (BRI), May (MAY), Sarah (SAR), Terri (TER)	52 min
Group 2	Kari (KAR), Annie (ANN), Lise (LIS)	51 min
Group 3	Victoria (VIC), Alison (ALI), Katherine (KAT)	42 min
Group 4	Jessica (JES), Max (MAX), Beth (BET)	55 min

Additionally, a second data set is a test recording from the NEST featuring two learners (Fred and Henrik, year 9) and their co-present teacher (Kajsa). The audio-recorded test is part of a corpus of 71 high-stakes NESTs (see below). After presentation of the setup, the teachers (henceforth *raters*) listened to one test recording in full, while taking notes and making initial assessments individually (cf. May, 2011). Raters were then divided into four groups, combined so that they consisted of teachers from different schools, and each group was assigned a separate room. The NEST recording was made available via a web link so that the groups, if they wanted, could choose to re-listen to parts of the recording together on a smartphone. CASS meetings were video-recorded in their entirety. Meetings ranged between 42 and 55 minutes (see Table 13.1), and the researchers were not present.

The NEST in Sweden

The authority responsible for national tests is the Swedish National Agency for Education. The national test of English is a mandatory proficiency test taken in year 9 of compulsory school (ages 15–16). The test consists of three parts: part A tests speaking, part B tests receptive skills (listening and reading comprehension), and part C tests writing. The learners’ English teacher is responsible for preparing, administering and assessing performance on all three parts. Using teachers as examiners for high-stakes standardized tests (rather than external examiners) has a long tradition in Sweden (Erickson & Börjesson, 2001). Consequently, the governing authority puts great faith in teachers’ professionalism; however, the setup can be a challenge in terms of achieving standardization and equity (Sundqvist et al., 2018; Swedish Schools Inspectorate, 2013).

In preparation for the national test, teachers receive an instruction booklet that includes information about all three test parts. For part A (the NEST), instructions encompass details on grading, and there is an accompanying CD with sample recordings of test-taker performances corresponding to different grades, also described in the booklet with reference to criteria. Thus, the sample performances serve as benchmarks (National Assessment Project, 2015). The instructions stipulate that the examining teacher should remain in the background of the test takers’

conversation, but they are allowed to help out should the learners run into difficulties (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2013).

NEST tasks are designed for interaction in pairs or small groups. The test begins with a warmup task where students take turns producing descriptive talk on a topic (e.g., their home environment or a picture prompt), followed by more advanced tasks aiming to generate peer interaction using *topic cards*. Each topic card lists either a statement with instructions (e.g., “*Money makes people happy. Agree? Disagree? Explain why and give examples.*”) or a question (e.g., “*What can you do to protect the environment? Discuss your own opinions about this question and also what other opinions there are.*”). Learners then take turns drawing topic cards and initiating talk on each topic. For the test in the present study, there is a secrecy bond until 2020, which means that no exact formulations of tasks in the test recording may be revealed.

The test construct targets learners’ “oral production and interaction” (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2013: 28). Teachers are instructed to award each performance a holistic grade from A to F, based on a number of assessment descriptors. In the booklet, there are two main headings, “Content” and “Language and expression” (referred to as “Assessment factors”), and under each, more specific assessment descriptors are listed (see Figure 13.2) (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2013; translated from Swedish).

Content

- Comprehensibility and clarity
- Richness and variation (different examples and perspectives)
- Context and structure
- Adaptation to purpose, recipient, and situation

Language and expression

- Communicative strategies
 - To develop and carry the conversation forward
 - To solve language problems by e.g. reformulations, explanations, and clarifications
- Fluency and ease
- Breadth, variation, clarity and confidence
 - Vocabulary, phraseology, idiomaticity
 - Pronunciation and intonation
 - Grammatical structures
- Adaptation to purpose, recipient, and situation

Figure 13.2 NEST assessment descriptors

To assist teachers in NEST assessment, the booklet also contains extracts from the current curriculum for English. The descriptors denote what is required for goal attainment for the grades E, C and A in English at the end of year 9 (encompassing all aspects of English proficiency, not only speaking). Grade D is awarded if all criteria for grade E plus most (but not all) for grade C are attained. Similarly, grade B is awarded if all criteria for grade C plus most (but not all) for grade A are attained. Grade F is assigned when passing criteria are not met. When teachers have decided on a grade, they record the grade by ticking a box (Figure 13.3). As indicated by the dotted lines, grades F through C can be either ‘minus’ or ‘plus,’ whereas no such evaluative distinction is made for grades B and A. In other words, although a 6-grade scale for *grades* is employed, the actual scoring of NEST is made on a 10-grade scale.

The grading criteria are largely aligned with the descriptors of the communicative abilities described in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001). A passing grade in English in year 9 corresponds to level B1.1 (‘Independent user’) in CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001: 34). However, a majority of learners in Sweden receive higher final grades in English. National statistics from 2016 regarding NEST reveal that 22.4% of the whole student population scored an ‘A’ and very few failed, only 3.6% (www.skolverket.se/statistik-och-utvardering). In the 2011 European Survey on Language Competence, encompassing 53,000 students from 14 countries tested on comprehension, Swedish ninth-grade students scored the highest in English. A great majority were at level B2, and some even at level C1 (‘Proficient users’ in CEFR) (www.survey-lang.org). In other words, L2 English oral proficiency is generally high among Swedish youth.

Part A- Focus: Speaking					
F	E	D	C	B	A
<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>

Figure 13.3 Assessment of NEST grades (teachers tick one box)

CASS Workshop Design: Selecting a Test Recording

The test recording was collected as part of a project on interaction in L2 tests, funded by the Swedish Research Council (reg. no 2012–4129). The corpus was collected in 2014 at four schools, with 161 learners in a total of 71 audio-recorded tests. All test takers had been assessed by their own teacher (also a participant in the recordings) and two external raters (based on recordings). Interrater reliability between the three raters was high ($r_s = .787^{**}, .836^{**}, .872^{**}$, Cronbach's alpha = .942).

In order to select a test for the CASS workshops, data were scanned for learners who had been given grades that differed by *at least two grade steps* by *at least two of the three raters*. The rating discrepancies indicated to us that these performances were perceived differently by the original raters, and these discrepancies were hypothesized to promote rater moderation (cf. Sadler, 2013) and negotiation (cf. Falk & Ort, 1998). Application of the grade variation criteria to the corpus yielded a subcorpus of 31 test takers in 23 NEST recordings (see Table 13.2).

Most of the diverging grades (42%) were found in the C to A continuum. Diverging assessments were found in equal amounts in clusters D–B and E–C (26%). Findings reported by Millet (2018) suggest that it is easier for raters to assign higher grades than intermediate grades. A hypothesis, then, was that performances at the extremes of the continuum (such as F, E and A) would be easier for teachers to agree upon. Furthermore, since the curriculum descriptors included descriptive texts only for the grades A, C and E, it was hypothesized that CASS discussions would possibly be richer if based on a cluster ‘in between’ the curriculum descriptors. Together, these assumptions motivated a focus on the D–B cluster.

Having weighed concerns such as recording quality, one recording was selected, featuring two male learners, Henrik and Fred (duration: 21 minutes and 13 seconds). Their teacher, Kajsa, was present, and as it turned

Table 13.2 Grade variation in the subcorpus

Grade difference	Test takers (N)	%
F–D	1	3
E–C	8	26
D–A	1	3
D–B	8	26
C–A	13	42
Total	31	100

out, she was often an active participant in the test interaction. In order to ensure participants' anonymity, the recording was anonymized using slight pitch editing, and bleeping was added when names and places were mentioned. The CASS raters had no demographic knowledge of the students, and only had access to the anonymized recording. In authentic NEST assessment, the grading teacher also has access to students' visual orientations and embodied action, which can be a limitation in assessing the learners for the CASS raters (cf. May, 2009). However, as CASS is usually done with audio recordings only, we consider this limitation acceptable for the purpose of this study.

The test used had a grade divergence for both learners, where one fit the criteria of a difference of *at least two grade steps by at least two of the three raters*. The grades assigned in the original data set by Kajsa and two external raters are presented in Table 13.3. As shown, the greatest difference lies between Kajsa and rater 2 on Fred's performance.

Table 13.3 Teacher and external rater grades for focal recording

<i>Rater</i>	<i>Henrik's grade</i>	<i>Fred's grade</i>
Teacher	B	B
External rater 1	C+	C+
External rater 2	C−	D+

CASS Group Assessments

The full recording was played, and all raters were instructed to take notes on an assessment form, including assigning a tentative grade to each of the two learners. Subsequently, raters, divided into groups, were instructed to discuss the learner performances and reach consensus on grades. All groups handed in a joint rater protocol with a written motivation for their decisions. As expected, the CASS groups also assigned varying grades (Table 13.4).

Table 13.4 CASS groups and assigned grades

[illegible]

It is worth noting how all groups ended up with consensus grades of C or D for both students, while the initial, individually assigned grades varied greatly. Thus, it can be assumed that CASS negotiations of raters' perceptions of the learner performances had taken place.

Analytic Focus

The study aims to uncover how CASS raters collaboratively display their understanding of IC. This is accomplished by (1) examining raters' overall views on interaction in the test recording, and by (2) specifically focusing on sequences where raters report on particular student contributions in qualifying their assessments in relation to scoring rubrics. Thus, Step 2 focuses on RS in rater interaction, such as in Example 1. Here, raters of CASS Group 1 (Brianna, May, Sarah and Terri) are discussing an instance where the learners were discussing the moral dilemma of finding out that a friend was involved with drugs. The learner sequence in question is briefly recapitulated by May (line 333) until shared understanding is displayed by co-participants:

Example 1: Speech report [File_CASS Group 1_333–337]

333	MAY	e:h säga prata med kompisar [om] droger E:h say talk to friends [about] drugs
334	BRI	[precis] [exactly]
335	TER	mm:
336	BRI	mm:
337	MAY	→ you can at least try
338	SAR	m:
339	MAY	tyckte Henrik då thought Henrik then

In line 337, then, May launches a turn (“you can at least try”) produced in English, indicating that it is reporting what Henrik had said in the test recording. The turn is also positioned as RS in line 339 with the verb *thought*, which here functions as a verb of speaking (cf. Sandlund, 2014). In Example 1, the RS has an illustrative function, displaying May’s perception of something specific in the recording worthy of

bringing into the assessment discussion. Turns like this have guided our data search.

Research on RS in interaction (e.g., Drew, 1998; Goffman, 1974) has shown that people report on talk for a variety of interactional purposes, such as making jokes, assessments and complaints (Clift & Holt, 2007). We find reports of talk to be of particular interest when comparing the rater interactions with the learners' test interaction. In the rater talk, RS represents the gap between situated interaction (i.e., original turns produced as part of 'doing test interaction') and the recontextualization of such turns in an interaction where they may serve as qualifications for assessment. In contrast to raters' general discussion of learners' IC, RS instances do the work of re-opening the test interaction for joint scrutiny. While RS turns are always 'inauthentic' in relation to the original, situated talk reported (cf. Clift & Holt, 2007), the reports in our data become part of negotiation sequences, and thereby built into the local assessment machinery as well as into the wider context of teachers' professional judgment (cf. Allal, 2013). RS of test takers' talk brought forth as evidence in negotiating a particular assessment of learners' displayed IC, and thus raters' treatment of test-taker actions, may be a rich source for understanding IC assessment.

After rater protocols and overall evaluations displayed in rater discussions were examined (Step 1), CASS recordings were marked for all instances in which the raters reported on test takers' turns.² The reported-on talk was then located in the learners' test talk, yielding a collection of RS in rater interaction along with the corresponding learner sequences. The sequences were analyzed sequentially in order to establish the work accomplished by RS on learner talk in the rater talk (Step 2). The next step was to examine the students' interaction in the sequences reported on (Step 3). For the purpose of this chapter, one instance in the students' talk that surfaced in all four rater groups was selected for presentation.

Transcription

Audio and video data were transcribed according to CA conventions (Hepburn & Bolden, 2013; see the appendix to this volume). Embodied conduct in video recordings is included in transcripts in the form of still images and on separate lines below the transcription of talk. The plus sign, +, marks the onset and termination of embodied action in relation to vocal/verbal actions. Double parentheses indicate the transcriptionist's scenic descriptions not captured in symbols or images. A parenthesis with three periods (. . .) at the beginning or end of a transcript indicates that immediately prior or subsequent parts of an ongoing (lengthy) turn have been omitted.

IC as Constructed by Raters

Before examining the RS turns, we situate our analysis in the raters' views on the test interaction as a whole. Thus, our first analytic presentation examines data from the written rater protocols and one excerpt from CASS Group 3.

"No Interaction": CASS Reflections on the Test as a Whole

The Rater Group Protocols

First, it should be mentioned that all four rater groups commented on the lack of interaction between Henrik and Fred throughout. In group rater protocols,³ Group 1 had noted "no interaction" as a minus for both learners. Group 2 wrote "weak interaction" about Henrik's performance, and "no use of strategies, question-answer, used Swedish a few times" about Fred. Group 3 noted that Henrik displayed strategies to overcome interactional problems, but that Fred showed "an unwillingness to take initiative and carry the conversation forward." Group 4 wrote that the teacher should have steered the test interaction so that "the students *interact*—talk to each other." Consequently, the rater groups were in agreement about the insufficient degree of interaction between the learners, something we will return to via Excerpt 1 below.

"It's Not a Conversation Between Them": Interaction in Group 3

The rater groups deal extensively with the lack of interaction indicated in the written protocols, as illustrated in Excerpt 1 (Group 3). Prior to line 582, the raters have been re-listening to parts of the recording and commenting on how the learners seem unwilling to communicate with each other, and how the teacher had to repeatedly prompt them. Here, a formulation from the assessment materials, i.e., the ability to develop and carry the conversation forward, is discussed in relation to what the learners display. As we enter, Victoria has made it known that while she accepts that one test taker is weaker than the other, he also displays "good things" in parts of the test (line 583). Katherine does not affiliate with Victoria, but instead refutes the assessment by claiming that Fred does not "do anything on his own," constructing the displayed ability to take 'independent initiative' as central to a positive assessment of *communicative strategies* (line 584). After Victoria has acknowledged agreement to this claim, Katherine elaborates by referring to the scoring rubrics (lines 589–590) in supporting her claim about initiative.

