

**A STUDY OF INTERACTIONAL COMPETENCE IN
THE TAIWANESE ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN
LANGUAGE CLASSROOM CONTEXT**

SHANE DONALD

**Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

Integrated PhD in Educational and Applied Linguistics

**Newcastle University
School of Education, Communication
and Language Sciences**

2015

Abstract

This thesis examines the construct of interactional competence and the manner in which interactional competence is displayed and maintained in the context of the English as a second or foreign language university classroom in Taiwan. Inherent in this research is the belief that it is the language use of the instructor that shapes and promulgates the conditions in which learners are able to participate in classroom events and utilize the target language as members of a learning community. What is being investigated here is what it means for language instructors to be interactionally competent and the influence this has on the ability of learners to enter into, and participate in, classroom discourse. The analysis of this construct is informed by the view that interactional competence should be examined from both a broad and micro-analytical perspective. The broad perspective argues for the assumption that interactional competence is the achievement of intersubjective relations between interlocutors, in and through turns at talk. It is how interactants display common understandings of what is occurring in the talk itself and act upon those understandings to manage the localized turn-taking system. This is affected by roles that are salient in the classroom, that of teacher and learner. In other words, an ‘ecological’ approach (van Lier 2004) is adopted. These suppositions are examined through analysis of episodes of interaction between three language instructors and their learners, taken from approximately 24 hours of classroom interaction in three EFL classrooms in a university in southern Taiwan. The findings suggest that intersubjectivity in the context of the English as a second or foreign language classroom in Taiwan is achieved by means of affordances (ibid 2000) offered by the instructor during episodes of interaction. These affordances include recipient design and repair. In conjunction with these affordances, extended wait-time is employed as a means of creating space for these affordances to be acted upon by learners. This thesis then goes on then goes on to argue that in light of

these findings, the construct of interactional competence needs to be redefined.

Acknowledgements

Even though my name appears on this thesis, I can't really say it's my all my own work. I received far too much help along the way to ever make that claim. First of all, many thanks to my supervisors Steve Walsh and Paul Seedhouse for advice and encouragement and for helping me see that there is always something interesting going on in the language classroom. Your help has made me appreciate how hard it must be supervising a research student or at least this one anyway. A big thank you to Peter Sercombe and Keith Richards for acting as internal and external examiner of this thesis. It's a much better piece of work thanks to your input and you helped me see this research in a different light. Any errors left in here are my own fault.

Many thanks also to the participants in this research who allowed me access to their classrooms and their thoughts on teaching. It's a cliché but this work wouldn't exist without your help. I also need to thank Michael McCollister and Lifan Chen for their help in securing funding for my studies (thanks also go to Feng Chia University for this), and thanks to Newcastle University for the international studentship scholarship they gave me.

I also want to thank Bian Bian, Blackie and Wawa for keeping their promise to their dad and Guo Jiang for coming along and joining our family. Thanks also go to Bai-I for help in transcribing the Chinese.

To Michael Hudson goes thanks for being a critical friend and making sure I wasn't biased in my approach, but also thanks for being a friend in general. Thanks also go to Abdullah Alenezi for his friendship and the long walks; meeting you has been one of the best parts of the degree. Thanks also go to my dad, Kevin and Donna for showing an interest in what I was doing even if they didn't fully understand it.

Finally, I need to thank my wife. She was one of the participants in the research but she

was also willing to let me go off and study. Knowing you were waiting for me to come home made this much easier and I can't thank you enough for your patience. Fifteen years together has flown by and I'm a much better person because you love me. If our son is anything like you (and I know he will be), he will be an amazing person.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1.1 Research Overview	1
1.2 Research Purpose	4
1.3 Thesis Structure.....	6
Chapter 2. Literature Review	8
2.1 Interaction as a Social Process	12
2.2 Sociocultural Theories of Learning.....	14
2.2.1 <i>The Notion of Context</i>	17
2.2.2 <i>Mediation</i>	19
2.2.3 <i>The Zone of Proximal Development</i>	20
2.2.4 <i>Scaffolding</i>	21
2.2.5 <i>Appropriation/ Internalization</i>	22
2.2.6 <i>Self-Regulation</i>	22
2.3 Sociocultural Theory and the Idea of Context	23
2.3.1 <i>Discursive Practice</i>	24
2.3.2 <i>Legitimate Peripheral Participation</i>	25
2.4 Interactional Competence.....	26
2.4.1 <i>Interactional Competence and Language Learning</i>	29
2.4.2 <i>Affordances for Teaching and Learning</i>	37
2.4.3 <i>Extended Wait-Time</i>	38
2.5 Interaction and Language Learning	39
2.6 Interaction and Language Learning: Theoretical Concepts	41
2.6.1 <i>The Interaction Hypothesis</i>	43
2.6.2 <i>The Output Hypothesis</i>	44
2.6.3 <i>The Input-Interaction Hypothesis</i>	45
2.7 Interaction and Development	46
2.8 Interaction and Language Learning: the Role of the Teacher	47
2.8.1 <i>Classroom Interaction</i>	48
2.8.2 <i>Teaching and Learning</i>	50
2.9 The SETT Framework.....	52
2.10 Summary	56
Chapter 3. Methodology	57
3.1 Introduction.....	58
3.1.1 <i>The Taiwanese Educational Context</i>	58
3.1.2 <i>Data Collection and Research Setting</i>	59
3.1.3 <i>The Participants</i>	60

3.2 The Foreign Language Classroom as a Research Setting: Ontological and Epistemological Considerations.....	61
3.3 Triangulation	64
3.4 Focus Groups	64
3.5 Conversation Analysis as a Research Method	75
3.6 Conversation Analysis and the Notion of Competence.....	76
3.7 Conversation Analysis and Professional Development	77
3.8 Conversation Analysis and Sociocultural Theory	79
3.9 Limitations of Conversation Analysis.....	79
3.10 Straight Ahead and Applied Conversation Analysis	84
3.11 Stimulated Recall and Semi-Structured Interviews	87
3.12 Stimulated Recall Interviews	88
3.13 Interviewing as a Process	90
3.14 Summary	93
Chapter 4. Research Design.....	95
4.1 Research Questions	95
4.2 Research Setting and Participants	96
4.3 Data Collection.....	96
4.4 Training in the SETT Framework	103
4.5 Data Collection: Filming Classroom Teaching	105
4.5.1 <i>Data Collection: Interviews</i>	107
4.5.2 <i>Data Analysis</i>	108
4.6 Summary	109
Chapter 5. Data Analysis.....	111
5.1 Focus Group One	111
5.1.1 <i>Perspectives on Teaching and Learning</i>	112
5.1.2 <i>Interactional Competence</i>	115
5.2 The Second Language Classroom as an Ecological Setting	117
5.3 Data Analysis Part A: What characterizes interactional competence within micro-contexts of classroom interaction?	118
5.4 Data Analysis Part B: What features of interaction delineate interactional competence?.....	139
5.4.1 <i>Recipient Design and the Affordance of Interactional Space</i>	139
5.4.2 <i>Repair</i>	172
5.4.3 <i>Concluding Focus Group</i>	185
5.5 Summary	188
Chapter 6. Discussion	190
6.1 The Characteristics of Interactional Competence	191
6.2 Features of Interactional Competence.....	194
6.3 Defining Interactional Competence	196

6.4 Pedagogical Implications	205
Chapter 7. Conclusion.....	211
7.1 Research Questions	211
7.2 Pedagogical Implications	213
7.3 Limitations and Further Research	214
References	217
Appendices	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Chapter 1. Introduction

The object of this chapter is to state the purpose of this research. In order to do so the various strands that form this thesis will be discussed and analyzed. A broad overview of the literature and research methodologies employed in this work will also be undertaken. The following section of this chapter will place this research in the context of previous work into the construct of interactional competence; from this both the purpose and relevance of this thesis will be made explicit. To conclude, the research questions that inform this research will be introduced, along with an outline of how this thesis is organized.

1.1 Research Overview

In any discussion of interactional competence it is important to note that this is a construct used to represent an idea, this idea being that there are optimal conditions and strategic deployment of interactional resources interacting together to foster competent interaction. Conversely, this also implies that there can be a deficit at work during episodes of interaction; an interlocutor may fail to engage competently in an episode of interaction, leading to consequences such as misunderstandings or inability to co-construct discourse in order to achieve goals inherent within that interaction. However, there are wider implications when discussing this construct. In arguing for interactional competence there are underlying assumptions that come into play. An example of this is the notion that competence can both be displayed and seen to be occurring. In other words, interlocutors respond to such displays through their next turn-at-talk, maintaining and renewing spoken discourse. This then raises the question of what it means to interact competently in spoken discourse. Kramsch (1986) in her paper arguing for the teaching of interactional competence to language learners describes successful interaction as interlocutors arriving at a match between intended, perceived and anticipated meanings. Awareness of the context in which interaction is

occurring and the messages being communicated in that context provide a frame of reference for interlocutors and it is in attending to these concerns that competence is manifest. Concerns such as competence in the grammatical and lexical components of language are less important than knowledge of knowing when and how to speak in order to co-construct spoken discourse. In recent years it has been argued (Dings 2007, Walsh 2011) that interactional competence is distinct from ‘communicative competence’, a term devised by Canale and Swain (1980) to describe the knowledge learners need to possess to communicate with a high degree of facility in a foreign language. This includes knowledge of linguistic and grammatical forms but does not take into account knowing *how* (italics mine) to interact with interlocutors. In broad terms this ‘how’ includes knowing when to speak and when to offer the conversational floor. In essence, it is the knowledge of how to co-construct spoken discourse. This thesis is concerned with how language teachers co-construct classroom interaction with learners. This differs from pragmatic competence (for more see Chomsky, 1980). Pragmatic competence, with its focus upon knowing how language is related to the situation in which it is used is an individual competency. It is what an individual knows regarding norms and conventions for communicating in a particular language. Interactional competence is concerned with knowing how to construct discourse in conjunction with other speakers. It is the co-construction of understanding and accomplishment of goals within interaction with another speaker or speakers. In this thesis, these speakers are the teacher and learners and it is to how they co-construct interaction that analytical attention is turned.

Bearing this in mind, when discussing the second or foreign language classroom, it is evident that the focus of research into interactional competence in this setting is largely concerned with language use of learners (see Kelly-Hall 1995 and Hellermann 2007 for example). This is not surprising given that Kramsch’s (1986) work argued for

interactional competence to be taught to this particular group. Therefore, research into this field has been concerned with how this may be achieved. This thesis is concerned with how interactional competence is manifested by language instructors within the context of classroom practice. Less attention has been given to the role teachers play in shaping learner language use (though Johnson 1995 and Walsh 2006 are exceptions, these examples are not primarily concerned with the construct of interactional competence). Interactional competence as displayed by learners of foreign languages has received much attention in research related to second language acquisition as a result of the dissemination of sociocultural theories of learning (Vygotsky 1988). In brief, sociocultural theory posits that developmental processes occur through a process of participation. While accepting this epistemological position, this thesis argues that in order for learners to participate in classroom life in and through the target language, it is the role of the teacher that is of primary importance in making this so. It is the teacher who will largely decide who will speak and when and has the greatest impact on the interaction (and participation) that occurs in the classroom.

The literature included in this thesis is primarily concerned with interactional competence and sociocultural theories of learning. What will be investigated here will be the language employed by the instructor to facilitate learner involvement in classroom discourse, rather than language development of learners as a means for evaluating learning. This thesis will examine language use within episodes of interaction but is not concerned with making claims regarding second or foreign language acquisition (though it should be noted that Kasper and Markee 2004 argue for an interrelation between the two).

Further to this, an argument will be made that current definitions of interactional competence are concerned with making generalizations with regard to this construct but do not account for the relationship between context, interlocutors and deployment of

interactional resources in a comprehensive manner. As will be discussed, assumptions are made regarding interactional competence to do with the competency of interlocutors and the context in which the interaction being examined occurs. For example, while much of the research on interactional competence stresses the importance of context (Chalhoub-Deville 2003, Young 2008), little research has been done with regard to the role the teacher plays in fostering this construct as part of classroom practice. In order to explain how these factors influence each other, the analysis performed in Chapter Five will investigate the characteristics of interactional competence and the interactional resources that delineate interactional competence in order to define interactional competence in the context being investigated (the Taiwanese English as a second or foreign language classroom). The objective is to identify what interactional competence on the part of the language teacher is in this context through examining this construct in a broad manner (relating interactional competence to the achievement of intersubjectivity) before identifying and analyzing the resources that illuminate this construct at work. In order to do so, it is through an analysis of turns-at-talk that interactional competence is manifest. This is the justification for employing Applied Conversation Analysis as a research method in this thesis and this research method will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Three. In this chapter, the justifications of utilizing a multiple-methods approach rather than a single research method will be discussed with regard to analyzing interactional competence in a comprehensive and holistic manner. The use of focus groups and stimulated recall interviews take the role of the participant into account, providing a more informed analysis of how interactional competence is embodied and manifest through examining the thought processes of instructors as they relate to episodes of classroom interaction.

1.2 Research Purpose

The aim of this thesis is to evaluate interactional competence on the part of

language teachers in one particular setting. The argument for doing so is that unlike other research into this construct, this research is not concerned with interactional competence as demonstrated by learners of English. The focus here is on the instructor and whether or not manifestation of interactional competence on the part of the teacher fosters learner involvement in classroom discourse. Therefore, a variable approach to data collection and analysis is called for. As outlined above, I contend that it is through analyzing turns-at-talk as the mechanism that allows for and demonstrates co-construction of spoken discourse, that interactional competence can be seen to occur. However, this method does not provide insight into the thought processes that inform how language instructors interact with learners. Therefore, a multiple-methods approach is used in this research, these methods being focus groups, Applied Conversation Analysis and stimulated recall interviews. The rationale for adopting a multiple-methods approach relates directly to the research questions that inform this thesis. These questions are as follows:

1. What characterizes interactional competence within micro-contexts of classroom interaction?
2. What features of interaction delineate interactional competence?

These questions are concerned with the use of language in the second or foreign language classroom setting. Applied Conversation Analysis, with its close attention to the micro-details of interaction such as turn-taking mechanisms, reveals the underlying ‘architecture’ of spoken discourse and provides the researcher with an emic perspective on the interaction as it unfolds. However, as will be related in the third chapter of this thesis, this approach to analysis is not without limitations. In particular, such a method is divorced from the notions that shape and inform classroom practice on the part of instructors. Therefore, classroom data alone is not sufficient to provide a comprehensive picture of classroom interaction. In analyzing how and when teachers provide space for

learners to participate in classroom discourse, gaining the insight of the instructors concerned is of importance. Given that interactional competence is highly individual and related to the interactional needs of a given moment, eliciting participants' views on their teaching goals and language use provides a more thorough exploration of the construct of interactional competence than would classroom data taken in isolation. Thus, two focus groups (one at the beginning and one at the conclusion of data collection) and stimulated recall interviews related to classroom data were also employed in this research. In adopting a multiple-methods approach the goal was to achieve triangulation (Bryman 2008); a variety of methods would provide a coherent and effective methodology for answering the research questions outlined above.

1.3 Thesis Structure

This thesis begins a literature review chapter. This section is, of necessity, broad in scope. The initial discussion is concerned with interaction as a social phenomenon. Attention is then given to the notion of intersubjectivity and how this informs spoken discourse, before referring to and analyzing literature related to the construct of interactional competence. Sociocultural theories of learning are then outlined with a particular focus on Legitimate Peripheral Participation and Communities of Practice (Wertsch et al 1995). This is then followed by the methodology chapter in which greater depth is given to the justification for the adoption of the research methods utilized in this thesis than that outlined above. The rationale for their employment and the manner in which they complement each other as part of a methodology is discussed. The limitations of the methods employed are also referred to. The subsequent chapter details the design of the research carried out. A description of the procedures and participants involved in this research is given. The following chapter is an analysis of the data collected from focus group discussion, classroom data and stimulated recall interview data. The analysis of the classroom data is organized thematically and discusses two

central features of interactional competence; these are recipient design and repair, and, in relation to these affordances, provision of interactional space to learners by means of extended wait-time. The discussion chapter refers to the contribution made by this research to the construct of interactional competence, arguing that the definition of interactional competence outlined here is comprehensive in scope, attending to context, deployment of interactional resources and the role of participants themselves, in distinction to earlier definitions of interactional competence such as those offered by Kelly-Hall (2005) for example. This thesis then concludes with a summary of the contribution this research makes to understanding the construct of interactional competence and how this construct is embodied in English as a second or foreign language classroom in the Taiwanese context.

Chapter 2. Literature Review

An analysis of the extant scholarship into the construct of interactional competence reveals a focus by researchers on how *learners* (italics mine) of English as a second or foreign language can develop this competency. Kramsch's argument for assigning interactional competence a central role within the language learning curriculum was concerned with learners' language acquisition but also instructing learners in knowing how and when to interact' (1986). As part of her argument she stated that interacting in a successful manner 'presupposes a shared knowledge of the world, the reference to a common external context' (ibid, p.367). I wish to draw attention to the word 'presupposes', as it is this idea that informs much of the literature that exists regarding interactional competence and also indicates how this construct is viewed. This notion of presupposition reveals that for those examining interactional competence there are conditions in place that aid in facilitating interaction prior to interaction occurring. As stated above, this includes knowledge of the wider social sphere in which interaction occurs. However, this is problematic when considering the English as a foreign language classroom. In this context, social relations are in service to the goals of teaching and learning. It is the teacher who is most active in determining who will speak and when, for example. Learners cannot be said to possess an equivalent level of speaking rights or knowledge of the context in which interaction will occur; it is the teacher who holds greater knowledge and power as language use will be predicated on the teaching and learning goals informing episodes of interaction. Studies by Kelly-Hall (2002, 2006), Lantolf (2000) and Young (1999, 2000 and 2004) are further examples of this analytical focus on learner language use and manifestation of interactional competence, with reference to theoretical considerations rather than empirical data. This research takes a counter-position with regard to interactional competence. An examination of current literature on the subject reveals limitations with regard to both

scope of enquiry and employment of methodology. Little is known at the current time about the role the instructor plays in fostering and developing interactional competence on the part of language learners. Rather, research into this construct has placed attention on language use by the learner. This raises questions as to the role the instructor plays in interaction in the language classroom and how language use on the part of the teacher influences what interactional competence is within this learning environment. As has been stated, previous research into interactional competence has been concerned with language use, especially that of learners. Therefore, it has been language use that has been evaluated. The method for doing so has been Conversation Analysis. In order to examine interactional competence language use must be analyzed. However, this approach is also somewhat limiting to the researcher as it does not take into account the intentions of participants that inform language use. Interaction is a goal-oriented activity. In the language classroom this notion is particularly cogent as language use is directed towards teaching and learning. To investigate interactional competence in this setting, analyzing language use alone does not provide a comprehensive understanding of this construct as it develops over time. Deeper understanding is fostered through engaging with those participating in the interaction being studied and gaining their perspective on that interaction. Unlike previous studies into interactional competence, this research utilizes multiple-methods to examine interactional competence, with interviews with participants serving to support an Applied Conversation Analysis of classroom data. The goal of this thesis is to fill a gap in current research into interactional competence in the setting of the English as a second or foreign language classroom by focusing on the role and language use of the instructor and utilizing multiple research methods to investigate the language classroom setting.

This literature review provides an overview of interactional competence and its place within the context of second language teaching, and by extension, learning. In

order to examine this construct, this chapter will begin with an analysis of interaction as an element of social discourse, and also a crucial aspect of the life of second language classrooms. The argument presented will be that interaction is a phenomenon that informs relations between human beings and is a fundamental aspect of social life. However, due to the institutional nature of second language classrooms, the interaction that occurs in this setting is, of necessity, different from that which occurs in society at large, with its own particular norms of language use and communication. These norms shape the interaction that occurs in second language classrooms and also affect what interactional competence is in this context. Completing the utterance of an interlocutor would denote interactional competence as noted by Dings (2014), showing as it does a shared understanding of what the other person wishes to communicate and precision timing in completing their utterance; however, were the teacher to complete a learner utterance in this way, an argument can be made that students lose an opportunity to develop in the target language. Such a teacher could be viewed as interacting in a less than competent manner. Focus will then shift to sociocultural theories of learning and how such theories of learning inform the concept of learning discussed in this research. This thesis argues that learning is an inherently social process in which language serves as the means by which learning occurs and the product of learning itself. A social view of learning also requires that interactional competence be conceived of in a holistic manner that includes language use, context and participants acting in concert. In other words, interactional competence needs to be comprehensively understood as a process and as a construct.

A description and commentary on differing views of the construct of interactional competence will then be offered. At issue will be how this construct is defined and this forms the substance of the discussion undertaken. Through an analysis of differing perspectives on interactional competence, it will be proposed that a new definition of

interactional competence needs to be fashioned with regard to second language classrooms and the interaction that occurs in this setting. The suggestion will also be made that interactional competence should be viewed as being central to, and arising from, the concept of interaction itself. Therefore, this construct should be evaluated as being distinct from other aspects of Canale and Swain's (1980) model of Communicative Competence.

The following section will deal with the dissonance that exists between sociocultural and cognitive views of learning, particularly with regard to how learning is demonstrated and how products of learning are displayed and evaluated. Attention will be given to Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1983, 1996), Swain's Output Hypothesis (2005) and the Input-Interaction Hypothesis (Gass 2004).

The discussion will then focus on the role of the language teacher in fostering interaction in order to facilitate opportunities for learning in the classroom context. More specifically, it will be suggested that the teacher is central to this enterprise; interaction is largely generated by and through the teacher. Participation in turns at talk is assigned by the instructor as they go about the business of fulfilling pedagogical goals. It is through language that the teacher attempts to include learners in classroom interaction, and in so doing, promote learning.

This chapter will then examine Walsh's (2006) SETT Framework as a tool for allowing language teachers to reflect upon their use of language in relation to pedagogical goals. This discussion makes the case that it is through reflection and critical analysis of language use in the classroom context that the development of interactional competence occurs on the part of language teachers; it is in the process of reflection and discussion of the insights generated (as in an interview regarding classroom data) that intentions in talk-in-interaction become clear to participants in that interaction. This discussion will also provide a context for the application of the SETT

Framework within this study and a brief overview of its relationship with other methodological underpinnings of this research.

The chapter will then conclude with a summary of the ideas that have shaped this chapter, in particular the notion that interactional competence as displayed by language teachers has not been the subject of a great deal of research. Further, the reader will be reminded that it is the teacher that has the greatest influence on how learners interact in language classrooms and so how interactional competence develops in this setting.

2.1 Interaction as a Social Process

Interaction allows human beings to realize themselves as social actors. Through interaction people express personal views, build relations with others in their community and achieve ‘the business of everyday daily life’ (Garfinkel 2008). The primary means for doing so is language. Language is the tool employed to enable communication. Interlocutors possess goals that they wish to achieve within spoken discourse such as self-expression, exchanges of information and problem-solving. Interlocutors co-construct discourse in order to achieve those goals, through the use of language. Kramsch (1998, p.47) states:

In face-to-face verbal exchanges the choice of orate features of speech can give the participants a feeling of joint interpersonal involvement rather than the sense of detachment or objectivity that comes with the mere transmission of factual information

What this quote highlights is that interaction is fundamentally social, co-constructed event. Through interaction, people form relationships, navigate topics and make sense of the world.

Kelly-Hall (2004) also describes interaction as being inherently social and containing its own systematic procedures and practices with which individuals engage with each other and manage joint attention, while Pekarek-Dohler (2002) posits that interaction provides ‘microsolutions’ to evolving social situations, and is therefore, a

local accomplishment.

These perspectives regard interaction as a process dependent upon communication; i.e. it is a social accomplishment (Kramsch 1993, Firth and Wagner 1997, Young 2002, Kelly-Hall 2004, Gan 2010). Young and Miller (2004) conclude that social realities are constructed through interaction; discourse is primarily a social action, whereby meanings are negotiated through interaction and are shaped and bound by context. Therefore, such meanings as are negotiated are not fixed and are influenced by discourse as it occurs in and through interaction.

A corollary to this is that interaction occurs in a context brought into being by interlocutors through their talk and as such is predicated on a series of norms that are related to communication. This includes factors such as interlocutors attempting to create a shared understanding or intersubjectivity based on negotiation and reference to the external context (Kramsch 1986) that the interaction takes place in. Nathan et al (2007) state that the role of intersubjectivity is one of organizing and maintaining discourse. Hence, this definition argues for a relationship between resources employed and the context in which this is done. Matsuov (2001, p.383) holds that intersubjectivity possesses three aspects. These are:

1. Intersubjectivity as having something in common
2. Intersubjectivity as coordination of participants' contributions
3. Intersubjectivity as human agency

This thesis is primarily concerned with interactional competence, and therefore, spoken discourse, and it is to the second aspect that most attention is given. However, the other aspects described have some relation in a wider context to the issues discussed in this research, as language is employed to foster mutual understanding between interlocutors (the notion of 'having something in common') and is informed by a desire to achieve particular goals through communication (human agency).

Young (2009, p.50) describes the interface between language and context as follows:

(the) distinction made is not between language and a context lying beyond the immediate interaction; rather, it is between people's conduct in a moment of interaction and the immediate sequential context

Hence, it can be seen that interaction is also a highly-situated event, shaped by and constituting local context (Firth 1996, Firth and Wagner 1997, van Compernelle 2010), a conceit that will be further developed later in this thesis. Further, interlocutors co-construct meaning and shared understandings in and through interaction, by means of language (Kelly-Hall 1993, Ohta 2000). Accordingly, any study of interaction must take situational context into account, as well as what is being communicated within the interaction with regard to content and topic, as argued by Hellermann (2007). Context, language use and co-construction of shared understandings connect and impact upon each other (Chalhoub-Deville 2003) and so must be conceived of as a whole and also as discrete components of interaction. In short, interaction is a collaborative enterprise, as interlocutors partially create the context for mutual understanding and intersubjectivity in and through language. Therefore, language use entails contextual and interactional factors (Markee 2000), as has been discussed above. From an overview of social interaction, discussion will now turn to learning as a social process.

2.2 Sociocultural Theories of Learning

Given that the following discussion deals with learning as being social in nature (through means of interaction), brief consideration will be given to learning as a process divorced from interaction (learning as 'having', Sfard1998). This is to clearly delineate learning as a social process from learning as a cognitive process. More will be said on this in section 2.6. Mondada and Pekarek-Doehler (2004) consider this position to be problematic. This is because it gives rise to a notion of competence that is treated as

isolated from socialization processes.

1. It engenders a conception of learning abstracted from organization of actions, community membership and participation frameworks.
2. It argues for a notion of context that is reduced to a stable variable that affects cognitive events.

In contrast, Firth and Wagner (2007, p.807) state that ‘Learning is an inseparable part of ongoing activities and therefore situated in social practice and social interaction’. What this quote reveals about learning is that learning is something that is demonstrated and performed; or to put it another way, learning is displayed (Donato 2000). In language learning, interaction is the way in which learning is demonstrated and there is a relationship between context and utilization of language within that context (Kelly-Hall 1995). Pekarek-Doehler (2002) expands upon this idea, stating that learning in interaction is contingent on dealing with situations that occur within the interaction as sociocultural encounters, and as such, involving learning how to deal with situations that arise interactively. Through interaction, participants collaborate and construct the sociocultural conditions of their encounter through the interaction that is taking place. Given that this thesis is arguing for a relationship between context and language use (for definitions of context see Walsh 2006 and section 2.2.1) as indicative of interactional competence (and therefore proficiency, Hellermann 2007), discussion will now turn to the sociocultural theory of language learning.

The Sociocultural Theory of Learning arose out of the work of Lev Vygotsky.

Vygotsky (1988) said of learning:

an essential feature of learning is that it creates the zone of proximal development; that is, learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers (p352).

Vygotsky is stating knowledge is social in nature and constructed through a process

of collaboration, that is, interaction and communication in social settings (see Wertsch et al 1995, Donato 2000, Roebuck 2000, Poehner and Lantolf 2005, Tusting 2005, Brooks 2009, Swain et al 2011). Wertsch et al (1995, p.3) state that, ‘the goal of a sociocultural approach is to explicate the relationships between human mental functioning...and the cultural, institutional and historical situations in which this functioning occurs’. Learning is constructed through interaction and communication among teachers and learners through a process of collaboration, with the classroom serving as a social setting in which experts and learners work together to create sociocognitive conditions of learning exchanges in and through interaction (see Nassji and Swain 2000, Pekarek-Dohler 2002 for more on this). What appears to be argued for here is that both acquisition and use of the target language are a social process. In other words there is a dialectical relationship between participation (the social aspect of learning) and the internalization of new information (the mental aspect of learning). This appears to be an integrated approach to learning rather than a dichotomous relationship. However, this position is potentially problematic. While it is true that learners need guidance in episodes of interaction, the nature of what learning is in interaction is open to question. More will be said later on the debate between sociocultural and cognitive views of learning. For those that argue that learning is largely a mental process (Gass 1994 and Long 1996 are two such examples), with interaction serving as a testing-ground for learners’ ideas about language, the argument that interaction is learning is contentious.

One way in which the charge that interaction does not constitute learning in and of itself may be refuted by Vygotsky’s (1988) idea that development rather than learning occurs through interaction. Vygotsky (ibid) is not arguing for a semantic difference between these two ideas. He is arguing instead that learners move from a social to a psychological understanding of concepts by means of the aid of a more-competent peer

and that this process leads to the development of new concepts by learners. The relation this idea holds to teaching and learning is clear. The teacher is an expert who aids the learner in acquiring new concepts through a process referred to as mediation, which is a dialogic process that occurs in the Zone of Proximal Development. A description of these concepts is given later in this section. This is not to say that the social and internal aspects of learning are in balance or equal; rather, Vygotsky (ibid) argues that development is constituted of both aspects to varying degrees. However, it is social interaction that initiates this process of development.

Gardner and Rogoff (1982) describe the role of the teacher within this dialogue as follows: ‘Inherent in instruction is the construction of a context in which the new information is made compatible with the learner’s current knowledge and skills’ (p. 96). Donato (2000) argues that instructional conversations between teacher and learner which are spontaneous in nature provide for greater language learning, unlike those carried out in experimental conditions which offer limited scope for interaction which leads to learning. Lantolf (2010) sounds a note of caution however, regarding the classroom as a quasi-experimental venue that does not reflect learning as it occurs in daily life. Thus, it can be seen that sociocultural theory holds that language learning is not a solely cognitive process where linguistic understanding is predicated on acquisition of vocabulary and grammatical knowledge (in keeping with Sfarid’s (1998) idea of ‘learning as having’) but also based upon social interaction (Sfarid’s ‘(ibid) learning as doing’).

2.2.1 The Notion of Context

Sociocultural theory suggests that context plays a role in learning. However, what is meant by context can mean different things in different situations. The purpose of this section of the literature review is to discuss definitions of context and clarify the notion of context described in this thesis.

Day (2007) in his discussion of ‘messo-context’ in which analysts go beyond the parameters of what can be observed in describing context, states that researchers should bring to bear knowledge of previous interactions. This makes it possible to go beyond the talk being analyzed and use the understanding gained of the research setting as part of the analysis. The setting that this thesis is examining is the Taiwanese English as a foreign language classroom. Interaction in such a setting is often teacher-fronted, with learners offered little space in which to enter into interaction in the target language. It is also a setting in which institutional practices (those of teaching and learning) are performed through classroom activities. The medium through which these practices are achieved is talk; the instructor uses talk to further the business of learning, while the learner displays understanding through his or her turn-at-talk. Thus, setting plays a role in how interaction is organized and developed.

However, this thesis is also concerned with context in another form as a subset of setting. Interactures (Walsh 2006) between teacher and learner serve as another form of context. Turns-at-talk between teacher and learner are organized based on a sensitivity to the setting in which the talk occurs but also to the organization of the turns-at-talk themselves. They are also a setting in which identities such as teacher and learner are negotiated and talked into and out of being. Arminen (2000) also states each turn creates a new context for the next. Interactures are a context in which turns-at-talk potentially function to achieve the goals of teaching and learning. It also the forum from which the analyst can interpret and attempt to understand the behavior of participants. For Gumperz (1992) context is equivalent to ‘what is going on?’ Those engaged in communication interpret each other’s utterances, employing negotiation of meaning and management of turns due to the situation they find themselves in. Further to this, Schegloff (1992) argues for the view that sequence is a contextual resource for participants in interaction that is oriented to in order to display understanding.

Organization of action creates context.

The above descriptions of context discuss both the distal (external) and proximate (discourse-based) nature of context. This thesis is mostly concerned with context as a proximate phenomenon as the discourse between teacher and learner is analyzed to examine the construct of interactional competence. This is not to say that setting plays no role in the research being carried out. However, it is not the central concern of this thesis.

Attention will now be given to the elements that make up Vygotsky's concept of sociocultural theory. These are mediation, the Zone of Proximal Development, scaffolding and self-regulation. Links will be drawn between how these ideas relate to teaching and learning and the concerns of this thesis.

2.2.2 Mediation

Problem-solving is an important component of sociocultural theory. In order for problems to be solved, tools must be utilized to achieve this end. Language is regarded as a tool that allows for mediation between the human mind and mental consciousness (Frawley and Lantolf 1985). Thus, this form of mediation can be perceived as a form of active participation, arguing as it does for action, as language is fundamental in solving problems that human beings encounter (Lei 2008). Interaction with others allows for deeper understandings of a problem to develop. These others can be classified as mediators. Pekarek-Dohler (2002, p.24) argues that mediation is an inherent part of learning. She states that 'what is mediated in a learning environment are ways of dealing with a specific object of learning as well as with the situation itself as social practice'. Through this process of mediation between expert and novice, co-construction of learning occurs. It can be seen that mediation is a process that argues for both individual and social perspectives, as learners may come to master language and then use language for interacting with others. Lantolf (2010) argues that mediation is a

conscious process in educational settings, as the teacher serves as a mediating force between pedagogical content and the learner. In this context the instructor provides assistance to the learner in and through language. Episodes of interaction become a locus for learning opportunities to be developed and utilized. For this situation to occur, however, the teacher must be aware of how to interact in a competent manner with the learner.

2.2.3 The Zone of Proximal Development

The idea of the Zone of Proximal Development is vital to any understanding of sociocultural theory. In brief, the zone of proximal development is:

the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86).

Inherent in this definition is the idea that there is a social aspect to the process of learning, as novices and experts interact in the attempt to solve problems, so co-constructing the Zone of Proximal Development through reaching intersubjectivity. Language is the mediating tool for doing so. The ZPD is constituted in, and through, talk and serves as the site of development, where learners move from a social to mental acquisition of concepts. As Brooks and Swain state (2009), it is in the Zone of Proximal Development that the social and individual are integrated, an idea supported by Albers et al (2008), who argue that engagement in the Zone of Proximal Development is necessary for novices in order to acquire new knowledge. However, it should be stated that the Zone of Proximal Development is a construct that has attracted some conflict as noted by Swain et al (2011, p.20). This is to do with how the Zone of Proximal Development is perceived – as a metaphor as outlined above, or as an opportunity for learning as is discussed below.

However, it must be stated that Vygotsky did not conceive of learning as a

dichotomy between the individual and the social or as a unified process as outlined in 2.2. Rather, Vygotsky makes a distinction between learning and development. Learning through participation occurs before development, with internalization of what is learned fostering development. Guk and Kellogg (2007, p.297) articulate this position as follows:

a ZPD that includes both teacher mediation and complete internalization of complex linguistic structures cannot be a short-lived affair. This is one reason why Vygotsky refers to a zone of development and not simply learning

For Nassaji and Swain (2000) and Kinginger (2002) the Zone of Proximal Development can be conceptualized as where learning occurs, with Kinginger (ibid, p.243) arguing that 'For foreign language education, the importance of the ZPD construct resides in its capacity to theorize present and future resources in a dialectic unity'. While this may appear to be a somewhat tidy conceptualization of the ZPD, I would agree with this description to the extent that episodes of interaction between teacher and learner are a discursive resource in which there is potential for examining recurring examples of classroom interaction for examples of interactional competence as manifest by language instructors.

2.2.4 Scaffolding

Scaffolding serves as a metaphor to describe how an adult structures interaction in order to build on what a child is already capable of. It must also be mentioned that the metaphor of scaffolding is closely related to the Zone of Proximal Development as each concept informs the other. The employment of scaffolding within the Zone of Proximal Development builds the zone and leads to self-regulation on the part of the learner. Scaffolding is informed by the idea that aid provided by peers may lead to an improvement in performance. Swain (2000) posits that dialogues may act as a mediating force as learners who verbalize mediate the internalization of external activity and so

develop an awareness of themselves as learners involved in the process of learning. An example of this is error-correction in which learners are asked to explain why a grammatical item is not correct, after receiving prompting from an instructor. The teacher builds on what the learner knows about language and then seeks to extend that knowledge. As stated earlier, for the instructor to achieve this goal, interaction has to be undertaken and managed in a competent manner.

2.2.5 Appropriation/ Internalization

Appropriation is defined as the relationship of agents to mediational means (Swain et al 2011). In other words, appropriation is synonymous with development as conceived of by Vygotsky. Tools (as discussed above) are appropriated for intra-mental functioning. Therefore, these tools are internalized. Within the sociocultural theory of learning, internalization is when symbolic systems achieve a psychological status; simply put, this means that mental activity takes precedence when practical actions are being performed, as novices demonstrate mastery of a concept or idea that has been appropriated. Language is one means by which appropriation occurs, through private speech, dialogue and imitation (ibid 2011). This is particularly relevant to the language classroom as it is in and through language that learners appropriate and internalize what is taught in this setting. If learners are able to demonstrate acquisition of new concepts about the target language, it can be argued this is due to how the instructor has utilized language and afforded interactional space for doing so.

2.2.6 Self-Regulation

Self-regulation refers to a process of learner development. Given that this is a summary of section 2.2 – 2.2.4, this is of necessity, brief. This occurs on two planes and can be summarized as follows:

1. The social or inter-mental plane in which learners become familiar with skills, ideas and language with the help of instruments and signs.
2. The personal, psychological or intra-mental plane in which learners internalize new language and use that language independently, along with new skills and ideas (Vygotsky 1978).

Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory of Learning provides insight into the construct of interactional competence due to its focus on development as a process that begins in, and through, interaction between experts and novices. In the context of this research, it is the role of the instructor and how interaction is shaped in the service of teaching and learning that delineates how interactional competence is developed and manifest. Through examining a phenomenon such as scaffolding, a deeper understanding of the interactional processes which inform interactional competence is possible.

2.3 Sociocultural Theory and the Idea of Context

In this section, discussion will centre around two concepts which are relevant when discussing interactional competence. These are discursive practice (for more see Young 1999 and 2009) and Legitimate Peripheral Participation (Lave and Wenger 1995). These concepts inform this thesis in that each concept argues for context as emergent in and through interaction and participation in a context as being vital for learning to occur. This thesis argues that learning is situated in discursive practice and that it is through increased participation in classroom interaction that is directed by interactionally competent teachers that students are provided with opportunities for learning the target language, through interaction in that language.

As has been discussed in this literature review, language use occurs in a context. In other words, learning is situated practice and context is vital when analyzing 'learning' from the viewpoint of sociocultural theory as learning is situated within contexts (Swain et al 2011). Rogoff (1990, p.2) states that, 'Thinking is intricately interwoven with the

context of the problem to be solved'. This notion of a problem to be solved relates to achieving intersubjectivity in interaction. Interaction with others is inherently a context-specific enterprise. Kelly-Hall (1995) observes that the employment of language as a resource within interactive contexts is predicated upon the context and thus potentially able to be transformed at any moment, while Mondada and Pekarek-Dohler (2004) perceive interaction to be a situated process whereby interaction allows participants to demonstrate competence to enter into interaction. Brooks (2009) observes that action cannot be separated from the context in which it occurs. Young and Milanovic (1992, p.407) state that 'The organization of discourse created in dyadic interaction is also related to the situational context of the interaction'.

2.3.1 Discursive Practice

It can be seen that context is the location in which language use is performed. Discussion will now be given over to the idea of discursive practice, which is demonstrated in context. Discursive practice is defined as 'recurring episodes of face-to-face interaction, episodes that have social and cultural significance for a community of speakers' (Young and Miller 2004, p.519). An example of this would be pedagogical tasks in the second language classroom which involve interaction. Given that learning cannot be divorced from context within sociocultural theory, this discussion will briefly focus on practice in context. Young (2009, p.3) says of context and practice:

When the context of a practice is known and the configuration of communicative resources is described, the ultimate aim of practice theory is to explain the ways in which the global context affects the local employment of resources and vice versa

Thus, context can be seen to be constructed in and through interaction and in a constant state of evolution.

This thesis is concerned with the development of interactional competence in

teachers in the English as a foreign language classroom in Taiwan. The role that the sociocultural theory of learning plays in the second language classroom can be encapsulated as follows:

language learning is rooted in learners' participation in organizing talk-in-interaction, structuring participation frameworks, configuring discourse tasks...becoming competent members of communities in which they participate (Mondada and Pekarek-Dohler 2004, p.504).

This quote reveals that learners in second language classrooms are required to perform multiple functions in order to negotiate the business of learning in the second language classroom. Therefore, the role of the teacher is vital as it is the teacher who, I would suggest, is predominantly responsible for creating the conditions in which learners are able to participate in classroom interaction. While I do not challenge the idea that teachers and learners co-construct these conditions together, I would argue that it is the teacher who has the greatest influence on structuring interaction to allow learners to participate and so learn the target language and also to learn how to use that language to achieve goals in and through interaction. The role of the teacher in this situation is not only to teach the target language but also to create the space for learners to participate in classroom interaction. This argues for an understanding of how context is created in and through language. Further discussion will be given to how teachers achieve this, later in the thesis. However, this discussion will now move on to the idea of learning as a situated activity, contingent on participation.

2.3.2 Legitimate Peripheral Participation

It has been argued by Lave and Wenger (1991) that learning can be situated in 'certain forms of social co-participation' (p. 14), as participants move from a position on the outside of a community to greater involvement, a process Lave and Wenger term Legitimate Peripheral Participation. The theory of communities of practice is useful as a means of examining the notion of participation fostering learning (Atkinson 2002).

Lave and Wenger posit that learning involves focusing on the manner in which learning can be seen to evolve, as relations between participants are constantly renewed. Therefore, learning is regarded as a process of 'becoming'. Hellermann and Cole (2008) state that three elements are necessary for a community of practice to come into being: participants need to perceive interaction as a joint enterprise, participate in mutual engagement and possess a shared repertoire. Therefore, a plurality of interactional resources is employed by participants in order to become members of a community of practice. In order for teachers and learners to skillfully navigate their way through this process, practice is necessary; participants engage in classroom interaction and over time gain competence in managing and maintaining interaction. However, as Lave and Wenger argue, improvisation and task performance are vital factors in the process of participating in a community of practice. In other words, 'practice' in this context is a process of adaptation to events within interaction as they unfold. In this context, it is clear that learning would be demonstrated through increased participation within a community of practice, and that therefore, greater communication would be able to be observed. However, this thesis is concerned with how teachers make this increased participation and increased communication possible. Increased learner participation and language use are a likely indicator of increased interactional competence on the part of the teacher, as well as evidence of acquisition in the learner. In summary, communities of practice perceive competence to be the employment of abilities as situations demand (Morita 2004).

2.4 Interactional Competence

As has been argued in the preceding sections of this literature review, there are norms that govern interaction as a social process. It has also been asserted that interaction in language classrooms differs from interaction as part of social relations in crucial ways, particularly with regard to the role of the teacher as the person who

generally shapes interaction in this setting. The asymmetric nature of classroom discourse is a point Kramsch (1986) makes note of in her call for a focus on teaching interactional competence in addition to language proficiency. Given that participation rights are unequal in second language classrooms, Kramsch offers the opinion that language classrooms are ‘hardly conducive to developing the interpersonal social skills and negotiation of intended meanings’ (ibid, p.369) that mark knowing how to use a language. Indeed, greater attention is being given in the academic community language learning ‘in the wild’, i.e. non-classroom settings (see Jenks 2007 for a discussion of language use in Skype casts for language learning). Therefore, the thesis presented in Kramsch’s paper is that proficiency in a language does not entail an ability to organize thought and speech in tandem. In other words, proficiency in a language and interactional competence in that language are not synonymous. Kramsch posits that successful interaction is evident by interlocutors arriving at a match between intended, perceived and anticipated meanings (ibid). The notion of how to use a language expresses a concern beyond acquiring vocabulary, grammatical structures and syntactic knowledge of the language being learned; rather, learning how to use a language is based on what Kramsch (ibid) maintains is knowledge of situational context and understanding what is being communicated in that context. These factors are vital if interlocutors are to display interactional competence. Young (1999) makes a similar case, arguing that the construct of interactional competence specifies what learners need to know in order to participate with others in interactive practices. Chaloub-Deville (2003) argues in a similar vein, stating that the language user, context and discourse are integrated, with a language user’s ability to use the language only visible in context. However, these definitions do not account for the roles of teacher and learner in the classroom context and how these roles influence how interactional competence is displayed in classroom settings.

Kramersch states that interactional competence is a necessary factor in language learning in order to ‘give our students a truly emancipating, rather than compensating foreign language education’ (1986, p.370). As has been argued above, Kramersch is not arguing for *language proficiency* (italics mine). Rather she is arguing for a focus on communication and the factors that lead to the maintenance of intersubjectivity between interactants. This includes factors such as knowledge of turn-taking and perceived meaning of paralinguistic features such as gaze and gesture.

It is apparent that interactional competence differs from communicative competence in several ways. These have been summarized by Walsh (2011, p.165), in which he argues for a view of interactional competence as a process of co-construction contingent on the context in which it occurs.

Table 1: Interactional Competence vs. Communicative Competence

Interactional competence	Communicative competence
Emphasizes the ways in which interactants co-construct meanings and jointly establish understanding.	The focus is on individual differences in competence and the fact that one of the aims of learning a language is to move to the next level of competence.
Includes both interactional and linguistic resources, but places more emphasis on the way the interaction is guided and managed through turns-at-talk, overlaps, acknowledgment tokens, pauses, repair and so on.	Emphasizes the knowledge and skills needed to use language in specific contexts as opposed to knowledge of language as an idealized system.
Is highly context-specific: the interactional competence required in one context will not always transfer to another. Different interactional resources will be needed in different contexts.	Context is everything; what we say is dependent on who we are talking to, where we are, why we are talking, what we have to say and when this takes place (Hymes, 1972).
Largely rejects individual performance in favour of collaborative enterprise.	Emphasizes individual performance and recognizes that this can and will change.

<p>Less concerned with accuracy and fluency and more concerned with communication; this means that speakers must pay close attention to each others' contributions and help and support where necessary.</p>	<p>Accuracy, fluency and appropriacy lie at the heart of communicative competence and are also the measures used to evaluate it.</p>
<p>Places equal emphasis on attending to the speaker as producing one's own contribution; listening plays as much a part in interactional competence as speaking.</p>	<p>Focuses more on individual speech production than on the listener and acknowledgment of what has been said.</p>

Dings (2007) states that interactional competence is a construct that has not been thoroughly explored in the field of second language acquisition, allowing that one way in which to approach this topic is as an extension of Canale and Swain's concept of Communicative Competence (1980), these being grammatical competence, sociocultural competence, discourse competence and strategic competence. However, I would contend that because interaction is central to learning in the second language classroom, it should be conceived of as being distinct from communicative competence, as also argued by Walsh (2011). The case can be made that interactional competence offers a perspective of examining and evaluating the effectiveness of interaction in the classroom that goes beyond Canale and Swain's notion of Communicative Competence, dealing as it does with how interlocutors achieve intersubjectivity and co-construct interaction, elements that are vital to successful classroom interaction.

2.4.1 Interactional Competence and Language Learning

As noted by Kelly-Hall (1997), the idea of competence argues for a view that perceives communication in the social realm as being essentially pragmatic. By this it is meant that communicative practices are organized around recurring elements of discourse that become known to members of a discourse community in order to achieve goals in and through spoken language. Kelly-Hall refers to these recurring episodes of

talk as 'interactive practices' (1995). These episodes possess a particular structure and are of sociocultural significance to a community of speakers. Given that the focus of this thesis is the development of interactional competence in teachers of English as a second or foreign language, this idea of 'significance' needs to be expanded upon. It is logical to assume that what is significant for teachers and learners in the language classroom is anything related to the business of teaching and learning. As has been discussed earlier, diverse elements come into play in the classroom context, as contexts are variable and evolve in, and through, talk. One unique feature of the language classroom, however, is that there are potentially multiple interactants at any given time. Therefore, the notion of individual competence is problematic when applied to the classroom context. Learners are likely to possess differing motivations for learning a language and bring these individual elements to bear in the business of learning. The same can also be argued of teachers. No two teachers are the same and may not perform classroom instruction in the same way, owing to differing perspectives on teaching and learning. This thesis takes the following view of interactional competence; teachers and learners co-construct learning. There is an interface between teachers and learners and the resources they employ in the service of teaching and learning. In other words, interactional competence could be conceived of as participants altering patterns of co-participation (Young and Miller 2004), arguing for a notion of interactional competence as a collective enterprise. The case will be made in this thesis that greater participation by learners in classroom interaction arises through skilful use of language and awareness of context as performed by, and through, the teacher. This is distinct from the idea of individual communicative competence, which is defined as the knowledge and ability to use means in expected and creative ways. However this definition argues that this is an individual undertaking. This thesis takes the position that the development of interactional competence by language teachers in the language

classroom arises out of, and because of, joint communication between teacher and learner, as teachers attempt to create conditions which will foster greater learner involvement in classroom events. Rather than the domain of individual performance, interactional competence in the language classroom appears to be a collaborative effort, co-constructed by participants (teachers and learners). As noted by Kasper (2006), talk performed in institutional settings (such as classrooms) requires a differing perspective of interactional competence than that which is demonstrated in everyday conversation and will require a differing configuration of interactional resources. Thus, it seems that the teacher directs and shapes talk and in so doing, creates the possibility of learners participating in classroom discourse. While it is debatable that this is a comprehensive way of determining if teachers are interacting with learners in a competent manner, I would suggest that it offers a means for examining interactional competence in the English as a foreign language classroom. If learners are using the target language, it is likely that this has come about due to what the teacher utilizing language to achieve pedagogical goals and create space for learners to potentially act on affordances. Learning in this context is a social process whereby participants in interaction respond to each other and the interactional needs of the moment and co-construct and manage interaction together.

It can be seen that in describing interactional competence, interlocutors and the context in which they interact must be taken into account. Young (1999) conceives of interactional competence as a 'theory of knowledge' participants in talk bring to and accomplish in interaction. Of note is his belief that an account of how such knowledge is acquired can be seen in the details of the interaction itself, a notion that informs this thesis. At a later date Young (2008, p.100) offers the following definition of interactional competence:

Interactional competence is a relationship between participants' employment of linguistic and interactional resources and the contexts in which they are employed

This definition integrates language, context and interactants, focusing on the idea of interactional competence as an amalgamation of these factors, though the roles of interactants is not accounted for. As such, according to Young's definition, interactional competence is a theory of second language knowledge and also importantly, second language acquisition, as it attempts to explain how interactants enter into and participate in the social world. Within the context of this study, the social world in question is that of the second language classroom.

Kelly-Hall (1999) offers the following multi-faceted perspective on interactional competence. This description is a synthesis of the argument presented in Hall 1999.

1. The goals of the interactive practice, the roles of the participants and topics and themes are considered pertinent.
2. Practice unfolds along optimal linguistic action patterns.
3. One has an amount of flexibility in rearranging or changing expected uses of practices and linguistic resources. This rearrangement may have consequences for the interaction that is occurring.
4. The skill to mindfully and efficiently recognize situations where patterns apply and use them to participate in new experiences.

As can be seen, Kelly-Hall takes a broader perspective on interactional competence than Young. Like Young, Kelly-Hall takes use of linguistic and interactional resources into account within given contexts; however, Kelly-Hall's description also considers the place of topic and theme as a part of spoken discourse along with the role that participants perform within that discourse. Both descriptions are concerned with context; within Kelly-Hall's description, however, the mutable and dynamic nature of language in use within contexts is explicitly considered, with rearrangement and change being included. Kelly-Hall's description also encompasses the recurring nature of certain patterns of discourse within contexts. This idea of recurring patterns of communication

will be returned to and developed further in the section discussing learning.

Kelly-Hall's description of interactional competence also includes an account of how such competence may be developed. It is stated that two activities are of importance for the development of interactional competence. These are guided practice in those interactive practices considered significant by learners and a systematic study of second language interactive practices. This description is arguing for the second language classroom as a site of development for interactional competence, with the teacher serving as guide within practice. This brings us to Hellermann's (2006) perspective on interactional competence and his rationale for its position in second language learning.

Hellermann takes the position that the major goal of learning a second or foreign language is to achieve interactional competence. He quotes Brown et al (2007, p.85) stating:

I consider interactional competence to be a learner's ability to co-construct appropriate linguistic forms, registers, and sequential routines in appropriate contexts in order to accomplish discursive practices. The development of this interactional competence can be seen in the way learners perform different discursive practices over time and in different but comparable contexts

He argues that interactional competence is developed through the performance of tasks or through interactional practices (ibid). This is done through socialization into the language being learned, for example, through interacting with others in this language and gaining insights through this interaction into how participants engage in and co-construct discourse. Within the classroom context, Hellermann conceives of the development of interactional competence as a change in participation at different levels of classroom discourse and interaction. In order to successfully engage in social practices, competence to do so is necessary. As such, interactional competence is a process of 'becoming' where learning is denoted by the competent use of interactional resources rather than accumulating cognitive or linguistic products. Therefore,

interactional competence is informed by the idea that utilizing language to achieve interactional goals and create a state of intersubjectivity is co-constructed and contingent upon the situational aspects of the interaction that is taking place.

Inherent in Hellermann's concept of the utility of interactional competence is discursive practice or how cultural meanings are produced and understood in and through language. This concept will be expanded upon later though a brief description will be offered at this point. Discursive practice is defined as 'recurring episodes of face-to-face interaction, episodes that have social and cultural significance for a community of speakers' (Young and Miller 2004). His argument is that interactional competence endeavours to understand the discursive practices participants adopt to co-construct social actions, i.e. spoken discourse. Interactional competence is revealed through employment of resources such as turn-taking, appropriate use of linguistic register and the ability to recognize and communicate boundaries within spoken discourse. (For more see Hellermann 2006). This is a dynamic and unfolding process whereby those involved in spoken interaction perform interactional work to co-construct and accomplish social actions specific to the context and situation speakers find themselves in.

With regard to the language classroom, Hellermann suggests that in order to develop interactional competence, the development of language learners possesses a reflexive relationship with language socialization. Learning how to participate within the speech events of the classroom community is synonymous with developing interactional competence. He states 'developing interactional competence for dyadic interaction gives specific empirical evidence for changes in participation in a community of practice and evidence for additional language learning' (2007, p.86).

Hellermann develops this theme further, arguing that classroom tasks, due to their recurring nature and as elements that constitute discursive practice, require learners to

participate regularly in interaction within the classroom community of practice. This requires the particular use of language with fellow learners and also with the teacher in order to realize particular actions. An indicator, therefore, of interactional competence is an increased ability and opportunity to participate in classroom events.

Hellermann's description focuses on the development of interactional competence in the language learner. While this thesis is concerned with the development of interactional competence in English as a second or foreign language teachers, there are aspects of Hellermann's description that are worth noting with regard to the language classroom context. I would agree that it is a goal of language learning for students to become interactionally competent. However, I would argue that given the central position the teacher holds within the social context of the classroom as the driving force of how interaction is shaped and developed and turns at talk are distributed, it is the development of interactional competence in the teacher that is more likely to affect the language classroom as a site of development of interactional competence. Classroom factors such as distribution of turns-at-talk, negotiation of meaning, repair and utilization of linguistic resources generally involve the teacher and are performed at the teacher's urging or discretion. In other words, the teacher occupies a position in the language classroom that largely influences the opportunities for learning that occurs in this context. This thesis takes the position that interactional competence on the part of the language teacher is manifest in the ways in which he or she is able to increase participation by learners in classroom events. A follow on from this is that if learners are able to become more involved in classroom events (in other words, socialized into the world of the classroom), they, in turn, would be more likely to develop as language learners.

A differing perspective on interactional competence is that offered by Markee (2008). He states that the development of interactional competence in a second language

is

a process involving learners co-constructing with their interlocutors locally enacted, progressively more accurate, fluent, and complex interactional repertoires in the L2

Like Walsh (2011) I would argue that the inclusion of accuracy as a marker of interactional competence is problematic. Other descriptions of interactional competence outlined above argue for interactional competence as a process of co-construction and as being locally situated. They also conceive of interactional competence as *how* (italics mine) interactants demonstrate knowledge of how and when to participate in spoken discourse, i.e. demonstrating competence to do so. Markee's inclusion of accuracy and complexity in linguistic use is a move away from interactional competence as the pragmatic use of resources to achieve goals in and through interaction. Kasper (2004) points out that displays of interactional competence may occur before linguistic fluency is acquired and that, for example, being able to reciprocate phatic inquiries from interlocutors is a display of interactional competence that does not require particular linguistic accuracy. Reciprocating phatic inquiries is also potential evidence of intersubjectivity being achieved. Intersubjectivity can be achieved though interlocutors may not employ linguistically correct forms of language to do so (see Firth 1996, 1997, 1998 for how speakers of English as a lingua franca go about this). Remy von Compernelle (2011) makes a similar point with regard to learner responses to questions in oral proficiency interviews. Learners display interactional competence (and achieve intersubjectivity) with their interlocutor through attempting to answer questions posed, though the answers provided may be highly indexical in nature and not display linguistic complexity.

As can be seen from the discussion in the above section, there are differing perspectives on interactional competence, particularly with regard to what constitutes interactional competence and how interactional competence is manifest in interaction. Given that each definition attends to differing aspects of interactional competence

(context, theme, topic, resources, roles), without attending to these aspects in other than broad terms, I would argue that interactional competence needs to be re-conceptualized in order to take into account the role of the teacher, when discussing second or foreign language classrooms, in fostering learner participation. This theme will be returned to later in this thesis as a definition of interactional competence as it applies to language teachers in the second language classroom will be considered.

2.4.2 Affordances for Teaching and Learning

That is why the notion of affordances (van Lier 2009) is also of importance when considering interactional competence. In brief, affordances are the relationship between actor and object. Li and Walsh (2013, p.249) describe affordances as follows: ‘the relationship between learners and particular features in their environment which have relevance to the learning process’. Taking the second language classroom as an example, language is the object employed in the service of teaching and learning by actors in the context in which the object is employed. Affordances allow for further activity but do not cause action itself. Thus, language emerges from, and as part of, context, and provides opportunities for learning within the second language classroom context. Cekaite (2007) observes that the provision of differing affordances affects patterns of participation. From this perspective, interaction is an affordance that may provide opportunities for learning the target language. However, interaction is a somewhat general term. In this thesis the deployment of recipient design and repair (see 4.5.1 and 4.5.2) were identified as features within classroom interaction that indicate interactional competence by language teachers. It was found that extended wait-time plays a significant role when these resources are deployed and it is to this that discussion now turns.

2.4.3 Extended Wait-Time

As stated above, affordances provided by the teacher allow for further action on the part of the learner. Taking recipient design for example, it is clear in the data collected here that such an affordance is seldom immediately acted upon by the learner. Thus, it will be argued that affordances are proffered by interactionally competent teachers in conjunction with extended wait-time. Extended wait-time gives the learner space in the interaction. The question arises as to the purpose this space serves. Tobin (1986, p.192) says that

‘the rate at which information is presented should be matched with the cognitive processing ability of students’

In other words, extended wait-time lets students process information presented by the teacher (for example, recasts of the previous turn) and to formulate a response. In pausing, the teacher is displaying awareness of the interactional context and giving students time to think before replying.

Research by Tobin (1987), Thornbury (1996) and Walsh (2002) also found that extended wait-time of between three to five seconds lead to improvements in the discourse enacted between teachers and learners. In mathematics classes, Tobin found that wait-time of this duration not only influenced learner responses but allowed teachers to ask fewer but more appropriate questions of students. Thornbury observed that extended wait-time served to increase the number of learners who responded to teacher elicitations, while at the same time, learners were able to offer longer turns-at-talk. Learners also initiated a greater number of questions. Walsh states that interaction between learners increased when more wait-time was extended by the teacher and engendered more complexity in the answers to queries from the instructor. It can be seen that offering space in which to formulate responses enhances classroom discourse, though as Walsh (ibid) notes many teachers may deem silence in language classrooms as denoting poor practice as learners are not responding to teacher

elicitations.

In the data collected for this research, a strong case can be made that extended wait-time is an interactional variable that is employed in conjunction with affordances such as recipient design. In pausing, teachers are managing the interaction; after soliciting a learner response, the space provided allows learners to process what the teacher has said. As noted by Tobin (1987), this space also gives teachers time to consider the quality and appropriacy of the language they have utilized up to this point and formulate utterances better fit to the needs of the moment, if required. This in turn can influence the thinking processes and response of learners.

2.5 Interaction and Language Learning

The discussion will now turn to interaction and views of the role interaction plays in language learning. It has long been argued by researchers in Applied Linguistics that interaction plays a central role in the process of learning a second language (see Allwright 1980, 1984, Malamah-Thomas 1987, van Lier 1996, Atkinson 2002, Kasper 2004). Language is the resource employed by both teachers and learners in the classroom environment in order to co-construct learning. Walsh (2006) identifies interaction as the means by which learning takes place in second language classrooms. Thus, language classrooms are viewed as fundamentally interactive environments where language serves multiple functions, such as communicating personal insights and building social relationships, though as mentioned earlier, the teaching and learning of the target language is the core goal of the second language classroom. Language is employed as a resource for teaching and learning and also constitutes what is being learned in that it is the product learners are expected to acquire (Cazden 2001, Gass 2003, Seedhouse 2005). Kelly-Hall (2002, p.187) summarizes the situation in this way:

Classroom interaction is one of the primary means by which learning is accomplished in classrooms. In language classrooms, it takes on an especially significant role in that it is

both the medium through which learning is realized and the object of pedagogic attention

In other words there is a connection between the second language classroom as an institutional context and how language is used in this context (Kelly-Hall 1995, Seedhouse 2005). Social context is vital in understanding classroom interaction, a point made by van Lier (1998, p. xiv) who argues ‘Without this social context it is difficult to see how classroom interaction can be understood’. The notion of context cannot be separated from interaction and reflexively, interaction cannot be divorced from context when investigating the uses employed by language teachers and learners of language.