Excerpt 1: "On his own initiative" [CASS3_00001_07.00 - 07.23]

- 582 VIC (...) att han som ä <↑svag> säger ju¹
the one who is <↑weak> do still say
- 583 ju ändå ↑bra grejer i↑bland
↑good things on ↑occasion
- 584 KAT ja men han (0.3) han gör ju inget på egen hand
yes but he (0.3) he doesn't do anything on his own
- 585 VIC eget bevå: g nej
on his own initiative no
- 586 KAT ne: j.=
No: .
- 587 (0.3)
- 588 VIC =nej.
no.
- 589 KAT inget på eget- (0.3) och det är ju ett utav
nothing on his- (0.3) and that's ju one of the
PRT
- 590 kriterierna +här att du t ar [<initia↑tiv>
+lifts up booklet))
criteria here that you take the [<initiative>

- 591 VIC [att man interagerar ja
[that you interact yeah

- 592 KAT och att du för sam[talet] <vi:dare↑>
and that you carry the con[versation] forward;
- 593 ALI [m:]
- 594 ALI m:
- 595 (0.8)
- 596 KAT .hh nu tar ju inte den andra heller #e::#
.hh now the other one doesn't either #e::#
- 597 han interagerar ju inte heller
he doesn't interact either
- 598 VIC ne:j dom <saknar> de
No: they <lack> that
- 599 (0.6)
- 600 KAT dom pr- (.) +dom (0.2) det är inget samtal
they pr- (.) +they (0.2) it's not a conversation
+gaze turns to VIC
- 601 (0.4)
- 602 mellan dom?
between them?
- 603 VIC ne:ej+
No:o +
+shakes head twice
- 604 KAT utan det är ett samtal mellan,
instead it's a conversation between,
- 605 (0.2)
- 606 VER det blir som [en inter|vju::]på nå vis
it's like [an interview] in a way
- 607 KAT [m e d läraren]
[with the teacher]
- 608 KAT de blir som en +intervju:.
it's like an +interview.
+lifts up hands
- 609 VER ja:
Ye:ah

Interestingly, *taking the initiative* and *carrying the conversation forward* are not listed in the booklet (Figure 13.2). Instead, they are mentioned on a separate sheet of paper accompanying the topic cards for part A. We cannot determine from the video whether Katherine points to the booklet or the task package, but, regardless, she is orienting to the test materials as evidence for why *taking the initiative* is central to the construct, thus a valid claim on her part. Victoria signals agreement with Katherine's account by making public a connection between Katherine's claim of initiative and her own formulation "that you interact yeah" (line 591). By completing Katherine's turn in overlap, Victoria is co-constructing the claim that *initiative* is relevant to the interaction construct, and she also adds the second aspect from the card package: "that you carry the conversation forward"—something clearly treated as not displayed by Fred. Katherine remarks that these features apply to Henrik as well (line 597), to which Victoria makes reference to a lack of something, presumably referring to the learners' displayed IC in the test as a whole (line 598). Katherine produces an upshot of prior talk (600) with the formulation "it's not a *conversation* (0.4) between them" and "instead it's a conversation between." Victoria completes her turn with a formulation: "it's like an interview in a way," after which Katherine continues her turn ("with the teacher") and recycles Victoria's proposed description with falling, 'closing' intonation (line 608).

In Excerpt 1, the raters collaboratively connect the assessment descriptors *take the initiative* and *carry the conversation forward* to the lack of these features in learner interaction. They also display that they partially ground this evaluation in observations of how the teacher had to intervene repeatedly, resulting in an interview format rather than a paired interaction. While raters display dissatisfaction with the students' displayed IC, they are also working in a stepwise fashion towards a shared understanding of features of the interaction and the assessment task, and they display orientation to the assessment descriptors in establishing a joint evaluation. However, what we do *not* see here is the raters linking particular learner actions to IC assessment. In pursuit of such evidence, we next present two selected sequences in which rater groups report on a particular action produced by Fred.

"My Mom": Raters' Reports of Talk as Evidence For/Against IC

First, we note that Fred's action, on which the CASS groups report in Excerpts 2–3 below, was topicalized in all four rater groups. For the sake of presentation, we selected reports produced in two of the rater groups. We first examine how Group 4 (Jessica, Max and Beth) orients to a particular turn in a RS format. Then, we analyze how Group 2 (Kari, Annie and Lise) topicalize the same action in their talk.

“So Says My Mom”: RS in CASS Group 4

We begin with a sequence that occurs late in the rater meeting where the raters are to make a joint decision on test grades. The raters have decided to go over the criteria one by one and sum up their impressions about the learners in relation to each criterion. Prior to Excerpt 2, Max has commented on the students’ interaction, stating that the teacher in the recording perhaps should have steered the students more towards peer-to-peer interaction. Jessica, subsequently, has pointed to the topic cards, which all include the formulation *Discuss with your friend*, indicating to her that the learners know what is expected. In line 1739, Beth sums up the gist of their perception of the students’ task management in the form of a polar question:

Excerpt 2: “So says my mom” [CASS Group 4_File_AA000210_03.40–03.56]

- 1739 BET så att egentligen [a s s å diskuterar] dom=
so really [I mean do they discuss]=
- 1740 MAX [men det glöms bort]
[but it's forgotten]
- 1741 BET =↑nå'n (.) uppgift med var~~ann~~?
=any (.) task topic with each other?
- 1742 (0.6)
- 1743 MAX .hhHHH vid nåt tillfälle har jag för mig
.hhHHH at some point I recall
- 1744 att dom [g i c k i n?]
that they [w e n t i n?]
- 1745 BET [>ja dom kommenterar] kanske<=
[>yeah they comment] maybe<=
- 1746 MAX =ja::?=
=Ye:ah?=-
- 1747 BET =A: så säger mamma [min mamma=
=A: so says mom [my mom =

1748	MAX	[ja:? [ye:s?
1749	BET →	=tycker [också så +eller nå' =thinks [also so +or somethin' +lowers hands
1750	MAX	[ja <preci:s> [yeah <exactly>
1751	JES	ja::, ((nods three times)) Yea::,
1752	BET	[de var] [it was]
1753	MAX	[m:::] [m:::]
1754	BET	de här me dataspelande this with computer gaming
1755	MAX	ja <preci:s.> yeah <exactly.>
1756	JES	*m.*
1757		(1.4)
1758	MAX	m.
1759		(1.9)

Beth's turn (lines 1739, 1741) with an interrogative syntax ("do they discuss *any* (.) task topic with each other"; cf. Hayano, 2013: 396) has a built-in preference for an agreeing 'no' response, as it appears to assume that the number of task topics where learners actually talk to each other is very low. This is visible also in Beth's emphasis on "any," and the sequential placement of the turn after preceding talk about the students' insufficient paired interaction (Max's overlapping turn at line 1740 is actually a response to prior talk on whether the learners are following the instructions by discussing with each other). There is a 0.6-second gap, and together with Max's turn-initial in-breath, his response to Beth has the shape of a dispreferred turn. Thus, Max does not affiliate with Beth, but instead accounts for his recollection of one particular instance in the test where the students did, in fact, interact in a way that agrees with the group's understanding of the assessment criteria for *interaction*. He does

not specify the recalled instance, and as he drops out of the overlap with Beth's turn (line 1745), he only partly reveals that whatever the learners did ("that they went in?") counters Beth's extreme case formulation (cf. Edwards, 2000).

Beth's response shows that she understands Max's somewhat vague reference as being when "they comment maybe," and she proceeds to exemplify such conduct (lines 1747, 1749). The enactment of talk begins with "A: so says mom," accompanied by embodied action: Beth moves both hands to her right as she produces "mom." She then immediately produces a second speech report: "my mom thinks also so," which is accompanied by a mirroring of the first gesture, but this time to her left at the production of "my mom." The emphasis on the first "mom" and on the "my" in the second part creates a contrast, and together with her hand movements, Beth displays that she is in fact enacting both Fred and Henrik, but without specifically indicating which speaker is referenced in the separate enactments. Her report-final "or somethin'" indicates the possible inaccuracy of the enactments and makes it hearable as a non-verbatim example of an occasion when the learners did talk to each other. Max emphatically agrees (line 1750), and Jessica produces minimal acknowledgment (line 1751, while nodding), after which Beth offers further claims establishing agreement on the instance in question (line 1754, "computer gaming").

In all four CASS groups, the raters frequently evaluate displayed IC in general terms, without reference to particular contributions. What is particularly interesting in the cases where the raters *do* refer to particular turns is that a comparative analysis of IC as conceptualized by raters and the interactional work accomplished by the same turns in the situated test interaction becomes possible. As in Excerpt 1, we noted that raters in Excerpt 2 collaboratively questioned the degree of paired interaction between Fred and Henrik. However, in Excerpt 2, the RS turn is offered as a contrasting example of when the learners *did display* IC. When the speech report is made available, Max and Jessica can re-inspect it, and allow for it to pass as a representative example of IC. As such, the RS works as an understanding check, but also as a device in the social process of moderation (Jönsson & Thornberg, 2014; Sadler, 2013) where raters can probe their own and others' interpretation of what is to be assessed and reach a shared understanding of scoring rubrics.

"A Little Spontaneously": RS in CASS Group 2

In Excerpt 3, the same focal turn becomes topicalized. Again, the RS turn is located after the raters have discussed the lack of interactional initiative from the learners, and from Fred in particular. In a similar

- 1150 KAR eller va han sa
or what it was he said
- 1151 LIS .hhja
.hhyeh
- 1152 (0.9)
- 1153 KAR ock då vart de lit- då kom <han>
an' then it became a little- then came <he>
- 1154 (0.4)
- 1155 då ly:ste han lite [där å]
then he was shi:ning a little [there an']
- 1156 ANN [ja]
- 1157 LIS [ja]
- 1158 KAR sa någonting som inte va:, (0.7) >han han
said something that wasn't wa:s, (0.7) >he he
- 1159 KAR + knocks pen to temple twice
- 1160 KAR [kom på det hä:r]
[came up with thi:s]

- 1161 ANN [han tänkte {själv} [ja:?
[he thought for himself [ye:s?]

Following Lise's comment, which is mitigated in line 1141 ("but not"), Kari picks up on the part of the test where Fred was more active, and through lines 1143–1145, she proposes a candidate identification of such a sequence, while also displaying some uncertainty as to whether it was actually Fred who "↑said that." Prior to line

1139, the group members have been attempting to determine whether it was Henrik who mentioned the singer Marilyn Manson and Fred who mentioned his mother, but only in such unspecific terms, so Kari is probably referring back to the general talk about “mom” or “Marilyn Manson.” This is treated as unproblematic by the co-participants, and Kari assesses the hitherto unknown turn as produced “somewhat spont↑a:neously.” In line 1148, the turn referred to is enacted: “not if you ask my:. hh mother” with the exactness of the report mitigated in line 1150. Thus, the RS makes the original turn available for recognition by co-participants.

Lise provides acknowledgment, treating Kari’s report as still incomplete. As Kari’s RS was produced in service of obtaining a shared understanding of which sequence they are currently discussing, an assessment of the report in connection with its identification may be expected. Kari does indeed elaborate on the representativeness of the reported turn with a positive assessment of Fred’s local performance (“then he was shi:ning a little there,” line 1153). She then accounts for the assessment: “said something that wasn’t wa:s, (0.7) >he he,” and appears to be searching for an appropriate description of the reported turn. Her search becomes fully available in line 1159 when she pauses and knocks her pen to her temple. Annie, in overlap with Kari’s trouble resolution, offers an upshot of Fred’s conduct: “he thought for him↑self ye:s?” (line 1161).

In Excerpt 3, the RS turn is first launched as part of a problem-solving sequence aiming to determine with certainty the respective contributions of Henrik and Fred in a part of the test where the raters felt there was more interaction. Kari uses the RS as support for her viewpoint that Fred displayed something distinctive in this sequence, namely, spontaneity. This is collaboratively built into several assessment-relevant turns (*shining, thought for himself, he came up with*), which all imply that taking the initiative to initiate topic elaborations is indicative of IC. The rater interaction thus reveals a view of the types of contributions that are valued for the construct ‘interaction,’ but also makes it clear that the occasion was uncharacteristic of Fred’s overall performance.

Having examined the CASS sequences where raters draw on RS as part of their assessment negotiations, we now turn to the learner interaction sequence in question and examine the sequential environment for the production of the “mom” turn.

“You Haven’t Met My Mom”: Interactional Work in the Test Recording

As we enter the test interaction containing the “mom” contribution, Henrik has initiated talk on a new topic card with a statement to be agreed or disagreed with. We are not at liberty to reveal the exact formulation,

but the topic involves video-gaming. The card statement is formulated as an opinion, and test takers are instructed to agree/disagree with whether people worry excessively about teens' gaming habits, and account for why.

As we begin, Henrik introduces an old media debate concerning a murder case in the United States in which blame for the crime had been attributed to the perpetrator's love for video games and for the rock singer Marilyn Manson (lines 123–131). He displays disagreement with such views on video games (line 133). In line 136, Henrik supports his view by referring to how “many people” play video games (line 138), presumably referring to the fact that not all gamers commit violent crimes as a result. Henrik closes his topical talk in line 139 by referring back to the topic card statement, i.e., whether people worry too much about the issue, to which he displays disagreement:

Excerpt 4:1: “You haven’t met my mom” [TT2014_File_32111231_08.02–09.55]

123 HEN if its- we jzt had an example when
 124 (therewz) a kid that wz playing like (0.5)
 125 Marilyn Manson and CO:D
 126 (0.2)
 127 and he got- (.) he killed somebody and
 128 >theywr like< †O:H it's only because he
 129 listened to Marilyn Manson n: (0.8) .hh
 130 ((thudding sound))
 131 and played violent ge- >video games °an'°
 132 (1.3)
 133 don't th[ink THAT's THE †CA::SE=
 134 TEA =((coughs))
 135 (0.3)
 136 HEN cuz there's there are many people playin'
 137 (1.3)
 138 >°videogames bud°< I: don't think
 139 they caring s: so much about it s: really
 140 .hh
 141 (2.1)
 142 TEA Do you agr†ee (.) Fred
 143 (0.6)
 144 that people care too much? .HHH

145 (1.0)
 146 FRE ye:h.
 147 (0.4)
 148 TEA yeah?
 149 (1.2)
 150 FRE If you <do:n't agree> (.) hhh
 151 → you haven't met my mom.
 152 TEA HHHh >heh heh °heh°
 153 FRE She: is
 154 (0.7)
 155 TEA ((loud coughing))
 156 FRE #e: a ao:#
 157 (0.8)
 158 TEA .pt sh'thinksh you play too ↑much?
 159 (1.3)
 160 FRE Ye::h .hhh=
 161 TEA =Mnhmm?
 162 TEA Do you thi[nk (.) you play too much?
 163 FRE [°o(hh):r, °
 164 (2.7)
 165 FRE #nn::# #a:h#
 166 (1.4)
 167 not nowadays (0.3) but (.) I >↑did
 168 TEA Mnhmm?