Within the context of the language classroom, interaction is seen as beneficial to the business of learning for a variety of reasons. Cazden (2001, p.2) states that ‘spoken language is the medium by which much teaching takes place, and in which students demonstrate to teachers much of what they have learned’. With regard to the teacher, interaction reveals what learners are able to do in the target language and so give the teacher insight into learners’ competence in the target language as it emerges (Richard-Amato 1988).

However, there is debate as to whether language use equates to learning, or is a means of facilitating this process. As stated above, the sociocultural view of learning views development as collaborative in nature. Knowledge is jointly constructed. The contrasting perspective argues that learning is an individual competency that takes place in the mind. In the context of language learning, the mind is where knowledge about language is constructed. A corollary to this is that interaction is not learning; rather, it is the site in which knowledge about language is demonstrated by the learner. Interaction is where hypotheses about the language being learned are tested and acted upon. In short, learning is an internal process. This is the cognitive view of learning and it is to this construct that discussion will now turn. The focus of this discussion will be how the cognitive view differs from the sociocultural view of learning, and as an antithetical

perspective, what the cognitive view of learning reveals about interaction in second language classrooms.

2.6 Interaction and Language Learning: Theoretical Concepts

Swain (2001, p.373) notes that research into interactional competence largely holds that language users and ‘the language user in context’ are not mutually exclusive and form an integrated structure. The position of researchers who support the cognition view differs in that language user and context are separate and it is stable language ability alone that should be examined in context. It should be noted that Swain argues that such a position is limiting; yet, those who favour the social interaction position need to consider the cognitive view, especially when focusing on assessment of language ability. What Swain’s viewpoint reveals is the dialectical stand-off between cognitive and interactionist views of learning and the problematic nature of integrating both approaches into a theory of learning. Atkinson (2002) argues for a sociocognitive view of learning whereby both perspectives are integrated. Language and language acquisition occur in the social world and also internally within the learner. This is not a dichotomous state of affairs; rather, cognition can be a joint enterprise achieved through individuals expressing a single idea in concert, in and through interaction. This is a cognitive state that also serves a social purpose, as in when the teacher asks the class to discuss a question as a group. Within this view the teacher and learners constitute an interactional unit. This is in keeping with the view of interactional competence as co-construction of turns-at-talk, and a display of knowledge of language - how and when to participate. However, Atkinson ameliorates his position in distinction to that of Vygotsky, arguing that acquisition of language is a necessary pre-condition for action in the social world. It might be argued that the sociocognitive view of learning is an attempt to integrate two conflicting perspectives on learning as a construct. Whether this is successful is open to debate and requires further research, and especially, empirical

data demonstrating how these two perspectives have been reconciled. This thesis takes the view that affording learners greater opportunities to participate in classroom events indicates interactional competence on the part of language instructors.

To date the discussion has taken a broad perspective on discussing interaction and its role in language learning. In order to clarify the arguments this thesis wishes to make with regard to interaction, attention will now shift towards an analysis and discussion of theories of interaction and learning which have proven influential in Applied Linguistics. These are Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1983, 1996), Swain's Output Hypothesis (1985, 2005) and the Input-Interaction Hypothesis (Gass 2004). These theories deserve elaborating upon primarily because they argue for the importance of interaction in learning a second language. However, each also argues for a view of language learning that is primarily cognitive, a position not adopted in this thesis. Ellis (1997, p. 44) acknowledges that 'Interactionist theories of L2 acquisition acknowledge the importance of both input and internal language processing', aspects that will be examined in the discussion below. Also of note are the differing perspectives regarding interaction and its role in language learning, these being the 'weak' version and 'strong' version of the interactionist approach. A brief description of each is provided here.

The weak version argues that interaction is beneficial for learning due to the fact that interaction provides opportunities for learners to be exposed to comprehensible, negotiated or modified input (Gass and Varonis 1985, Long 1983, 1986). Within this perspective, social interaction provides a temporary situation in which learning processes may occur.

The strong version argues that interaction is fundamental to daily life (as discussed above) and as such, is familiar to learners. From this perspective interaction is a social practice in which learners co-construct activities (whether linguistic or related to other competencies) with others. This engenders a process of modification and

accommodation to other contexts and other participants in interaction.

2.6.1 *The Interaction Hypothesis*

Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1983, 1996) argues that developing language proficiency is predicated on interaction and communication. The role of negotiation is central to this approach, as it is argued:

negotiation work that triggers interactional adjustments by the NS or more competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways (Long 1996, pp. 451-452).

This negotiation arises out of interactional trouble occurring during communication, with interlocutors attempting to clarify meanings. (For more on the role of negotiation of meaning see Gass and Varonis 1985, Doughty 1991, Foster 1998, Gass et al 1998). As can be seen from this quote, Long's Interaction Hypothesis takes an integrated approach to the process of second language acquisition. The elements that facilitate language acquisition (input, internal learner capabilities, output and selective attention) appear to be 'a plain causal chain between use of elements and learning' (Firth and Wagner 2007, p. 809). Whether negotiation of meaning is an indicator of learning as it is unfolding or offering potential for opportunities for learning is, however, somewhat open to debate, as observed by van Lier (2000), though Brooks (2009) suggests negotiation creates a shared social world between interlocutors which engenders intersubjectivity. Of note is the mention of 'internal learner capabilities'. This indicates a focus on the acquisition of language through interaction. Conversation is the means by which learners acquire knowledge of the language being learned, with knowledge being a process of internalization, rather than a display of interactional competence and the ability to enter into social relations. As such, Long's theory possesses a cognitive perspective on second language learning.

2.6.2 *The Output Hypothesis*

Swain's Output Hypothesis (1985, 2005) posits that learners encounter gaps in linguistic knowledge when producing output and that noticing such gaps leads to modifications in output. In other words, learners become aware that they possess gaps in linguistic knowledge and through practice, learn to communicate personal meanings. The process of interaction allows learners to practice language structures, Learners are also able to test out hypotheses related to grammatical structures, improving grammar through interaction with both teacher and classmates, based on feedback received on earlier efforts. This 'collaborative dialogue' (Swain 2000) functions as a means of problem-solving and knowledge building. Participants are able to solve problems related to the language being learned in and through social interaction. The process occurs as follows: verbalization about the problem is initiated through social interaction, with dialogue providing the solution to the learning and teaching task being undertaken. The dialogue itself is a mediating force for the co-construction of meaning. Participating in a collaborative dialogue leads to knowledge building. The process of externalising problems through speech is one of appropriation with regard to strategic processes and linguistic knowledge (adapted from Swain 2000). This, however, raises questions as to whether social context affects cognitive processing or acts as a mediating force for displays of cognition with regard to language. Like Long, it is clear that Swain is arguing for an accommodation between language acquisition and language use, though the Output Hypothesis does not take a wholly social view of learning; the cognitive aspect of language learning is emphasized as discussed below.

The Output Hypothesis also possesses a metalinguistic function; learners reflect upon their linguistic knowledge (a process of internalization) and so are able to produce more controlled output. This in turn leads to greater reflection on what has been learned. The focus is on the individual learner gaining command of grammatical structures

through a process of testing and internalization, and then reproducing language.

2.6.3 *The Input-Interaction Hypothesis*

Gass' Input-Interaction Hypothesis (2004) suggests that interaction or negotiation functions as a 'setting stage' for language learning rather than the location of actual learning. In other words, conversation functions as a resource or as Gass (2004, p.35) states 'conversation is not only a medium of practice, but also the means of which learning takes place'. Gass' Input-Interaction Hypothesis encompasses the notion of speech as a form of practice; language is employed as a resource for rehearsing language structures, in keeping with Long and Swain. Gass also makes the point that interlocutors must, of necessity, accommodate each other within interaction in order to achieve some measure of intersubjectivity, an indication that the social aspect of interaction is being attended to. She also argues for a view of interaction that sees this process as forming the basis for the development of language, not just the linguistic components of language. However, Gass is arguing for the potential of modified input to be adopted and transformed by the learner into acquisition of the language being taught. As such, she is proposing that interaction leads to changes in knowledge of, and about, the language being taught, a modification in understanding, rather than use. Examples would include more accurate use of language forms. As such, this is a description of language learning as a mental process, rather than language use. Indeed, in an earlier paper Gass and Varonis (1994) make the point that consciousness raising about language will lead to learning.

Each of these theories argues that interaction is central to the enterprise of learning a language. Through negotiation of meaning, clarification of utterances, testing out and practicing language structures and learning to accommodate other interlocutors, it is held that learners acquire knowledge of, and about, the language being learned. However, it must also be stated that each of these theories argues for learning as

cognitive change with regard to linguistic knowledge, displayed in, and through, interaction. Interaction is regarded as a site for displays of linguistic knowledge. Participation as learning, as argued for in sociocultural theories of learning, is an epistemological position not adopted within these theoretical frameworks.

2.7 Interaction and Development

So far, this chapter has discussed interaction as a social event. The discussion will now briefly touch on how interaction is seen to influence development. Rogoff (1990) describes development as progress in understanding problems and being able to devise an appropriate solution as required based on local exigencies. For the purposes of the discussion in this section ‘development’ will be confined to the notion of increased participation in discourse and learning how to participate in that discourse. Kelly-Hall (2002, p.187) states that:

language development begins in our social worlds, constituted by a varied mix of regularly occurring goal-directed intellectual and practical activities

In other words, development encompasses the notion of participation in a discourse community and comprehension of the norms of communication in that community. Gass (2003, p.235) states that ‘Conversation is not only a medium of practice, but also the means by which learning takes place’. Leo van Lier (1996, p.36) suggests that social interaction provides the impetus for personal development and therefore learning. He posits that it is necessary to ‘understand the mechanisms whereby social interaction fuels cognitive growth’, while Ohta (2000) holds that interaction is an inherently social activity that reveals the developmental processes experienced by participants in interaction. For Swain (2000) interaction can engender collaborative dialogues between interlocutors in which interlocutors become involved in a process of problem-solving and knowledge building. These statements are highly relevant to the argument proposed in this thesis, that it is through participation in interaction that opportunities for learning

a second or foreign language takes place, though what ‘learning’ means in the context of the second language classroom and in language learning as a whole is open to discussion.

As stated earlier, interlocutors are able to display thought processes, be exposed to differing perspectives on a variety of subjects and take part in communal discourse on differing topics. Through involvement in, and management of, interaction via means of negotiation, clarification and co-construction of intersubjectivity and context, it is evident that interlocutors are required to develop competence in order to manage this interaction. Successful interaction, it is argued, is based upon negotiating intended meanings, anticipating the response of interlocutors and dealing with possible misunderstandings, and arriving at a match between intended, perceived and anticipated meanings (Kramsch 1986). Smolka et al (1995) and Thorne (2000) develop this position further, arguing that intersubjective states are created in and through spoken language and are an indicator of successful interaction, as intersubjective states emerge when communication is successfully practiced.

It can be seen that the ability to interact with others in a way that prevents impediments to shared understanding is comprised of differing elements. Though it may be taken for granted that interaction is a commonly-occurring facet of daily life and that interlocutors are able to manage and co-construct interaction successfully, this position is less tenable with regard to the second language classroom, with the demands placed upon teachers and learners to co-construct and manufacture language that contributes to what Seedhouse (2005) refers to as the core institutional goal of the second language classroom – the teaching and learning of the target language.

2.8 Interaction and Language Learning: the Role of the Teacher

The nature of the classroom as an institutional and social environment has an impact on learning. As has been stated earlier, interaction is central to the enterprise of

learning as interlocutors employ language as a means of sharing information, clarifying meanings and negotiating participation in the language classroom. Interaction is the ‘engine’ (van Lier 1996) that creates and maintains social relations within the context of the second language classroom, through language. Kumaravadivelu (1999, p.458) opines that:

The emphasis on social context has helped classroom discourse analysts look at the classroom event as a social event and the classroom as a minisociety with its own rules and regulations, routines and rituals

This idea of ‘rules and regulations, routines and rituals’ within the second language is what this discussion will now turn to.

2.8.1 Classroom Interaction

Managing interaction in classrooms is a problematic endeavour. As has been observed by Johnson (1995) and Walsh (2006) language classrooms differ from content classrooms in key ways. These differences relate to language use and language function within the context of classroom communication and learning, as well as the role of the teacher in facilitating learning. An example of this is using language to manage interaction on the part of learners. It is common in language classrooms for teachers to assign participation rights to learners (Dinsmore 1985). In this situation, teachers need to be aware of when and how to intercede in interaction, so as not to impede the flow of communication that is occurring. Edwards and Westgate (1987, p.43) describe the role of the teacher in the following way:

‘In orderly classrooms, the teacher takes turns at will, allocates turns to others, determines topics, interrupts and re-allocates turns judged to be irrelevant to those topics and provides a running commentary on what is being said and meant’.

In content subjects, such as mathematics for example, it can be argued that there is less focus on the part of the teacher on negotiation of meaning or clarification of an utterance owing to the nature of the subject; an expected answer from learners when

asked questions related to subject content is likely to be objective. In other words, there is only one possible answer and the teacher is not expecting to interact with the learner beyond obtaining the expected answer. While I am not arguing that interaction does not occur in content-based classrooms, I would suggest that it is less central to the process of learning than is the case in second language classrooms. (For more on this subject, see Walsh 2006).

Interaction in the second language classroom is co-constructed and often involves greater numbers of interlocutors, unlike conversations in other social settings, such as between friends and acquaintances (Allwright 1984), meaning that equal communication and turns-at-talk is highly problematic. Turns- at-talk within this context are asymmetrical (Young 1992, Johnson 1995, Walsh 2006), there is a period of adjustment between teacher and learners and learners with each other as relationships are negotiated on a recurring basis and modifications in language use occur due to this. Within the context of the second language classroom the teacher has two roles. These are:

1. To facilitate communicative processes between participants in the classroom and between activities and texts.
2. To be an interdependent participant in teacher and learner groups (Adapted from Breen and Candlin, 1980, p.99).

It then devolves upon the teacher to assign turns at talk and manage and develop interaction in the classroom in order to facilitate learning. Teachers are also expected to possess content knowledge related to subject matter being taught, as well as the ability to communicate information regarding this content. This is inherently difficult in second language teaching where ‘content and medium of instruction are intertwined’ (Andrews, 2001, p.88), a situation alluded to earlier in this chapter. This situation is contingent on teachers being able to deliver content and also generate communication from and with

learners (Bax 2003). Therefore, rather than increasing interaction, it is the quality of the interaction that occurs that facilitates learning. Kramsch (1986, p. 366) states that, ‘The goal of language teaching is to enable students to take part in the normal give-and-take of target language conversation’. This implies an ability on the part of the teacher to create conditions that allow for participation in classroom interaction and facilitate discourse in this environment, as well as learn the target language, a discussion that will be returned to later in this thesis. Therefore, teachers need to be aware of and manage multiple facets of classroom context and interaction as lessons unfold and make decisions relating to pedagogy and language use, a process Walsh (2003) refers to as interactive decision making.

2.8.2 Teaching and Learning

However it should be pointed out that communication alone may not equate to learning (in particular the debate on sociocultural versus cognitive theories of learning, for example, Lantolf and Thorne 2007). One role it is necessary for the teacher to perform is to add a learning dimension to communication and communicative activities in the classroom (Bygate and Samuda 2009) while serving as both a guide and a resource within the classroom. Walsh (2003) also argues that teachers and learners co-construct opportunities for learning, though this is primarily controlled by the teacher as the participant in interaction who assigns speaking rights. In order for teachers to co-manage and co-construct interaction in a skilful manner, teachers need to understand how language and context are related. However, this is a somewhat complicated relationship; language and interaction need to work in tandem for opportunities for learning to occur. This discussion will now turn to how this might occur.

Cullen (1998) concludes that the communication that occurs in second language classrooms cannot fully adhere to the norms of communication that occur outside the

classroom. This is due to the issues outlined above: asymmetrical speaking roles, the position of authority the teacher holds as arbiter of who speaks and when and the objective that informs and shapes classroom interaction; that is, the teaching and learning of the target language. Cullen argues that it is the language employed by the teacher that is of primary importance in facilitating learning and promoting communicative interaction through questioning strategies, seeking clarification and repair of learner errors. He also contends that classroom context cannot be ignored; what being communicative in the context of the second language classroom means does not equate with being communicative in the outside world.

Tsui (2001) observes that while teacher-talk is a valuable form of input for language learners, such input may require modification in order to render it comprehensible to the learner. This is done through a process of clarification, repetition and negotiation; in other words, interaction. Johnson (1995) holds that in order for learners to be involved in classroom events, patterns of classroom communication need to be perceived and understood by them. Seedhouse (1996, p.16) states that ‘even teachers who are committed to communicative language teaching can fail to create opportunities for genuine interaction in the language classroom’. This is due to pedagogical goals not being made explicit to learners. These observations by Cullen, Tsui, Johnson and Seedhouse underline that classroom language is similar to, but not comparable to, communication as it occurs outside the classroom. It differs in that classroom interaction is a form of ‘institutional discourse’ (Seedhouse, 1996, 2005) and as such develops in a manner different from that of communication outside the classroom. It is incumbent upon second language teachers to modify the language they employ in the service of classroom instruction in order to render input comprehensible to the learner. It is also the case that the teacher needs to shape learner utterances, and through interaction with learners, extend learner turns and clarify meanings so that learners are

able to develop more sophisticated language and syntax, while also making pedagogical goals explicit. Walsh summarizes this position as follows:

the interactionally competent teacher is able to shape learner contributions...through shaping the discourse, a teacher is helping learners to say what they mean by using the most appropriate language to do so (2006, p.131).

Given that language is the apparatus by which classroom interaction occurs, the discussion will now move towards an analysis of how the language employed by teachers can facilitate learning. As outlined above, Walsh (ibid) states that successful management of interaction on the part of the practitioner equals successful teaching. With this idea in mind, the discussion will now focus on how teachers manage interaction in concert with their learners. In order to do so, a description and analysis of the SETT Framework as developed by Walsh (2002, 2003, 2006, 2011) will be undertaken.

2.9 The SETT Framework

This thesis takes the epistemological position that language teachers' development of interactional competence can be observed, and therefore, be analyzed. This being the case, it is imperative that a means of examining the language used by teachers for teaching that can also serve as an agent for fostering reflection with regard to the use of that language be employed. It is for these reasons that the SETT Framework is utilized in this research along with Applied Conversation Analysis, stimulated recall interviews and focus groups. SETT is employed as a tool for investigating classroom discourse but in itself is not a research methodology. By this I mean that the SETT Framework (ibid) was used for collecting data but was not employed as a means of analyzing the data collected. The modes in which participants were operating were not a concern of this thesis. While greater attention will be given to the rationale for employing a multiple-methods approach to data collection in the chapter on methodology, briefly, the

purpose of this research is to analyze the language teachers employ as it relates to including learners in classroom interaction, through an emic or participant-relevant perspective. Given that spoken interaction is the main subject of this thesis, Applied Conversation Analysis, with its focus on the micro-details of how talk is accomplished between interlocutors, allows for detailed analysis of how interlocutors co-construct talk. Focus groups engender collective discussion on issues related to classroom interaction, providing insight into how the participants in this research regard the role interaction plays in the second language classroom and provides a forum for participants to express shared and differing perspectives related to this topic. Stimulated recall interviews form a basis for the use of the SETT Framework, as these interviews allow the researcher to guide participants through an uncovering of the interactional processes at work in their classrooms. It is these concerns that led to these research methods being used in this research in conjunction with the SETT Framework. The rationale at work can be summarized as follows:

close examination of classroom discourse recorded precisely as it happens not only allows detailed analysis of classroom practices, but can also validate or provide counter evidence to the self-reflection provided by the teacher (Lazaraton and Ishihara, 2005, p.529).

The following overview will of necessity be brief owing to the space afforded. (For further on the SETT Framework see Walsh 2002, 2003, 2006, 2011; for examples of the application of the SETT Framework, see Lee and Ng 2009, Howard 2010, Coyle et al 2010).

SETT is an acronym for Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk and functions on the principle that language classrooms are made up of multiple contexts created by, and through, the talk that occurs in the classroom context; interactional processes shape the learning that occurs in the classroom context. In order for practitioners to reflect upon and make changes in language use, it is desirable for practitioners to take 'ownership' of data collected from their own language classrooms, usually filmed data and transcripts

of this filmed data. This in turn facilitates the process of reflection as teachers are analyzing data in which they were a participant and through utilizing the SETT Framework, become aware of how pedagogical purpose and language use converge (signaling successful instruction) or diverge (signaling less successful instruction), as it is through talk that pedagogy and interaction achieve synthesis. This should, in turn, lead to better quality language use and therefore interaction on the part of second language teachers. The goal of the SETT Framework is to uncover the relationship between institutional goals (teaching objectives) and language used to achieve these goals (for further detail see Walsh, 2006, 2010). The SETT Framework seeks to reveal how language use by teachers facilitates opportunities for learning. It provides a framework for examining the relationship between interaction and learning and how teaching objectives and teacher-talk coincide or conflict. It is a starting point to understanding the interactional processes that occur in a language classroom. The goal of the framework is to contribute to an understanding of what forms of teacher-talk are appropriate in certain modes. Therefore, teachers can relate their use of language to their pedagogic goals. The framework also provides a meta-language for interpreting teacher-fronted interaction. Walsh (2006, p.62) defines a mode as ‘the interrelatedness of language use and teaching purpose’. These modes are as follows:

1. Managerial Mode (the main focus is on setting up an activity).
2. Materials Mode (the main focus is on the use of text, tape or other materials).
3. Skills and Systems Mode (the main focus is on particular language items, vocabulary or a specific skill);
4. Classroom Context Mode (the main focus is on eliciting feelings, attitudes and emotions of learners). (Adapted from Walsh, 2006, pps. 66-68).

It should be noted that movement from one mode to another is constant and therefore, modes themselves are not fixed entities; based on pedagogical goals of the moment and

language used to promulgate these goals, modes are in a state of flux.

In addition to identifying the modes at work in a sample of classroom data, teachers are also required to identify the interactional features occurring in the data sample. These include items such as scaffolding, display questions and confirmation checks. The approach adopted is informed by the belief that examination of filmed classroom data in conjunction with a template for evaluating language use in relation to pedagogical goals can develop an awareness of when learning opportunities are created or missed by teachers (ibid 2006). Thus, teachers are armed with the tools to evaluate and so understand their use of classroom language, leading to an adjustment in language use to facilitate learning opportunities on the part of students. Teachers also become aware of the contextual nature of classroom interaction; modes equate to differing micro-contexts brought into being by pedagogical goals and are distinguished by the interactional features that occur in that context. Howard (2010) argues that SETT goes beyond former models of analysis of classroom interaction that commonly examine IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback). Focusing on one form of interaction in the second language classroom is, she states, reductionist, as a focus on this form of exchange does not encompass all the interaction that occurs in a classroom. This is a particularly salient point; if teachers are to better develop an awareness and understanding of the relationship between pedagogy and interaction in their language classrooms, it is imperative to be able to perceive of the language classroom as consisting of multiple forms of interaction. It is also worth noting that the SETT framework allows its users to retrospectively uncover the interactional decisions made while teaching and how discourse may affect pedagogical outcomes through a process of guided self-discovery (Sert 2010). The potential value of this is that teachers are then able to make changes to practice based on empirical knowledge of what has occurred in their classroom, rather than intuition, based on an increased awareness of how interaction facilitates or

precludes learner participation in classroom interaction. A caveat, however, is that the framework does not encompass all parts of classroom context or forms of interaction. The framework is 'a means to an end, not an end in itself' (Walsh, 2006, p. 91) and aims at building understanding in practitioners, rather than explicating every interaction that occurs in the second language classroom.

2.10 Summary

This literature review has discussed interaction as both a social process and fundamental aspect of life in the language classroom. Attention has been given to the construct of interactional competence and how this construct informs this research. Differing concepts of learning have been discussed and the sociocultural theory of learning has been examined. In the following chapter, the research methodologies employed in this thesis will be discussed, in particular how a multiple-methods approach informs the research undertaken.

Chapter 3. Methodology

This research is concerned with how interactional competence is embodied and developed by English as a foreign language instructors in the Taiwanese university context. In brief, three teachers of English employed at a university in Taiwan volunteered to provide data for this study; approximately 24 hours of filmed classroom data were collected, along with approximately four hours of interview data with the instructors involved. More will be said regarding the research design of this project in the following chapter. The research questions informing this research are as follows:

1. What characterizes interactional competence within micro-contexts of classroom interaction?
2. What features of interaction delineate interactional competence?

This initial section of this chapter will serve to provide the reader with an overview of the distal context in which this research takes place. An understanding of the educational system at work in Taiwan and the influence this holds on higher education in this setting is necessary in order to describe and discuss classroom practice and learning in a manner that is comprehensive and valid.

The chapter will then shift to a description of the participants involved in this research, discussion on focus groups and how this research method informs this study. Attention will be given to how focus groups function and the tensions at work within this research method, for example, establishing group dynamics and participation. Also under discussion will be the potential problems inherent in employing focus groups as a research method and ways in which these problems may be circumvented.

The focus of the chapter will then shift to Applied Conversation Analysis and how this analytical framework provides a theoretical basis for the analysis and interpretation of the data collected in this thesis. The position taken will be that while Conversation Analysis provides an emic perspective for the researcher, there are theoretical

underpinnings that are problematic when examining data collected from language classrooms, such as maintaining an agnostic position with regard to data collection and analysis.

The chapter will conclude with a discussion of stimulated recall and semi-structured interviews and the justifications given for employing this research method. Attention will also be given to the limitations of this approach.

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 *The Taiwanese Educational Context*

It is generally the case that university students in Taiwan will have had seven years of instruction in English before attending university. Students learn English along with other academic subjects where the measure of proficiency in that subject is test scores. Therefore, English has the same status as content subjects such as mathematics, and more importantly, is approached in a similar way by learners; there is information to be acquired and reproduced in a test. The target language is not learned for communicative purposes. Students in the public school system generally do not learn English in a communicative manner and are limited to acquiring items of vocabulary and rules of grammar to pass tests. This also influences the practice of instructors. Given that the benchmark of effective teaching is also the marks learners achieve in standardized tests that often do not contain a speaking component, there is little expectation or opportunity afforded in class to use English in its spoken form. It is usually not until attending university that students are exposed to the communicative approach to teaching English and the attendant expectation that they will use this language for communication. However, this is a somewhat problematic situation as learners revise the expectations they have of the language learning process and methods of instruction utilized by teachers.

The data collected for this thesis was taken from two Freshman Listening and Speaking classes and a Reading and Grammar class. As will emerge in the analysis section, participants were very much aware that getting students to interact in the target language was an uncertain process, dependent upon both the teacher and learner and communicating this necessity in an unambiguous way. However, it can be argued that for learners who are beginning their university studies after learning English as part of the public school curriculum, a communicative approach to language learning is potentially face-threatening and would take a period of adjustment.

3.1.2 Data Collection and Research Setting

The data collected for this thesis is from digital film and audio files of three English as a Foreign Language teachers carrying out classroom instruction, collected over the course of one 18 week semester. In addition to this data, audio files of interviews conducted with these three instructors with regard to pedagogical goals, classroom language use and other items of interest that arose during the interview process were collected. Given that this thesis is concerned with the development and evolution of interactional competence of English language teachers, filmed and recorded classroom data in addition to transcripts of this interaction provided the material for discussion during the interview process. During the collection of classroom data, this researcher was not present, other than to provide a general description of the purpose of the research to students enrolled in the classes that were being filmed, and to set up and arrange the cameras and recording equipment that were used to collect data.

The data for this thesis was collected from National Pingtung University of Science and Technology. Science and Technology universities in Taiwan hold an equivalent position to polytechnic institutions in the United Kingdom. Students attending these universities are generally learning vocational subjects and in Taiwanese society are perceived as being less ‘academic’ than peers who attend other universities. However, it

must be said that attending a national university is still viewed as possessing status.

None of the students in the classes where data was collected major in languages.

Freshman English and Speaking and Reading and Grammar are required classes at this university. The profile of the three classes that provided data is as follows:

Table 2: A Summary of Research Participants

Participants	Number of students	Level of students	Background of students	Class materials
Participant A	55 students	intermediate level	Taiwanese students	Interchange 1 textbook
Participant B	62 students	advanced level	Taiwanese and Malaysian students	class textbook and powerpoint files
Participant C	55 students	intermediate level	Taiwanese and Malaysian students	Interchange 2 textbook

Class sizes in the data sampled numbered 55 – 62 students with learners placed in class according to their college (for example, Engineering) but from several different subject areas within that college.

3.1.3 The Participants

The three instructors who participated in this research are all employees at National Pingtung University of Science and Technology. Each had been employed at this university for four years at the time this research was undertaken. Participants were also graduates from Newcastle University, participants A and B having majored in Translation and Interpretation, with Participant C majoring in TESOL and Applied Linguistics. Attention is given to the academic background of participants due to the fact that none of the participants has undergone specialized teacher training. Each has

acquired their perspective on teaching based on developing their classroom practice over time and undertaking ‘on the job training’ as it were, with these beliefs coming to bear in classroom practice in general, and in the opinions expressed in the interviews in particular (see Chapter Five for examples of this).

3.2 The Foreign Language Classroom as a Research Setting: Ontological and Epistemological Considerations

The setting for this research project is the English as a foreign language classroom. At its heart, the language classroom is a social environment in which language performs the function of both subject content and medium by which social relations are manifest and maintained. In order to conduct research into such a setting, a methodological framework that aids in analyzing communicative processes and the thoughts that inform and shape those processes is required. In utilizing a particular research paradigm, methodological considerations are taken into account, principally how a researcher can find out what he or she believes can be known and understood about the area being researched (Guba and Lincoln 2004). Concerns such as research design, measurement, analysis and personal involvement in the research process follow on from this. Research methods arise from the research methodology employed.

This research is informed by the assumption that foreign language classrooms are a social environment in which relations are constructed and observable (and therefore able to be analyzed) through use of language. Social reality displayed in this setting is a local accomplishment constructed in situ. I am in agreement with Miller and Fox (2004) who hold that in a social environment researchers are able to show the manner in which members use interactional resources to either construct, realize or alter social reality. Of course, the notion of ‘social reality’ is problematic, as this changes from research setting to research setting. However, the ontological stance taken in this thesis is that the social world is not separate from those involved in its fashioning; it is something that is

constructed by its members. In this research the language classroom is regarded as a social environment in which members construct and shape social reality in an ongoing process of social engagement. In order to investigate this environment, the employment of multiple research methods is necessary to examine and explicate the meanings of interaction and social relations in this setting. This has led to the adoption of a qualitative research methodology. As Boeijie (2010) states, qualitative research relies on the belief that individuals are involved in creating social reality and it is through qualitative research methods that this process of construction is visible and able to be analyzed. Furthermore, qualitative research methods allow for insight into the meaning and purpose social actors invest in the activities they undertake (Guba and Lincoln 2004). This is a primary concern of this thesis. This research is concerned with analyzing how interactional competence is demonstrated and maintained in the context of the Taiwanese English as a second or foreign language classroom and how this competence is characterized and demonstrated by language teachers. How this influences classroom instruction and learning is also considered. The justification for employing qualitative methods is based on the relation to the rationale of the research being undertaken. Given that spoken interaction and interactional competence are being analyzed, qualitative methods serve to uncover the processes that shape interaction in the classroom and how interactional competence potentially develops; quantitative research methods will not give insight into the elements that influence the employment of language in classroom instruction or the relation between language and context. Put simply, the methods chosen in this research are a 'toolkit' that will allow me to find out how interactional competence is achieved in the social world that is the English as a foreign language classroom. A range of tools are needed to examine what happens in depth. These 'tools' (focus groups, Applied Conversation Analysis, stimulated recall interviews) will let me examine what occurs in this research setting and the properties of

what can be known about interaction in this context; they are fit to the purpose of examining how interactional competence develops. More will be said regarding the particular methods adopted later in this chapter. It could be contended that qualitative research methods are not as rigorous as quantitative research methods. By this I mean that quantitative research methods are deemed to be less prone to subjective value judgments employed by researchers (as with qualitative research) and therefore, able to engender greater reliability and validity than results generated through qualitative methods (Bryman 2008). I would disagree with this position. Interactional competence is contingent upon and demonstrated through interaction; it is manifest through turns-at-talk. In analyzing how talk is organized and progresses, statistical analysis will not reveal the details of the interactional processes at work in the manner that Applied Conversation Analysis can. This has led to the use of multiple-methods – focus groups, Applied Conversation Analysis and stimulated recall interviews. This methodology will aid in answering the research questions that inform this thesis and so go some way towards filling the gap in understanding of interactional competence this thesis is concerned with.

A distinction must be made here between the terms method and methodology. King and Horrocks (2010) state that methods are ‘the techniques and procedure used to collect and analyze data’ while methodology is:

the process where the design of the research and the choice of particular methods and their justification in relation to the particular research project is made evident’ (2010, p.6).

The function of this chapter is to delineate the process implemented to investigate the research questions that inform this thesis. Attention will be given to the methods used (focus groups, Applied Conversation Analysis, semi-structured and stimulated recall interviews) within the broader framework of how these methods complement each other as a *methodology* (italics mine) to examine the issue of interactional competence in the Taiwanese English as a foreign language classroom.

3.3 Triangulation

The issue of research methods complementing each other is the focus of the next section of this chapter. Triangulation is ‘collecting data from a variety of perspectives, using a variety of methods’ (Carruthers quoting Guba, 2007). There are a variety of benefits in doing so for the researcher. They can be encapsulated as follows. If two or more methods are combined to investigate research questions, possible weaknesses in one method may well be compensated for by the strengths of another method (ibid). As will be discussed in greater depth later in the chapter, Applied Conversation Analysis will explicate how instructors make use of language in classroom instruction.

However, this method may not reveal why language is employed in differing ways depending on issues such as pedagogical focus and context; stimulated recall interviews are one method for attempting to investigate and interpret the interactional decisions that instructors perform during the process of classroom instruction. Triangulation also serves to influence the validity of research; if similar results are found when using different methods, it would appear that the argument for validity within the research is strengthened (ibid).

3.4 Focus Groups

Rowney (1987, p. 173) makes the argument that ‘research methods cannot be neutral’ as ‘they act as filters through which the environment can be experienced’. The research being undertaken is exploratory in nature, as has been previously stated. Therefore, the epistemological position adopted in this research is that knowledge about the social world of the second or foreign language classroom is co-constructed by instructors and learners. In other words, it is through talk that knowledge is brought into being and communicated. The research methods selected for this study were chosen because it was thought that they would best complement each other, serve to function as an overall methodology within this research and also be the most effective means of

answering the research questions that form the basis of this study. The focus of this chapter will now shift to a description and validation of each individual research method. Attention will also be given to possible limitations within these research methods.

The use of focus groups has been adopted by social science researchers from the marketing field (Linhorst 2002, Kreuger and Casey 2000). Focus groups allow the researcher access to the experiences and knowledge of participants with regard to the topic being researched. A strength of focus groups is that they reveal to the researcher the common experience and ideas of a group of people. Thus they improve 'our comprehension of the whole...meaning that we can explore the depth and complexity inherent in particular phenomena' (Webb, quoting Burns and Grove, 2002, p28).

Hollander (2004) draws attention to a distinction that focus groups may have when compared to other research methods in the social sciences. She states that focus groups are not an instrument for conducting research; rather they are a site where researchers are able to observe the processes of social interaction. From this perspective it can be argued that focus groups are a context. It is through establishing a context that researchers are able to develop the discussion in which interaction will take place.

A further strength of focus groups in social science research is that they permit researchers to collect a large volume of data within a limited period of time (Fallon and Brown 2002). Morgan (1997, p.13) states that focus groups will 'produce concentrated amounts of data on the topic of interest'. However, it should also be observed that this will only occur if the moderator is able to direct group interaction in a way that will achieve this aim. Hollander (2004, p.605) observes that 'all research situations are instances of social interaction'. The motivating force for researchers to make use of focus groups is this notion of social interaction. It is through this interaction that the opinions and ideas that form the data to be collected and analyzed are formed and explicated.

The research questions in this study have led me to the belief that this method will afford insights into what is relevant for language teachers in Taiwan when designing lessons and the interactional decisions instructors make when teaching. Morgan (1997, p.2) states that:

The hallmark of focus groups is their explicit use of group interaction to produce data and insights that would be less accessible without the interaction found in a group

An example of this can be found in the initial focus group that informs this research.

Extract 3.1 – Initial Focus Group

1. Interviewer: OK. Well maybe to introduce a slightly different idea, do you...I'm sure you all know what a pent...ah sorry, a pedagogical focus is. So at the start of a lesson, a teacher might begin today we're going to look at blah blah blah. So how do you go about introducing your lessons? Because that's one way to create opportunities for learning is in the introduction. You know, talking about what you're going to teach, how you're going to teach it. So how do you do that?
2. Participant C: To me it's like ah the topic is something to do with whether then I might come in you know, when the students all settle down then then I might, ' Oh so you know, oh it's so hot today, you know um you know I will actually....'
3. Participant B: Bring up a a a conversation related to the...
4. Participant C: Yeah. I will you know do you call it little talk?
5. Interviewer: OK. Small talk.
6. Participant B: Small talk.
7. Participant C: I have small talk before the class begins with something related to the topic.
8. Interviewer: OK.
9. Participant C: Yeah maybe something like that or I often share my own experience.

The employment of focus groups is predicated on the belief that interaction will be meaningful in that it will produce responses that are of interest and benefit to the researcher. As can be seen above all three participants engage in discussing the topic at hand (establishing a pedagogical focus), though the interviewer has to perform a great deal of interactional work to achieve this.

This is not to say that focus groups are not a valid research method. However, it must be acknowledged that this approach is not without possible internal tensions

(owing to group dynamics) that will have some impact on the research carried out using this approach. Factors such as the selection of participants, number of participants, role of the moderator and the position focus groups may hold when used as part of a mixed methods approach must all be considered by researchers. With regard to this research and the methods employed to answer the research questions that inform this thesis, focus groups serve as a means of revealing participants' perspectives on teaching and learning and so provide both a starting and end point for the research process and an overview of how participants conceive of teaching and learning. Applied Conversation Analysis is used to uncover how instructors achieve intersubjectivity with learners through talk in interaction, with the focus being on how interactional competence is demonstrated and maintained through mechanisms such as turn-taking. Stimulated recall interview data will be shown along with transcribed excerpts of classroom data in order to demonstrate guided self-discovery by means of the interview process. This will show the perspective participants have on their own classroom practice and language use. A multiple-methods approach has been adopted because it provides the greatest scope for answering the research questions in this thesis.

It has been noted that focus groups attempt to generate naturally-occurring data (see Chui 2003, Hopkins 2007, Linhorst 2002, Kitzinger 1994). This is because 'focus group activities are concerned mainly to facilitate identification of concerns and exploration of opinions and experiences among participants' (Chui, 2003, p.169). Of importance is the idea that focus groups will allow researchers access to participants' personal experiences. Within the context of the research undertaken, knowledge and understanding of what shapes the language employed by instructors when teaching is one of the goals of this study. Focus groups allow the researcher to undertake an inductive process of investigation (Kreuger and Casey 2000). This means that it tends to be the participants' voices and perceptions of the issue being discussed that shape the

interaction and obviates judgments the researcher may hold. This is often cited as a strength of focus groups (Chui 2003, Kreuger and Casey 2000). Through interaction, the perspective of participants' emerges and it is through the process of interaction that data relevant to the researcher is thought to occur. In this research, this position is accepted because it is believed that participants will possess differing and possibly conflicting ideas with regard to the role instructor's language plays in classroom discourse which will be borne out in the classroom data itself. However, much discussion has also occurred in the academic community with regard to how valid this belief is.

Linhorst (2002) notes researchers adapt focus groups in order to fit the purpose of the research being carried out. Chui (2003) also comments that a range of focus group methods have been developed within the context of differing research traditions. Therefore, it can be argued that focus groups are not necessarily a 'bottom-up' approach to data collection. Kitzinger (1994) and Fallon and Brown (2002, p. 196) note that focus groups are by their very nature a 'contrived form of research' that involve 'the convening of carefully chosen groups to discuss a particular topic'. This quote argues that researchers are in a reflexive bind; naturally-occurring data as it occurs in interaction is the goal, but in order to approximate conditions where this might take place, the researcher must influence the process. It is to how this influence is accomplished that will now be discussed.

As has been mentioned earlier, there is a tension at work within the employment of focus groups. It is hoped that group interaction will lead views on a particular topic to emerge and so provide data for analysis. To achieve this, the researcher will, of necessity, design focus group research around a designated topic and select participants based on this topic. In other words, the researcher will seek respondents with information about, and insights into, the topic to be discussed. As Chui puts it, researchers will 'carefully 'sample' participants' (p. 171). This is a reality of focus

group research. The researcher is not divorced from the process, though, as has been mentioned, proponents of this method state that it is not the researcher's voice that emerges, but that of the participants.

A further issue with regard to focus groups is how such groups are to be structured. Kitzinger (1994) reports it may benefit the researcher to work with pre-existing social groupings when selecting participants. Considerations such as age, gender and social class may have some influence upon how free participants feel to interact. To engender engagement with the topic under discussion and with other members, social context is of importance as it is the site within which interaction is to take place. Chui (2003, p.166) emphasizes this point, stating that 'group processes are central because of their potential in engaging participants in research activities'. It is also argued by Hopkins (2007) that focus groups which contain members familiar to each other or at least from the same social context will contain greater interaction and potentially richer sources of data. Fallon and Brown (2002) state that participants in focus groups who feel some sense of commonality will feel better able to express differences of opinion about a topic, which may provide richer data to researchers, as well as express their own perspectives on the topic under discussion in general. Participants who share a sense of common background or culture may be able to draw upon shared experiences within focus group discussion.

However, it is also argued that this is a potential weakness of focus groups. Homogeneous membership, it is claimed, (ibid) may also limit the variety of discussion and range of opinions expressed within such groups. Participants who are less familiar with each other may feel less inhibition, it is argued, when expressing opinions or beliefs that may be controversial. Having participants who do not share common values or cultural identity may be one method of avoiding 'group think', thus rendering the data collected of potentially more value.

In the case of the research that I am undertaking, a shared culture is necessary. The participants I am working with share a common identity; teachers of English as a foreign language in Taiwan. These participants are native Taiwanese who possess English as a foreign language. However, all participants possess a specific institutional identity, that of teachers of English as a foreign language. I would argue that this is of benefit within the research undertaken due to the fact that these informants are being asked to reflect upon this professional identity and experiences gained through and in language instruction. Therefore, homogeneity of professional background should engender interaction that will go some way to answering the research questions of this study.

The role of the moderator in focus groups may be somewhat problematic (Morgan 1997, Kreuger and Casey 2000). The function of the moderator is to stimulate interaction among the participants, rather than dominate discussion with a schedule of questions. The moderator guides discussion and withdraws when appropriate. However, this stance is open to question. The level of moderator input into focus group discussion is commented on by Linhorst (2002); if moderators do not involve themselves in controlling the interaction, informants may discuss topics outside the realm of the study. However, if the moderator is too intrusive, interaction may be obstructed and this may potentially limit the data collected. Within the literature on focus groups (Kreuger and Casey 2000, Chui 2003) it is recommended that moderators be trained in conducting focus groups and gain competency through practice before commencing the project. In the case of the research conducted, I made the deliberate choice to moderate the focus groups in this research myself. This was due to a variety of reasons. Focus groups form a limited yet important part of the data collection undertaken. I held no more than two focus groups. Conducting the focus groups myself helped to allay fears in respondents about interacting with the moderator. Also, being aware of the research questions that

informed data collection and understanding the role focus groups play within the overall context of the study meant that I possessed a level of reflexivity regarding the research another moderator may not have had. By this I mean that I was aware of my place within the research project; that of researcher, and to a limited extent, participant, through acting as moderator in the focus groups being held.

A further issue related to the role of the moderator in focus groups is the structuring of questions. Given that focus groups are 'distinguished from the broader category of group interviews by the explicit use of group interaction as research data' (Kitzinger, 1994, p.103), questioning has a critical function in stimulating group interaction. Linhorst (2002) notes questions may be either specific or unstructured. This is because such questions may be asked in response to participants' comments. This argues for a level of flexibility on the part of the moderator and the ability to respond to the interaction that takes place in the focus group as it occurs. The advantage of focus groups that begin with a less structured approach is that free and open discussion is more likely to occur (ibid). Prepared questions may have less utility than asking participants to share their views on the topic being discussed, rather than beginning with a predetermined set of questions. However, this approach is also potentially problematic. A less structured approach to questioning may promote the discussion of data irrelevant to the research being carried out, rendering the data difficult to codify and analyze. Also of note is the fact that the moderator should endeavour not to be seen as the authority that designates who can speak and when; this would undermine the fundamental purpose of a focus group, to 'examine how knowledge and ideas both develop and operate within a given cultural context' (Kitzinger, 1994, p.116). Participants should be given the opportunity to ask questions within the focus group and respond to the comments of others. The level of questioning within a focus group influences the interaction that takes place; therefore, within the context of the study undertaken I

aimed to ask open-ended questions that would stimulate discussion and allow space for interactants to formulate questions of their own.

As mentioned previously and has emerged in this chapter, focus groups are regarded as a somewhat problematic research method. There is a balance to be achieved with regard to the role of the moderator and the questions employed. However, there are some generally-agreed principles on how focus groups should be formed and what they should look like. Kreuger (1994) lists these as follows:

1. Focus groups should contain four to ten members.
2. A series of groups is desirable.
3. Members should possess certain characteristics or commonalities.
4. Focus groups should provide data through interaction.
5. They are concerned with qualitative analysis.
6. They are concerned with focused discussion.

Attention will now be given to the number of participants to have in a focus group. The focus group was conducted at the National Pingtung University of Science and Technology and consisted of three members. These samples are predicated on the fact that the response rate to participating in my study was somewhat low.

There is some debate as to the optimal size of focus groups. Kreuger and Casey (2000) relate conducting focus groups with up to 30 members (though comment that this could not be deemed a true focus group due to the large number of participants and so reduced opportunities for interaction), as well as with smaller numbers of less than ten. Given that the focus group conducted at National Pingtung University consisted of only three members, there is a valid argument to be made that this cannot legitimately be called a focus group. However, I would disagree with this stance. The interaction that occurred still offered the researcher data of interest. It could also be argued that because this focus group was with social contacts, a smaller number of participants allowed for

greater interaction.

Linhorst (2002) observes that focus groups are of benefit to the researcher when part of a multiple-methods approach. It is widely accepted that the employment of a range of methods as part of a research design will potentially afford the researcher greater insight into a topic than an adherence to a single method of data collection and analysis (Bryman 2008, Linhorst 2002). Focus groups may be used as a primary source of data or function to supplement other forms of data. It is this position that has been adopted in this research. I have used focus groups to reveal the concerns participants in my study may hold about the language that is employed within their classroom practice and how they feel this language may potentially influence pedagogy and interactional decision making. I have taken this approach for a variety of reasons. I believe that gaining an awareness of how the participants in this research approach classroom practice and an understanding of the processes which inform this classroom practice prepared me for the experience of being an observer within the classrooms led by these participants. 'Focus groups can be conducted prior to observation to develop insights into the population to be observed' as Linhorst (2002, p.215) states. It is also through group interaction that I believe these participants reveal and disclose these concerns because they are among colleagues who possess the same institutional identity and so may discuss the same situations they encounter in classroom teaching.

Focus groups are used in conjunction with Applied Conversation Analysis of filmed excerpts of classroom interaction and interviews based on shared examination of transcripts of classroom interaction. It is accepted that focus groups complement these qualitative research methods (Seedhouse 2005) and can work in conjunction with other forms of data. In the context of my research, neither of these methods employed on their own would answer the research questions asked in the study I am undertaking.

Another aspect of the role of focus groups within research seldom mentioned is the

affective aspect; that is, fostering a sense of shared identity within focus group participants. The utility of focus groups in this context is that they are a beginning point for the research process and also allow the participants to gain insight into how they each conceive of their role within the study and feelings about how they employ language in the classroom. This means that participants gain a sense of common purpose with regard to their role in the research. While not wishing to overstate the case that focus groups may promote a collegial feeling among participants, this is an aspect that would be of benefit to the researcher as participants are more likely to continue their involvement in the study.

As is now clear, focus groups offer the researcher a perspective on the commonly-held beliefs and understandings of a selected population who possess insights into the topic being investigated. However, focus groups are problematic due to their focus on group interaction. This interaction needs to be facilitated. Inherent in this is the notion that researchers must consider their own position within the research and adopt a reflexive stance in order not to compromise the data collected due to undue influence upon the progress of the focus group. Without a reflexive perspective on focus groups, the researcher runs the risk of negating the data collected through intrusion upon the discussion, for example. The role of the moderator, selection of questions and size of the focus group must all be considered and dealt with reflectively in order for focus groups to be effective in the context of the study being undertaken. Within the context of the research undertaken here, focus groups are a beginning point and also serve to supplement the other research methods employed; Applied Conversation Analysis and qualitative interviews. Focus groups are the beginning step in this research and it is for this reason that they have been discussed first. Applied Conversation Analysis and qualitative interviews are, however, the primary methods for answering the research questions of this research and it is to their role within social science research that the

latter sections of this chapter will now address.

3.5 Conversation Analysis as a Research Method

Conversation Analysis is predicated on the position that participants in talk co-construct talk, examining and responding to each others' utterances, so developing interaction (Seedhouse 2005). Therefore, talk is structured and organized, rather than a random act; there is order at all points in interaction, contributions are shaped by the context in which they occur (and help shape and form that context) and within interaction no detail is extraneous (ibid). Through analysis the organizational principles of talk such as sequence organization, turn-taking and adjacency pairs can be evaluated within the interactional environment in which the talk has occurred. Therefore, it is argued that Conversation Analysis applies an emic perspective to the business of analyzing talk and examines talk as a social act, rather than examining language use. How talk is constructed and performed at a local level is examined and it is the participants' perspective that is considered within the interaction (Mori 2004, He 2004).

Conversation Analysis has been described as 'empirically grounded' (Richards 2007). It is the data that shapes the analyst's interpretation. A fundamental principle of Conversation Analysis is that researchers cannot bring to bear prior assumptions with regard to the data (Mori 2004). Mori (2002, p.342) encapsulates this position by saying that 'determination of research agendas and construction of interests prior to examination of data contradict the fundamental principles of Conversation Analysis'. It has been noted by a range of researchers that Conversation Analysis is 'theoretically agnostic' (ibid 2007) with regard to talk; 'unmotivated looking' and the collection of large amount of cases to demonstrate an interactional phenomenon are employed to validate a researcher's stance regarding a phenomenon in interaction. Details such as the age, gender or social class of interactants are only of interest to the researcher if participants focus on these details within the interaction.

For researchers of talk and interaction, Conversation Analysis appears to be a method that meets requirements within the social sciences with regard to reliability, validity and replicability. Reliability is derived from what is chosen to be recorded, the technical quality of what is recorded and how adequate a transcript is with regard to the detail of interactional features that are noted. Conversation Analysis also displays primary data and, more importantly, displays the analysis of the researcher; that is, the process of analysis is made transparent for the reader. The reader can go through the process that the researcher has undergone and examine the validity of the claims made. The research that has been undertaken can be replicated (Seedhouse 2005a). Paul ten Have (2007) further contends that owing to its concern with naturally occurring data, Conversation Analysis is less artificial than other forms of research methods; the data collected is from daily life (related to Conversation Analysis' roots in ethnomethodology) and not data derived from experiments or influenced by the researcher.

3.6 Conversation Analysis and the Notion of Competence

As can be seen from the above description of Conversation Analysis, this appears to be a research methodology that offers advantages to the researcher of interaction in and through talk. Conversation Analysis allows the researcher to focus on competence from the perspective of what communicative skills are employed in interaction and how and when these skills are used. Richards (2007, p.6) further develops this theme, stating that

Instead of working from the assumption that competence is something that one either has or does not have, CA provides a means of exploring the ways in which such competence is constructed in particular circumstances by the participants involved

Conversation Analysis seeks to examine data at a level beyond surface phenomena and reveal how talk is constructed; it allows the researcher to undertake a 'fine-grained analysis' of the data collected (Young 2009). Hellermann (2005, 2006) argues for the use of Conversation Analysis as a method for revealing how participants perform

classroom practice as it focuses on micro-level details of interaction and also provides a detailed description of observable behaviour as it relates to learning; learning in Hellermann's view is situated practice, performed through repeated interactions that occur in the classroom community. Conversation Analysis allows the researcher to see and describe how talk in the classroom is accomplished (Kelly-Hall 2004, Gan 2010, Kasper 2004). Conversation Analysis is also of use in revealing how learners participate in classroom interaction through the language they have learned, one of the primary concerns of this thesis. The primary importance that Conversation Analysis also affords in focusing on how talk is organized and orientations displayed by participants within the interaction, means that the researcher is directed in how to analyze the data collected.

3.7 Conversation Analysis and Professional Development

It could be argued that Conversation Analysis is a method that does not allow researchers to consider areas of interest that do not appear in the data; however, it could also be claimed that this research method offers researchers clarity and direction with regard to data collection and analysis.

This thesis is concerned with interactional competence as it is developed and embodied in the Taiwanese English as a foreign language classroom. The research I am undertaking is sociocultural in its approach; I am basing my research on the belief that second language development occurs through interaction between instructor and learners rather than solely through explicit classroom instruction. This research, therefore, is also concerned with professional development on the part of English language teachers. Conversation Analysis has much to offer in the field of professional development. (For further see Richards and Seedhouse 2007). Richards (*ibid*, p.3) summarizes the ways in which Conversation Analysis may be of benefit for professional training as follows:

1. CA is empirically grounded and therefore well placed to generate the sort of discoveries that can inform practice.
2. CA's focus on practical accomplishment through interaction establishes a natural link with professional practice.
3. Because CA's raw materials are publicly observable phenomena, these materials are available as resources in subsequent training interventions.

This work makes no claims that Conversation Analysis is a research method that will be of use to all language practitioners as a means of professional development. While there are benefits to using this method, Conversation Analysis is a time-consuming endeavour that requires specific training, rendering this method of use to the researcher but of limited value to the classroom instructor for the reasons outlined here. There is a wide range of literature to support this belief (see Markee 2002 and Hellermann 2007 for example). In order to reveal how instructors and learners use language to mediate learning and co-construct the interactional environment of the English as a foreign language classroom, I have recorded and analyzed classroom talk collected from a selection of Taiwanese EFL classrooms. Given that I am seeking to analyze language as it is employed in the EFL classroom, Conversation Analysis would appear to be a methodology that affords insights into the development of interactional competence that other methods such as Critical Discourse Analysis may not. He (2004, p.573) notes that:

CA can provide highly detailed insights into how opportunities for language learning and teaching are socially constructed by participants who orient to the practices of institutional varieties of talk

However, it must be noted that for Conversation Analysis to make change explicit as it occurs over time in the language classroom, a large corpus of data needs to be collected, a point noted by Markee (2008). This study is based on approximately 24 hours of classroom data, with examples of interactional competence transcribed according to the conventions of Conversation Analysis.

3.8 Conversation Analysis and Sociocultural Theory

Conversation Analysis is concerned with observable phenomena, focusing on local context as it is shaped by talk-in-interaction. It can be argued, as it is by Markee (2000), that Conversation Analysis delineates language use rather than language acquisition. In other words, Conversation Analysis is not concerned with learning per se. Sociocultural theory is a theory of learning and so at first glance may appear incompatible with the tenets of Conversation Analysis. However, Conversation Analysis offers a fine grained analysis of interaction in conjunction with this theory of learning. (For further studies that apply sociocultural theory and Conversation Analysis see Mondada and Pekarek-Dohler 2004 and Hellermann 2007).

As has been stated earlier, Conversation Analysis is a methodology that is based on researcher objectivity; the data ‘speaks for itself’, free from researcher influence and prior assumptions brought to bear on the data, shaping how the researcher presents findings and conclusions drawn from the data. It also allows researchers to analyze interaction in great detail, taking into account examples such as pauses of micro-seconds, which Discourse Analysis, for example, may not. Proponents of this method argue that Conversation Analysis affords the researcher insights into how talk is constructed that other methods cannot, given their concern with details that occur outside of talk (see Billig 1999 for further detail). Walters quoting Schegloff (2007, p.7) states that ‘behavior in conversation actually emerges through sequences of talk-in-interaction, a sequence being an observed course of linguistic action co-constructed by interlocutors across multiple turns.’

3.9 Limitations of Conversation Analysis

The first sections of this analysis have given an overview of the theoretical

underpinnings of Conversation Analysis and the approach taken with regard to data collection and data analysis and the advantages it offers the researcher of talk in general and classroom interaction in particular. Attention will now be given to issues of concern with this research method and the possible impact these issues may have for this research.

While Conversation Analysis offers researchers of classroom interaction many advantages, it must be noted that it is a method with particular drawbacks. Paul ten Have (2007) notes that for researchers that intend to use Conversation Analysis a large commitment of time and effort is required. A large amount of data needs to be collected and detailed transcription performed that is both time-consuming and painstaking. As has previously been discussed, a large selection of cases is found to demonstrate recurring phenomena in interaction. In this regard, the researcher is not able to hypothesize based on a small sample of data. The researcher is obligated to spend a large amount of time collecting data and performing transcription in order to validate any claims made. I will now discuss the process of recording and transcription and how these practices may not be as free of researcher influence as proponents of Conversation Analysis would have it.

As has been commented on previously, (see ten-Have 2007) Conversation Analysis is often presented as a research method free from researcher bias or input. This is regarded as an advantage; data is examined only after being collected, according to what occurs in the data. The evidence under analysis is that which is presented in the recording and transcript of that recording.

Of concern regarding Conversation Analysis is that this method is removed from potentially more revealing sources of data. Markee (2000, p.2) states that:

In all cases, the recordings are considered to be the definitive source of information about the behaviors that were observed. Transcripts are understood as a tool for analysis to be used in conjunction with recordings

Conversation Analysis works at several removes from the original data source.

Transcription is performed retrospectively, and so, functions as a representation of what has occurred and possibly not an accurate reproduction of the video data. In the case of this research that is the classroom interaction between instructor and learner itself.

Conversation Analysis works based on transcripts of filmed and recorded data; therefore, the transcript is two steps removed from the classroom context. It is a 'representation of the data' (Hutchby and Woofitt, 2009, p. 70). It is not being argued that Conversation Analysis does not work with empirical data; rather it is claimed that the data collected potentially does not possess the level of authenticity advocated by its adherents.

A further concern with regard to this method is the idea that 'the analyst follows exactly the same procedure as the participants' (Seedhouse 2005, p. 195) when analyzing transcribed data. It is inarguable that the analyst is at work within the 'sequential environment' (ibid, p. 252) of the interaction but the data is a representation of what occurred and does not allow the analyst full disclosure of what motivated participants during the interaction under analysis. The researcher makes claims only about what occurs within the talk under analysis. This is often advocated as a strength of Conversation Analysis (Hutchby and Woofitt 2009); somewhat paradoxically this may also perhaps be a weakness of Conversation Analysis and it is to this possible weakness that attention will now turn.

The social sciences are concerned with what motivates human beings to behave as they do. Ethnomethodology is concerned with the basic material of life and as is noted by ten Have (2007, p.1) 'conversation is one of the most mundane of all topics'. Given that Conversation Analysis focuses on how talk is constructed and how participants co-construct interaction, motivations and personal perspectives are not included in analysis unless specifically mentioned in the talk itself. The research undertaken here examines the development of interactional competence by instructors within the

Taiwanese EFL classroom. In order to perform this research I have filmed and transcribed classroom data. In addition I have interviewed instructors of the classes I was given access to, in order to reveal to practitioners the role language plays in their classroom teaching. I have presented transcripts of classroom interaction and questioned instructors as to what occurred during lessons and discussed their practice with regard to how interactional competence is being fostered over a series of lessons (see Chapter Five for more on this). While this may strengthen the argument I make with regard to the development of interactional competence and afford insights into the motivations that lie behind the interactional and pedagogical decisions performed by language instructors, it would be regarded by some adherents of Conversation Analysis as counter to the notions that inform Conversation Analysis, in particular allowing the data to speak for itself. This issue has been commented on by ten Have (1999) who observes that retrospective accounts offered by participants in interaction may not accord with the behaviour that occurs in filmed data. However, in this research I am attempting to discover how language instructors *develop* (italics mine) interactional competence; Conversation Analysis alone will not provide enough insight into the phenomenon under investigation. It could also be argued that employing interviews in conjunction with Conversation Analysis will allow triangulation (Bryman 2008) in the methodological approach, as well as lending reflexivity to the data collected, which would strengthen the arguments made, after analyzing the data collected.

Conversation Analysis is also a problematic method of research to apply in this study given that it is presupposed that this method is *theoretically* agnostic (italics mine). As Nakamura notes ‘it could be argued...that the process of transcribing the data is part of the analysis (2008, p. 273). However, I wish to take this idea a step further. Paul ten Have (2007, p.6) states to ‘do CA one would need to have special motivations and arguments’. This quote appears to be counter to one of Conversation Analysis’ central

precepts, that of unmotivated looking. Yet, it is unlikely that researchers approach data with a completely open mind and possess some awareness of what they believe is at work in the talk-in-interaction under analysis. Therefore, Conversation Analysis cannot be conceived of as an agnostic research discipline. As has been mentioned earlier, recordings and transcripts are representations of what has occurred in the interaction, not the reality of the interaction itself (Hammersley 2003). There have been events that have occurred before and after the interaction are ignored by the researcher.