In line 142, the teacher allocates the next turn to Fred, using a yes/no interrogative pinpointing the task instructions (i.e., agreement). Here, the teacher's intervention tells us that she is expecting Fred to continue, and when no response is forthcoming (line 141), she makes Fred accountable for a next action. In line 144, perhaps prompted by the 0.6-second silence, she clarifies for Fred what he is expected to agree on. In this particular turn, Kajsa narrows down the types of responses expected from Fred by asking for agreement with the *topic card* rather than with Henrik's turns. Consequently, Kajsa's turn here temporarily steers learners away from the paired format. Fred's agreeing response ("ye:h") is not immediately forthcoming but produced after another noticeable silence (line 145). The response, albeit minimal, is structurally aligned with the yes/no question posed, but the teacher repeats the agreement token with a rising intonation, indicating that she treats the response as incomplete. A silence follows, but Fred appears to read Kajsa's turn as a pursuit of an account,

and the focal turn for the present analysis is produced in lines 150–151: “If you <do:n’t agree> (.) hhh you haven’t met my mom.” Fred’s turn functions as an account for his agreement but has the design of a negated conditional statement. Consequently, Fred’s turn not only addresses the card instructions, but also specifies the conditions for a possible disagreeing response—it would be impossible to disagree with the fact that people worry too much about teens and gaming if you knew Fred’s mother.

Our audio-only access restricts a full analysis of Fred’s turn (i.e., there may be non-vocal invitations to laughter), but Fred thus makes a rather sophisticated joke on the basis of the topic card instructions, which attends both to the teacher’s expectation of an account and to the topic card statement. This indeed occasions laughter from Kajsa, and between lines 153 and 157 Fred appears to be initiating accounts for his mom’s role in agreeing with the card, albeit with some trouble. Picking up on the displayed trouble, the teacher offers a candidate understanding (line 158): “. pt sh’tthinksh you play too ↑much?.” There is some delay (line 159) before Fred’s agreeing response, and the teacher produces additional prompts (lines 161–162) as Fred’s responses still indicate trouble in producing anything beyond agreement (line 160, silences in lines 159 and 164). Fred cuts off something and drops out of the overlap (line 163). As Kajsa completes her question turn (line 162), there is now a new context for Fred to respond to: whether Fred himself thinks that he plays “too much.” Fred’s drawn-out disagreeing response in 165 may reflect a space for processing the new question and preparing a response, or just a ‘thinking space’ for deciding on his opinion. A response is offered (line 167)—he does not play excessively nowadays but used to. Kajsa offers acknowledgment with a rising intonation, treating Fred’s account as still unsatisfactory.

After a lengthy silence, Fred continues with an upshot: his mother is still “all over” him about gaming (line 172), as shown in Excerpt 4:2:

Excerpt 4:2: “You haven’t met my mom” [TT2014_File_32111231_08.02–09.55]

169	(2.1)
170 FRE	But she’s ↑ <u>STILL</u> hhh
171	(1.8)
172	is: (0.7) all over me
173 TEA	>huh huh< .HHH (.) do you think e:hm
174	(0.6)
175 HEN	>ye:ah if-<
176 TEA	why: do you think she’s
177	(2.2)
178 FRE	#°Hhhmm°#
179 TEA	she’s talking with you about those things
180	all the time

181 FRE She's talking about (0.7)h- how it
 182 affects me
 183 .hhh all the time.
 184 (0.6)
 185 TEA Mmhmm?
 186 (2.2)
 187 FRE Sure I:? can't feel it but (1.5) I'm a
 188 hundred percent su:re (.) that it affects
 189 me n- in †some ways,
 190 TEA Mmhmm?
 191 (0.6)
 192 FRE buddit haven't- (0.4) hasn't have to be a
 193 †bad way.
 194 TEA Mmhmm?

As we can see, Kajsa produces a new question (initiated in line 173 and restarted in line 176) with a notable silence before its completion in line 179. The *why* question is shaped for an answer in the form of an account for Fred's mother's concern, and Fred aligns with this preference in his response (lines 181–183), where he reveals that his mother talks about how gaming “affects” him “all the time.” Kajsa's continued receipt with rising intonation (185) results in an assessment of his mother's stance, where he acknowledges likely effects that are not necessarily negative (lines 187–189, 192–193). The exchange continues for another 16 lines (omitted here) until Henrik, in lines 211–212, joins in with a view revised from what he had expressed at the beginning, namely, that he agrees that mothers worry too much, but not the “rest of the world” (lines 215–216):

Excerpt 4:2: “You haven't met my mom” [TT2014_File_3211 1231_08.02–09.55]

((16 lines omitted))
 211 HEN yeah if we are going to talk about the
 212 → MO:MS, the Hhh
 213 TEA °Hhhh°
 214 HEN then a:h the- (.) they care too much but
 215 (0.4) I don't think (.) the †rest of
 216 the world,

Henrik thus shows that he has been monitoring his co-participants' talk closely. Thereby, he is able to make a contribution that reaches back to his own prior talk and to fit his new turn into the interactional trajectory that has transpired between Fred and Kajsa.

The "mom" turn, then, is produced as an account for *agreeing* with the topic statement for which Henrik had reported a *disagreeing* stance. It also brings something new to the ongoing interaction in the sense that it is brief enough to warrant more probing or elaboration, but still attends to the request for additional accounting implicit in Kajsa's "yeah?" response (line 148). Furthermore, it also displays disagreement with Henrik's stance on the card statement, facilitated by the fact that Fred does not address Henrik, but rather Kajsa's question, and he also attributes his disagreement to a third party: his mom. The trajectory that follows shows Fred producing additional talk on the topic when prompted by Kajsa, and while he does tailor his responses in structural alignment with the questions, he also displays an understanding of the ongoing interaction as a matter of awaiting prompts and aligning with them, rather than producing more independent topical contributions. Fred thus is orienting to local contingencies (the local establishment of an interview format) in an interactionally competent way, but perhaps not as much to the communicative event as a peer-to-peer interaction where he is assessed on how he orients to his co-test taker (cf. Sandlund & Sundqvist, 2011). Proficiency-wise, Fred's more extended turns show competent use of L2 vocabulary and turn design, and Henrik, who has appeared to treat the latter part of the sequence as being between Fred and Kajsa, displays a close monitoring of their interaction, which results in a well-fitted revision of his earlier claim. Henrik's silence mid-sequence also shows that the test takers treat NEST interaction as a matter of talking one at a time and awaiting completion of their peer's topical talk before turn transitions (cf. Sandlund & Sundqvist, 2013).

Discussion

Participants in the rater and learner interactions, respectively, are faced with different challenges: producing versus identifying ratable samples of IC, where learners can only hope that what they collaboratively construct in the test is also salient to raters as IC. For test developers, equally, tasks and rating scales need to be concise enough to generate the kinds of interaction and rater interpretations that the construct aims to capture. Add to the mix the difficulty in discerning IC as a human, social competence, and as L2-relevant IC (cf. Pekarek Doehler, 2018), and the challenge for learners of sticking to instructions while producing L2 discourse that resembles everyday interaction between peers. The present study has touched on some of these challenges; thus, we now return to review our research questions.

As for research question 1, which aimed at uncovering the ways in which CASS raters collaboratively construct IC when reporting on learner turns in their assessments, our analysis shows raters struggling to apply fixed assessment criteria to learner conduct. We also see how raters work jointly to support their initial, intuitive evaluations of the learners' IC with general as well as specific accounts of test conduct. In the rater sequences examined, we see that an overall negative assessment of the learners' IC is also countered by the joint identification of particular moments that cast learners' IC in a more positive light. The RS turns examined in both rater groups pertain to the same sequence in learners' talk that, given it was topicalized in all four groups, was salient to the raters as a sequence where IC was displayed. In Group 1, whose RS of "mom" was not presented here, one participant assesses the "mom" sequence in the following way: "that was really charming," which speaks to the difficulty in scoring IC strictly based on pre-set scoring definitions of what is successful L2 conduct.

Teachers in the workshop draw on the reported turns in supporting or challenging co-constructed views of the learners' IC. Not surprisingly, the talk reported is presented very differently in the rater groups. We saw that in Group 4 (Excerpt 2), Beth enacts a dialogue between Henrik and Fred that has little resemblance to the original interaction as it was only Fred who talked about his mother. The group's interaction reveals that the paired format is central to their assessment, and that the learners do not display enough paired talk to count as displaying IC with reference to the instructions to test takers. However, the RS turn is used as a representative example of temporary displays of IC in which the learners engaged in topic elaboration with each other. In Group 2 (Excerpt 3), Kari makes evident that the RS is not true to the original, but instead reports the gist of Fred's action and how that action symbolized competence in the form of spontaneity and an unprompted topical contribution. As such, the reports are deployed not in the service of reproducing the original, but for the purpose of either jointly identifying a sequence where IC was (or, in other cases, was not) displayed or offering examples of temporary displays of IC for the other participants to inspect and evaluate in making a joint grading decision. The RS thus serves as a focal example of what raters had wished to see across the interaction in order to award a higher grade. The RS turns thus provide an insight into raters' situated cognition regarding the application of assessment factors for the test.

As for research question 2—the interactional work accomplished by learners in the sequence reported on by raters—we concluded that the teacher in this test was an active participant, and thus implicated in the trajectory that develops. It is safe to assume that this teacher wanted to

help the learners by prompting more topical discussion (cf. Sandlund & Sundqvist, 2013). Unsurprisingly, however, the outcome resembles an interview format rather than a paired interaction, which may lead the learners to anticipate topical prompts from the teacher in ongoing talk. The “mom” turn in the learner talk is produced in a slot where the teacher’s continuers had indicated that an elaboration was expected, and Fred indeed produces a turn that is not specifically an agreeing/disagreeing response but an independent angle on the topic, which had the double function of orienting to the card statement and offering an account for his agreement. The teacher probes Fred’s new angle with a series of questions, to which Fred responds fluently and competently, but the interview format that develops is treated by the rater groups as negative in terms of IC.

As for research question 3, pertaining to the gains of comparing the RS turn with its original production, we see that for the raters the importance of adhering to the paired format overrides the learners’ displays of competence in interacting with the teacher, even though both learners display that they can flexibly adapt to the contingencies of the moment and that they can “use the context-free interactional organizations . . . in a context-sensitive manner to participate in social activities” (Kasper & Ross, 2013: 24). The combined analysis of test interaction and rater interpretations of the same underscores the necessity of either preparing learners extensively for what is expected and assessed (i.e., orienting to a co-present third participant should be avoided) or examining and assessing the competence displayed in the interaction as a whole, including when learners orient to the teacher. The second option is appealing from a CA perspective as it aligns with a view of interaction as both universal and context-specific (cf. Pekarek Doehler & Petitjean, 2017).

Our findings are also relevant in light of the function of reports on talk in making claims, where RS “provides a key resource by which speakers can provide evidence for a position, or attest to the factuality of a claim or version of events” (Wooffitt, 2008: 244). Indeed, raters draw on RS to support their judgments of the interaction, but also in the service of identifying and highlighting counter-examples to be considered in assessment, such as in the case of the “mom” turn. Also, from a CA perspective, the RS turns provide insights into the gap between post-interaction reports and their original location. When “importing speech or thought into conversation from a situation removed from the here-and-now” (Couper-Kuhlen, 2007: 119), the original action takes on a new life as a resource for doing something else, such as for justifying or assessing something. In the case of CASS talk of a past interaction, the reported turns serve to substantiate collaborative views-in-progress. By enacting or reporting

on learner turns, raters also made public a contrast (cf. Sandlund, 2014) between the reported turns as IC and the interaction as a whole as non-IC with reference to the paired format. In sum, we believe the analysis of raters' RS turns opened a window into rater cognition on IC as it allowed for an examination of what was salient to them in the original sequence. While the saliency to raters probably pertained to more than just the one reported turn, the turn itself is launched as representing an exception, and also allowed us to examine why in our analysis of the learner sequence.

In terms of rater moderation, we also observe that CASS as an assessment practice has potential in terms of uncovering rater understandings of what IC in general, and scoring rubrics in particular, actually mean aside from intuitive interpretations. Along these lines, we believe the raters in our CASS groups do qualified, in-depth work in checking their own and others' understanding of what the assessment factors mean in relation to learner conduct in a recording that has been inspected together. For example, raters in Excerpt 1 do the work of establishing a shared interpretation of what *taking the initiative* and *carrying the conversation forward* mean in relation to learner conduct, which is what Jönsson and Thornberg (2014) refer to as efforts to enhance teachers' shared interpretations (Sw. *samsyn*) of steering documents, scoring rubrics and their application to learner performance.

Conclusion and Implications

In a study of language proficiency interviews, van Compernelle (2011: 132) argued that while "providing a response where conditionally relevant" (such as in response to a teacher's question) does present evidence of learners' IC *as test takers*, such routinized testing formats may be unproductive for fairly assessing IC. As our study has shown, what raters treat as insufficient L2 IC is linked to the interview format that developed in the paired test examined here. However, in light of our study, we can also partially challenge the critique of the interview format, as the raters nevertheless identified an interview-like sequence as one where one learner did display IC-relevant conduct. In this sequence, Fred's contribution stands out as unprompted, which is indicative of the kinds of conduct the raters perceived as L2 IC. However, the raters paid little or no attention to how Fred competently aligned with the teacher's questions, which tells us that IC, for these raters, is not assessed mainly in terms of how well learners adapt to the contingencies of the moment, nor how they monitor ongoing talk.

When educators or educational authorities administer tests of L2 'speaking,' they rely on test constructs to capture the abilities desirable for future purposes. In the case of high-stakes national tests, the desired

abilities are grounded in the curriculum in question, and as such, they are focused on what learners as future communicators should be able to do in their L2 at a certain stage of development. Our findings on the precedence given to paired talk over relevant responses to the teacher underscore the relevance of further studies on what can be considered to be useful L2 IC in other contexts (cf. Young, 2011) and, consequently, what should be included in constructs.

Adie et al. (2012) observed that most studies of CASS work have been based on teachers' self-reported experiences of the positive effects of moderation and called for research studies that approach CASS from other angles. The present CA study is one such attempt, and one we believe holds promise for further studies on assessment practices *as* social interactions, where different views are made publicly available for confirmation or negotiation (Jönsson & Thornberg, 2014: 392). The findings from the present study also indicate that examination of raters' interaction in assessment can reveal weaknesses in scoring criteria that leave too much room for interpretation, and as such, rater interactions also serve as important sources of information for the development of tests and assessment criteria on IC. Examining the collaborative interpretative work in assessment talk allows insight into one step in a didactic transposition process (Chevallard, 2007; Achiam & Marandino, 2014), where subject knowledge is transformed from academic disciplines, through steering documents and curricula, to subject teaching and learning in the classroom. From this vantage point, teachers' interpretations and applications of formal assessment criteria will undoubtedly impact their teaching and assessment practices. Further, the examination of such displays can yield knowledge of relevance to the calibration of subject constructions in curricula, syllabi and national testing constructs.

Notes

- 1 Hall (2018) suggests replacing the concept of IC with *interactional repertoires*, whereas others emphasize the need to reconsider the meaning of *competence* to denote observable interactional *practices* and *methods of interaction* (e.g., Waring, 2018).
- 2 No a priori division was made between direct and indirect reported speech (cf. Clift & Holt, 2007).
- 3 Translated from Swedish.

References

- Achiam, M., & Marandino, M. (2014). A framework for understanding the conditions of science representation and dissemination in museums. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 29(1), 66–82. doi:10.1080/09647775.2013.869855

- Adie, L. E., Klenowski, V., & Wyatt-Smith, C. (2012). Towards an understanding of teacher judgment in the context of social moderation. *Educational Review*, 64(2), 223–240. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2011.598919>
- Allal, L. (2013). Teachers' professional judgement in assessment: A cognitive act and a socially situated practice. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(1), 20–34.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Butler, Y. G., & Zeng, W. (2014). Young foreign language learners' interactions during task-based paired assessments. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(1), 45–75. doi:[10.1080/15434303.2013.869814](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2013.869814)
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Chalhoub-Deville, M., & Deville, C. (2005). A look back at and forward to what language testers measure. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 815–832). London: Routledge.
- Chevallard, Y. (2007). Readjusting didactics to a changing epistemology. *European Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 131–134. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2007.6.2.131>
- Clift, R., & Holt, E. (2007). Introduction. In R. Clift & E. Holt (Eds.), *Reporting talk* (pp. 1–15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2007). Assessing and accounting. In E. Holt & R. Clift (Eds.), *Reporting talk* (pp. 81–119). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, L. (2009). The influence of interlocutor proficiency in a paired oral assessment. *Language Testing*, 26(3), 367–396. doi:[10.1177/0265532209104667](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265532209104667)
- Drew, P. (1998). Complaints about transgressions and misconduct. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 31(3–4), 295–325.
- Ducasse, A. M., & Brown, A. (2009). Assessing paired orals: Raters' orientation to interaction. *Language Testing*, 26(3), 423–443.
- Edwards, D. (2000). Extreme case formulations: Softeners, investment, and doing nonliteral. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33(4), 347–373.
- Erickson, G. (2009). Nationella prov i engelska: En studie av bedömarksamstämmighet. Retrieved from www.nafs.gu.se/digitalAssets/1319/1319572_bed.np-eng-g.erickson-2009.pdf
- Erickson, G., & Börjesson, L. (2001). Bedömning av språkfärdighet i nationella prov och bedömningsmaterial. In R. Ferm & P. Malmberg (Eds.), *Språkboken* (pp. 255–269). Stockholm: Myndigheten för skolutveckling.
- Falk, B., & Ort, S. (1998). Sitting down to score: Teacher learning through assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(1), 59–64.
- Galaczi, E. D. (2014). Interactional competence across proficiency levels: How do learners manage interaction in paired speaking tests? *Applied Linguistics*, 35(5), 553–574. doi:[10.1093/applin/amt017](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt017)
- Gan, Z. (2010). Interaction in group oral assessment: A case study of higher- and lower-scoring students. *Language Testing*, 27(4), 585–602. doi:[10.1177/0265532210364049](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265532210364049)

- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Gramkow, K. (2000). Overlap management and interactional competence. *Odense Working paper sin Language and Communication*, 19(2), 17–31.
- Greer, T., & Potter, H. (2008). Turn-taking practices in multi-party EFL oral proficiency tests. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 297–320.
- Hall, J. K. (1995). “Aw, man, where you goin’?”: Classroom interaction and the development of L2 interactional competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 37–62.
- Hall, J. K. (2018). From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires: reconceptualising the objects of L2 learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 25–39.
- Halvorsen, K., & Sarangi, S. (2015). Team decision-making in workplace meetings: The interplay of activity roles and discourse roles. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 76, 1–14. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.11.002>
- Hayano, K. (2013). Question design in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 395–414). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hayashi, M., Raymond, G., & Sidnell, J. (2013). Conversational repair and human understanding: An introduction. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Conversational repair and human understanding* (pp. 1–40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- He, A. W., & Young, R. F. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. In R. F. Young & A. W. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 1–24). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 57–76). Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269–293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Jönsson, A., & Thornberg, P. (2014). Samsyn eller samstämmighet? En diskussion om sambedömning som redskap för likvärdig bedömning i skolan. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 19(4–5), 386–402.
- Kasper, G., & Ross, S. J. (2007). Multiple questions in oral proficiency interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(11), 2045–2070. doi:[10.1016/j.pragma.2007.07.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.07.011)
- Kasper, G., & Ross, S. J. (2013). Assessing second language pragmatics: An overview and introductions. In S. J. Ross & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Assessing second language pragmatics* (pp. 1–40). Bristol: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(4), 366–372.
- Masuda, K. (2011). Acquiring interactional competence in a study abroad context: Japanese language learners’ use of the interactional particle “ne.” *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(4), 519–540.
- May, L. (2009). Co-constructed interaction in a paired speaking test: The rater’s perspective. *Language Testing*, 26(3), 397–421. doi:[10.1177/0265532209104668](https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532209104668)
- May, L. (2011). Interactional competence in a paired speaking test: Features salient to raters. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 8(2), 127–145. doi:[10.1080/154303.2011.565845](https://doi.org/10.1080/154303.2011.565845)

- McNamara, T. (1996). *Measuring second language performance*. New York: Longman.
- Meadows, M., & Billington, L. (2005). *A review of the literature on marking reliability*. London: National Assessment Agency.
- Millet, I. (2018). The relationship between grading leniency and grading reliability. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(9), 1524–1535. doi:10.1080/03075079.2016.1265497
- Nakatsuhara, F. (2008). Inter-interviewer variation in oral interview tests. *ELT Journal*, 62(3), 266–275.
- National Assessment Project. (2015). National Assessment Project. Retrieved from <http://nafs.gu.se/english/?languageId=100001&disableRedirect=true&returnUrl=http%3A%2F%2Fnafs.gu.se%2F>
- Nguyen, H. t. (2012). *Developing interactional competence. A conversation-analytic study of patient consultations in pharmacy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. Shweder & R. Levine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion* (pp. 276–320). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Okada, Y., & Greer, T. (2013). Pursuing a relevant response in oral proficiency interview role plays. In S. J. Ross & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Assessing second language pragmatics* (pp. 288–310). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Elaborations on L2 interactional competence: the development of L2 grammar-for-interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 3–24.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Petitjean, C. (2017). Introduction: Interactional competences in institutional settings—Young people between school and the workplace. In S. Pekarek Doehler, A. Bangerter, G. de Weck, L. Fillietaz, E. González-Martínez, & C. Petitjean (Eds.), *Interactional competences in institutional settings. From school to the workplace* (pp. 1–26). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sadler, D. R. (2013). Assuring academic achievement standards: From moderation to calibration. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(1), 5–19. doi:10.1080/0969594X.2012.714742
- Sandlund, E. (2014). Prescribing conduct: Enactments of talk or thought in advice-giving sequences. *Discourse Studies*, 16(5), 645–666.
- Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2011). Managing task-related trouble in L2 oral proficiency tests: Contrasting interaction data and rater assessment. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 5(1), 91–120.
- Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2013). Diverging task orientations in L2 oral proficiency tests: A conversation analytic approach to participant understandings of pre-set discussion tasks. *Nordic Journal of Modern Language Methodology*, 2(1), 1–21.
- Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2016). Equity in L2 English oral assessment: Criterion-based facts or works of fiction? *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 15(2), 113–131.
- Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2017, January). *Equity in the assessment of “interactional competence” Rater inconsistencies and interactional organization*. Paper presented at the ICOP-L2 conference, Neuchâtel, Switzerland.

- Sandlund, E., Sundqvist, P., & Nyroos, L. (2016). Testing L2 talk: A review of empirical studies on second language oral proficiency testing. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 10(1), 14–29. doi:10.1111/lnc3.12174/epdf
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(1–2), 361–382.
- Schegloff, E. A., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S., & Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 3–31.
- Seedhouse, P. (2013). Oral proficiency interviews as varieties of interaction. In S. J. Ross & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Assessing second language pragmatics* (pp. 199–219). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sundqvist, P., Wikström, P., Sandlund, E., & Nyroos, L. (2018). The teacher as examiner of L2 oral tests: A challenge to standardization. *Language Testing*, 35(2), 217–238. doi:10.1177/0265532217690782
- Swedish National Agency for Education. (2013). *English. Ämnesprov, läsår 2012/2013. Lärarinformation inklusive bedömningsanvisningar till Delprov A. Årskurs 9*. Stockholm: Swedish National Agency for Education.
- Swedish Schools Inspectorate. (2013). *Olikheterna är för stora. Omvärdering av nationella prov i grundskolan och gymnasieskolan, 2013 [The differences are too great. Re-assessing national tests in compulsory and upper secondary school, 2013]*. Stockholm: Swedish Schools Inspectorate.
- Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualizing classroom interactional competence. *Novitas ROYAL*, 6(1), 1–14.
- Walters, F. S. (2007). A conversation-analytic hermeneutic rating protocol to assess L2 oral pragmatic competence. *Language Testing*, 24(2), 155–183.
- van Compernelle, R. A. (2011). Responding to questions and L2 learner interactional competence during language proficiency interviews: a microanalytic study with pedagogical implications. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellerman, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 117–144). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- van Compernelle, R. A. (2013). Interactional competence and the dynamic assessment of L2 pragmatic abilities. In S. J. Ross & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Assessing second language pragmatics* (pp. 327–354). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wang, B. (2010). On rater agreement and rater training. *English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 108–112.
- Waring, H. Z. (2018). Teaching L2 interactional competence: problems and possibilities. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 57–67.
- Wiliam, D. (2007). Content then process: Teacher learning communities in the service of formative assessment. In D. Reeves (Ed.), *Ahead of the curve: The power of assessment to transform teaching and learning* (pp. 182–204). Bloomington: Solution Tree.
- Wooffitt, R. (2008). The dead in service of the living. In R. Clift & E. Holt (Eds.), *Reporting talk* (pp. 244–269). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Youn, S. J. (2015). Validity argument for assessing L2 pragmatics in interaction using mixed methods. *Language Testing. Advance online publication*, 32(2), 199–225 doi:10.1177/0265532214557113

- Young, R. F. (2011). Interactional competence in language learning, teaching, and testing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 426–443). London: Routledge.
- Young, R. F., & He, A. W. (Eds.). (1998). *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Conclusion

Deepening Roots and Broadening Horizons in Interactional Competence Research and Praxis

Hanh thi Nguyen

How does one learn to communicate in a new language? This question is at the heart of the force that has driven the research program on interactional competence (IC), which collectively endeavors to find out what it is that one needs to learn to communicate in a new language, how the developmental trajectories take shape and how learning may be triggered or hindered. As the field matures, we have come to an exciting point when applied questions about teaching and testing can be addressed with practical solutions. This volume—together with ideas such as those by Barraja-Rohan (1997, 2011); Betz and Huth (2014); Wong and Waring (2010) and initiatives such as the Center for Language and Intercultural Communication (<http://clic.rice.edu/>) and the Language Learning in the Wild Project (<http://languagelearninginthewild.com/>)—attests to the robustness of IC research, as well as its usefulness and potential. Further, as often is the case, the application of abstract concepts in praxis has pushed the field into new frontiers and prompted the re-examination of those very concepts, eventually enriching the research-praxis enterprise. In this conclusion, I will discuss how the authors in this volume have extended our understandings of IC at the abstract and practical levels. With these understandings, I call for a unified conceptualization of IC while appreciating its nuances, and suggest future directions for IC research and praxis. I propose that the future of the IC program involves a deeper commitment to ethnomethodological conversation analysis (EMCA) as well as broader connections with like-minded programs and frameworks.

Towards a Unified Conceptualization of IC

The IC research program came about as a convergence of, on the one hand, ground-breaking theorizations by researchers informed by linguistic anthropology, sociocultural theory and, to some extent, ethnomethodology (Hall, 1993, 1995, 1999; He & Young, 1998) and, on the other hand, the spotlight on conversation analysis (CA) as a suitable framework and methodology to analyze key concepts in second language acquisition

(SLA) concerning discourse and communication (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Wagner, 1996).¹ Perhaps due to the eclectic nature of its emergence, IC has been reconceptualized by several scholars, including this volume's authors. These respecifications can advance the field towards a unified conceptualization of IC in which its various important facets are appreciated.

Early conceptualizations of IC highlighted three key aspects that departed from previous theorizations about the ability to communicate (such as 'communicative competence'; Canale & Swain, 1980). First, IC is practice-specific, with "interactive practices" being "*recurring episodes of purposeful, goal-directed talk* which are significant to the establishment and maintenance of a group or community" (Hall, 1995: 38, emphasis added; see also He & Young, 1998: 7). Thus, rather than being some form of 'general' competency, IC is considered bound to specific types of recognizable situations. Second, since interactional practices are realized through particular configurations of action sequencing, topic management, linguistic choices, turn-taking mechanisms, participation structures and so on, IC involves the ability to attend to and employ these resources (Hall, 1995; He & Young, 1998). Finally, since social interaction is jointly achieved (Jacoby & Ochs, 1995), IC is argued to also be co-constructed. In He and Young's (1998) words,

interactional competence is not an attribute of an individual participant, and thus we cannot say that an individual is interactionally competent; rather we talk of interactional competence as something that is jointly constructed by all participants (including an analyst if the interaction is subjected to analysis).

(p. 7)

This conceptualization of IC suggests that IC development entails co-constructing social interaction with others in recurring interactional practices (He & Young, 1998). Hence, a robust line of empirical research is opened up to investigate not only what IC entails in second language use, but also how IC can be developed over time in second language learning. As a result of this research, understandings of IC have been elaborated and modified regarding both the original three tenets and new dimensions.