Also of importance is the fact that researchers are responsible for deciding what to include in a transcript. Features such as intonation and stress are given prominence by a researcher arguably due to larger concerns such as the topic of the project being carried out. Therefore, it can be argued, as it is by Hammersley (*ibid*), that researchers approach the data with ideas of how to represent talk and that this affects how readers will interpret the data. As has been discussed earlier, Seedhouse (2005) makes the point that transcripts and analysis are visible to the reader, rendering data and analysis transparent, something that other methods in the social sciences are less capable of doing; however, it can be argued that what is visible to the reader is the representation of what has occurred in the talk being analyzed and more specifically, what the researcher has decided is worth presenting in the data. Thus, it can be seen that Conversation Analysis is not as free of researcher input as its adherents sometimes state.

Of further concern is the idea that the analyst decides what is relevant for analysis. Being able to conduct Conversation Analysis relies upon collecting a large body of data; it cannot all be represented in a thesis or journal paper. Therefore, out of necessity, the researcher must select fragments of data which explicate the point being argued in the research. It may be argued by Conversation Analysis proponents that no detail be left out of transcripts, yet it is a reality that large parts of the corpus of interaction be left out of the data presented. The researcher directs the reader as to what is important, and by

omission, decides for the reader what has been worth observing in the interaction. The researcher makes a decision based on, for example, research questions that need to be answered, as to what sections of the data will be analyzed after transcription and then presented in the finished research.

3.10 Straight Ahead and Applied Conversation Analysis

This brings us now to a division within Conversation Analysis between ‘straight ahead CA’ and ‘applied CA’. Mori (2002, p.342) quoting Heap states that ‘straight ahead CA tells us how to look, and what we must do in order to show how the features of institutions, like education, are produced in situ...interactionally’. This definition of Conversation Analysis is in keeping with the theoretical underpinnings that inform how to do Conversation Analysis. It is noted that ‘applied CA tells us what to look at’. Unmotivated looking is not performed, as the researcher is aware of what features of interaction he or she wishes to observe and analyze. This is the position taken in this research. As I have stated earlier, I am analyzing how interactional competence is developed in the Taiwanese EFL classroom. Much of my ontological stance on this subject is shaped by the work of James Lantolf (2000); that is, I believe that instructors and learners co-construct the interactional environment of the second language classroom. My epistemological stance is that this phenomenon can be observed and analyzed through the methodology that informs this research. I have approached my data from this perspective. It should also be stated that I am aware that I am examining talk as it occurs in an institutional environment. Language use within this context is generally defined and shaped by the pedagogical goals at work in this environment, meaning that language use in this context is highly indexical and in service to the business of teaching and learning (Walsh 2002, 2006). Therefore, the talk analyzed is that which is employed in, and for, teaching and learning, in effect classroom talk, mainly that performed by the teacher. In other words, this research is concerned with

professional development as it relates to the language employed in class by language teachers. This also means that as a researcher I am aware of what I am hoping to find in the data I collect. I am looking at features such as how linguistic resources are utilized to accomplish social action in classrooms, topic introduction, turn taking, the sequential organization of talk and how pauses are used to promulgate interactional competence. Thus, I have approached the data I collected with a prior set of assumptions, rather than allowing the data itself to delineate the features I wish to examine. Richards (2007, p.3) outlines the similarity of both forms of Conversation Analysis as well as the crucial difference in the following passage:

As far as applied CA is concerned, then, the fact that the data are collected in institutional settings and the findings have relevance to practice in these settings does not imply that the approach to analysis should be fundamentally different from that of the broader discipline. If a distinction is to be drawn between CA and applied CA, it is not to be found in methodological difference but rather in terms of the phenomena to which attention is directed and the relevance of the research to training in professional development

It could be argued that I am adapting Conversation Analysis to fit within the parameters of the research I am carrying out. I am in agreement with this stance. I am investigating interactional competence in a particular context. In relation to this I am also attempting to describe what interactional competence looks like in this setting by analyzing the features that delineate this phenomenon. Given that I am investigating the problem of how interactional competence is displayed and manifest and describing the features of interaction that show interactional competence at work I would feel limited by the approach advocated by traditional adherents of Conversation Analysis by having an agnostic approach towards the data I collect. What is being analyzed (interactional competence in the Taiwanese English as a foreign language classroom) is shaped by the research problem under investigation. Being aware of the interactional features I wish to examine potentially means spending less time on detailed transcription, as I know what I am looking for within the data. Using 'applied CA' provides me with the freedom

(as researcher) to take advantage of the benefits offered by Conversation Analysis such as close attention to detail and fine-grained analysis of the data collected. However, it may also be argued that this approach means that I am not using Conversation Analysis in its authentic form.

To go further, it may be argued by some researchers that my treatment of the data is antithetical within the research method I am choosing to employ. Martyn Hammersley (2003, p.751) encapsulates the situation that researchers may encounter when using Conversation Analysis as part of a research project by pondering what Conversation Analysis is in the following statement:

a method to be used by social scientists for the problem being investigated with other methods or a paradigm – an exclusive, self-sufficient approach to investigating the social world

For Hammersley there is no doubt – proponents of Conversation Analysis treat CA as a paradigm, not as a method. This idea of the paradigm implies that those who employ Conversation Analysis in research are hidebound by notions of what is correct use of this research method. Yet, as I have argued in this chapter, analysts bring to bear much that contradicts the idea of Conversation Analysis as theoretically agnostic; researchers determine what is transcribed and what is analyzed and then presented when the research is written up. Therefore, there is a tension between the underpinnings of Conversation Analysis and its employment, which has inspired the debate between Billig (1999) and Schegloff for example. Bryman (2008) observes that Conversation Analysis possesses many dimensions; it is part theory, part method of data collection and part method of analysis. With regard to the research undertaken here, Conversation Analysis offers advantages that have been commented on previously that make it a useful method to apply. While I am aware of the theoretical underpinnings of Conversation Analysis, I am not fully accepting of the claims of neutrality that Conversation Analysis is based upon. As noted by Wei (2002), Conversation Analysis is

not truly atheoretical. Instead, Conversation Analysis ‘has a different conception about how to theorize about social life and a different notion of the nature of evidence and of how to validate hypotheses’ (p. 171). In using this research method I am aware of the benefits that it offers as a means of analyzing classroom interaction; however, I am choosing to circumvent what I perceive to be limitations in this method with regard to how data should be examined. As a researcher I am aware of what I wish to examine within the data and so approach the data seeking particular features that delineate interactional competence.

Conversation Analysis has much to offer those researching interaction. It is a research method with a clear focus on how data is to be collected and analyzed. It allows researchers to analyze interaction in fine detail and examine the structure of the social action talk-in-interaction. However, the theoretical underpinnings of Conversation Analysis may conflict with some of the aims of the research in question, especially with regard to ‘unmotivated looking’, which may be an unrealistic expectation when researchers begin collecting data.

3.11 Stimulated Recall and Semi-Structured Interviews

I wish to draw a distinction between the use of focus groups and interviews within this research project. While both methods involve questioning in order to gain access to and insight regarding participants’ views, these methods differ in purpose. As has been related earlier, focus groups were used to stimulate group discussion and interaction, the belief informing this choice being that interaction would reveal shared attitudes on classroom practice. Semi-structured and stimulated recall interviews have been used to assess participants’ individual ideas with regard to their classroom practice. Rather than a starting point for the research, interviews have served to illustrate the perspectives that individual instructors have on the role of language use in the language classroom and their own practice in particular.

3.12 Stimulated Recall Interviews

The interviews undertaken in this research have been concerned with eliciting teachers' perspectives on the language utilized in the service of teaching and learning. In order to achieve this aim, stimulated recall interviews have been used. In brief, stimulated recall is based upon the premise that interactive thought processes can be described and examined in retrospect. However, this research method is not devoid of criticism, due to the following concerns:

1. the adequacy with which teachers can accurately report information (e.g through processes) that is no longer in their short-term memory;
2. the extent to which stimulated recall can generate a complete account both of teacher thinking (much of which may be tacit) and teacher behaviour (which will often be automatized and thus not subject to explicit description);
3. the extent to which teachers under pressure to explain their actions in stimulated recall interviews, may provide post-hoc rationalizations for them – i.e explanations made up at the time of the interview rather than accounts of the thinking underpinning the events they were asked to reflect on;
4. the possibility that the stimulus itself (e.g video) may supplement teachers' incomplete memories, thus generating comments on what the video suggests rather than on prior thinking processes;
5. the manner in which the video presents the events under study from a different perspective for the teacher, creating a new experience which does not allow teachers to recall the original one;
6. the extent to which the prompts used to assist teachers' recall may influence the way in which they report their thinking.

(taken from Borg, 2006, p.211).

It can be seen that the use of stimulated recall interviews is not without limitations for the researcher. However, in the research undertaken here, this method is of value because it is a method that facilitates discussion of teaching events and provides insight into the rationale informing language use, particularly in relation to pedagogical goals of lessons. It was for this reason that it was decided not to rely exclusively on video data when performing stimulated recall interviews but rather to use video in conjunction

with transcripts of the lessons themselves. This was also the preference expressed by participants in the research who felt that a transcript would make the process of identifying classroom modes and discourse features easier. It was from these transcripts that interview questions were developed. Teachers were sent copies of transcripts with both participant and researcher selecting sections of the transcript to discuss. For participants, this selection was based on identifying modes and discourse features. Given that participants were guided on what to select from the transcript based on the SETT Framework (Walsh 2006), this allowed participants to investigate teaching episodes and language use of interest to them, giving them some ownership of the process. Thus, the process was largely open-ended in that not all questions were predetermined and I was not sure what would emerge in the interview process. The process was co-constructed by researcher and participant. Mann (2011) observes that much research in Applied Linguistics makes this claim without providing concrete examples. That is why in the analysis chapter, interviewer questions are at times shown in conjunction with the responses of participants in order to provide a context for the answers given.

It must be said that the preparation of transcripts is somewhat time-consuming; therefore, interviews occurred approximately one week to ten days after the teaching episode in question. This leaves the research performed open to the charge that participants may have performed post-hoc rationalizations of language choice and decisions reached while teaching. While accepting that this charge is valid, I would refute this claim due to the fact that participants were trained in how to prepare for these interviews. Participants were trained in the use of the SETT Framework (see Walsh 2006 for further detail). Rather than solely being given data in advance to analyze, participants were given a framework to enable them to analyze this data and arrive at conclusions related to their use of language as a part of their professional practice. This,

I would argue, means that the data had been reflected upon by participants in a manner which would allow for greater depth of discussion in interviews. Rather than arriving at a conclusion regarding the language employed my interest was in teachers' interpretations of events as they occurred, language used for teaching and decisions related to instructional practice. It is the interpretation of the participant that matters here, rather than the perspective of the researcher. The interviews that occurred were similar to guided discussion, with participants evaluating and reaching conclusions about teaching practice independent of the interviewer. This would place the interviews performed in the realm of semi-structured interviews.

3.13 Interviewing as a Process

As with the other research methods used in this research, there are tensions at work within the interview process. While it was hoped that interviewing would be a somewhat collaborative process where knowledge is co-constructed, it must be noted that interviewing can be viewed as a coercive practice. Gillham (2000) observes that notions of control influence the interview process. 'The form and style of an interview is determined by its purpose' (p.1) and this means that the interviewer is ultimately shaping the interaction that takes place in the interview to some degree. Roney et al (1987) develop this point further, stating that the researcher has a purpose in asking questions (collecting data that will hopefully answer research questions) that will impact the roles assumed by both interactants in an interview – the interviewer and subject. In other words, the roles of each interactant are asymmetrical. Roney et al (p.1) also relate that 'An interview is a collaborative venture but the reconstruction of what occurs is usually seen as the analysts' sole prerogative'. There is a tension at work between the responses given by participants and the interpretation that analysts place on the responses. Selection and interpretation of data is required, though as Gillham (2000, p.79) notes, this should be minimized as much as possible 'for the implications of the

evidence to be apparent’.

Rubin and Rubin (1995, p.1) state that the function of qualitative interviewing is to ‘find out what others think and feel about their worlds’. In this regard, qualitative interviewing resembles a conversation (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009, Millar et al 1992, King and Horrocks 2010), albeit a conversation with a purpose behind it, the elicitation of answers relevant as research data. As alluded to earlier, there are issues of control within this framework, related to roles, interpretation of data and questioning strategy. Gillham (2000, p.16) posits that ‘Complex human experiences are not things that people can glibly speak about in an organized fashion. A good deal of ‘teasing out’ is required and only skilled interviewing can do this’. This ‘teasing out’ is dependent on the questions that researchers ask and it is to this issue that attention will now turn.

Millar et al (1992) place question forms into the following categories:

1. Leading – questions are phrased in such a way that the interviewer is suggesting implicitly or explicitly the desired answer.
2. Closed – restrictive yet useful when factual information is desired.
3. Open – broad in scope, offering freedom to interview subjects in how they respond.
4. Probing – serving to give further information on a response.

Within the context of the research carried out, it is open questions that have elicited the data that answer the research questions in this study. This is because it is informants’ perspectives on their use of language as a means to facilitate participation and learning in the language classroom that is of value in this research. Responses were analyzed in relation to this broad theme, with attention then being afforded to the particulars of how this was achieved. In a broader context, I have attempted to elicit the experiences that informants have with regard to classroom practice and enable informants to share personal meanings on this topic. The questions that I employed allowed the participants’

voices to emerge as part of the research. DiCicco et al (2006, p.314) encapsulate this position, saying that the qualitative interview should allow knowledge to emerge that is 'based on meanings that life experiences hold for interviewees'. King and Horrocks (2010) describe the qualitative interview as follows:

1. It is flexible and open-ended in style
2. It tends to focus on people's actual experiences more than general beliefs and opinions
3. The relationship between interviewer and interviewee is crucial to the method

Consideration must be given to this notion of a relationship between interviewer and subject. A large number of the participants were social contacts previously known to me (see section 4.3 for more on this). Due to this, the interviewing that I carried out was highly sensitive. I have analyzed data collected from the classrooms of these informants and asked questions about what has occurred in the classroom, with a particular emphasis on the language used for classroom instruction. It may be argued given the personal relationship that exists that interviewing may have been a less fraught process than when interviewing less familiar informants. However, I would also argue that this relationship may have constrained the researcher when asking probing questions related to classroom practice. Therefore, the notion of reflexivity is once again of significance. The role I, as researcher, played within the research and as possible contributing factor to the data, must be considered. The relationship between interviewer and subject may have at times been obscured. Therefore, it was of importance that I not allow personal perspectives to come into play when interviewing informants or analyzing data; this would have undermined the validity of the data collected and call my analysis of this data into question. The role of the researcher in the research must be a consideration at all times.

Therefore, it can be argued that the interviews that I conducted resembled guided

conversations. It is for this reason that the interviews were semi-structured in form. By semi-structured it is meant that interviews were organized according to pre-determined open-ended questions, with further questions emerging from the dialogue that developed between the interview subjects and myself. The rationale for employing open-ended questions and applying a semi-structured method to interviewing was for a nuanced and in-depth picture of participants' views on classroom interaction to emerge (Rapley et al 2001). Rather than impose meaning on the responses offered by participants, the aim of this research was to allow their perspectives to emerge through the questions employed. However, due to the reasons alluded to earlier (asymmetrical roles, the process of questioning itself), this is a process that is not without problems. While I wished for participants' views to emerge, interviews must be partially structured according to the needs of the research; this is a practical concern as interviews are expected to go some way towards answering the research questions of this study. Also of concern is asking common questions of participants so that the data collected adheres to standards of validity and reliability. A flexible approach to questioning is needed (as noted by Gillham, 2000) in order to reveal what participants believe regarding the topic being researched. However, it must be acknowledged that informants are unique and will offer perspectives that differ in focus. Thus, there is a tension between working with individuals and respecting this individuality, and also attempting to question participants in similar ways.

3.14 Summary

This chapter has delineated the methodological process that this research employs. As has been previously stated, triangulation is aimed at and has influenced the choice of the research methods that inform this study. The research methods selected (focus groups, Applied Conversation Analysis and qualitative interviewing) were chosen due to their ability to answer the research questions that form the basis of this investigation.

The epistemological position that I adopt with regard to the development of interactional competence in language instructors is that this is an observable phenomenon and these research methods reveal this development. While each method is not without tensions that must be considered when undertaking the research, it is my position that the employment of reflexivity will act as a check to the influence I may have on the research as it is being carried out. The following chapter will provide an overview of the practical details of the research project; what data was collected, the procedures involved in the collection of that data and an overview of the research participants.

Chapter 4. Research Design

The previous chapter discussed the methodological underpinnings that inform this research from a theoretical perspective. This chapter is concerned with how the data collection methods employed in this research were undertaken and integrated to answer the research questions of this thesis. The early sections of this chapter provide an overview of how and where the data were collected (Section 4.1). The following section introduces the research participants (Section 4.2), while Section 4.3 describes the limitations at work when collecting data from institutional settings such as an English as a second or foreign language classroom.

4.1 Research Questions

The literature review of this thesis was concerned with providing an overview of interactional competence and differing perspectives on how this construct is embodied and defined. It was stated that there are a variety of positions taken on this issue (see section 2.4 for more).

This thesis also considers how interactional competence is manifested by language instructors. Given that the SETT Framework (Walsh 2006) is employed as a method for investigating this, the first two research questions that inform this thesis are focused upon the notion of micro-contexts of classroom discourse as the local site of displays of interactional competence and upon the interactional features that delineate such competence.

The research questions that inform this thesis are as follows:

1. What characterizes interactional competence within micro-contexts of classroom interaction?
2. What features of interaction delineate interactional competence?

These research questions will be examined through data collected from focus groups, Applied Conversation Analysis of classroom interaction and stimulated recall interviews

based upon transcripts of classroom interaction. Conversation analytic transcripts of classroom interaction will be shown along with participant commentary gathered from stimulated recall interviews where appropriate in the data analysis section of this thesis.

4.2 Research Setting and Participants

As discussed at the start of the previous chapter, the data collected for this thesis was taken from three EFL classrooms at National Pingtung University of Science and Technology. Three instructors gave written consent to be involved in this research (see Appendix 2), allowing digital cameras and an audio recorder to be placed in their classroom for the purposes of collecting data of classroom practice that would be examined for interactional features that would delineate interactional competence in these classroom settings. I was present in the classroom before class began for the setting-up and placement of the cameras, as well as a discussion with the teacher as to where to place the digital voice recorder. I then left the classroom and returned approximately two hours later to collect the recording and video equipment.

4.3 Data Collection

The focus of this thesis is on interactional competence as visible in classroom interaction, meaning that the comments made in this research are limited to an analysis of interactional competence in reference to classroom discourse. Therefore, this thesis can make no claims as to how interactional competence in a second or foreign language is demonstrated in other settings such as daily-life encounters, playing online games or oral proficiency interviews (for more on this see Kelly-Hall et al 2011 and Thunqvist 2007). The conclusions reached are confined to interactional competence as demonstrated by EFL instructors within the context of the Taiwanese university classroom.

Approximately 24 hours of filmed classroom data was collected for this thesis. In

exploring the evolution of classroom language and possible changes in practice, a large data sample is required, as noted by Markee (2008). Three instructors volunteered to be involved in this research. Eight hours of classroom data per instructor were collected. While eight hours does not in any way equate to an entire semester of classroom instruction, a data sample of this size does allow the researcher insight into how the instructors in question go about organizing classroom tasks and using language in order to fulfill pedagogical goals. However, owing to the fact that there were differences in the subject content of the classes being taught and organization of teaching, data collection varied with regard to the frequency of filming. Participant B was teaching a reading comprehension and grammar class that met once a week for two hours. This class was filmed on four occasions. The other participants in this research (hereafter referred to as Participant A and Participant C respectively) were both teaching a listening and speaking class that also met for two hours a week; however, the second hour of classroom instruction was performed by a teaching assistant who was focused on giving tests related to the previous hour of instruction. This situation meant that it was necessary to film these particular listening and speaking classes on eight occasions, during the hour when the classroom instructor was taking class. In order to describe and analyze classroom language use and practice on the part of these instructors, having data samples of the same quantity was felt to engender greater validity to claims that would be made in the thesis with regard to how interactional competence develops on the part of language instructors in this setting.

It should be reiterated at this point that Applied Conversation Analysis is employed as part of the research methodology at work in this research. Transcription is performed according to the conventions set out by Atkinson and Heritage (1984) (for transcription convention see Appendix 1). Focus groups and stimulated recall interviews are also used as part of a multiple-methods approach to data collection. While approximately 24

hours of filmed classroom data was collected, this data was initially only broadly transcribed, i.e Conversation Analysis was not made use of as part of the initial transcription. In brief, broad transcription means that the data was transcribed as ordinary talk, without attention to the detail that informs Conversation Analysis (see the previous chapter for more on this). This thesis is exploring how interactional competence develops over time in language instructors, with the SETT Framework (Walsh 2006) serving as a tool for examining classroom language use. Given that interactional competence was conceived of by Kramsch (1986) as an awareness of how to manage interaction between speakers, Applied Conversation Analysis has been utilized in this thesis only with regard to talk between the instructors and learners participating in this research. A focus on how intersubjective states are achieved and maintained by instructors renders much of the language employed by instructors (taking the class roll for example) extraneous to the concerns of this research. While not wishing to make ad hoc generalizations with regard to language use by instructors, it was decided before data collection that this research would focus on how instructors interacted with learners and the language employed to do so. Therefore, ‘interactures’ (Walsh 2006) between teacher and learners form the core of the data analyzed. This research is concerned with analyzing interactional competence on the part of language instructors from the perspective of creating and maintaining intersubjective states with learners. This decision meant that a great deal less than the 24 hours of classroom data collected were transcribed according to the conventions of Conversation Analysis. Sets of data were analyzed that show how interaction between instructor and learner unfolds based on the premise of collecting examples of interactional phenomena that reveal, and make clear, how interactional competence is developed and achieved by instructors. Therefore, approximately three hours of classroom interaction was subjected to Applied Conversation Analysis; within these three hours, instructors were operating in two

modes of discourse. These are the skills and systems mode and classroom context mode (for more See Walsh 2006). As the concern of this research is the development and maintenance of intersubjective states, larger turns at talk which resemble monologues such as the setting up of tasks as typified in managerial mode, were eschewed in favour of examples where instructors and learners were interacting together in and through talk.

The classes in question were filmed, rather than audio-recorded. This means that details of non-verbal interaction could have been included in the transcription of the interactions under analysis (for more on paralinguistic features as they are employed in spoken discourse see Lazaraton 2004). However, it should be noted, that due to limitations in space, these features are only described and analyzed in select data samples in which they support the language used by interlocutors and so delineate interactional competence. Further, non-verbal details are generally not included in the transcription that will follow because I initially believed that interactional competence was achieved through talk and that paralinguistic features served to support talk. My thoughts were that language use was the way to approach examining interactional competence. In hindsight, this means I may have missed details of non-verbal interaction that would reveal more about interactional competence. In later research, it would be illuminating to include these details.

Initially, participants for this research were contacted by email. It was decided to enlist participants from the university where I am employed as an instructor. It was felt that the collegial relationship would possibly engender greater receptivity to the goals of the research. However, such was not the case. Of those that replied to the email asking for participants, the vast majority felt that having cameras in the classroom would be intrusive. It was also felt that undergoing a process of guided self-discovery with regard to one's classroom language use would potentially be face-threatening. With few

colleagues willing to participate in this research, I felt that collecting data in this setting would undermine claims I could make to having data that fulfilled the requirements of validity and reliability. In this setting I would have been able to collect data from only one classroom, creating a potentially problematic situation in the research. A data sample collected from one classroom would not afford me the opportunity to examine this data in conjunction with data collected from the same setting, albeit from a different instructor, and so examine how differing instructors in the same teaching environment display and manifest interactional competence. A sample of only eight hours of classroom practice by a sole instructor would not permit a credible or worthwhile analysis of how interactional competence is developed. Given the low interest in participating in this research it was decided to seek participants at the university in the city in Taiwan in which I reside. In this I was aided by a personal contact who expressed interest in participating in this research and who also gained the consent of two other instructors who were known to me; indeed, one of these instructors had previously aided me in data collection for a different research project.

The participants in this research are all native speakers of Mandarin Chinese. Agreement to participate in this research was gained by means of a consent form. Each expressed some reservations about their classroom language use being analyzed, with a recurrent theme being that as non-native speakers of English, it was likely that their classroom language use would not be similar to that of native-English speaking teachers. Another concern expressed was with regard to the element of code-switching. Participant B taught a class focusing on reading comprehension and grammar; his belief was that certain concepts related to grammar were better explained to learners in their L1 (Mandarin Chinese), than in English, the general classroom language of instruction. While this thesis is not focused on the principles that inform and influence code-switching, it is one of the precepts of Conversation Analysis that data cannot be

analyzed with preconceived notions regarding the participants' motivations and orientations. Therefore, the data in this thesis, does on occasion, include examples of the participants' L1 (Mandarin Chinese) being used in classroom instruction. (For more on this phenomenon see Ustinell and Seedhouse 2005, Raschka et al 2009). This Chinese transcription was performed by a personal contact, proficient in Mandarin Chinese, with another contact translating this text into English. It should also be stated that code-switching itself should be considered an aspect of interactional competence. Code-switching is performed by teachers in order to ensure understanding on the part of the learner; it serves functions such as explanation of grammar points, achieving solidarity with learners in their mother tongue and to clarify content offered by the teacher in the target language (Sert 2005).

As has been discussed earlier, the participants were three English as foreign language teachers at National Pingtung University of Technology with four years of teaching experience. In describing this data sample, the term 'sample of convenience' (Bryman 2008) is applicable. Given my failure to find participants at my place of employment, I was left with little choice to rely upon social contacts in order to collect data for this thesis. It is to this issue of working with social contacts that the discussion will now turn. When performing research with social contacts, your own position as researcher may be perceived as placing you in a bind with regard to the role you are expected to play; that of researcher or that of social acquaintance. At all times I attempted to behave in a professional manner and in the cases of participants A and B, did not see them during the period of data collection or analysis, other than for the scheduled interviews. I also did not discuss with them the conclusions I had reached concerning the data collected. I was aware my role was to act as a researcher and constantly scrutinize how I went about analyzing data and interacting with participants, given they were social contacts. This was done to ensure the research process was as

free from bias as possible and performed in a manner no different than if the participants were not known to me socially.

It must also be disclosed at this point that I am married to one of the participants in this study. The other participants were known to me socially through my wife. It may be argued that involving a spouse in data collection is somewhat unusual and may lead to conflicts and dilemmas in the research process. An example of this would be asking my wife to teach certain material that would engender greater interaction between her and her learners, informing her of the insights given by other participants, or directing her as to how to reply to questions asked in the stimulated recall interviews undertaken. I would emphasize that there was no conflict involved. By this I mean that my wife underwent the same process of training in the SETT Framework as other participants, as well as the same strictures with regard to data collection and being interviewed. Therefore, I would argue that my wife was generally treated in the same manner as other participants and as much as possible was viewed by me as a research participant rather than as someone I have a personal relationship with. In order to safeguard against claims of bias, I enlisted the aid of a 'critical friend' (Wellington 2007) to analyze and evaluate the focus group, interview data and analysis of the data supplied by my wife. This 'critical friend' possesses a background in Applied Linguistics and has some familiarity with the research being carried out. His evaluation is as follows:

Overall, your questions were open and didn't lead her in any particular direction (What do you notice about...? Can you give me an example?). You gave her space to talk, elaborate and identify things for herself and avoided interjecting with your own experience (you know the context doubly well as a teacher at the same institution and the husband of the interviewee):

He cites this particular example to support his view and goes on to say:

I: What modes can you identify?

C: Oh there are managerial mode.

I: Hm hm

C: And lots of it.

You specifically referred to the data and while you did refer her to salient features (i.e. the longest turn in the data in Interview 4) you let her speak for herself. While there were one or two examples where you could perhaps be accused of leading her slightly (top of page 5 in Int 2 on echo) when I double checked you were referring back to things she'd brought up herself (and were recorded in your data).

(email communication Hudson, June 7th 2013).

As the research project unfolded, my wife did not express an interest in the findings revealed in the data and remained a disinterested participant in the research process. At no time did we discuss the research other than in the interviews she agreed to undertake, related to her classroom data.

As will be borne out in the data, the process of guided self-discovery afforded by the SETT Framework generally was not face-threatening for these participants.

It is readily apparent that three participants is a small sample for evaluating the construct of interactional competence. However, I would argue that approximately 24 hours of data allows for an in-depth analysis of how interactional competence is displayed in this particular research setting, though it is more difficult to generalize with regard to how instructors go about classroom practice from a limited sample such as this. For future research into the area of interactional competence in EFL classrooms, a larger sample of participants may provide greater insight into how interactional competence is displayed and maintained. Thus, this research is a beginning point for examining this construct; further research is needed into interactional competence and the role it plays in the life of English as a foreign language classrooms. In particular, a larger sample of participants is required to investigate this phenomenon further.

4.4 Training in the SETT Framework

Before beginning the process of filming and collecting classroom data, participants were trained in the use of the SETT Framework. This was done during the first focus group. The focus group was divided into two parts; training in the SETT Framework

and then analyzing and discussing a short excerpt of filmed classroom data in order to determine if language use and pedagogical goal were working in concert.

The material utilized for training in the SETT Framework is taken from Walsh (2006; see Appendix 4 for further detail), with participants required to identify and match spoken modes of teacher discourse with transcripts of classroom discourse, before then moving on to identifying and matching interactional features with a description of that feature (for further detail see Walsh *ibid*). After this session, participants informed me by email that they were still somewhat unsure as to how to utilize the SETT Framework and requested an exemplar where modes of spoken discourse and interactional features had been discussed and analyzed. Participants felt, as has been discussed earlier, that as non-native speakers of English, being able to evaluate and describe one's classroom language and practice was problematic. Of particular concern was the issue of providing an overall evaluation of the lesson in terms of the intersection of language use and pedagogical goals. This section required self-evaluation and use of critical faculties that participants informed me were not commonly utilized in what is a Confucian-heritage educational culture. It was also related to me that summarizing the lesson in paragraph form with an evaluation of language use as it related to pedagogical goals was difficult as participants had previously not conceived of their practice in these terms. Therefore, an exemplar based on a filmed piece of classroom data was provided to participants to aid them in evaluating their lessons and language use.

It was decided hold a focus group after training in the SETT Framework in order to apply the concepts discussed in the training workshop. A short filmed excerpt of classroom interaction between an instructor and young learners was shown in which the instructor's language use and use of questioning, in this case what children of courage are like, was employed (Harrogate data, year unknown). This was done as a means of

assessing whether concepts such as the intersection of pedagogical goals and language use had been internalized by participants, as well as attempting to identify the interactional features and questioning strategies put into play by the instructor. Further general questions related to language teaching were also provided for discussion. As a researcher, I felt it was important, if possible, to gain an understanding of the participants I was working with, particularly their beliefs and attitudes about teaching and learning as these would have some influence upon how instructors went about the business of classroom instruction. I was particularly interested in participants' beliefs regarding the instructor's use of language in relation to pedagogical goals. Participant C, for example, responded that the use of L1 may be valid in some situations:

Extract 4.1 Focus Group One

I think you know when you try to avoid using the mother tongue in the second language classroom um it takes longer time. Sometimes when I ask a question if the students you know um don't understand what you say I will ask the same question in a different way. So I might say it you know in a few different ways, let them understand my question. Yeah, I think they get something out of it if you try this. You know they actually get what you want. And they might be better than you think about at the time but it takes longer time.

It can be seen that Participant C brings to bear a critical perspective on her language use with regard to how to formulate questions based on classroom experience. Being privy to perspectives such as this before collecting classroom data afforded this researcher some insight as to how participants conceived of themselves as language instructors within the context of the classroom environment. This extract is illustrative of how such beliefs are expressed and the perspectives that participants may have regarding classroom language use.

4.5 Data Collection: Filming Classroom Teaching

In the week prior to filming classes for the first time, students in these classes were provided with consent forms (see Appendix 3) outlining the purpose of the research and

their role as participants, i.e. to go about the business of learning as usual. Before the first class to be filmed began, on each occasion, I introduced myself to the students in each of the three classes and outlined what this research would involve. The desire to be unobtrusive and not interfere with the normal running of the class was emphasized. No objections were raised by students to being involved in this research and consent forms were signed by all students.

In order to gain as much detail of the interaction occurring in the classes under analysis as possible, three digital cameras were used to record classes. One camera was placed at the front, focusing on the classroom teacher. A second camera was placed at the back of the classroom to take in the students as well as the classroom instructor. The third camera was placed on a desk at the front of the classroom, in order to provide a frontal view of learners as they went about participating in class. The instructor was also provided with a digital voice recorder which was either placed in the middle of the classroom or transported around the class by the instructor as he or she interacted with learners involved in discussion as part of a dyad or group work. It was felt that a digital voice recorder that could be moved about the classroom would be necessary in order to record details of interaction that may have been missed by the stationary digital cameras. As has been noted by Markee and Kasper (2004) hoping to capture all the interaction that occurs in language classrooms is an unrealistic endeavour given that multiple interactants may be involved in classroom discourse at any one time, depending upon the pedagogical goal classroom language is involved in serving on a moment by moment basis. Therefore, no claims are made here to have recorded all the details of the interaction that occurred in these three classrooms. What is asserted is that the quantity of data collected is sufficient to provide for an analysis and overview of classroom language patterns as they relate to the evolution of interactional competence on the part of language instructors in the context of the classrooms under discussion.

As has been related earlier, listening and speaking classes were filmed on eight occasions. Generally this meant that four units of lessons were recorded, leading to continuity in lesson content, lending the claims that will be made later in thesis greater validity, as this was in keeping with the eight hours of classroom data collected on four occasions taken from Participant B's reading comprehension and grammar class.

4.5.1 Data Collection: Interviews

Participants were provided with SETT Framework materials after the initial focus group. This was done by email, with instructors then being responsible for evaluating the class according to the intersection or pedagogical goal and language use, identification of classroom modes and interactional features. As has been stated earlier, I was required to provide participants with an exemplar to make this procedure clearer. In addition to providing an exemplar of a completed SETT Framework evaluation, I agreed to provide participants with a broad transcript of each lesson prior to each interview, in conjunction with a video recording of the classroom session to be evaluated. This was done at the request of participants who felt that evaluating a classroom lesson without a transcript was problematic. Each participant made this request based on the belief that as non-native speakers of English, analyzing classroom language use solely by means of video would lead to errors in analysis based on incorrect understanding of the English employed in class. Therefore, a broad transcript of each class was given to participants to facilitate evaluation of their own classroom language use. While this meant that there was a delay of approximately two weeks between the day the class was taught and a follow-up interview regarding that class, it was felt that providing a broad transcript of the class prior to the interview would serve two purposes; it would put participants at greater ease when analyzing their classroom language use and also possibly engender greater accuracy with regard to the details of language employed in the classroom.

Participants were interviewed on four occasions, generally at their place of work. Interviews were not filmed but rather audio recording was performed. Given that participants were being interviewed at their place of work (an open-plan office with each participant possessing a cubicle), it was felt that filming the interviews would be somewhat intrusive as other colleagues were likely to be in the office space at the time interviews were held.

Applied Conversation Analysis is one of the research methods employed in the thesis and as has been discussed earlier (see section 3.5), concerns itself only with that which is seen to occur in the data itself. However, due to the fact that this research is focused on interactional competence, the perspective of participants on their own language use is of importance when evaluating a construct such as interactional competence; changes in language use and classroom practice are not abstract concerns but factors that participants need to take into account when undergoing a process of guided self-discovery as in the case of the SETT Framework. Therefore, interviews were used in conjunction with classroom data not only to achieve triangulation in the data, but more fundamentally, to allow both researcher and participant insight into the thought processes and imperatives that informed and shaped classroom language use. Reliance upon classroom transcripts alone would not, I would argue, reveal why language instructors utilize language in particular ways in the service of teaching and learning. Stimulated recall interviews in concert with transcripts of classroom data reveal to both researcher and participant the thought processes that shape classroom language use.

4.5.2 Data Analysis

In brief, the data collected to answer the research questions that inform this thesis are focus groups, video of approximately 24 hours of classroom data, transcripts of this classroom data and approximately four hours of audio recordings of stimulated recall

interview data. The focus group data was examined with regard to participants' perspectives on teaching and learning, particularly with regard to classroom language. All classroom data was broadly transcribed and then a small sample of classroom data that delineates how interactional competence is demonstrated and developed was transcribed using Applied Conversation Analysis in order to show how intersubjective states are achieved and maintained. Stimulated recall interviews were broadly transcribed and comments from those interviews will be shown alongside excerpts of classroom transcripts. This has been done to show how a process of guided self-discovery regarding teaching practice relates to the development of interactional competence.

4.6 Summary

The research design used in this thesis can be summarized as follows:

Table 4.1 A Summary of the Research Design

Data Type	Focus Group (three participants)	Classroom Data (eight hours per class involving three participants)	Stimulated recall interviews (three subjects)
Amount of Data	Approximately two hours	Approximately 24 hours	Approximately six hours
Approach to Analysis	Broad transcription	Broad transcription followed by applied Conversation Analysis of examples delineating interactional competence	Broadly transcribed

Methodology Employed	Coding for themes	Examining data for turn-taking and interactional features that delineate interactional competence	Coded for themes and examined in relation to classroom data delineating examples of interactional competence
---------------------------------	-------------------	--	---

The following chapter will analyze the data collected, presenting how the methods outlined in this chapter were employed to answer the research questions that inform this research.

Chapter 5. Data Analysis

In Chapter Two it was argued that interactional competence as demonstrated by language teachers could most effectively be analyzed when examining interaction between the instructor and individual students, as well as such interaction as arises out of general class discussion. The opening section of the previous chapter outlined the two research questions that inform this research. The questions are focused upon how interactional competence is manifested in the institutional environment of the English as a second language classroom and the features occurring in interaction that delineate interactional competence.

As will become apparent in section 5.4, interactional competence is highly individual; that is, different interactants respond to utterances, display understanding of those utterances and achieve intersubjectivity in differing ways. This section of the thesis will begin with an analysis of focus group data collected from participants before collection of classroom data in order to provide an overview of participants' views regarding classroom pedagogy and how language facilitates teaching and learning. Focus will then shift to an examination of individual participants' classroom data from an Applied Conversation Analysis perspective, supported by stimulated recall interview data. The chapter will conclude with an overview of this classroom data, where observations will be made on the ways in which each participant demonstrates interactional competence, along with findings taken from the focus group held at the conclusion of the research project.

5.1 Focus Group One

As has been stated in Chapter Four, it was decided to begin this research by holding a focus group. Given that stimulated recall interviews related to classroom data were to form another part of the data collection, it was felt that an initial focus group would allow for greater insight into participants' perspectives on classroom practice and

language teaching pedagogy prior to beginning the interview process, important factors in this research. Rather than relying solely on an interpretation of the classroom data itself, I felt that focus groups and stimulated recall interviews would allow me to go beyond a superficial examination of that data; in other words, this research is informed by the view that Applied Conversation Analysis alone may not sufficiently explain the construct of interactional competence. It would also afford insight into how participants were likely to go about their classroom practice. I would also build upon the rapport I had with participants, based upon discussion of themes related to classroom practice. It must be said that while this research is not explicitly concerned with teacher cognition (for more on this area see Borg 2003, 2006), teacher beliefs and knowledge inform classroom practice. Therefore, gaining insight into the beliefs held by participants about classroom practice prior to primary data collection was necessary. A focus group would also be an effective way of providing participants with an overview of the research that was to be carried out and would ensure that participants began the data collection process with what would be a similar level of knowledge regarding the aims of this research and the procedures to be employed in the collection of data.

5.1.1 Perspectives on Teaching and Learning

This initial focus group lasted approximately one hour and took place at National Pingtung University of Science and Technology in a language lab that was not in use. Participants were asked a series of questions on how they viewed classroom practice and language use. Each participant expressed a belief that the goal of their teaching was getting students to communicate in the language being taught, though there was no consensus on the most effective way to achieve this, given that each participant felt that their classroom context was unique. Language was the means for creating conditions for learning. One such example was provided by Participant C who described her classroom language use as goal-oriented. She stated that:

Ideally you know I I want to ah apply communicative ah method but I I think that in this context it's not that that easy. Sometime students have to...how do you say? You you can't just use one method in the teaching. You are uh...apply applying many different methods but sometimes you actually use grammar and ah...translate...translation?

It emerged in the data that participants were aware that a varied approach with regard to methods of teaching and learning would need to be applied in order to motivate learners. It was also apparent that participants possessed differing views on the role of the teacher. Participant A saw his role as being that of someone who would lead learners to express themselves in greater depth, acting somewhat like a guide in the classroom. He stated that:

to guide them kind of by step by step to ask questions and to make sure yes, so far they understand

Participant C was in agreement, stating that she would supply examples from her own experience as a model for how she wished learners to express themselves, her goal being to 'have other students see what I want them to do then I let them do it'. For Participant B the notion of being a guide is a vital part of classroom practice due to how learners in the Taiwanese context approach learning. He stated that:

I think that's very important for students to be guided because um if you just tell them the answer directly I I think they don't think and that's what Taiwanese students usually lack of. Like they wants to get the most correct answers um as possible but they don't think...but what I think that's could hinder their progress in English.

It can be seen that for participants personal beliefs inform classroom practice, in particular the notion that the teacher is a facilitator or guide in the classroom, rather than a resource for providing correct language forms. With regard to classroom interaction, therefore, it could be expected that these instructors use language to guide and shape learner utterances.

Each participant also felt that involving learners in classroom events was important in order to facilitate learning. Group discussions were seen as an effective means of

doing so. Learners would be engaged in using the target language to communicate information and at this time, the teacher would monitor communication, becoming involved in order to provide a model for facilitating discussion. This dual role performed by the instructor of monitoring interaction and also being involved as a co-structor of discourse emerged as a recurrent factor in the data extracts that will be analyzed. This suggests that an important factor in displaying interactional competence is an awareness of when to intercede in student dyads and when to withdraw from interaction and that interactional awareness influences instructors' language use (see section 5.4 for more on this)..

For Participant C the teacher's role is also to provide a resource for learners to question and interact with. Her feeling was that learners need to use the target language in order to gain an understanding of that language. She further exemplified this theme when discussing the interaction that is typical in her classroom. Participant C's preference was for students to rehearse their answers to her questions with each other before sharing with the class. Her view is that:

For me I think if you ask a question, you call on someone to answer the question, other students they might not even think about your question

Therefore, this approach was adopted in the belief that it involved larger numbers of students in the learning process. Participant C also felt that the questioning strategy employed by the teacher was also an important factor in facilitating learners in using the target language.

for me I try not to get them to you know...I try not to ask questions like that, you know even like it's in the text book, it's not um...I try to create more questions that are not from in the book

While not naming this strategy as employing referential questioning, it is clear that Participant C is aware that this strategy is effective in achieving her major classroom goal—getting learners to communicate in the target language. Participant B also favoured

this method, stating that:

if you design like open questions, that will trigger student's um discussion between each other and uh they will have more courage to talk in class and that way the interaction will be much more effective

Participant A offered a different approach, preferring to ask learners direct questions or question the class as a whole in order to evaluate a choral response. His belief was that a choral response would reduce learner anxiety with regard to providing correct answers in front of classmates.

It can be seen from the above statements that there is some disagreement among participants on the most effective strategy for employing questions to stimulate learner interaction but there is also an agreement that questions form an important part of classroom discourse.

With regard to planning a lesson, participants B and C felt that language use was not something that could be planned for. Each agreed that classroom events would have some influence on language use but that also in dealing with learners language use would need to be flexible and take the learner needs of the moment into account. For Participant A this potentially meant going off-topic, a concern not shared by other participants.

5.1.2 Interactional Competence

Later in the focus group, participants were asked, 'What is your understanding of the term interactional competence?' This question was asked to gauge participants' understanding of the major theme of this research before classroom data was collected and stimulated recall interviews focusing on that data were performed. Given that the research process is concerned with developing participants' awareness of this construct within their classroom practice, this question was also asked to gain insight into participants' beliefs about this construct before the collection of classroom data.

Participant B believed interactional competence was:

the the strategy and the method which the teacher use in the class to enhance the interaction between the teacher and students...maybe the...his or her competence to encourage the people...encourage each student to communicate with each other.

Of note here is the variable perspective offered; that is, that interactional competence in the institutional environment of the EFL classroom involves multiple participants and is not solely the domain of the instructor. Further, Participant B makes use of the terms 'strategy' and 'method'. This implies a belief that interactional competence is a technique and resource that can be deployed by teachers to further communication in the classroom. For Participant C the term interactional competence meant the ability to interact but is only manifest if this is a specific goal of the teacher in question. Interaction will only occur if the instructor plans for and allows interaction to develop. Participant A offered that interaction was also dependent on the character of the students within a class; certain learners are more willing to interact than others.

The data collected in the initial focus group served to provide some insight into the views held by participants about classroom pedagogy and the construct of interactional competence. The purpose of the focus group was to allow participants to share beliefs and through the process of interaction, develop themes and arguments. The themes that emerged included perspectives on teaching and learning, classroom language use and pedagogy and beliefs regarding interactional competence. At this juncture of the research process, the data collected was unsupported by classroom data. While not wishing to undermine the validity of the insights offered here, these are the expression of general beliefs that relate to classroom practice. It is through a detailed analysis of classroom language use itself and participants' evaluation of their classroom language use through a stimulated recall procedure that offers greater scope for the analysis of how interactional competence develops and is manifest. The focus group served as an initial means of gaining a broad perspective on participants' beliefs regarding teaching

and learning, and also as an early indicator of how classroom practice may be undertaken. In the subsequent sections, the focus will turn to the insights afforded by a detailed analysis of classroom language use through means of Applied Conversation Analysis and participants' evaluations of that language use. Of concern will be the extent to which comments made in the initial focus group are supported and made manifest by empirical data, that is, classroom practice.

5.2 The Second Language Classroom as an Ecological Setting

The analysis that is to follow is informed by van Lier's (2002) concept of second language classroom interaction as a phenomenon that arises in and out of the environment in which interaction occurs. This interpretation, therefore, argues for an ecological approach to the analysis of spoken data; the turn-taking mechanisms at work and the deployment of interactional resources are both context-sensitive and context-dependent. As a corollary to this, affordances that are provided to learners to engage in learning as the interaction develops and unfolds arise through the deployment of interactional resources. In short, there are multiple modalities at work in second language classroom interaction. In the sections to follow, recipient design and repair, and the provision of interactional space by means of extended wait-time will be discussed as affordances for learning that are indicative of interactional competence that occurred most commonly in the data extracts that will be examined. However, the reader is reminded that talk-in-interaction is a highly sophisticated endeavour in which multiple interactional features are deployed by speakers and that these features are interconnected as talk unfolds. In the analysis to follow recipient design, repair and interactional space are not considered in isolation from other features that occur in the interaction. However, the bulk of discussion is given over to these features because of what they reveal about interactional competence in the context examined here.

5.3 Data Analysis Part A: What characterizes interactional competence within micro-contexts of classroom interaction?

As was made clear in the literature section of this thesis, interactional competence is a construct with a variety of definitions. Associated with this is the fact that because interactional competence is perceived to be sensitive to, and arising from, the context in which interaction occurs, describing interactional competence is inherently problematic. A range of interactional resources are deployed dependent on the needs of a given moment. Therefore, rather than focus on specific micro-details of interaction, this section of the thesis assumes the following broad position: before attempting to describe and analyze the minutiae of interaction, it is useful to provide an overview of what interactional competence in the English as a second language classroom is comprised of. This in turn raises question of whether or not interactional competence can be examined in such a comprehensive manner. I would suggest that this is possible if the following assumptions are taken into account:

1. Turn-taking is the mechanism (and resource) by which interactional competence can be examined.
2. This in turn implies that in broad terms interactional competence is the business of interactants coordinating these turns to achieve imperatives which guide the interaction. This process is influenced by the roles interactants possess.
3. The major underlying imperative guiding interaction is the achievement of intersubjectivity; by this it is meant how interactants display understanding to each other

Sidnell (2010, p.72) observes that:

intersubjective understanding is a contingent achievement accomplished on a turn-by-turn basis, as a by-product of other activities in which the participants are engaged

As interactants go about the business of talk, they are attempting to understand each

other and organize their talk to achieve this aim.

None of this is to deny the role that environment plays in interaction. However, when examining co-construction of talk it is this very process of co-construction that allows us to see the underlying micro-details of interaction in greater relief. Of note is that the following three data extracts used to underline these points are somewhat lengthy. In order to describe and analyze the resources that are deployed on a moment-by-moment basis, such extracts serve to illustrate the multiple affordances offered in classroom interaction by language instructors, leading to observations that can be made regarding how interactional competence is manifest and developed by the language teacher in question. These affordances will then be discussed with regard to how they relate to and show interactional competence, and how they integrate within the pedagogical goal of the interaction that unfolds.

Extract 1.1 and 1.2: Participant A, Lesson Three 16.46 – 18.13. Describing Your Family

These extracts are taken from the third lesson of Participant A's corpus. In this lesson students have been directed to a page in their textbook and asked to look at a photo of a family tree. Students are then required to discuss whether or not they themselves are from a large or small family and how many people make up their family. They have discussed these questions in dyads and the instructor is now asking learners to share their answers with the class.

1 T: I am lai (0.8) I- I come lai (0.6) h:m 回答 GO! (.) I ↑ (.)

(Reply)

2 L8: I come from a small-a small fa .hhh. mily=

3 T: =o:h you mean you come from a small? family right? (.) you come from (.)

4 >>good good good>> (.) 好接下來第二個問題(.) so (.) if you come

(Ok, we're down to the following question.)

5 from (.)a small family (.) .hh how many people are there in your family (.) there
6 are ↑ (.) lai go (1.1) 對對對對(.)

(Yup right.)

7 L8: there are six people in my family=

8 T: =oh there are six people in your family (.)yes (.) so you are from a small family
9 right (.) good (.) very good. 好接下來我們請問一下另外一個同學

(OK, Let's ask another student)

In the above extract, learners are expected to produce an utterance describing the size of their family. As can be seen in the initial line of this extract, learners are required to use particular language to do so and it is to this agenda that learners are expected to orient. Seedhouse (2004) describes this as the form and accuracy context in which learners are expected to produce specific language forms. As can be seen in the first adjacency pair in this extract, the teacher begins the interaction with a prompt, which L8 recognizes as both an indicator of the floor being offered and the language form to be used. As typified in the form and accuracy context, the teacher affords little wait-time to the learner. In line 1 the teacher reiterates the language that he is expecting L8 to produce, using the Chinese expression 'lai' to signal that the floor is open to the learner. On both occasions this expression is used, the learner does not heed this cue, leading the instructor to code-switch, using 'go' to signal the floor is again being offered. This is supported by a rise in intonation to show that L8 is required to produce an utterance. In line 2 the learner is able to produce the language form required by the teacher, with the following latched turn serving as a conformation and evaluation of the content provided and language use of the student. The discourse marker 'so' signals a shift within the interaction in line 4, as the teacher introduces a new question requiring the learner to state how many family members he has. In this section of the interaction, the teacher uses the conditional form in line 5 to phrase the question, linking the concept of being

- 19 L9: great (.)
- 20 T: >>good good good good>> (.) are you tired now (.) tired?
- 21 L9: not
- 22 T: >>no no no>> (.) right (.) did you eat banana today?
- 23 L9: no .hhh.
- 24 T: no* (.) >>you are not my friend>> (.) ok (.) (name deleted) 來 come on (.)
(come on)
- 25 hey (.) so do you come from a big family or a small family (.) big or small? (.)
- 26 L9: small (.)
- 27 T: >>oh come from a small family>> (.) I- I- come from right lai (.) use the
28 complete sentence (.) right (.) ok (.) I come from (.) go*
- 29 L9: xxx
- 30 T: I↑ (.)
- 31 L9: I come from (.) s .hh. mall family (.)
- 32 T: all right (.) so (.) >>if you come from a small family how many people are
33 there in your family>> (.)
- 34 L9: five (.)
- 35 T: oh there are ↑ (.) lai go?
- 36 L9: there are five people in my family=
- 37 T: = >>oh there are five people in your family (.) so you come from a small
38 family>> (.) good good good (.) right?*

At the end of this turn, the instructor nominates a new speaker to enter into the interaction in line 10, with L9 confirming his selection in line 11. Through this summons, the instructor is establishing the framework for the participation that is to follow – he will initiate interaction and the learner is to respond. Overlap takes place in lines 10 and 11 which indicates that L9 has been closely attending to the teacher’s talk

and intercedes in the interaction to signal that he is aware that there is an action he is expected to perform, in this case, show that he knows it is him the teacher is addressing. L9's utterance in line 11 also performs multiple functions – completing the adjacency pair and indicating the conditional relevance of the teacher's incomplete utterance in line 10. Turns 12 through 23 involve an exchange between instructor and learner that mirrors the process of phatic enquiry. This form of enquiry serves a pedagogical purpose as it engages the learner in interaction with the instructor and engenders a sequential environment of turn-taking as information is exchanged. This sequence of interaction is composed of a series of adjacency pairs that are highly indexical and brief in linguistic content. Lines 12 and 13 are also overlaps in which L9 shows that he is listening to the teacher's speech and utilizes next-turn proof procedure to show that he is aware that a greeting requires a greeting in response. There is a 1.7 second pause in line 14 at this TCU position as L9 formulates a response to the instructor's enquiry about his well-being, offering that he is 'not bad' in line 15. Lines 16 to 19 consist of two adjacency pairs in which L9 offers that he is feeling great (in lines 17 and 19); however, the instructor reiterates the word 'good' in lines 16 and 18, showing that he has not attended to L9's earlier offerings. In line 20 the teacher evaluates L9's offerings with the word 'good' repeated rapidly four times, then asks if L9 is tired. At the end of this TCU, L9 offers that he is not tired in line 21, leading the instructor to offer a further rapid evaluation in the third turn position of 'no no no'. He signals a change in focus with the discourse marker 'right' and follows this up with a new question in line 22. In line 23 L9 confirms that he has not eaten a banana that day. In line 24 the teacher signifies shock with a high-pitched repetition of L9's 'no' from line 23.

It is in line 24 that the instructor returns to the pedagogical focus of this interactional sequence, with the discourse marker 'hey' signaling this transition to a new topic, and then asking L9 how large his family is. This is the focus of the talk that

follows. Within this turn, the instructor asks twice, first in an extended question, then employing the adjectives big and small to focus learner attention on what description is required. L9 provides a limited contribution in line 26 of 'small' which the teacher disapproves in lines 27 and 28, requiring the learner to use a complete sentence and then providing an example to the learner of how to begin his turn. In line 30 the teacher again prompts the learner but L9 is not able to complete his utterance using the language supplied by the instructor. What follows is an example of 'letting it pass' (Firth 1997), as the teacher does not offer overt repair of L9's utterance, instead signaling a change in focus with the discourse marker 'so' in line 32. 'All right' has served as an evaluation of L9's contribution. This leads to a new question that orients to L9's contribution in line 26 (small), with the instructor asking him to relate how many people there are in his family. In line 34 L9 is able to provide the information the teacher is seeking but not in the form that the teacher requires, leading to an offer of the floor in line 35 in which rising intonation and a linguistic cue (there are) serve to indicate how L9 should answer in his upcoming turn. In line 36 L9 is able to answer in a full sentence. The teacher latches his turn to this in line 37 and backchannels L9's offering and provides an evaluation that signals acceptance of L9's contribution to the interaction.

In these data extracts the instructor is focused on learners achieving linguistically correct responses. Therefore, learner participation is contingent on not only providing a response but a response of a certain kind. This in turn affects the interactional work performed by the instructor as he seeks to shape learner turns by means of prompts as in line 3. This is performed in concert with a strategy of backchanneling the learner's contribution (as in lines 5 and 27 for example) in order to affirm the learner's offering and prepare the ground for the interaction to follow; in line 32 the learner's earlier offering regarding the size of his family leads to the teacher asking for clarification as to how many members he has in his family. (n.b. Hereafter 'backchanneling' refers to

looping the learner's utterance back into the interaction, as in a feedback loop. This usage is taken from that used in Computer Science). The prompts offered serve to extend the turns offered by the learners. They are employed to develop and further output of the learners within the sequential environment and afford the learners in this extract the opportunity to participate in the discourse, albeit in a proscribed manner.

The second extract is also of note due to the incidences of the instructor explicitly choosing to ignore learner error in order to maintain intersubjective relations. In line 32 the teacher's response acknowledges an earlier contribution offered by the learner in line 26 (small) and identifies this offering as adequate for the purpose of maintaining the flow of discourse though the learner is not able to provide a linguistically complex response.

Participant A is able to afford learners the opportunity to participate in the discourse, though as stated earlier, in a controlled way. However, this does not undermine the idea that the teacher is manifesting interactional competence. It is clear that in this sequence of interaction, the instructor is focused on language form in tandem with communication and use of the target language on the part of the learner. However, I would say that he is not focused on accuracy and fluency at the expense of involving learners in the discourse, as Markee's (2008) description of interactional competence argues for. In the above extracts learners are able to participate in the interaction and co-construct that interaction. The interaction that takes place here is not framed as being limited to correct linguistic forms. Learners are encouraged to express personal meanings by the instructor and provided the space to interact and co-construct the discourse.

The above extracts show that interaction is a process of responding to previous turns, maintaining channels of communication and fitting turns together to achieve goals. It is a process of mutual engagement where understanding is displayed and acted

Extract 2: Participant B, Lesson One 16.01 – 17.14. Structuring a Paragraph

Taken from a reading and grammar lesson, the teacher has given his students a 'paragraph scramble', containing seven sentences that need to be reassembled to form a coherent paragraph. Students have been placed in groups of four to perform this activity. The topic of the paragraph is the affect of caffeine on health. Students have been asked to discuss how to structure a paragraph and its component parts. The teacher has now ended the discussion and asked the class to report back on their findings.

1 T: ok (0.9) right (0.1) s::o can you tell me th:at↓ (0.5) to unif:y (0.6) a

2 paragraph (0.2) what do we need? (1.9) what do we need? (2.1)

3 L1: top[ics

4 T: [usually (.) yeah topic (0.4) is the first one that we have to know

5 right?(.) ah it tells us what (0.4) u::m <<is going to be u:m>> said (.) in one

6 paragraph.主題當然是非常重要，從主題可以獲得一些資訊，所以我剛

(Topic is very important. We can get some information from the

7 剛告訴你什麼? (.) topic is caff:eine (0.2) and (0.3) health. 對不對齣?咖

topics. So did I just tell you?)

(Right? The

8 啡因跟健康的關係 Right? (.) all right (.) so((clears throat)) (1.4)

relationship between caffeine and health)

9 in English (0.8) its very common that we ha:ve (0.1) three parts (0.6)

10 >>ok its very common that we have three parts>> to form a paragraph

11 (0.1) to form a paragraph (0.3) they are ↑ (0.3) top:ic sentence? (0.4) ok?

12 (.) top:ic sentence=

13 L1: =°supportive°

14 T: u::h

15 L1: SUPPORTIVE

16 T: sup:portive (.) yes support- supportive (.) supporting sen::tences (.)

- 17 L1: oh (.)
- 18 T: all right? (.) and the last will be ↑ (.)
- 19 L1: con[clusion.
- 20 T: [conclusion (.) >>yes very good>> (.)

In the first interview Participant B was asked, ‘what was the pedagogical focus of your lesson overall? What were you trying to do that day?’ This question was posed in order to gain an understanding of how Participant B organized the lesson in question with regard to a pedagogical goal.

In this first lesson, Participant B’s pedagogical goal was

to let them know how a paragraph formed. Yeah so they basically just let them know um the structure, the basic structure of a paragraph. Um also the element...uh the the basic elements in one paragraph

In the extract Participant B is engaged in a discussion with L1 with regard to the unifying features of a paragraph. Thus, the interaction begins in line 1 with an explicit request for information on the part of the instructor, with extended wait- time afforded the learner after two attempts to elicit information (‘what do we need?’) Each question is followed by significant wait-time, 1.9 seconds initially and then 2.1 seconds. After the second pause at this TCU L1 is able to offer ‘topics’, which is seized upon by the instructor as is witnessed by the overlap in lines 3 and 4. In line 4 the teacher emphasizes the word ‘know’, indicating the importance of this idea of topic to the learners. In lines 4 to 12 the teacher performs an extended turn as he first affirms the response offered by L1 (it’s the first one we have to know’) and provides an example from the set reading of a topic. In this part of the extract the teacher code-switches between English and Mandarin Chinese. In utilizing the learners’ L1 he is performing the function of making his meaning explicit regarding the relationship between caffeine and health the text book discusses. This is an example of what Schwab (2011) calls a

multilogue, as the content of the discussion between the teacher and a single learner is also made available to the class. He also appeals to the class by asking if he has told them about this relationship before in lines 7, 8 and 9. The teacher then shifts his focus to learners building on this information, stating that there are three parts that make up a paragraph in English. In line 11 the teacher emphasizes the word 'three', in relation to the parts of a paragraph, pausing for 0.6 seconds, emphasizing this word again in line 12, this time with more rapid speech, indicating that learners have had sufficient time to grasp the concept of three constituent parts of a paragraph. In lines 12 and 13 the instructor repeats and emphasizes the word 'form' in conjunction with wait-time of 0.1 and 0.3 seconds, linking the idea of the number of parts of a paragraph with their function of forming a unified structure. Near the end of this turn (in line 11), the teacher affords learners an opportunity to participate in the discourse, as shown by rising intonation after 'they are' which signals an offer of the floor by means of a turn constructional unit and the provision of 0.3 seconds for learners to take the interactional floor. There is no learner uptake so the teacher offers topic sentence as an example of a further element that forms a paragraph, once again providing wait-time. The 0.4 seconds offered represents an opportunity for learners to process the new information that has been offered and a possible offering of the floor, which appears to be supported by the following utterance of 'ok', as a confirmation check and then reiterating that a topic sentence is one part of a paragraph. L1 involves herself in the interaction at this point (in line 14), latching her turn with the teacher's previous utterance. She avers that 'supportive' is the third element in forming a paragraph, orienting her turn to the instructor's earlier appeal in lines 10 and 11 that there are three parts in the formation of a paragraph, albeit in a quiet tone of voice. In line 14 the teacher displays lack of understanding by means of a sub-vocalization, which causes L1 to raise her voice in line 15 as she realizes the teacher may not have heard her clearly. In line 16 the teacher

shows affiliation with her response, emphasizing the word 'yes'. Of note in this turn are the series of micro-pauses that signal a possible completion of a turn-at-talk. Of greater interest however, is the self-initiated self-repair as the teacher alters his initial offering of 'supportive' to the more linguistically correct 'supporting, which may also function as repair of L1's offering of 'supportive'. In line 18 L1 responds with 'oh', a change of state token which signals that she is aware that repair has been offered and that her earlier turn was not linguistically correct. In line 19 the instructor returns to his pedagogical goal of eliciting information, asking 'the last will be?'. 'Last' is emphasized in this line, informing learners that further interaction is conditionally relevant, in other words that a further response is required, and that the pedagogical goal that this interactional sequence is serving has nearly been fulfilled. In line 19, L1 again provides the required information, in this case 'conclusion'. Overlap again occurs in lines 19 and 20. The teacher overlaps with L1's contribution, but does not intrude on her turn to any great extent. Instead, overlap in this case is contingent upon L1's completion of the earlier adjacency pair initiated in line 20 where the teacher sought information on the third part of a paragraph. In this third turn position, the teacher's overlap arises because of L1's offering of the correct answer and a sign on the instructor's part that he is monitoring the interaction closely. It is a signal of affiliation on the part of the teacher with the offering made by the learner, which is also confirmed by the evaluation offered (yes, very good).