The first tenet, that IC is *practice-specific* in the sense defined by Hall (1995), has evolved to mean more broadly 'local,' 'situated' or 'context-sensitive,' as seen in the definition by Hall and Pekarek Doehler (2011): "IC, that is the *context-specific* constellations of expectations and dispositions about our social worlds that we draw on to navigate our way through our interactions with others, implies the ability to mutually coordinate our actions" (pp. 1–2, emphasis added).² This distancing from the idea that IC is specific to "recurring episodes" (Hall, 1995) in favor

of a broader notion of local situatedness is again expressed by Pekarek Doehler (Chapter 1), who advocated a “dialogic, distributed and locally contingent view of IC with a focus on *in situ* social practices and the routine procedures employed for their social coordination” (p. 28, emphasis added). This is a broad notion of context sensitivity and local contingency and captures the nature of IC. More specifically, social interaction takes place in different *speech-exchange systems* with accompanying interactional features (Schegloff, 1999: 409). In fact, empirical studies on IC development typically track an individual’s participation in recurring actions within the same speech-exchange system, such as a *story opening* between an au pair and host-family members (Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018), a *task opening* in classroom interaction (Hellermann, 2007) and *topic initiation* in conversations-for-learning (Kim, 2017). So it seems that although not articulated explicitly in recent definitions, the notion that IC is bound to speech-exchange systems is crucial especially for practical applications in teaching and testing (see also Taguchi, 2015; White, Chapter 7, on the importance of ‘domains of practice’ in IC development in study-abroad settings). Naturally, this brings up questions about the extent to which IC is specific to speech-exchange systems and the extent to which it is shared across related systems or distinct systems. Nguyen (2018a, 2018b) started with analyzing how a novice’s IC may develop in varied directions in two related settings in North American pharmacy discourse, but further empirical research is needed to explore the answers to these questions.

A related question is which aspects of IC may be at the core of human communication and which aspects may be language-specific. Almost two decades ago, Schegloff (Wong & Olsher, 2000: 120–121) suggested that the structural organization of actions may be universal, but how this structural organization gets realized in talk depends on the linguistic resources of specific languages. He gave the example of same-turn self-repair, which involves some form of initiation to alert the recipient of the upcoming repair. In English, this alert typically comes in the form of cut-offs and sound stretches, but in Quiché, where both features are phonemic, self-repair is signaled by non-phonemic long sound stretches. More recently, Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2017) referred to findings in comparative interactional linguistics to demonstrate how basic actions in interaction can be realized in different ways with different resources in different languages. Since talk-in-interaction consists of universal mechanisms that are realized through language-specific resources, we can then infer that developing IC in a new language involves figuring out how to assemble a new set of language-specific resources to implement these mechanisms that are core to human communication. Markee (Chapter 2) seems to agree with this view as he stated, “users’/learners’ interactional repertoires emerge as by-products of their competent orientations to the underlying machinery of talk-in-interaction” (p. 65) (see

Hall, 2018: 31–32, for a similar view). Support for the underlying universal machinery of interaction comes readily from CA findings about core patterns of human interaction (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2017; Levinson, 2006; Schegloff, 2006; Stivers & Sidnell, 2013). The IC program, however, is interested in the *emergence* of interactional resources when someone learns a new language. So far, research on L2 IC development, as reviewed by Pekarek Doehler (Chapter 1), has provided glimpses into this emergence, and Huth and Betz (Chapter 12) demonstrated that this view of IC gives a rationale for assessment to target language-specific features of interaction. Further research is still needed, however, to inform us further about the processes of language-specific IC respecification.³

The second tenet of IC, that it involves a number of *interactional resources*, has enjoyed much elaboration, largely with input from CA findings. An inventory of interactional resources is particularly helpful, since they are the “object of L2 learning” (Kasper, 2006: 86; Hall, 2018: 34) and thus can become the target of instruction and assessment. Since interactional resources form the substance of IC, some researchers have called for a shift from the term *interactional competence* to *interactional competencies* (Kasper, 2006), *interactional repertoires* (Hall, 2018) and *interactional practices* (Waring, Chapter 8). Kasper’s (2006) plural form, *competencies*, aims to recognize the diverse choices that participants draw on and make in social interaction while retaining a clear focus on participants’ *capabilities to use* resources (see also Kasper & Ross, 2013: 9, cited by Sandlund & Sundqvist, Chapter 13). In contrast, Hall’s (2018) and Waring’s (Chapter 8) terms focus on the *substance* of IC, which Hall (2018: 34) referred to as ‘meaning-making resources’ and Waring (Chapter 8) referred to as “methods of interaction.” In my view, while analytical attention in IC research will decidedly be on observable and publicly displayed resources that participants bring into being in talk-in-interaction, it is important to indicate explicitly that the IC program is interested in not just the collection of these resources or methods but also the ways they are mobilized by participants in social interaction. Indeed, Waring (Chapter 8) defined interactional practices to be “the methods of interaction that are the observable *manifestations of one’s interactional competence*” (p. 216, emphasis added). Given such a definition, which many would find reasonable, it makes sense to still use the term *interactional competence* or *interactional competencies* (following Kasper, 2006), of course with an appreciation of the dynamic, changeable and adaptable nature of the semiotic resources that make up IC (Hall, 2018), and the fact that competence is concretely observable in social interaction (Waring, Chapter 8; Markee, Chapter 2; see also Goodwin, 1981; Jacoby & Ochs, 1995).

The third tenet of IC, that it is co-constructed, is maintained by all IC researchers, including the authors of this volume. Being perhaps the most radical claim by the IC program, it is also one of the thorniest issues

to operationalize in studies on IC development and in IC assessment. Hauser (Chapter 3) is quite right that, to date, “the conceptual contradiction between interactional competence as something constructed by the participants in interaction and as something acquired by the individual remains” (p. 79). Hauser is thus admirable in taking the notion of co-construction all the way in an analysis of a conversation involving an L2 Japanese speaker (Hauser himself) and L1 Japanese speakers at a committee meeting when Hauser, the researcher, approached a newly arrived member, “Izumi,” to request his consent. Hauser characterized the participants (including the researcher) as co-constructing the researcher as “need[ing] assistance,” “unable to repair trouble in his own talk,” and perhaps also “unable to understand a joke” (p. 98), in other words, as incompetent, at least in these moments. To broaden the analysis, we may consider the participants’ membership categorization work (which Hauser did to some extent when he analyzed how another committee member was treated as a broker between the researcher and Izumi, p. 99). If we do so, it is possible to see that the participants’ orientation away from the researcher—and the researcher’s own orientation to their orientation—co-constructs not necessarily the researcher’s incompetence as an interactant, but his role as an outsider vis-à-vis the other committee members as insiders. This interpretation of the data is meant to build on Hauser’s detailed account and to offer an invitation, in analyses of competence-in-interaction, to consider the multitude of actions and membership categories (or participation frameworks, in He and Young’s (1998) terms) that participants may be achieving in a given moment of talk.

Hauser is absolutely right in his conclusion that there needs to be a distinction between (a) “interactional competence as it is constructed within interaction” and (b) “the resources . . . that participants draw on” (p. 102) (see also Markee, Chapter 2, cited above). What participants do in social interaction, that is, how they negotiate the employment of interactional resources, is co-constructed, but the abilities to recognize and mobilize interactional resources must also be individual. This is how it is possible for individuals to learn to do something that is contingently shared by nature—social interaction. This distinction is also consistent with the notion that the erosion between individual abilities (competence) and coordinated publicly displayed conduct (performance) is *necessarily* incomplete, as Wootton (1975) and Cicourel (1971) asserted (see in-depth discussion in Hauser, Chapter 3). Finally, this distinction may help dissipate some of the reasons to shift from *IC* to *interactional repertoires* (Hall, 2018).

So, how should we conceptualize IC? Markee (Chapter 2) is absolutely right that, first and foremost, the IC program needs to stand firmly rooted in EMCA and not just ‘employ’ CA as a ‘method’ (in “hybrid CA” as Markee called it). EMCA as a conceptual and analytical program

provides not only the toolbox to tackle data, but also insights about social interaction, competence and, importantly, learning. Markee (Chapter 2)—together with Kasper (2009), Hauser (2011) and Nguyen (2017, 2019, forthcoming)—is convinced that the IC program can find sound conceptualizations of competence and learning inside EMCA without resorting to any EMCA-exogenous theory.

First, a full commitment to EMCA means that the interactional resources that make up IC need to be understood and investigated in EMCA terms. For example, analyses of linguistic resources can draw on CA's research on formulation and turn design, perhaps the most rigorous line of inquiry on how linguistic forms are employed to achieve social actions. How roles and relationships are jointly invoked and utilized in sequentially organized social actions can be investigated with membership categorization analysis (MCA; see Housley & Fitzgerald, 2015; Pomerantz & Mandelbaum, 2005; Sacks, 1972, 1995; Stokoe, 2012). Thus, an EMCA-based IC program does not need to borrow EMCA-exogenous concepts to understand interactional resources. Further, EMCA resists viewing interactional resources as *etic* and discrete entities. Instead, they are mobilized holistically and participant-relevantly to achieve actions. So, for example, style shifting (Taguchi & Yoshimi, Chapter 6) serves to mark discourse boundaries, but it also indexes roles and relationships and is realized through linguistic means.

Second, as Markee (Chapter 2) pointed out, EMCA views competence as *emic*, enacted locally in social interaction, and thus publicly observable. Precisely because the machinery of interaction is visibly displayed and instantiated in talk-in-interaction, newcomers can learn to interact through direct participation. In Garfinkel's (1996) words, "phenomena of order are made *instructably* in formal analytic details of concerted *recurrent* achievements of practical action" (p. 92, emphases added). Learning thus takes place "over the course of the actual interaction, as a function of actual participation, and by accepting the risks involved" (Garfinkel, 1967: 146). The triggers for learning can be found right in interaction, as not-yet-competent members "learn to deal with the moment-to-moment contingencies of life in interaction, and the details of language use and conduct, *in* the moment-to-moment contingencies of life in interaction, with their deployments of language and other conduct" (Schegloff, 1989: 152, emphasis in the original). Although EMCA did not set out to formulate a learning theory (or any theory), its bottom-up, data-driven insights have inevitably enabled an elegant conceptualization of learning.

Taking a strong EMCA stance, Markee proposed replacing the term *IC* with the EMCA term *competence*. His argument is that since *competence* is the term used in EMCA, using the same term will signal affiliation with it. While I agree with Markee on the tie with EMCA, I do think that the IC program needs to retain the word *interactional* in the term. This

is because EMCA predominantly works with social interaction, so the word *interactional* would be redundant in EMCA. In applied linguistics, however, it is necessary to designate the focus on interaction to contrast with other focuses. Markee's second reason for the term *competence* is that the word *interaction* implies, to his ear, a bias towards the verbal aspect of talk-in-interaction, and therefore risks neglecting the embodied and multimodal nature of interaction. This is an important reminder that analysis of IC needs to consider whatever types of resources are relevant to participants. However, I see the term *interaction*, that is, *inter-action*, as quite apt to capture IC's focus on actions and what participants do together as they achieve social actions. Therefore, I would propose that the term *IC* (or *interactional competencies*, following Kasper, 2006) continue to be used. A unified terminology and conceptualization is important because (a) shared understanding about IC does exist among scholars engaging in the IC program, (b) the IC program has been widely identified by the very term *IC*, and (c) although other traditions may use the term *competence* with different implications (e.g., Chomsky, 1965), reclaiming a term both strikes a dialogue with contrasting views and empowers a new agenda.

From the discussions by the authors in this volume and recent discussions elsewhere, it is possible to formulate a unified conceptualization in which *IC* refers to *participants' observable and situated capacities to draw on their ever-changing repertoires of universal interactional mechanisms and language-specific meaning-making resources to co-construct actions contingently in speech-exchange systems*.

Strategies and Challenges in Teaching and Testing IC

From early on in IC conceptualization, an interest in pedagogical implications was already present (Hall, 1999). In creating frameworks for teaching and testing IC, the authors in this volume have truly taken IC to new frontiers with great innovation and sensibility. From their ideas, some common strategies and issues emerge that can inform future applications of IC.

The chapters have demonstrated concretely that CA findings about the infrastructure of social interaction can serve as the target of instruction and assessment. The rich body of CA research in English as well as other languages (though less abundant) clearly has redefined and enriched our understandings about what needs to be learned, taught and tested. CA findings that were drawn on as instructional objects or assessment baselines are from either L1 conversations (Waring, Chapter 8; Taleghani-Nikazm, Chapter 4; Huth & Betz, Chapter 12) or L2 conversations (Taguchi & Yoshimi, Chapter 6; Lilja, Piirainen-Marsh, Chapter 10; Kley, Chapter 11). If we are to maintain EMCA's emic stance, we will want to see learners'⁴ interaction in its own right rather

than referring to the L1 speaker as a baseline or model (Firth & Wagner, 1997; also White, Chapter 7). Further, as Firth (1996, 2009) and Firth and Wagner (2007) demonstrated, L2 participants in lingua franca communication employ interactional resources in unconventional but effective ways to get business done. Additionally, L2 interaction can be quite informative as instructional materials. Taguchi and Yoshimi (Chapter 6) demonstrated that samples of naturally occurring conversations involving learners can be used to sharply highlight how style shifting works, especially in moments when learners self-repair to shift styles. Lilja and Piirainen-Marsh (Chapter 10) showed the tremendous benefits of bringing in learner-generated data (see more discussion below). While there is great value for learners to observe and practice with L1 interaction, IC instruction may be enriched by a range of L1 and L2 interactions (as shown in Kunitz & Yeh, Chapter 9), especially those involving the learners themselves.

Another strategy in IC instruction that several authors in this volume suggested is to use awareness raising and deductive learning before production. Taleghani-Nikazm (Chapter 4) used contrastive analysis to highlight differences between L1 and L2 interactional resources. Taguchi and Yoshimi (Chapter 6) suggested metatalk to guide learners' analysis of sample transcripts. Waring (Chapter 8) recommended analyzing and orally reproducing a sample conversation with audio cues. Kunitz and Yeh (Chapter 9) used contrastive analysis of scripted dialogues in textbooks and real-life conversations, critical evaluation of L1-L2 conversation samples to identify interactional troubles, reproductive exercises to fill in missing parts of a conversation, and deductive analysis of data samples. These chapters showed that making understandings about interactional resources explicit is valuable in defining the object of learning for learners. They also showed that IC needs to be taught in its natural habitat when it is in action—social interaction. This is in alignment with Garfinkel's (2002) insight that the abilities to achieve social actions "cannot be learned or taught by imagining them. They are not imaginable. They can only be empirically found out" (p. 111). Thus, learners' direct participation in talk is a must in IC instruction.