In the sequence of interaction above, the instructor is attempting to engage learners in discourse directed towards eliciting a particular response, in this case providing specific information on how paragraphs are structured. Therefore, how the instructor shapes and develops the interaction is dependent upon this pedagogical goal; he is aware of the answers he requires and this shapes how the interaction unfolds. In this interactional context, the affordance of space to participate in the interaction becomes

the affordance for the possibility of learning itself. In line 2 the teacher affords extended wait time to allow learners to participate in the discourse in response to two display questions, with L1 eventually taking the floor. While lines 4 through 12 are an extended teacher turn, this turn at talk serves the role of laying the groundwork for the contributions of learners to the discourse. In this turn the instructor affirms L1's contribution and uses the information provided in this contribution within his own turn, giving the example of caffeine and health from the reading being undertaken. This turn also functions as a means of shaping (Li and Walsh 2013) forthcoming learner contributions as further information is provided on the topic being discussed. The teacher emphasizes that there are three elements in structuring a paragraph, showing that he expects learners to contribute this information. It can be seen that he is constructing a dialogue in which learners are to participate and that this expectation is explicit, as denoted by 'so can you tell me' in line 1. This is an invitation for learners to contribute to the discourse. It is also clear that the teacher wishes to engage in discussion with his learners. There are several examples of overlap in the interaction (lines 3 and 4 and 19 and 20) where the instructor is attending closely to the offerings of the learner. Overlap also shows acceptance of, and affiliation with, learner contributions. In both instances the teacher has offered the floor to learners (lines 2 and 18) and L1 has responded to this offer. Though he overlaps with L1 on both occasions, I would argue that this does not serve to hinder interaction. Rather, it delineates a desire to accept the learner contribution and incorporate that offering into his following turn. Therefore, in relation to the construct of interactional competence, Participant B is able to create space for learner involvement in interaction and also incorporate learner offerings into the talk as it unfolds.

It can be seen in the above extract that the teacher's goal in the interaction is for learners to state the three elements which constitute a paragraph. This is achieved

through a dialogue based on exchange of information. As the turns at talk are controlled by the teacher the mechanisms for affording interactional space to the learner (wait-time, offering of the floor), it is he who directs and controls interaction and creates the space for the learning process to occur. The learner is able to participate in the discourse and engage with the instructor in co-constructing interaction.

A consistent theme to emerge from Participant C's interview data was her belief that interaction in her classroom is a dialogue between her and her students, a two-way process. When asked to describe her beliefs about successful teaching she stated that:

My main goal is for them to speak and to feel confident. Um in using the language to express their ideas

Therefore, it would be logical to assume that interaction between her and her learners takes the form of a conversation. However, it must be noted that classroom interaction is a form of institutional discourse (see Seedhouse 2004 for more on this theme). In other words, classroom interaction is shaped by the organizing principle of a pedagogical goal. In this regard, classroom interaction may not resemble talk as it occurs in daily life.

Edwards and Westgate (1987, p.31) state that

'In relation to classrooms, competence is usually defined by the demands of instructional encounters which are dominated by teachers'

Therefore, linguistic encounters between teacher and learner in the setting of the language classroom are developed according to a pedagogical purpose and interactional competence in this setting does not resemble that of everyday conversation.

In the extract being examined below, taken from the first lesson that makes up the corpus of classroom data being analyzed, the teacher is focused upon getting students to describe the traffic situation on their university campus.

Extract 3: Participant C, Lesson One 17.03 – 18.55. Describing Traffic on Campus

Students have been asked to discuss the level of traffic on their campus in small groups in relation to vocabulary items from the textbook that have been written on the

whiteboard. These words are used to describe traffic. The instructor is going around the room to monitor the discussion and get feedback from these groups as discussion takes place. Unlike the previous extracts discussed here, the instructor is involved in monitoring group discussion and so joins the interaction part-way through and is not at this time making the content of the interaction available to the rest of the class as part of an ongoing multilogue (Schwab 2011).

- 1 L3: um if you (0.8) if you (1.0) drive in the school and (.)
- 2 T: do you drive↑ (1.2) or do you ride↓ (.)
- 3 L3: I drive (.) driving a motorcycle and you uh you (3.0) u::h niga hhh see the
- 4 um accident or some dangerous thing (3.0)
- 5 L4: << u::m how how to say that>>
- 6 L3: ((laughter)) (.)
- 7 L4: how to say hhh=
- 8 L3: =I dont hhh (7.0)
- 9 L5: we say >>we should set the traffic light in our campus>> (.)
- 10 T: we should have traffic light=
- 11 L5: =yeah=
- 12 T: =maybe? (.) why↑ >>why do you think so>> (.)
- 13 L5: because the (1.0) the car (.) or motorcycles (.) are s:o quickly (.) quick (.)
- 14 yeah (.)
- 15 T: yes
- 16 L5: and (1.0)
- 17 T: [so-
- 18 L5: [yes
- 19 T: do you feel dangerous↓=
- 20 L5: =yeah (.) very dangerous (.) and some time they turn right or turn left

21 <<they dont have the sight>>=

22 T: =they dont signal their turn right (.) ok (2.0)

As stated above, Participant C's classroom practice is informed by the belief that learners should use the target language to express personal meanings. Rather than solely a pedagogical goal, such a belief is an overall perspective on classroom practice. In line 1 L3 is formulating the language she wishes to employ, pausing for 0.8 and 1.0 seconds respectively, after initially offering 'if you'. The teacher does not intercede and allows L3 to complete her turn, with the continuer 'and'. In line 2 the instructor interrupts, in order to clarify if L3 rides a motorcycle or drives a car to university. (n.b. In Taiwan the vast majority of university students ride motorcycles and it is likely that the instructor intercedes at this moment to ensure L3 offers a factually-correct utterance). In line 2 the instructor affords L3 wait-time of 1.2 seconds after asking if she drives. Of note is that L3 is able to complete this adjacency pair in line 3 after a micro-pause, recognizing that the floor is available to her. In line 3 L3 states that she drives to school on a motorcycle. The instructor does not repair this utterance, choosing instead to withdraw from the interaction. At the end of this turn L3 pauses for 3.0 seconds and L4 accepts this as turn-completion and then initiates a question which shifts the focus of the discussion. L4 explicitly orients the discussion towards finding a specific vocabulary item, asking 'how to say that?' in a slower-paced tone. In line 6 L3 is unable to offer an answer and employs laughter to show her inability to do so. L4 again posits her question in line 7, with L3 latching her turn to this in line 8, showing L4 through next-turn proof procedure that she has understood the question but is unable to answer it. At the end of turn 8 there is a significant pause of 7.0 seconds. No one assumes the interactional mantle; L4 does not recast her question and the instructor does not intervene in the interaction to provide L3 with the vocabulary item she seeks. At this Transition Relevant Place (TRP), L5 involves herself in the interaction, summarizing the group's

discussion by stating that they have agreed there should be traffic lights on campus in line 9. L5 has used the word 'set' and in line 10 the instructor repairs this error in usage. In line 11 L5 offers a latched turn, accepting the teacher's statement with the signifier 'yeah', but not incorporating the correct form of the verb into her speech. In line 12, the instructor evaluates L5's contribution with the term 'maybe' and then initiates a topic-shift, asking L5 why she believes traffic lights are necessary on campus. This section of line 12 serves as the 'anchor position', a term Schegloff (1986) devised to describe the place in interaction where a topic is brought up. In line 13 L5 completes this adjacency pair by stating that cars and motorcycles on campus speed. The instructor affords L5 a great deal of interactional space in line 13; there is a 1.0 second pause after the initiator 'because' and a series of micro-pauses. At no time does the instructor seize the interactional floor, instead allowing L5 to complete her turn-at-talk. Once L5 has completed her turn in line 14, the instructor shows affiliation with L5's offering in line 15 with the an evaluation of 'yes', which shows she has attended to L5's talk and accepts her contribution. In line 16, L5 retakes the interactional floor, signaling she has a further contribution to make. There is a 1.0 second pause as the teacher waits for L5 to complete her turn; however, L5 adds no further information to her turn-at-talk and at this failure of conditional relevance, the teacher begins to retake the floor, beginning the first part of an adjacency pair in which she is going to ask a question. There is overlap at this point in lines 17 and 18 as L5 indicates that she is still participating in the interaction by overlapping 'yes' with the teacher's use of the word 'so'. In line 18 the instructor completes her question begun in line 19 by asking L5 if she feels a sense of danger. In line 20 L5 emphasizes 'yeah' and slowing her talk in line 21 to emphasize drivers are impeded in their vision when turning. In turn 22 the instructor repairs L5's utterance (they don't have the sight), stating that drivers do not signal their turn. She completes her turn by using the discourse marker 'ok' to indicate that her turn-at-talk

has been completed.

In this extract it can be seen that Participant C's view of interaction as conversational in form is largely adhered to. In line 2 the teacher is focused on getting L3 to provide a personal evaluation of the traffic situation in campus (do you drive or do you ride?). She then withdraws from the interaction from lines 3 to 9, creating space for learners to discuss what contribution to offer later in the interaction. L4 asks for assistance twice during this period (lines 5 and 7), seeking clarification as to what appears to be a linguistically correct offering. L3's seven second pause in line 8, after claiming insufficient knowledge is interpreted by L5 as offering the floor and L5 then fills in the space by offering what for her is a summary of the main point of the discussion she has been engaged in with her group members – traffic lights on campus will reduce the number of accidents. In turn 10 the teacher performs direct repair of the previous utterance (have instead of set), acknowledged by the learner in turn 11. In further turns (lines 12, 15 and 17), the teacher attempts to extend the learner turns by offering a referential question (line 12) and the response 'so' in order to promote further discussion. The teacher's utterance of 'yes' in line 15 serves two functions – an acknowledgment of the self-correction performed in lines 13 and 14 (quickly and quick) and also the comment that motorcycles on campus speed. It is in line 19 that the teacher abandons this course and asks another referential question ('do you feel dangerous'), to which L5 responds with a longer turn which contains an example of dangerous driving (they don't have sight) which is then repaired by the teacher in the following turn (they don't signal their turn right).

Participant C's perspective on classroom interaction is that learners should express personal meanings in the target language. In analyzing the interaction above it can be seen that space is afforded learners to negotiate meaning together at the beginning of the extract and part of this interactional agenda involves leaving the floor open for learners

(for example, the seven second pause in line 8) and utilizing repair to integrate with, but not disrupt, interaction (line 10). Attention is also given to shaping learner contributions (lines 12 and 19). Li and Walsh (2013) observe that shaping learner discourse serves as a potential means of whole-class instruction in general by making available the learner's offering, and instruction for that learner in particular. Of note is the teacher's evaluation in line 12 (maybe) as an acknowledgment of learner contributions and also an expression of doubt that signals a query that serves the purpose of shaping learner contributions by having learners develop their ideas (why do you think so?).

It can also be seen that the distribution of turns here are generally even, with the teacher offering limited contributions that serve either to acknowledge or extend the offering made by learners. Thus, it can be argued that the interaction in this extract generally follows a conversational model as favoured by Participant C. Learners are involved in the discussion and are offered space to interact with each other. It is also apparent that the instructor is focused on evaluation and shaping interactions with the minimum of involvement. This concurs with the view put forth by Edwards and Westgate (1987, p. 45) that

‘the more successful the teacher is in initiating ‘discussion’, the more the ensuing talk may move towards the structure of conversation’.

What this illustrates about interactional competence is the idea of classroom discourse as being social in nature. This is not to say that classroom discourse is not directed towards learning. In this extract learners are utilizing the target language to express personal meanings and exchange information. That they do so in the target language delineates this as an episode of learning. Further, it is through the strategy of withdrawal from the interaction that Participant C is able to afford learners space to co-construct the discourse with her. Intersubjective relations are maintained through turns-at-talk as the teacher takes the role of a shaper of interaction rather than chief interlocutor.

The three extracts above each represent different types of classroom interaction. In Extract 1, the teacher is focused on having a student recreate the dialogue he has been engaged in as part of a learner dyad. Extract 2 involves the instructor asking display questions and managing interaction to allow a student to relate what she knows about how paragraphs are formed, while Extract 3 is an example of a teacher monitoring learner discourse and shaping that discourse to engage students in interaction. What each extract has in common is that it is in, and through, language that this is done. As the three extracts above reveal, interactional competence is comprised of much more than interlocutors coordinating turns-at-talk. This coordination is contingent on the deployment of various interactional resources based on the needs of the moment in order to maintain and renew interaction. In the extracts above it can be seen that interactional competence is characterized by creating and maintaining intersubjectivity through a process of utilizing resources dependent on the interactional needs of a given moment. Recall that in section 2.7 definitions of interactional competence to be found in the literature on this construct were listed and examined and it was stated that much of the research into this construct is theoretical in nature, i.e there is a paucity of data utilized to support claims made regarding what characterizes interactional competence. What the data utilized in this section of the thesis delineates is that interactional competence is highly contextual. This of course means that the interactional resources deployed in such contexts arise due to demands of the moment. However, the data here makes clear that, in broad terms, interactional competence is the creation and maintenance of a shared state of intersubjective relations; in other words, this is shared understandings of what the interaction is designed to achieve and how turns-at-talk are to be managed. In the extracts above, intersubjectivity is achieved by means of interactional resources such as repair, extended wait-time, overlaps, latching and interactional work performed by the instructors that allows learners to participate in the

interaction. A range of interactional resources are configured as part of classroom practice. In this institutional context, communicative practices are teacher-lead; it is the teacher that organizes interaction so that learners can participate in using the target language. In this setting, intersubjectivity means displaying understanding of one's role in the interaction and knowledge of how to manage the turn-taking system to achieve interactional goals. As stated earlier, institutional goals such as teaching and learning render interactional competence in the classroom setting different from that of daily life talk. More will be said about interactional resources in the following section of the analysis chapter but I would like to draw the reader's attention to the example of how repair functions in these extracts as a means of achieving intersubjectivity (for more on repair see section 5.5).

It is clear that repair arises out of the interaction between various interlocutors; as such it serves the purpose of maintaining the ongoing collaboration of these interlocutors, as sources of trouble are attended to and so allow interaction to continue. The reader will recall that in Extract 1, line 31, the instructor chooses not to repair the learner's utterance, as he was aware that the interactional trouble was not a hindrance to maintaining intersubjective relations. In Extracts 2 and 3, however, on these occasions, repair was performed in order to minimize disruption to the contributions made by the learners. In Extract 2, line 16, the teacher repairs the term 'supportive' offered by the learner by offering the correct form of the word 'supporting'. This is repair performed with one word and does not prevent the learner from maintaining a role in the discourse. In Extract 3, line 22, the instructor performs repair in a different manner, providing greater linguistic input to the learner, offering the word 'signal' as a clarification of the learner's contribution. As in Extract 2, this does not impede the learner from maintaining a role in the discourse. Repair, as the data shows in these cases, is a resource that serves to maintain social relations between speakers. Repair functions as a

way of achieving intersubjectivity.

Before moving onto the next section of this chapter, the reader is reminded that second language classroom interaction is inextricably bound with teaching and learning, the role of the teacher in classroom discourse is to both direct and participate in such discourse. Therefore, pedagogical goals influence how this is done. There is coordination of turns-at-talk to create and maintain intersubjective relations. Intersubjectivity in the English as a foreign language classroom context is shaped and informed by pedagogical goals and so does not involve completing other's turns for example. In this setting, this is what interactional competence looks like. However, this is informed by intention and this influences which interactional resources are deployed and when. In other words, it is awareness that shapes interactional competence. There will be more said on this in the discussion chapter. In the second section of this chapter, the focus shifts to the features deployed in interaction that delineate interactional competence.

5.4 Data Analysis Part B: What features of interaction delineate interactional competence?

5.4.1 Recipient Design and the Affordance of Interactional Space

It has been decided in the extracts below to present recipient design and affordance of interactional space in tandem due to the belief that these interactional resources are intertwined and often dependent on the other. There is a reflexive relationship at work. Theodorsdotter (2011) describes recipient design as a process implicit in both language and learning. Nguyen (2011, pps. 176-177) quoting Sacks et al states that recipient design is:

a multitude of respects in which talk by a party in a conversation is constructed or designed in ways which display an orientation and sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are coparticipants

As such recipient design resembles a testing out of language items and managing interaction to arrive at a state of mutual understanding. Sensitivity here is synonymous with awareness of local context and how interaction is developing and unfolding.

Shaping one's utterances based on the needs of an interlocutor argues for awareness (of sources of interactional trouble for example which will be discussed later) and a change in language use and possibly participation structures. In other words, awareness leads to a change in behaviour. Therefore, modification of language by an instructor within the micro-context of classroom interaction to further understanding and participation on the part of the learner is a display of interactional competence. It is also evidence of awareness in that the instructor is aware that a modification of language is necessary (i.e. the instructor has learned that the earlier utterance did not achieve the desired interactional goal) and an affordance to further learner participation. A case will be made that extended wait-time is a function of recipient design. By this it is meant that the modification of an utterance is followed by extended wait-time in order for the learner to process that utterance and plan and formulate a response.

The following example is taken from Participant A's first lesson. In the interview data that accompanies the extracts of classroom data below, Participant A expressed a belief that context was the major factor in shaping the spoken discourse occurring in his classroom. By this, he was not referring to factors pertinent to the interaction itself (in other words the micro-details of interaction) such as sequential environment and linguistic choices dependent on the communicative needs of the moment. Rather, he took a broader view, believing that the learning situation of the students themselves had a bearing on how interaction was shaped and developed. He was referring to distal context. Participant A described his learners as being of low to intermediate English ability, and therefore, less capable of engaging in interaction in the target language. Participant A was concerned with motivating his learners to 'speak more English words',

a concern expressed throughout the interview process.

Participant A was asked to describe the structure of this first lesson that forms the corpus of his data. He stated that:

after their discussion ah I want them to know more more kind of jobs and asking them the meaning of certain things for example like ideal perhaps that's occurred in the lesson

In order to facilitate this, Participant A's focus was on eliciting the feelings of learners in relation to the topic of their dream job. In the extract below the instructor is engaged in asking a learner to describe her perfect job. Under discussion will be how the instructor involves the learner in expressing her opinions on this topic by affording her interactional space to do so and how effective the instructor's use of language is in fostering learner participation in the discourse.

Extract 4: Participant A, Lesson One 29.54 – 30.24. Describing Your Ideal Job

In this extract learners are in dyads and are discussing their ideal job and the factors that make this job their ideal choice. The instructor is going around the classroom to monitor the interaction.

1 T: s:o (0.8) whats your (1.1) >>whats your ideal job>> (2.1)

2 L1: ideal job=

3 T: =°whats your dream job° (0.8)

4 L1: um to study=

5 L2: =work (0.5)

6 T: >>no work>> (.) stay at home (.) eating and sleeping ↓ (0.8)

7 L2: yes .hhh. (.)

8 T: thats my dream job as well (.) yu:h? (.) ok .hhh. (1.6) so what- and what is
9 the most important factor for you to choose your job (3.7) y::uh (1.1) what
10 is the most important factor (2.7)就是最重要的因素,所以才能夠 (4.2)

(that is the most important factor so that)

11 L2: money=

In line 1 the instructor makes an explicit request for information. Initially, there is a pause of 0.8 seconds as the teacher opens the interaction with a drawn-out ‘so’ to signal a topic is about to be introduced. Of note in line 1 is the extended wait time offered to allow the learner to formulate a response (2.1 seconds). Speech also becomes rapid after a 1.1 second pause as the teacher offers the initial part of the question before continuing. In line 2 L1 completes the question and answer adjacency pair, not with an answer to the question but a reiteration of ‘ideal job’, an indication that she is processing the question that has been asked and is experiencing trouble in formulating a response due to this phrase. In line 3 the instructor recasts his earlier offering, changing ‘ideal job’ to ‘dream job’, an example of recipient design, as he realizes that L1’s repetition of ‘ideal job’ was an attempt at seeking clarification. There is a shorter period of wait time (0.8 seconds) in line 3 as L1 demonstrates better understanding of the question, stating that study is her ideal occupation in line 4. At this juncture L2 offers repair of L1’s offering, showing with the word ‘work’ an awareness that ‘study’ does not equate with the notion of having a job and that therefore ‘work’ is the preferred response to the utterances offered by the teacher, an example of next-turn proof procedure at work. In line 6 the instructor provides expansion of L1’s turn in line 4, expanding on the offering of ‘study’ by defining it as the opposite of work. In line 6 there are two micro-pauses where the floor is not taken by L1, where the teacher offers ‘stay at home’ and then ‘eating and sleeping’ as facets of studying. After wait-time of 0.8 seconds, L2 responds in the affirmative. For the first part of line 8 the instructor responds to L2’s offering (that’s my dream job as well). The teacher then offers ‘ok’ as a summary of L1’s offering in line 8, followed by wait-time of 1.6 seconds, in which L1 makes no further contribution to the interaction. The instructor then introduces a change in topic in lines 8 and 9, asking, ‘what is the most important factor for you to choose your job?’ followed by wait-time of

3.7 seconds and is recast in simpler terms with the subject omitted when the question is asked again (what is the most important factor?), again followed by extended wait-time of 1.1 seconds. When no response is offered, in line 10 the instructor chooses to code-switch. Of note here is that the wait-time that occurs is the longest in this extract (4.2 seconds) as L2 processes what has been asked and develops a response, after being addressed in her L1 of Mandarin Chinese.

While it is evident in this extract that both L1 and L2 do not offer extended turns as they participate in the discourse, I would argue that this is not relevant when analyzing the construct of interactional competence. As has been stated earlier, this research is concerned with how interactional competence is demonstrated on the part of the instructor in terms of building and shaping discourse with learners. Kramsch's (1986) call for a greater concern with teaching learners interactional competence is inherently concerned with teaching students *when* and *how* to interact (italics mine) in order to achieve successful communication. Therefore, what turns-at-talk are attempting to achieve at a given moment (their function within spoken discourse) is of greater importance when discussing interactional competence, rather than length of turns at talk. Learner contributions are, therefore, contextually relevant (von Compennolle 2011). In the extract above the instructor performs the majority of interactional work in order to afford the learners space to participate in the discourse. This is achieved in a variety of ways. The instructor provides space for the learners to contribute to the discourse through extended wait-time (in lines 1, 3, 6, 8, 9 and 10) and also through displaying awareness of the needs of the other interactants. An example of this is in line 3 where the instructor recasts his earlier utterance, changing 'ideal' to the more likely familiar 'dream', recognizing that L1 is experiencing interactional trouble. Language is recast in response to the perceived need of the learner. In line 4 L1 is able to construct the discourse in conjunction with the instructor even though the utterance offered is short.

Nevertheless there is a two-way flow of information occurring here and the learner is able to communicate a personal perspective to the instructor. Line 6 by the instructor provides examples of not working which allow L2 to evaluate her earlier offering in line 5 and express affiliation through next-turn proof procedure in line 7. L2 has recognized the instructor's previous utterance as an appeal for information and offering of the interactional floor. In line 8 the instructor responds to L2's previous utterance with a personal response, maintaining a two-way communicative flow, before shifting topic by querying which factor determines L2's interest in a job. As stated earlier, the instructor affords L2 a great deal of space to respond to this referential question. Once again the instructor is able to recognize and respond to interactional trouble on the part of the learner, choosing to utilize the learner's L1 to restate his query. In this extract the instructor and L2 are able to construct the discourse together, with the instructor establishing and maintaining the interaction in service of a pedagogical goal (a request for information on what the learner's ideal job is and what factor influences this choice). It can be seen from the above extract that the interactional work performed by the instructor and space afforded the learner to participate in the discourse provide the learner with both the imperative to maintain relations through talk-in-interaction and also indicators that she is required to do so. It is also evident that the instructor and L2 are able to display mutual understanding of both the linguistic content of each other's utterances but also of their roles in the interaction; they utilize the sequence of turn-taking in coordination in order to achieve the interactional goals of the moment.

Extract 5: Participant A, Lesson Two Part A 31.07 – 31.46. Talking about your Favourite Singer

The extract below is taken from the second lesson analyzed as part of this thesis. In this second interview Participant A was asked, 'So what I'd like to do first of all is for you if you could take me through the transcript and tell me the story of what was

happening in your class.’ He stated that

because the aim of this uh the class...that class is basically to introduce the students with the vocabularies respects to music, different music types. So first I will like to acquaint them with different English vocabularies about music so um yes so so I introduce different kinds of music, for example rap and then uh rock music. Yeah and um in the process of trying to teach them the vocabularies I also use uh for example when I talk when I talk about rock I know I try to uh relate them to some rock stars maybe they know

The goal of the instructor here is to introduce what is potentially new vocabulary to learners supported by authentic examples that will reinforce understanding of that vocabulary. Therefore, the interaction that follows is informed by the belief that learners will apply the vocabulary they have been exposed to in a discussion either in paired dyads or as in the extract below, with the teacher. Participant A was asked, ‘What were you trying to communicate to the learners?’ with regard to how he used language to communicate with learners in this lesson. He stated that a further goal he had was that learners be able to

use the English word they just learned and to put them into the uh conversations. And also uh I I need them to think about why they think in that way. For example why why do you like rock music? Why do you...why don’t you like, for example, classical music? Yeah I want them to think about it and to organize these ideas in their mind and to put them into words

In the above quote, Participant A is describing a situation of learning as demonstrated in and through interaction. New vocabulary can be seen to have been acquired if learners use this word in spoken discourse. However, it is also evident that Participant A is arguing for a need for learners to extend their contribution to this discourse by justifying their preference for a particular musical form. This is to occur after incorporating the new vocabulary item into their discourse. This application is in turn predicated upon a cognitive process, described here as organizing ideas and putting them into words.

Given that there is a processing burden placed upon the learners in this situation, it can be assumed that wait-time to allow for processing of information and formulation of a

response will be of importance in the interaction that Participant A hoped would occur. It is clear that Participant A displays understanding of the process at work in developing the interaction he believes will facilitate learning. There is a debate when discussing the construct of interactional competence (see Pekarek- Doehler and Kelly-Hall 2011 for more on this issue) with regard to learning as an object (the acquisition of new vocabulary for example) or learning as a process (interaction as learning itself). While not wishing to argue for a dichotomy between the two, this work is concerned with learning as a process. This particular extract that will be discussed is of note due to the fact that the deployment of new vocabulary is the pedagogical goal of the moment; this is done in and through interaction as a process.

Students have been working in dyads, asking and answering each other two questions related to music, the theme of the lesson. These questions are why they prefer a certain kind of music and do not like another form of music. The teacher is now calling on individual students to share their answers with the class, with L11 being the third student he has called on in this sequence of interaction.

- 1 T: hey ((name deleted)) (0.6) hey how are you? (.)
- 2 L11: fine thank you=
- 3 T: =good (.) you are happy today? (.)
- 4 L11: yes (.)
- 5 T: are you happy? (.)
- 6 L11: eh YES (.)
- 7 T: oh hh good. (.) so what kind of music do you like the most? (1.7)
- 8 L11: °pop° music (.)
- 9 T: oh you like pop music (.) all right (.) so who- who is your favourite singer? (.)
- 10 L11: °who° (.)
- 11 T: who is your favourite singer? (.)

- 12 L11: Jay- Jay Jay (0.8)
- 13 T: huh?
- 14 L11: JAY JAY (.)
- 15 T: >>Jay Jay>> (.) all right Jay Jay is quite pop- hes very popular (.) rig:ht? (.)
- 16 oh (.) so (.) uh why do you like pop music? (0.3) why? (1.4)
- 17 L11: why? (.) because it is (1.3) comfortable. (.)
- 18 T: it is comfortable (.) right Jay Jay make you feel comfortable (.)

In the interaction above, the instructor requires the learner to respond to his enquiries regarding their favourite music and performers. The preamble to this is that the instructor begins the interaction with a phatic enquiry that appears to have little to do with the topic under discussion (popular music). However, there is a pedagogical purpose at work. Participant A describes his reasoning as follows:

before the these questions I I use what you call the small talk to chat with them. The reason I think is because um...yeah this topic is for me quite relaxing. I want them to feel free to talk to some topic which they may interested in. And then shift to the formal question.

Participant A is aware that learners need to feel able to interact with him as an interlocutor by creating conditions in which they feel free express personal meanings which are related to the topic under discussion. Thus, the interaction in turns 1 to 6 serve the purpose of involving L11 in the interactional process (and so establishing a system of turn taking contingent on a structure of question and response) before dealing with the overt goal of the interaction; being able to describe the music and performers one prefers. It is also worth noting that in this sequence of interaction there are no significant pauses as L11 is able to identify his role in the discourse and respond to the queries made by his interlocutor.