Direct participation, as shown in this volume's collection of studies, can be either assigned student-student conversations (Taleghani-Nikazm, Chapter 4; Sert, Chapter 5; Kunitz & Yeh, Chapter 9; Kley, Chapter 11) or naturally occurring conversations between learners and others in the community (Lilja and Piirainen-Marsh, Chapter 10; study-abroad situations as reviewed by White, Chapter 7). An unavoidable problem with assigned conversations is that learners are put on the spot to produce language for the sake of teaching or testing (see further discussion on learners 'doing being guinea pigs' below). In contrast, in Lilja and Piirainen-Marsh's chapter, learner-generated data of a business transaction outside of class was used as instructional material for open-ended

reflective analysis by the learners. The value of this instructional design is that learners get to do learning in the midst of getting things done in the real world, with real-life purposes and concerns (Garfinkel, 1967, 2002 (cited above); also see Nguyen, 2018a, 2018b, on the differences between learning in classroom role plays and in actual workplace task performance). Further, as shown by Lilja and Piirainen-Marsh, opportunities for learning are afforded again in reflective analysis, when learners revisit a moment in the recorded interaction to doubt, verify and confirm an understanding that took place *in situ* in the real-time interaction. This kind of retrospective analysis is *emic* in that the learning object is identified by the learners, and learners make observations about the actions achieved in the recorded interaction in their own right, without referencing an *etic* baseline.

Two thorny issues in IC assessment—to which the authors of this volume have provided very useful insights—are how to assess individual abilities in co-constructed, jointly achieved interaction and how to maintain an *emic* stance. Huth and Betz (Chapter 12) proposed assessing learners' underlying ability to access interactional resources in isolation from co-construction. After careful review of interactional resources in German in contrast with those in the learners' L1 (American English), the authors designed indirect test materials using CA transcripts and common testing techniques with adaptations for IC. These include unscrambling and re-ordering sequences to test understanding of the sequential organization of telephone closings; matching, multiple-choice and conversation completion plus explanations to test understanding of the linguistic resources to project quoted speech; and teaching-oriented techniques such as guided questions for analysis of data samples and pattern recognition questions to test understanding of the discourse functions of a connector. As with any indirect testing, verification by direct testing would boost validity and provide a fuller picture of learners' IC.

A solution for assessment of individual abilities in actual interaction is not as handy. Sert (Chapter 5) showed that some learners produced more collaborative turn completions (an indication of active listenership) than others in same-group conversations over time. Understanding the co-constructed nature of interaction, Sert was careful not to equate higher frequency of collaborative turn completions with higher IC. This is sensible because a participant who does not produce collaborative turn completions may be already producing the initial turns in the first place for others to complete collaboratively, or may be expressing supportive listenership by yielding the floor to others—thus being a competent participant.

Maintaining an *emic* stance is as challenging. Taleghani-Nikazm (Chapter 4) compared the interactional resources that learners of German employ in post-expansion turns to those by L1 speakers of German. She concluded that the learners “fail[ed] to use the target-like method

of signaling their affective and epistemic stance towards the immediate prior turn of their co-participant” (p. 138). When something in a conversation is perceived as anomalous by the analyst (or tester) but is treated as non-problematic by the participants (that is, the participants ‘let it pass’), it may be necessary to refer to known patterns to pinpoint how a particular instance deviates from expected routines (Schegloff, in an interview in Wong & Olsher, 2000: 118). However, in comparing an anomaly against a collection, we need to (a) establish that the comparison is warranted, that is, that the instance we are looking at is similar to the collection with which it is being compared, and (b) analyze participants’ conducts for the actions they accomplish rather than viewing them as deficient compared to L1 norms (White, Chapter 7). For example, in Excerpt 4 (Taleghani-Nikazm, Chapter 4), when Dan (line 3) produces *ich bin sehr müde, und du?* (‘I’m very tired, and you?’), the particular format of the turn (ending with a reciprocal question) does not project a relevant next slot for Mitch to uptake on Dan’s statement about being tired (see Maynard & Zimmerman (1984) for how an answer plus a return-question can focus away from further topical talk on the answer itself). Thus, a consideration of the import of Dan’s turn design may provide a different interpretation of Mich’s lack of uptake on Dan’s statement. Dan’s turn design is also distinct from that by J in the L1 conversation presented for comparison (*nicht so gut*, ‘not so good’), Excerpt 5), in which a reciprocal question is not produced. It appears that when analyzing learners’ IC for assessment, that is, taking an analytical focus, we still need to consider all details of talk and pursue the analytical focus in the context of that consideration. IC is inherently ‘messy’ in the sense that participants achieve social actions “in the midst of things” (Garfinkel, 2002: 101), and as analysts we need to keep these things in sight.

The ‘emic challenge’ is well stated by Kley (Chapter 11), who pointed out that “while CA is emic in perspective, language assessment is etic” (p. 292). Kley developed a data-driven assessment rubric to etically evaluate learners’ topic management with respect to progressivity, intersubjectivity and diversification. I believe that assessment can strive to be emic by focusing on *action accomplishment* from participants’ perspectives (see, for example, Kunitz and Yeh’s CA-based definition of IC in which action is highlighted; Chapter 9: 228). For instance, progressivity, although generally preferred in interaction, may be compromised *necessarily* as part of a dispreferred response (Schegloff, 2007: 100), such as refusing a request (Schegloff was discussing the “stalled” excerpt reproduced in Waring, Chapter 8). Also, diversification of interactional resources, while being an indicator of IC development (Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015; Sert, Chapter 5), is not necessarily a requirement for successful communication in one given conversation. It is not natural to expect a range of resources to be used *regardless* of the actions being done. The students in Kley’s (Chapter 11) study were required to speak with each

other on any topic (suggested topics provided) to fill a given amount of time. If they used disjunctive topic shifts or reciprocal questions instead of stepwise topic shifts to further the conversation, that may have been their way of making sense of what they needed to do to carry out the given test task (see Wagner, 1998; Schegloff in the interview with Wong and Olsner (2000: 121) on learners 'doing being guinea pigs').

Finally, a challenge for IC instruction and assessment is the training for teachers and testers. Not only is IC itself complex, nuanced and contingent, but the kind of knowledge and skills needed to understand IC is accumulated through detailed analysis. The success of IC teaching reported in Kunitz and Yeh (Chapter 9) is due largely to the teacher's clear understanding of IC. Sandlund and Sundqvist's (Chapter 13) emic analysis of testers' in situ conceptualization of IC in assessment talk is a reminder of how important it is to train testers about IC. In this regard, the workshops, conferences and materials provided by the Center for Language and Intercultural Communication (<http://cllc.rice.edu/>) are invaluable to practitioners as well as researchers.

Some Future Directions

Moving forward, IC research and praxis would benefit greatly from a deeper reach into its EMCA roots and a stronger commitment to the emic stance that identifies and empowers EMCA. Standing firmly on this ground, the IC program can also broaden connections with related EMCA-based programs to address questions about IC development and training. Two such programs are child development and workplace communication. Arguments for emic conceptualizations of children's IC (e.g., Bateman & Church, 2017; Hutchby, 2005; Keel, 2016; Ogiermann, 2015; Wootton, 2006) and children's IC development (e.g., Filipi, 2015; Forrester, 2009, 2013; Nguyen & Nguyen, 2016; Wootton, 1997) may support and inform research on IC in an L2. Research on workplace communication, where issues of training, assessment and skills development are debated and examined (e.g., Koschmann, 2013; Nguyen, 2012, 2017, 2018b, 2018a; Sanders, 2003; Zemel & Koschmann, 2014), may also lend useful insights for the IC program.

At the practical level, IC assessment has been shown (Waring, Chapter 8; Kunitz & Yeh, Chapter 9) to be compatible with data-driven assessment frameworks, such as the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). I believe that this partnership can be further expanded. The Council of Europe, Modern Languages Division (2001) dedicated a section (pp. 84–87) to interactive strategies and activities in which turn-taking, cooperating and asking for clarification are incorporated in assessment rubrics. Elaboration on this aspect of language competence can certainly be made with insights from the IC program. At the same time, IC teaching and testing can benefit from CEFR's data-driven tools, such as CEFR's English Profile interactive website

(<http://englishprofile.org/>). For example, Waring (Chapter 8) intuitively rated the “stalled” excerpt at the Basic User level (A1–A2). This rating can be fine-tuned by using CEFR’s English Profile website, which places most of the language of the conversation at the Basic User level but some expressions at a higher level (“open up something” is at level B2, the conditional construction with *would* is at level B1, *except (that)* + clause is at level B1). Further integration may be beneficial to both CEFR and IC.

Finally, more intensive data collection on the phenomenon under study will enlighten us on not only how but also why learning does or does not take place. White (Chapter 7) observed that “it may be very difficult to demonstrate an empirical effect of the external setting on IC development with an analysis of IC using CA methods” (p. 202). However, I believe that the problem is not with EMCA’s emic requirement, but with data collection that may miss the emergence of competence in interaction. With more frequent data collection points and more wide-ranging data (as White also suggested), researchers have a better chance at capturing how problems and needs within interaction—visible and relevant to participants—may trigger changes in subsequent interactions (see, for example, Nguyen, 2019, forthcoming). More data of course requires more systematic analysis. Sert’s (Chapter 5) use of corpus tools to track interactional resources by learners over time opens up new possibilities for large data corpora. As long as emic and fine-grained analysis is applied to individual instances, it is quite useful to obtain an overview of the accumulative patterns with corpus utilities. The affordances of corpus tools such as tagging, concordance and concordance plot are quite compatible with CA interests in locating phenomena in sequential context and within a structural organization.

The authors in this volume embarked on brave endeavors and have charted new territories. It is clear that their insights will inform IC research and praxis for years to come.

Notes

- 1 Although there were others (e.g., Kramsch, 1986) who used the term *IC*, it was the ideas expressed by Hall (1993, 1995, 1999), He and Young (1998) and Firth and Wagner (1997) that informed and influenced the IC research program.
- 2 Hall’s sense of *practice* is different from CA’s sense of *practice* (Waring, Chapter 8), which is synonymous with ‘members’ method’ or ‘resources.’
- 3 Kecskes, Sanders, and Pomerantz (2017) proposed a distinction between Basic Interactional Competence (BIC) and Applied Interactional Competence (AIC), which they claimed to interact with each other to surface in conversations. However, their data analysis only illustrates what is assumed to be BIC (such as fitting and achieving mutual understanding) without elucidating how BIC interacts with language-specific AIC.
- 4 I thank John Hellermann for pointing out that a ‘learner’ is a competent multilingual person, which is all the more reason to treat their interaction as interaction.

References

- Barraja-Rohan, A.-M. (1997). Teaching conversation and sociocultural norms with conversation analysis. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 71–88.
- Barraja-Rohan, A.-M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(4), 479–507. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811412878>
- Bateman, A., & Church, A. (2017). Children's knowledge-in-interaction: An introduction. In *Children's knowledge-in-interaction: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 1–11). Singapore: Springer.
- Betz, E., & Huth, T. (2014). Beyond grammar: Teaching interaction in the German language classroom. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/ Teaching German*, 47(2), 140–163. <https://doi-org.hpu.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/tger.10167>
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cicourel, A. (1971). The acquisition of social structure: Toward a developmental sociology of language and meaning. In J. D. Douglas (Ed.), *Understanding everyday life* (pp. 136–168). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Council of Europe, Modern Languages Division. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Strasbourg, France: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (2017). *Interactional linguistics: Studying language in social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Filipi, A. (2015). The development of recipient design in bilingual child-parent interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 48(1), 100–119.
- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On “lingua franca” English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237–259.
- Firth, A. (2009). Doing not being a foreign language learner: English as a lingua franca in the workplace and (some) implications for SLA. *IRAL*, 47, 127–156.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285–300.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 800–819.
- Forrester, M. (2009). Ethnomethodology and adult-child conversations: Whose development? In H. Gardner & M. Forrester (Eds.), *Analyzing interactions in childhood: Insights from conversation analysis* (pp. 42–58). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Forrester, M. (2013). Mutual adaptation in parent-child interaction. *Interaction Studies*, 14(2), 190–211.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Garfinkel, H. (1996). Ethnomethodology's program. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59(1), 5–21.
- Garfinkel, H. (2002). *Ethnomethodology's programs: Working out Durkheim's aphorism*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

- Hall, J. K. (1993). The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The sociocultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language. *Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 145–167.
- Hall, J. K. (1995). “Aw, man, where you goin’?”: Classroom interaction and the development of L2 interactional competence.” *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 37–62.
- Hall, J. K. (1999). A prosaics of interaction: The development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 137–151). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, J. K. (2018). From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires: Reconceptualising the objects of L2 learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 25–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2018.1433050>
- Hall, J. K., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). L2 interactional competence and development. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 1–15). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hauser, E. (2011). On the danger of exogenous theory in CA-for-SLA: A response to Hellermann and Cole (2009). *Applied Linguistics*, 32(3), 348–352. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1093/applin/amr015>
- He, A. W., & Young, R. F. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. In R. F. Young & A. W. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (Vol. 14, pp. 1–24). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hellermann, J. (2007). The development of practices for action in classroom dyadic interaction: Focus on task openings. *Modern Language Journal*, 91(1), 83–96.
- Housley, W., & Fitzgerald, R. (2015). Introduction to membership categorisation analysis. In R. Fitzgerald & W. Housley (Eds.), *Advances in membership categorisation analysis* (pp. 1–22). Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington, DC: Sage.
- Hutchby, I. (2005). Children’s talk and social competence. *Children and Society*, 19, 66–73.
- Jacoby, S., & Ochs, E. (1995). Co-construction: An introduction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28(3), 171–183.
- Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review*, 19, 83–99.
- Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view? *IRAL*, 47, 11–36.
- Kasper, G., & Ross, S. J. (2013). Assessing second language pragmatics: An overview and introductions. In S. Ross, & G. Kasper, (Eds.), *Assessing second language pragmatics* (pp. 1–40). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kecskes, I., Sanders, R. E., & Pomerantz, A. (2017). The basic interactional competence of language learners. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 124, 88–105.
- Keel, S. (2016). *Socialization: Parent-child interaction in everyday life*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Kim, Y. (2017). Topic initiation in conversation-for-learning: Developmental and pedagogical perspectives. *English Teaching*, 72(1), 73–103.
- Koschmann, T. (2013). Conversation analysis and learning in interaction. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing. Retrieved from DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0208

- Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(iv), 366–372.
- Levinson, S. (2006). On the human “interaction engine.” In N. J. Enfield & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality* (pp. 39–69). Oxford: Berg.
- Maynard, D. W., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1984). Topical talk, rituals, and the social organization of relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47(4), 301–316.
- Nguyen, H. t. (2012). *Developing interactional competence: A conversation analytic study of patient consultations in pharmacy*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nguyen, H. t. (2017). Toward a conversation analytic framework for tracking interactional competence development from school to work. In S. Pekarek Doehler, A. Bangerter, G. de Weck, L. Filliettaz, E. González-Martínez, & C. Petitjean (Eds.), *Interactional competences in institutional settings: From school to the workplace* (pp. 197–225). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nguyen, H. t. (2018a). A longitudinal perspective on turn design: From role-plays to workplace patient consultations. In S. Pekarek Doehler, J. Wagner, & E. González-Martínez (Eds.), *Longitudinal studies on the organization of social interaction* (pp. 195–224). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nguyen, H. t. (2018b). Interactional practices across settings: From classroom role-plays to workplace patient consultations. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(2), 213–235. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1093/applin/amw007>. Advance Access published March 17, 2016.
- Nguyen, H. t. (2019). Interactional competence development in a lingua franca at the workplace: An ethnomethodologically endogenous account. In H. t. Nguyen & T. Malabarba (Eds.), *Conversation analytic perspectives on English language learning, teaching and testing in global contexts* (pp. 59–84). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Nguyen, H. t. (forthcoming). Turn design as longitudinal achievement: Learning on the shop floor. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler, & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of L2 interaction in the wild*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Nguyen, H. t., & Nguyen, M. T. T. (2016). “But please can I play with the iPad?”: The development of request negotiation practices by a four-year-old child. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 101, 66–82.
- Ogiermann, E. (2015). In/directness in Polish children’s requests at the dinner table. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 82, 67–82.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2018). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(4), 555–578. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw021>
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 233–267). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pomerantz, A., & Mandelbaum, J. (2005). Conversation analytic approaches to the relevance and uses of relationship categories in interaction. In K. L. Fitch & R. E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 149–171). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Sacks, H. (1972). On the analysability of stories by children. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 325–345). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on conversation, Vol. I & II*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Sanders, R. E. (2003). Applying the skills concept to discourse and conversation: The remediation of performance defects in talk-in-interaction. In J. Greene & B. Burleson (Eds.), *The handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 221–256). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1989). Reflections on language, development, and the interactional character of talk-in-interaction. In M. H. Bornstein & J. S. Brunner (Eds.), *Interaction in human development* (pp. 139–153). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1999). Discourse, pragmatics, conversation, analysts. *Discourse Studies*, 1(4), 405–435.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2006). Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction* (pp. 70–96). London, UK: Berg.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T., & Sidnell, J. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Chichester, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Stokoe, E. (2012). Moving forward with membership categorization analysis: Methods for systematic analysis. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 14(3), 277–303.
- Taguchi, N. (2015). *Developing interactional competence in a Japanese study abroad context*. Bristol, UK, New York, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Wagner, J. (1996). Foreign language acquisition through interaction: A critical review of research on conversational adjustments. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 215–235.
- Wagner, J. (1998). On doing being a guinea pig: A response to Seedhouse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30, 103–113.
- Wong, J., & Olsher, D. (2000). Reflections on conversation analysis and nonnative speaker talk: An interview with Emanuel A. Schegloff. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 111–128.
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Wootton, A. J. (1975). *Dilemmas of discourse: Controversies about the sociological interpretation of language*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Wootton, A. J. (1997). *Interaction and the development of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wootton, A. J. (2006). Children's practices and their connections with "mind." *Discourse Studies*, 8, 191–198.
- Zemel, A., & Koschmann, T. (2014). "Put your finger right in here": Learnability and instructed experience. *Discourse Studies*, 16(2), 163–183.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions

All authors followed the main conversation analytic conventions as specified by Jefferson (2004).¹

IDENTITY OF SPEAKERS IN THE MARGIN OF THE TRANSCRIPT

Mary:	pseudonym of an identified participant
?:	unidentified participant
John?:	probably John

SIMULTANEOUS AND CONTIGUOUS UTTERANCES

[	beginning of overlapping talk
]	end of overlapping talk
=	no gap between utterances

INTERVALS WITHIN AND BETWEEN TURNS

(.)	a pause of one beat
(0.3)	a pause of 0.3 second
(1.0)	a pause of 1 second
(—)	untimed pause

CHARACTERISTICS OF SPEECH DELIVERY

.	falling (final) intonation
,	low-rising intonation suggesting continuation
;	falling to mid intonation
?	rising intonation, not necessarily a question
¿	a rise stronger than a comma but weaker than a question mark
!	strong emphasis, with falling intonation
—	flat, non-terminal intonation (level)

↑word	marked rising shift in intonation
↓word	marked falling shift in intonation
wo:::rd	one or more colons indicate lengthening of the preceding sound; each additional colon represents a lengthening of one beat
wo-	cut-off
<u>word</u>	underlined letters indicate marked stress
WORD	capitalization indicates loud volume
°word°	talk between degree signs is quieter than the surrounding talk
hhh/.hhh	in-drawn breaths
hhh	out-breaths or laughter tokens
wo(h)rd	word interspersed with laughter
>word<	> . . . < indicates speeded-up delivery relative to the surrounding talk
<word>	< . . . > indicates slowed-down delivery relative to the surrounding talk
#no#	creaky voice
'	elision of a consonant or vowel usually found in the canonical form
£word£	talk between pound signs is delivered with a smiley voice

COMMENTARY IN THE TRANSCRIPT

((coughs))	verbal description of actions noted in the transcript, including non-verbal actions
((unintelligible))	indicates a stretch of talk that is unintelligible to the analyst
)/(—)	unintelligible talk with no approximation
(xx)	unintelligible talk with each cross corresponding to a syllable
(word)	unclear or probable item

OTHER TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS

/	slashes indicate phonetic transcription
→	an arrow in the margin of a transcript draws attention to the focal phenomenon

Note

- 1 Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Contributors

1. Emma Betz is Associate Professor of German at the University of Waterloo (Canada). Her interests are in Conversation Analysis and language teaching. She is the author of *Grammar and Interaction: Pivots in German Conversation* (Benjamins, 2008) and co-editor of *Beyond Grammar: Teaching Interaction in the German Language Classroom* (*Unterrichtspraxis*, 2014–2016).
2. Thorsten Huth is Assistant Professor of German at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (USA). His interests include the emergence of pragmatic and interactional competencies in language learners and the implications for second language teaching. He is co-editor of *Beyond Grammar: Teaching Interaction in the German Language Classroom* (*Unterrichtspraxis*, 2014–2016).
3. Katharina Kley is a lecturer of German at the Center for Languages and Intercultural Communication at Rice University (USA). She received a Ph.D. in second language acquisition from the University of Iowa (USA). Her research interests include the teaching and testing of interactional competence, interactional development and classroom-based assessment.
4. Silvia Kunitz completed her Ph.D. at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (USA). She is currently working at Stockholm University (Sweden) in the Department of English and the Department of Swedish Language and Multilingualism. In her research she adopts a conversation analytic approach to study language learning environments and L2 interactions.
5. Niina Lilja is working as a University Lecturer at Tampere University (Finland). Her research interests include second language interaction and learning. She is especially interested in analyzing how linguistic, embodied and material resources work together in interactions and how participants deploy these resources to construct meaningful social actions.
6. Numa Markee is an Emeritus Associate Professor at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (USA). His research interests include multimodality, socially distributed cognition and the use of

ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis as a tool for analyzing learning processes in second language classrooms from an emic, social perspective.

7. Hanh thi Nguyen (Ph.D., University of Wisconsin–Madison) is Professor of Applied Linguistics in the TESOL Program at Hawaii Pacific University (USA). She is interested in an ethnomethodological/conversation analytic approach to understanding issues in interactional competence development, English language teaching and learning in global contexts, workplace communication and Vietnamese applied linguistics.
8. Arja Piirainen-Marsh is Professor of English in the Department of Language and Communication Studies, University of Jyväskylä (Finland). Her research focuses on the interrelationship between language use, embodied practices and structures of interaction in a variety of social tasks involving the use of L2 and/or multilingual resources.
9. M. Rafael Salaberry (Ph.D., Cornell University) is Mary Gibbs Jones Professor of Humanities at Rice University (USA). His research focuses on second language development/teaching, the acquisition of tense/aspect, and educational applications of technology. He serves on the Editorial Board of *Language@Internet* and the *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*.
10. Erica Sandlund is Associate Professor of English Linguistics at Karlstad University (Sweden). She conducts conversation analytic research on social interaction in institutional settings, such as meetings, performance appraisal interviews, L2 speaking tests, teachers' assessment training and language classrooms. Her current research interests include multilingualism, code-switching and professional learning.
11. Olcay Sert works in the School of Education, Culture and Communication at Mälardalen University (Sweden). He is the editor-in-chief of *Classroom Discourse* (Routledge) and the author of *Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse* (Edinburgh University Press, 2015), which was shortlisted for the BAAL Book Prize and AAAL First book award.
12. Pia Sundqvist is Associate Professor of English Education at the University of Oslo (Norway), and of English Linguistics at Karlstad University (Sweden). Her research interests include informal language learning, extramural English, vocabulary acquisition and assessment of L2 oral proficiency. Her current projects involve English language teaching in multilingual classrooms and code-switching.
13. Naoko Taguchi is Professor in the Modern Languages Department of Carnegie Mellon University (USA). Her research interests

include L2 pragmatics, intercultural competence, English-medium instruction and technology-assisted learning. She recently published *Second Language Pragmatics* (2017; with Carsten Roever) and the *Routledge Handbook of SLA and Pragmatics* (2019). She co-edits the journal *Applied Pragmatics*.

14. Hansun Zhang Waring is Associate Professor of Linguistics and Education at Teachers College, Columbia University (USA), and founder of The Language and Social Interaction Working Group (LANSI). Her 2016 book *Theorizing Pedagogical Interaction: Insights From Conversation Analysis* offers a synthesis of her work on the discourse of teaching and learning.
15. Kate White (Ph.D., Slavic linguistics and Second language studies, Ohio State University) is a Postdoctoral Research Associate and Research Director (for the Accelerating Systemic Change Network) at Western Michigan University (USA). Her research interests include evidence-based teaching and learning, environmental effects on learning, learner cognition, bilingualism, interactional competence and systemic change in higher education.
16. Meng Yeh, Teaching Professor at Rice University (USA), specializes in language pedagogy, curriculum design and second language acquisition. Her recent research focuses on developing students' interactional, pragmatic and reading literacy competence. She has co-authored two textbooks: *Chaoyue: Advancing in Chinese* (Columbia University Press, 2010) and *The Routledge Course in Modern Mandarin Chinese* (Routledge, 2011).
17. Dina Rudolph Yoshimi, Ph.D., is Associate Professor in the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures at the University of Hawai'i-Mānoa (USA). She is a contributing author to *Musubi: A New Approach to Japanese Language and Culture* (Open Educational Resources, UH-Mānoa) and has authored several articles on pragmatics and the learner of Japanese as a second/foreign language.
18. Eric Hauser received his doctorate from the Department of Second Language Studies at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (USA) in 2003 and is currently Associate Professor of English at the University of Electro-Communications in Tokyo (Japan). He has recent publications in *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Modern Language Journal*, and *Pragmatics*.
19. Simona Pekarek Doehler is Professor of Applied Linguistics at the University of Neuchâtel (Switzerland). Her research is dedicated to exploring the development of interactional competence in a second language, based on longitudinal Conversation Analysis, as well as the role of grammatical resources in the organization of social interaction.

20. Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm is Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics and German at the Ohio State University (USA). Her research centers on the use of language in social and cultural settings. She uses methods from Conversation analysis and Interactional Linguistics to examine how speakers formulate utterances to accomplish social actions in everyday interaction.

Index

Note: *Italicized* page numbers indicate a figure on the corresponding page. Page numbers in **bold** indicate a table on the corresponding page.

- action accomplishment 5, 35, 237, 410
- active listenership turn sequences:
 - collaborative turn sequences 143–145, 155, 159–160;
 - development of L2 interactional competence 145–146, 146;
 - introduction to 15, 142–143
- adverbials 34–35, 42
- affective alignment 178, 264
- alignment activities 201
- American conversations 331
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) 6, 12, 194, 329
- American English speakers 126, 217
- applied linguistics (AL) 14, 60–61, 145, 159, 162, 223, 407
- assessments: bottom-up criteria in 50;
 - challenges to 409; collaboration and moderation in 366–367;
 - criteria for development of IC 48–51, 49; group assessments in CASS moderation study 373, 374; of language ability 7; raters' perceptions of learners' IC 362–367
- attention-getting devices 38
- attentive listening 144, 148, 151–152, 156, 159–161
- authentic speech 9
- authoritative voice 170
- autonomous turns 38
- awareness-raising tasks 3, 102, 168, 176–177, 408
- body posture 84–85, 98, 264
- bottom-up criteria in assessment 50
- boundaries, defined 167, 168
- British English speakers 126
- CASS moderation study: analytic focus 374, 374–375; data and participants 368, 368–369, 369; discussion 392–394; evidence for/against IC 380–386, 381–382, 384–385; group assessments 373, 374; interactional work in test recording 387–389, 387–392, 390, 391; NEST assessment 368, 368–373, 369; overall reflections on interactions 376–380, 377–379; overview 367–368; rater-constructed IC 376–392; summary of 395–396; transcription 375–376; workshop design 372–373, 372–373
- Center for Languages and Intercultural Communication (CLIC) 2–4, 401, 411
- change-of-state token 126–128, 135–137, 154, 231, 270, 275, 280, 308
- Chinese as a Foreign Language 16
- classroom: conversation analysis in 225; as diversified interactional space 51–53; ESL longitudinal classroom data 32; impact on linguistic resources 11, 101; interactional competence studies 31–39; language activities 7; learning targets 324–326, 350–352; testing tools 11
- Classroom Discourse* (Eskildsen) 4, 60
- co-constructed nature of interaction 2
- cognitive processing of input 28

- collaboration in assessments 366–367
- collaborative turn sequences 143–145, 155
- Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) 16, 46, 217, 217–218, 225, 329, 411–412
- communicative competence (CC):
 - background on 26–28; defined 78; historical background 62–63; introduction to 1–3, 7, 9; joint construction of 167; social interaction and 25, 79; testing 363
- competence: in action/interaction 30, 334, 405; communication concept in 7; defined 14, 60–62, 145, 216; linguistic competence 197; participation in social interaction 362–363; practices *vs.* 216, 216–217; pragmatic competence 195–198, 203, 215; *see also* interactional competence (IC) in second language
- compliment response 330–331, 334
- computer-mediated spoken interaction 145
- concept learning/development 179–180
- connecting actions 327
- conscious interpretation 332–333, 332–333
- consensus moderation 366–367
- context dependence 352
- context-independent interactional practices 362
- context sensitivity 30, 48, 50–51, 362–363
- context-specific interactional competence 402
- contrasting actions 348, 349
- conventional expressions 197
- conversational initiative 379
- conversation analysis (CA): classroom learning targets 324–326, 350–352; conscious interpretation 332–333, 332–333; interactional organization of human sociality 360; as key framework for analysis 401–402; in language classroom 225; linguistic competence and 215; methods of 201; as naturalistic observational discipline 4; research *vs.* teaching gap 9–13; as theoretical foundation for interactional competence 4–6
- conversation analysis of SLA (CA-SLA): active listenership turn sequences 145; Discussion Task
 - interactions 142–143; empirical studies 30–31; ethnomethodological conversation analysis in 60, 66–69; experiential research on 26–27; social interaction 29
- conversation closings 336–339, 337, 338–339
- Council of Europe, Modern Languages Division 411
- data analysis/discovery learning 347, 347–348
- data extract of interactional incompetence 81–98, 81–98, 106–120
- declarative sentences 267
- deductive learning 408
- deliberate misattribution 333
- desu/masu* alternative form *see* Japanese style shifting
- development trajectory of interactional competence 47–48
- discourse boundaries 15, 167–168, 170–174, 178, 185, 406
- discourse completion tasks (DCTs) 196
- Discussion Task interactions *see* active listenership turn sequences
- disfluency 178, 223, 302
- diversification of practices 47–48
- diversification of resources 319
- doing interaction 327
- domains of practice 203–204, 403
- embodied actions: effectiveness of 366; lifting two fingers 251; in NEST assessment 373; researcher as interactionally incompetent 98; spaces for learning through 263, 272; with talking 382–383; termination of 375; transcription-related challenges 68, 238–239, 287
- embodied conduct 267, 283, 327, 375
- emergent circumstances of interaction 5, 228
- English as a Foreign Language (EFL) 145
- English as Second Language (ESL) 28–29, 32
- ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis (EMCA): historical background 64–65; implications of 66–69; introduction to 14, 60–61; social action and 327; summary of 401, 405–407, 411–412

- experience access through mobile phones 264
- experiential pedagogy 17, 261, 282
- extracurricular activities in language development 199
- face-to-face interaction 28
- first language (L1) ability 13–14, 47–48, 66
- first tier in second-language instruction 8, 80
- forms of address 197
- forward projection in grammar/ actions 341, 341–346
- French-as-a-foreign-language students 52, 180
- generative linguistics 77–78
- generic orders of organization 49
- German second language (L2)
 - learners: closings 336–339, 337, 338–339; data corpus 129–130; forward projection in grammar/ actions 341, 341–346; introduction to 125–129, 126, 127, 128; quoting others' words and actions 339–341, 340, 341–346; response behavior in post-expansion position 130–134, 130–137, 136; summary of 137–139; syntax-for-interaction and repair 346–349, 346–350; topic management 294–320, 296–301, 303–308, 310–315, 320–321; *wh*-questions 125–126, 126, 134
- Goodwin, Charles 62
- Google Hangouts 133
- grammar: assessments of 147; forward projection in 341, 341–346; pedagogical emphasis on 8, 16, 325, 334; positionally sensitive grammar 333; pragmatics and 327–330; simple structures of 219; social matrix of 77, 326; turn sequences 155, 232, 352
- grammar-for-interaction 46, 186, 215
- greeting others 40, 131, 197, 220, 301, 315, 326–330
- group assessments in CASS
 - moderation study 373, 374
- hermeneutic dialogues 366
- homestay study-abroad experiences 194
- how-are-you sequence 315
- human sociality field 64
- Hymes, Dell 26–27
- identity resources 167
- indirect speech comprehension 197
- information-seeking question 239, 248–251, 301–303, 308, 315–319
- initiative in conversations 379
- institutional testing 328–329
- intention-based accounts of social actions 2
- interactional ambiguity 331–332
- interactional competence (IC) in second language: active listenership turn sequences 145–146, 146; analysis and findings 149, 149–159, 151, 153–158; analytic procedures 148; background on 1–4, 26–28; classroom as diversified interactional space 51–53; classroom studies on 31–39; conversation analysis as foundation 4–6; criteria for development and assessment 48–51, 49; data and methodology 146–148, 147; data extract 81–98, 81–98, 106–120; defined 14, 216; development trajectory of 47–48; discussion and conclusions 159–162, 160; future directions 411–412; historical background 62–66; incorporating into teaching 6–9, 407–411; introduction to 1, 25–26, 60, 401; longitudinal classroom data 31–35, 32–34; outside of instructional settings 39–47, 40, 42–43, 45; preliminary observations 60–62; relevance and implications for praxis 47–53; repairing interactional trouble 38–39, 44–45, 45; research *vs.* teaching gap 9–13; sequentially organizing actions 35–38, 36; taking turns-at-talk 38; understanding of 28–31; unified conception of 401–407; *see also* German second language (L2) learners; Japanese style shifting; raters' perceptions of learners' IC
- interactional incompetence in second language: constructions of 101–102; data and transcription 80, 80–81; data extract 81–98, 81–98, 106–120; embodied actions 84–85, 98–99; introduction to 77–78; morphemic gloss symbols

- 121; repair initiation 86–91, 99–100, 102; researcher as 98–101
- interactional knowledge 334
- interactional repertoires 61, 404
- interactional resources 14, 61, 65–69, 157, 167, 260, 403–405
- interactive listening 365
- Interlanguage Pragmatics field 26–27
- International English Language Testing System (IELTS) 364
- interpersonal engagement in conversation 176–177
- intersubjectivity 145, 292, 318, 324

- Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) 175, 178, 182–184, 186
- Japanese second language (L2) learners 145
- Japanese style shifting: acquisition of 170–172; data collection on 172–175, 173–174; grammatical glosses 191; introduction to 15, 167–168; learner agency 182–186; speech styles and 168–170, 169; summary of 186–187; teaching of 175–186; tolerance for complexity 179–182, 185
- joint action ability 30, 281
- joint learning activity 260, 280
- Journal of Pragmatics* 68

- Knowing-in-Action 12
- knowledge through mobile phones 264
- Koschmann, Tim 61

- L1 language *see* first language (L1) ability
- L2 interactional competence (IC) *see* interactional competence (IC) in second language
- L2 interactions in discussion tasks (L2DISCO) 146–148, 147
- language behavior tracking 65
- language-in-interaction 326–328
- language-in-use research 346–349, 346–350
- Language Learning in the Wild Project 401
- language socialization studies 27
- language testing 292, 328–329
- learner agency 182–186
- learner-centered tolerance in style shifting 179–182
- learning in action 262–263
- lexical construction 130, 326, 340
- limited linguistic resources:
 - competence *vs.* practices 216, 216–217; discussion 225–226, 225–226; interactional practices with 218–223; introduction to 215; learners with 217, 217–218; one-hour intervention class 223–224, 224; pre-sequence example 220; request-reject example 221–222; resources and 101–102; stalled tape 218–219; telephone closing example 222–223; telephone opening example 219–220
- linguistic competence 13, 16, 48, 78, 161, 197, 215
- linguistic resources: accuracy of 157; active listenership and 236; classroom impact on 11, 101; defined 167; development trajectory 47–48; disagreeing turns 35; diversity of 253; of German speakers 127, 135, 138; interactional practices with 161, 218–223; social actions and 16, 37, 406; in storytelling 44; structural organization in talk 403; style shifting and 170, 175, 183; talk-in-interaction 29; testing understanding 409
- listenership *see* active listenership turn sequences
- local circumstances of interaction 5, 13, 30, 48

- membership categorization analysis (MCA) 406
- metatalk labels 183–185, 188, 408
- misattribution of meaning 332–334
- MLA Teagle Report (2009) 8
- mobile-supported sharing activities:
 - case studies 264–280, 265–266, 269–270, 272–279; co-constructing relevance of problem 268–272, 269–270; discussion 280–282; evaluation 278–280, 279; introduction to 260–262; learning in action 262–263; problems of understanding 262–263; questions guiding debriefing 288; situational resources 263–264; transcription symbols 287
- moderation in assessments 366–367

- moment-to-moment shifts in stance 177–178, 184–185
- morphemic gloss symbols 80, 121
- morpho-syntactic principles 326
- multimodal transcript 68–69, 407
- mutual gaze 82, 89, 94, 160, 167
- native/nonnative speaker status 295
- NEST assessment 368, 368–373, 369
- next turns 5, 99, 134, 137, 242, 268–270, 328, 389
- non-verbal behavior 80–81
- non-verbal interpersonal communication 365
- objects of language learning 61
- one-hour intervention class 223–224, 224
- open-class repair initiator 302
- Oral Communication Skills (OCS) 147
- Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) 160–161, 194
- oral skills 9, 233
- ordered moves 68, 337
- paired moves in closings 336
- paired tests of Spanish 365–366
- payment sequence 267
- peer-to-peer conversation 172, 202, 318, 380
- philosophical-linguistic traditions 326
- pointing gesture 276, 278
- positionally sensitive grammar 333
- positioning within sequences 326–327
- possibility of responsiveness 125
- post-expansion position response behavior 130–134, 130–137, 136
- practice-specific interactional competence 79, 402
- pragmatic competence 195–198, 203, 215
- precision timing 38, 48–50, 182, 185
- preference organization 5–6, 37–38, 48–52, 60, 62, 145, 148
- prescriptive normativity 329
- pre-sequence example 220
- problems of understanding 262–263
- professionalization efforts 3
- proficiency concept in interactional competence 7
- progressivity 50, 292, 319
- projection mechanisms 339–341, 340, 341–346
- psychological distance 170
- public self 170
- quoting others' words and actions 339–341, 340, 341–346
- raters' perceptions of learners' IC:
 - assessment of 362–367; competent participation in social interaction 362–363; data and participants 368, 368–369, 369; discussion 392–394; evidence for/against IC 380–386, 381–382, 384–385; introduction to 360–362; moderation and collaboration in assessments 366–367; NEST assessment 368, 368–373, 369; rater interpretations 365–367; study overview 367–368; summary of 395–396; testing 363–365; *see also* CASS moderation study
- rating categories for rubrics: assessing IC 291–292; data analysis 294–320, 296–301, 303–308, 310–315, 320–321; discussion 318–320; German learners' topic management 294–320, 296–301, 303–308, 310–315, 320–321; introduction to 291; topic management research 293–294
- real-world interactional practice 51–52
- reciprocity 30, 48, 50, 143
- reciprocal moves in closings 336
- reciprocation questions 246, 302, 309, 316, 319
- recurrent moves in closings 337
- Reflection-in-Action 12
- repair/repairing: defined 167; initiation of 86–91, 99–100, 102; interactional trouble 38–39, 44–45, 45
- repetition of other people's utterances 46
- request-making 4, 50, 131, 197, 230, 330
- request-reject example 221–222
- research-based L2 undergraduate curriculum 3
- response behavior in post-expansion position 130–134, 130–137, 136
- response tokens (RTs) 15, 125–138, 144, 184, 231

- return gesture 69
- rubrics *see* rating categories for rubrics
- Schegloff, Emanuel 62
- second language acquisition (SLA) 25, 204, 362, 402; *see also* Conversation Analysis of SLA
- second language interactional competence (IC) *see* German second language (L2) learners; interactional competence (IC) in second language
- self-recorded service interactions 260
- self-repair 403, 408
- semantic relationships 294, 303
- semiotic resources 29, 262–263, 404
- sequential organization: conversation closings 336–339, 337, 338–339; interaction 262, 324, 334–335; introduction to 35–38, 36; placement 50; turns-at-talk 125–126
- sequential use of language 78–79
- situated learning 63, 145–146
- situational resources 263–264
- social action/interaction: behavior in testing 334; communicative competence and 79; competent participation in 78, 362–363; conceptual development 28–30; intention-based accounts of 2; language testing and 292; learning targets 329–330, 408; linguistic resources and 16, 37, 406; mobile phones and 263–264; performance distinction 78; turns-at-talk/turn taking 38; verbal and embodied conduct 327–328
- socialization: communicative competence 27, 29; criticism from language perspective 63; identity and 200; impact on listener behavior 161; second language acquisition 362; into speech styles 171–172, 175; turns-at-talk 38, 41
- sociocultural theory (SCT) 63, 179, 182
- sociolinguistic competence 78
- socio-pragmatic knowledge 334
- Spanish modality study 179
- Spanish second language (L2) learners 144–145, 365–366
- speech acts 27–28, 167, 185, 197–199, 326
- speech-exchange systems 403, 407
- stalled tape 218–219
- stepwise movement into new topic 293–294
- storytelling 31–35, 32–34, 41–44, 42–43, 201–202, 403
- study-abroad experiences: current concerns 192–195; introduction to 192; pragmatic competence and 195–198, 205; research and interactional competence 198–203; summary of 203–205
- style shifting *see* Japanese style shifting
- subject-verb-object (SVO) word order 329
- Swedish National Agency for Education 369
- syntactic boundary completions 160
- syntax: ambiguity of 331; for interaction and repair 346–349, 346–350; pedagogical emphasis on 8
- systematic testing 329
- tag questions 267
- taking the initiative in conversations 379
- talk-in-interaction 29, 175, 333, 403–404
- target language (TL) 192, 193–195, 199–205
- task openings 31–35, 32–34, 145, 403
- telephone conversations: closing example 222–223; opening example 219–220; in the wild 39–41, 40
- TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) graduate program 223
- testing formats for specific learning targets: conversation closings 336–339, 337, 338–339; discussion 350–352; introduction to 324–326; language-in-interaction 326–328; nature of 328–335, 330–331, 332–333; raters' perceptions of learners' IC 363–365; summary of 352–353; syntax-for-interaction

- and repair 346–349, 346–350;
- turn construction and projection 339–341, 340, 341–346; written test formats 335–353
- Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) 364
- test-taker discourse 295
- tolerance for complexity 179–182, 185
- topic boundary marker 316
- topic initiation 178, 233, 246, 293, 315, 318–319, 403
- transcript-based testing formats 351–352
- transcription symbols 287
- transition relevance place (TRP) 150
- translingual/transcultural discussion 294
- turn construction and projection 339–341, 340, 341–346
- turn-format/composition 326
- turns-at-talk/turn taking:
 - communicative interaction through 25; competence *vs.* practices 216, 216–217; interactional incompetence in 100–101; interactional mechanisms of 14; introduction to 2, 4; in Japanese style shifting 167; sequentially organizing actions 35; sequential organization and practice of 125–126; social action in 29; social interaction 38, 48, 49
- tu/vous* forms 180
- two-way conversation 173
- unified conception of interactional competence 401–407
- university cafe case study 264–280, 265–266, 269–270, 272–279
- verbal conduct 25, 327
- verb constructions/ordering 271, 346
- Vietnamese learner of English 28–29
- vocabulary: pedagogical emphasis on 8, 16, 325, 334; pragmatics and 327–330; social matrix of 326; turn sequences 352
- what-to-say search 316
- wh*-questions 125–126, 126, 134
- word class ambiguity 331
- written test formats 335–353