Given that lines 1 to 6 are concerned with laying the ‘interactional groundwork’ for the interaction that is to follow, it is not until line 7 that the instructor explicitly sets the pedagogical agenda for the following discourse by asking L11 which music he likes

most. Prior to this a series of adjacency pairs are used to establish the turn-taking structure that is to be followed, that of question-answer-evaluation and question. In line 1 there is a pause of 0.6 seconds after the teacher has nominated L11, followed by an enquiry after his health. After a micro-pause, L11 relates that he is well in line 2, which is followed by a latched turn in line 3 as the instructor offers the evaluation 'good' and then develops his theme by asking L11 if he is happy. After a micro-pause, L11 offers 'yes', to which the teacher restates his question from line 3, in line 5. In line 6, L11 restates his earlier response from line 4 in a louder tone, realizing that the instructor may not have heard his earlier response. As stated above, the instructor is focused on having learners apply potentially new vocabulary related to forms of music as part of their response and so it can be expected that extended wait-time will be a strategy employed to allow learners time to formulate a response. This is the case in line 7, as the instructor affords the learner 1.7 seconds to respond to his question about which music L11 likes. In line 8 L11 quietly offers 'pop' as his preferred musical choice. In line 9 the instructor backchannels the response offered and emphasizes the word 'pop'. After a micro-pause, he evaluates L11's turn with the discourse marker 'all right' and then asks a referential question, related this time to L11's favourite singer. In line 10 L11 repeats the word 'who' sotto voce, displaying interactional trouble and an example of 'linguaging' (Swain 2011), employing language as a stimulus for thought. The teacher seizes upon this display of trouble by reiterating his question in line 11, with the learner this time able to respond to the question in line 12, after a micro-pause. After a false start in line 12, L11 states that 'Jay Jay' is his favourite singer. However, in line 13 the instructor displays a lack of comprehension, his utterance of 'huh?' serving as a request for clarification. L11 interprets this as such and displaying next turn proof procedure at work, restates his offering in an amplified tone in line 14. In lines 15 through 16 the instructor performs a great deal of interactional work, displaying an understanding of

the content of the previous turn and then shifting the focus of the interaction to a discussion of why L11 prefers pop music. In line 15 the teacher reiterates L11's offering of 'Jay Jay', in a rapid tone, then uses 'all right' to signal a change of topic. He then states that Jay Jay is popular and after a micro-pause after his attempted elicitation through the use of 'right', utters 'oh' to signal a change of state; in this case, an indicator of surprise at a lack of response. His utterance of 'uh' in line 16 further signals surprise at not receiving a response to his question in line 15. The instructor then asks L11 why he likes pop music. After offering wait-time of 0.3 seconds, the instructor recasts the question as one word (why?) and offers further wait-time of 1.4 seconds. The response offered by L11 in line 17 begins with a reiteration of the teacher's question (why?) and then the use of a particular vocabulary item (comfortable) that is not linguistically correct and can possibly be interpreted as an attempt by L11 to explain a concept he is unable to fully explain in the target language especially given the 1.3 seconds pause between forming the sentence (it is) and providing the evaluation 'comfortable'. What is of note here, however, is that the instructor's response in line 18 is an example of 'letting it pass' (Firth 1997), whereby the utterance offered by L11 is not an impediment to understanding and he does not take the opportunity to repair the learner's contribution. The instructor incorporates L11's offering of 'comfortable' into his own evaluation and uses the discourse marker 'right' to signal his affiliation with L11's response.

As has been discussed earlier, interaction between teachers and learners is contingent upon pedagogical goals. The interaction in the extract above is an example of this, as the instructor's goal is for learners to apply vocabulary related to the topic of music to paired discussion, in which they also explain why they prefer a particular kind of music. In order for this type of interaction to successfully occur there are a range of resources that must be deployed by the instructor. These include creating the conditions,

and therefore expectations, for co-constructed interaction to occur, by means of preparatory interaction, extended wait-time, reiteration and recasting of previous turns (in other words recipient design), either those of the learner or those offered by the teacher, in order to shape and extend the contributions offered by the learner. These are affordances that provide the opportunity for learners to participate in interaction and have space to employ the target language in and through that interaction. In the extract discussed here, the language use of the instructor serves to afford learners the opportunity to participate in the interaction and apply vocabulary items that have been taught in class. Thus, the segment of interaction above is an example of how pedagogical goal and language use coincide to create space for language use on the part of the learner, and therefore, learning.

Extract 6A: Participant B, Lesson Two 38.03 – 38.39. Wearing a Tie

This following extracts are taken from Participant B’s reading and grammar class. Students have been placed in groups of four and asked to discuss their impressions of people who wear ties. The teacher is now going around the classroom and monitoring the discussion that is occurring. The instructor stated that he was concerned with engaging learners in discussion in this lesson but was not sure if learners would possess the vocabulary related to fashion to fully participate.

- 1 T: so (.) what kind of impression (0.4) do you have (.) what do you have when
- 2 you see a man or woman wears (0.8) <<wear a tie>>? (.)
- 3 L1: no tie (.) I don’t have experience (.)
- 4 T: oh (.)
- 5 L1: I dont have (.)
- 6 T: you never? (1.1) ok s::o if theres a chance >>would you like to hav:e>>
- 7 (1.0) would you like to (.) wear a tie? (0.7) neck tie? (0.7) if theres a chance
- 8 yes (.)

- 9 L1: hehehe y.hhh.es.
10 T: yes? (.) why? (0.7)
11 L1: [be-
12 T: [why (.) why (.) why do you (.) think like this ↓ (.)
13 L1: uh its more comfortable xxx

In line 1, the instructor asks two referential questions, with the second question serving as a recast of the first. There is little space between each question, indicating that the teacher is sequencing language according to what he perceives the level of the student to be, an example of recipient design that shows that the instructor is employing language in a context-sensitive manner (though I would argue here that ‘context’ in this case means knowledge of the level of the learner in question rather than related to the interactional context above) and has made his second utterance contingent upon the first. He begins by asking for an impression, with a pause of 0.4 seconds and then shifts to asking that the student ‘has’, with emphasis, when seeing a person in a tie, omitting ‘impression’. After the verb ‘wears’, there is wait-time of 0.8 seconds, with ‘wear a tie’ spoken in a markedly slower tone, summarizing the subject the instructor wants students to think about. In line 3 L1 offers what is a linguistically incorrect response (no tie) in tandem with a clarification that he does not have experience of dressing in this way. Of note here is that the instructor does not identify this as being in need of repair as ‘no tie’ is comprehensible and not an impediment to understanding or interaction. In line 4 the teacher signals a change of state with the discourse marker ‘oh’, signaling that he has attended to L7’s response, though it may not be the response he wishes for. L1 then resumes the interaction in line 5, reiterating ‘I don’t have’. It is clear that L1 is aware of the goal of the interaction – that he shares information and is able to co-construct the interaction with the teacher. In short, L1 is aware that there is a need to fit his utterances together with the teacher’s in order to co-construct the discourse. L1’s offering in line 5

could refer to either lacking a tie or lacking experience in wearing a tie. However, this ambiguity does not hinder the interaction, as the instructor seeks clarification of L1's utterance in line 6 (you never) and affords the learner the opportunity to respond and clarify his contribution by means of extended wait-time of 1.1 seconds. There is no uptake from the learner, leading the instructor to shift the topic to a hypothetical situation. In this section of his turn, the teacher formulates language to facilitate communication with the learner. The drawn-out 'so' in line 6 signals a shift in topic. This means that he recasts his question before completing it. There is a one second gap after 'would you like to have' where Participant B alters the verb 'have' to wear' in order to simplify and explicitly state what he wishes L1 to imagine; that he is wearing a tie. This is an example of recipient design and extended wait-time deployed together as an affordance. In line 7 there are two pauses of 0.7 seconds, after 'wear a tie' and 'neck tie'. In line 8 the instructor adds 'yes', as an indicator to L1 that he needs to imagine he has the chance to wear a tie. In line 9 L1 is able to respond to the question put to him in the affirmative, using laughter to show that this situation is unlikely. In line 10 teacher backchannels L1's response in line 9 and extends the learner's turn with a referential question (why) and deploying wait-time of 0.7 seconds to allow the learner to formulate a response. In lines 11 and 12 there is overlap between L1 and the instructor as L1 begins to formulate the word 'because'; however, at this initial stage of L1's turn, the teacher, reiterating this demand in line 12 with three repetitions of the word 'why', the first emphasized and each containing a micro-pause that is not followed by learner uptake. In line 13 L1 offers the opinion that he would wear a tie owing to the comfort it offers. The teacher then involves other learners in the interaction.

Extract 6B 38.44 – 39.18

- 14 T: ok wha- what about you two? (.) if there is a chance to wear a
15 tie (0.6) are you willing t:o wear a tie? (.)

- 16 L8: n::o (.)
- 17 T: yes ↑ (.) why? (.)
- 18 L8: why? (.)
- 19 T: yeah (3.6)
- 20 L9: no reason (.)
- 21 T: for no reason (.) or for in- in the name of fashion?
- 22 LL and T: ((laughter)) (4.3)
- 23 L8: want to try (.)
- 24 T: yeah you- you want to tr:y (.) why? (.)
- 25 L9: why (.)
- 26 T: any reason? (2.9)
- 27 L8: dont know (.) hehehe (.)
- 28 L1: for something different (.)

Line 14 begins with an explicit request for the dyad that had been discussing the topic of wearing a tie to share what they had been discussing. The word ‘two’ is emphasized, a clear sign from the instructor that he wishes this particular group to share the results of their discussion. There is a micro-pause after ‘two’ but neither L8 nor L9 enter the discussion at this point. There is a 0.6 second pause in line 15, as the instructor sequences his utterance into two parts – the notion of there being a chance to wear a tie and after the 0.6 second pause, the question-part of the utterance (are you willing to wear a tie?). In line 16 L8 states that she would not wear a tie by means of an extended ‘no’ and the teacher seeks clarification of this offering in line 17; here he demands a positive response, stating ‘yes’ in a rising tone and asking ‘why?’ L8 reiterates ‘why’, which the teacher follows with ‘yeah’ in line 19, a clarification of what L8 is required to do, and an initiator of a new adjacency pair. After extended wait-time of 3.6 seconds, L9 assumes responsibility for the interaction, stating that there is ‘no reason’ for L8 not

wanting to wear a tie in line 20. In line 21 the teacher seeks to expand on L9's contribution by means of a referential question, introducing the idea of wearing a tie for the sake of fashion. There is an extended period of laughter in line 22 (4.3 seconds) between teacher and learner. It is in line 23 that L8 intercedes in the discourse again, having changed her perspective on the question and saying that she 'wants to try' wearing a tie. Line 24 sees the teacher backchanneling L8's response and again seeking to extend the learner's offering through a referential question. L9 also seeks to encourage L8 to share her perspective, also asking L8 to explain her decision in line 25, asking 'why?' In line 26 the instructor recasts his question (an example of recipient design at work), echoing line 21 by asking for a reason and after extended wait-time of 2.9 seconds, L8 admits she does not know in line 27. L1 intercedes in the discourse in line 28, and offers a contribution likely based on the information L8 provided earlier when practicing this discussion; L8 would wear a tie to have a different experience.

In the above extracts Participant B is engaged in involving learners in a discourse that they have been rehearsing with a partner. Therefore, the instructor's role is both observer and participant; he is checking for learning and also contributing to the interaction as it develops. This also means that the interaction above serves a wider pedagogical purpose. It is an affordance provided to the class as a whole, as they are privy to the interactional workings of other classmates' discussions. It can be seen that there is another aspect to giving learners the space and time to practice in a dyad before presenting to the class. As Schwab (2011) notes, all learners are potential interlocutors in classroom discourse. In the second extract L9 is able to intercede in the discussion on L8's behalf (lines 20 and 25) and demonstrate understanding of both L8's earlier contribution and also participate in the discourse with the instructor, perceiving both interactional trouble (L8 cannot respond) and an opportunity to further the discussion by taking the interactional mantle. In both extracts, the instructor affords learners the

opportunity to participate in the discourse by means of referential questions that require a personal response. In the first extract, this occurs in lines 1, 2, 7 and 12. Of note there is how the instructor takes that response and employs it in furthering the interaction. In both extracts L7 and L9 offer brief responses (see lines 5 and 20). However, the teacher is able to incorporate the information in each contribution in his following turn and develop a question based upon that information, tailoring his language to the needs of the learner and to also further the interaction (see lines 9 and 10 and 20 and 21). Thus, recipient design is a method deployed to extend learner offerings and further involve learners in the interaction. It also serves as a marker to the learners in question that there are expectations inherent within this interaction. These expectations are displayed through the posing of a question, with the response of the learners serving to further the interaction and as a marker of understanding. Learners are expected to participate and construct the discourse with the instructor. However, of note here is that as the interaction concludes L9 feels able to posit a question to L8 (why in line 25), to which L8 responds with a claim of insufficient knowledge. L9 is then able to take up the interactional mantle again and state wearing a tie would afford a feeling of difference. Thus, learners also feel free to interact with each other and complete a turn on another's behalf. This indicates that the learners in this interaction can and do participate in the interaction and are able to self-select for a turn-at-talk and so participate in the discourse. Wait-time is also an element in the above extracts that denotes the manifestation of interactional competence. Wait-time affords learners the opportunity to process input and then formulate a response. I would also suggest extended wait-time also serves as an expression of teacher expectation. Lines 10, 19 and 26 involve extended wait time and the teacher's ability to afford interactional space to the learner signals that learners have a role to play in the discourse as participants and that the interactional floor is available to them.

Extract 7: Participant C, Lesson Three 16.26 – 16.56. Describing how a Person is Sitting

In the third lesson that forms the corpus of Participant C's classroom data, the focus of the lesson was for students to talk about wishes using the second conditional form. The extract below is taken from this lesson. In this extract Participant C is attempting to elicit a vocabulary item from the class as whole. Schwab (2011b) notes that dyadic interaction between teacher and learner is a potential source of input for other learners in the classroom. While this research is primarily concerned with how the instructors in this research interact with individual and small groups of learners, it should be noted that in this extract, the teacher is also engaged with the class as a whole at certain points and this extract (despite its brevity) is included owing to the insights afforded by how the instructor manages the interaction and also for the issues it raises with regard to practice offered in the interview data. Further, this data illustrates that certain lessons are formed of several interactional or proximate contexts, each dependent on, and arising from, differing pedagogical considerations. Therefore, while a lesson may be informed by an overarching pedagogical goal, as has been observed above, contexts may arise based on a pedagogical need of the moment, as occurs in this extract.

In this segment of classroom data, Participant C was asked what the aim of her language use was in this segment of interaction. She stated that she was focused on eliciting a specific vocabulary item.

It was a a word or phrase you know in this situation students didn't know how to describe you know uh sitting with legs crossed.

Students have been listening to a dialogue from their textbooks and asked to focus their attention on a picture of both speakers. The teacher is attempting to elicit the relationship between the two speakers from the students. To do so she has asked L50 to describe the body language employed by one of the speakers, after a previous student

has described the dress of both speakers.

- 1 T: how do you describe how he is sitting? (2.5)
- 2 L50: uh (3.2)
- 3 T: its very easy right? (.) how do you call this? (1.8) ((crosses thumbs))
- 4 LL: close (.)
- 5 L50: cross (.) cross (.)
- 6 T: close↑ (.)
- 7 LL: cross (.)
- 8 T: whats that (1.0) ((demonstrates using hand gestures))
- 9 LL: cross cross (1.0)
- 10 T: yes ((name deleted)) (.) what do you call it? (.)
- 11 L50: °cross°=
- 12 T: =cross right (.) right cross (.) so (.) how is he sitting? (.) he is sitting
- 13 down with his legs ↑
- 14 L50: crossing (.)
- 15 T: crossed ok? (.)
- 16 LL: crossed.

The interaction begins with the teacher directing student attention to the text book and asking learners to describe how one of the people in the picture under discussion is sitting. She nominates L50 to describe how the man in the picture is sitting. At the end of line 1 the instructor offers 2.5 seconds of wait-time. At this time L50 takes the floor and responds with the continuer uh (line 2) but does not elaborate on this offering, instead waiting for 3.2 seconds. In line 3 the teacher offers encouragement to L50 by means of a question (it's very easy right?), followed by a micro-pause where L50 does not take the floor. There is an explicit request for an answer (how do you call this). After 1.8 seconds, the class responds in line 4 with 'close'. In line 5 L50 provides an answer

‘cross cross’. The teacher echoes what she believes she has heard from the class in line 6, uttering ‘close’, delivered with rising intonation. This indicates that the response offered by the class in line 4 is not correct. This also serves to indicate to L50 that the teacher expects L50 to recast the answer offered and that she is offering the conversational floor. At this moment the class offers a choral response in line 7 which indicates to the teacher that while learners are able to offer a description of how the man in the picture is sitting (cross) this is not the correct grammatical form, and therefore, not the correct answer. At no stage does the teacher explicitly state this however. Rather, she relies on paralinguistic cues (line 8) to support a question (what’s that?), followed by 1.0 seconds of wait-time. In line 9 the class again responds as a group, offering ‘cross’. There is a pause of 1.0 seconds. In line 10 the teacher indicates that the class is on the right track but not fully correct by uttering ‘yes’ and then nominates L50 to again take the floor and asking ‘what do you call it?’ (referring to the hand gestures from line 8). In line 11 L50 quietly offers the word ‘cross’, which is not the vocabulary item the teacher is seeking. In line 12 the teacher affirms the offering ‘cross’ with a latched turn and the signifier ‘right’. In this turn there are several micro-pauses as the teacher affirms that ‘cross’ is close to being correct. The discourse marker ‘so’ signals that there will be a shift in focus, with the instructor once again asking ‘how is he sitting’, then beginning to answer the question, followed by rising intonation. This rising intonation and the fact that lines 12 and 13 are a designedly-incomplete utterance (Koshik 2002) indicates the floor is offered to learners. This cue is accepted by L50 in line 14 who offers ‘crossing’ in answer. It can be observed that L50 has offered a modified response to the earlier offering of ‘cross’ in line 11, recognizing that the earlier offering was not correct. In line 15 the instructor decides to offer the correct grammatical form she has been seeking herself, coupled with the discourse marker ‘ok’, a signal that this is the form of the word that has been sought. The interaction ends in line 16 with learners repeating ‘crossed’.

As can be seen this is an example of scaffolding (see section 2.8.3), where the teacher has been focused on leading students from what they currently know to a slightly higher level of development, in this case from one vocabulary form to another. In the interview data of this segment of data Participant C was asked, ‘So what scaffolding is going on here?’ She observed that

So I decide to to introduce this phrase by um elicit you know the the word crossed by doing the action. Um I was trying to lead them into you know...I um...this is people will talk about you know I want to introduce the phrase uh legs crossed um so I introduce it by um doing the action...um cross my um thumbs? Yeah just and eventually students come up with the word cross cross and then you know we move onto the...just at the end we use the phrase legs crossed.

What is apparent here is that Participant C’s choice of language and action is informed by a pedagogical purpose; that is, attempting to lead learners to produce a particular utterance. When examining the transcript of the interaction it is observable that the teacher offers extended wait-time in lines 1 and 3 and manages the discourse by means of questions and several offers for the conversational floor. I would argue that these are examples of recipient design in action. Throughout the instructor is modifying her language use until it is highly indexical, that is, focused on the interactional needs of the moment. It is noticeable that from lines 1 to 8 Participant C moves from a specific question in line 1 to a modified form of that question in line 3 that employs a less specific linguistic description (‘sitting’ to ‘this’). The description has become general by line 8, ‘that’ replacing ‘sitting’ as the form of linguistic input afforded learners. In line 9 learners are able to supply an approximation of the desired vocabulary item. Of note is that extended wait-time has accompanied the modified input provided by the teacher (recipient design in other words) in lines 3 and 8. The teacher then shifts to nominating an individual learner to check for uptake of this vocabulary item. Thus, interactional space is afforded learners in order for them to use the target language to produce the utterance the teacher is seeking. It is also apparent that this segment of interaction is

highly indexical. In other words, both teacher and learner are focused on using the minimum of language, and turns, in order to successfully complete the interaction (a point made by Seedhouse (2004) regarding task-based interaction), their interaction shaped by, and developing out of the context in which it is employed. What this reveals about interactional competence is that an awareness of context; in other words to organizing turns-at-talk in relation to pedagogical goals. This can be examined by focusing on the questioning strategy employed by the instructor in this segment of interaction. The initial turn serves to make explicit what students are required to do – describe how the man is sitting. Lines 3, 8, 10 and 12 also include variants of the same initial question and arise out of the turns offered by learners. Thus, Participant C is demonstrating interactional awareness, which I would argue is a precursor of and instigating force for interactional competence. The teacher in this extract recasts her questions, making them shorter in length and eventually focused around being able to describe a gesture rather than decode a lengthy linguistic turn as seen in line 1. In the interview data related to this section of interaction Participant C made the point that language use arises out of the interactional context. She was asked, ‘Do you reckon it’s easy to scaffold students through a task, for example, or eliciting the response you want like this?’ She said that

It depends on the situation. But at...well sometimes it looks like you know I try very hard but maybe maybe I was thinking you know something...they... the correct answer but they didn’t speak it out loud.

Also of note is that the instructor is able to evaluate whether or not this strategy is effective in eliciting the vocabulary item in question, as is alluded to by her in the above quote. In line 15 the teacher decides to elucidate the item she has been attempting to elicit from learners, rather than continue the discourse. In this case, awareness is indicated by a decision to abandon a pedagogical strategy that is proving to be ineffective and also indicates to learners that the lesson is shifting focus. Thus,

awareness is translated into decisions to modify language based on the needs of students as interaction unfolds and develops, which in turn indicates interactional competence.

In the extract below, Participant C is focused upon guiding the learner through the interaction to achieve a specific goal; a response to a particular question. As the interaction unfolds, what is of note in this extract is the interactional work performed by both participants to maintain the interaction and the manner in which the instructor relates to and responds to the utterances produced by the learner.

Extract 8: Participant C, Lesson Five 29.47 – 30.46. Commenting on Computer-Usage

Learners have been engaged in discussing in groups how computers have made their lives easier or more difficult and how computers affect the ways in which they spend their free time. These questions are from the class text-book. The teacher has called upon L2 to answer these questions after gaining feedback from other learners on the earlier questions under discussion.

- 1 T: do you think computer (0.5) computers hhh (.) have made your life more
2 difficult? (.) in what way? (3.5) its a little (0.5) in some way related to
3 the third question right? (0.5) whats (.) is the third question? (0.8) how
4 do computer affect the way you spend your free time? (0.6) lets hhh look
5 at this question first (.) how? (2.2) ((name deleted)) (0.3) how? (0.8)
6 L2: how? (1.3) u::h-
7 T: >>what do you do on your free time>>? (.) in your free time? (.)
8 L2: reading online (0.7)
9 T: you read (.) on the web right? (.) o:k? (.) what do you usually read? (0.5)
10 L2: u:h novels (.)
11 T: novels? (0.5)
12 L2: yes (.)

- 13 T: so you dont really read (.) pap:er↑ (1.6)
- 14 L2: because th:e book [is
- 15 T: [kind of book
- 16 L2: is too expensive (0.8)
- 17 T: its hhh expensive=
- 18 L2: =yeah (.) yeah (.)
- 19 T: you can borrow it from the library (0.5)
- 20 L2: but the library didn't have the book that I want (.)
- 21 T: so can you read it online for free?=
22 L2: =yeah=

This sequence of interaction begins with an extended turn by the instructor, from lines 1 to 5. In this turn, she is concerned with establishing the pedagogical goal of this interaction. Learners are originally required to deal with the question of how computers have made life more difficult. In lines 1 and 2 the instructor asks if computers have made life more difficult. There are two micro-pauses in this section and a longer pause of 3.5 seconds in line 2 as the teacher seeks clarification of how computers may have made life more difficult. There is no learner uptake at this point, so the instructor reminds learners that this question is similar to the third question they have discussed. There is a 0.8 second pause in line 3 as the teacher asks the class what the third question was. In lines 3 and 4 the instructor repeats the third question, emphasizing the word 'computer'. After a 0.6 second pause in line 4, the teacher orients the class to this third question. In line 5 there is 2.2 seconds of wait-time after the teacher asks 'how?' as a summary of the previous question. She then nominates a learner and reiterates the word 'how'. This is followed by 0.8 seconds of wait-time. In line 6 L2 displays an inability to answer, repeating the teacher's question and waiting for 1.3 seconds before producing an utterance (uh) that is a marker of pre-formulation of a response. The teacher

intercedes in line 7 and recasts the question, asking the learner what he does in his free time in order to prevent what she sees as interactional trouble. This is done in a fast-paced tone of voice. In line 7 the instructor condenses her earlier offering (in your free time). L2 responds that he reads online in line 8, with a pause of 0.7 seconds after this, to which the instructor seeks clarification in line 9. She emphasizes the word 'read' and utilizes 'right' and 'ok' as a specific requests for clarification of L8's earlier offering. She then seeks to extend the learner's contribution, seeking knowledge of what the student reads. There is wait-time of 0.5 seconds. In line 10 L8 thinks for a moment and offers that he reads novels. A sequence of clarification occurs until line 18. In this sequence of interaction, there is a series of adjacency pairs in which the teacher solicits information through a question, which L2 answers, and the instructor seeks clarification of the answer. In line 11 the teacher repeats L8's earlier answer of novels, and after 0.5 seconds, he confirms this in line 12. In line 13 the instructor asks if L2 reads on paper. This is a DIU (Koshik 2002) followed by rising intonation. After a 1.6 second period of wait-time, L2 begins his turn-at-talk with the word 'because'. There is overlap in line 14 as L2 begins to state his reason for reading online and in 15 as the instructor concludes her turn in line 15, after L8 offers no uptake. In line 16 L2 concludes his turn by stating that paper copies of books are too expensive. After a 0.8 second pause the instructor backchannels L2's offering in line 17. L2 displays affiliation to this in line 18, stating 'yeah, yeah', as part of a latched turn. In line 19 the instructor shifts focus, stating that L2 can borrow books he is interested in from the library. After 0.5 seconds he responds to this turn in line 20, saying that the library does not contain items he would wish to read. In line 21, the teacher returns to L2's offering in line 8, asking L2 if he can read online for free, a request for clarification, to which L2 replies with a latched turn in line 22.

It can be seen from the above extract that the instructor is involved in a process of

interactional give and take with L2. The pedagogical goal of the moment is to elicit information from the learner with regard to how he spends his free time in relation to his computer use. There is a reflexive relationship at work here between this desire to elicit information and the turn-taking sequence that develops. The teacher's initial turn establishes the pedagogical goal and the boundaries of that interaction; the teacher is seeking specific information from L2. While it is apparent that there is a largely even distribution of turns, it is the instructor determining when and how L2 will participate in this interactional sequence. When examining the interaction as it develops it is clear that Participant C affords L2 opportunities to participate in this sequence of discourse. The resource employed by the instructor in this instance is the use of referential questions that serve as affordances to involve the learner in the discourse but also as the interactional work of reshaping earlier offerings in order to promote learner response. While lines 1 through 5 are managerial in nature as the instructor lays the ground for the interaction that is to develop, line 7 is an explicit offer of the conversational floor to L2 to which he is able to respond. Initially, L2's responses are short (a fact commented on by Participant C in the stimulated recall interview devoted to this lesson), he is able to participate effectively in the interaction. Of note here is how the instructor maintains the flow of the interaction, shaping the contribution made by L2 (Walsh 2006) and extending that contribution. For example, lines 7 to 11 involve the instructor taking what the learner has offered and shaping that response into a further question to maintain intersubjective relations with L2 but also to afford him the opportunity to add to the discourse. In lines 14 and 16 L2 is able to contribute a personal observation. While this is done in response to a prompt made by the teacher, this is not offered in the form of a question. L2 is able to distinguish between differing interactional forms and the demands made by these forms, I would argue, due to the earlier recipient design work performed by the teacher in lines 9 and 13. In turn 19 the instructor affords the

learner a further opportunity to participate, again through a statement offered as a suggestion. In line 20 L2 refutes this suggestion, after very little wait-time. His contribution here is an extended turn that arises, I would argue, due to the instructor's management of the sequence of interaction at work here, in other words, the turn-taking mechanisms employed.

The sequence of interaction above illustrates how elicitation of information develops, with the teacher affording L2 several opportunities to participate and contribute to the discourse. Interactional space is offered to L2 through wait-time and explicit offerings of the conversational floor. As in other extracts examined in this chapter, it is clear that Participant C is able to withdraw from the interaction as and when required to maintain intersubjective relations with a learner, as well as organize the distribution of turns in order to achieve pedagogical goals as they relate to a sequence of interaction. This requires monitoring of the interaction as it develops and argues for interactional competence. This is demonstrated through knowing how to achieve and maintain intersubjectivity in the classroom context as interaction develops and displaying an understanding, through talk, of what another interactant wishes to relate and responding to that contribution, through strategies such as reshaping an earlier offering and extending wait-time to allow an interactant to respond.

Extract 9: Participant C, Lesson Five 37.52 – 38.44. A Message on an Answering Machine

This extract is taken from later in the lesson. Students have been listening to a dialogue in which speakers have been attempting to leave a message on an answering machine. The teacher is checking for comprehension, asking the class as a whole what the conversation was about. L30 and 31 self-select and engage in interaction with the teacher.

1 T: so what is this conversation about? (2.6)

- 2 L30: 手機. (0.7)
(cellphone)
- 3 T: cellphone↑ (.) >>can you say 手機 in Ch- in English>>?
(cellphone)
- 4 L30: um phone
- 5 T: >>phone (.) what kind of phone>>? (0.7)
- 6 L30: cellphone (.)
- 7 T: yes (.) and? >>what about cellphone>>? what happens (1.3) in the
8 conversation? (0.5) there are one man (.) one woman right? (.) what are
9 they doing? (1.1)
- 10 LL: xxx ((overlapping voices))
- 11 T: us:ing a cellphone (.) yes and ↑ (0.8)
- 12 L31: xxx
- 13 T: the woman ↑ (1.1)
- 14 L31: she dont know how to use a cellphone=
15 T: =she doesnt know how to use a cellphone right? (0.9) yes and so what
16 happened? (0.7)
- 17 L32: the man teach step by step (.)
- 18 T: yes the man is teaching the woman step by step right? (.) so what is the
19 first step of using a cellphone? (0.7)
- 20 L32: unlock the cellphone (.)
- 21 T: yes I was thinking about that (.)

The above extract is a further example of scaffolding taken from lesson five. The goal of the instructor in this extract is for students to describe a conversation they have just been listening to.

In line 1 the instructor has established the topic and parameters for the interaction

that is to follow by asking what the discussion is about. After 2.6 seconds of wait-time, L30 processes what the instructor has asked. L30 delivers the answer in her L1, delivering the answer in Mandarin Chinese. The instructor waits for 0.7 seconds, an indicator of the teacher processing what has been offered and deciding how to respond. In line 3 the instructor chooses to repair the utterance offered by the learner, offering 'cellphone' with rising intonation and asking L30 in a rapid tone if she can say cellphone in the target language, English. This allows for the maintenance of what, as has been stated before, is the core institutional goal of the second language classroom, the teaching and learning of the target language (Seedhouse 2004). In line 4 the learner attempts to do so, offering 'phone'; however the instructor offers further repair, backchannelling the learner's utterance and asking her to clarify her thinking, asking 'what kind of phone?' Again, the teacher's response is rapid, an indication that there is other business in the interaction the teacher wishes to attend to. After 0.7 seconds of wait-time, L30 appropriates the information offered by the instructor in line 3, offering 'cellphone'. The instructor's acceptance of this utterance is shown by her almost immediate response of 'yes' in line 7. In this turn the instructor returns to getting the learner to describe what has happened in the conversation students have been listening to. After asking 'what happens', there is a pause of 1.3 seconds, in which there is no learner uptake. The teacher then provides contextual information (there are one man and one woman) and asks L30 to state what they are doing. After a 1.1 second pause, the class, who have been monitoring this discussion, offer a variety of answers, which could not all be discerned and so transcribed. In line 11 the instructor attends to the offering of the class, possibly isolating one answer and stating 'using a cellphone...yes'. However, the teacher seeks further exemplification from learners, using 'and' and rising intonation which signals to learners that she is seeking further output. This is another example of a 'designedly-incomplete utterance' (Koshik 2002) that serves to elicit output from the

learner through explicitly failing to complete a turn at talk. L31 interprets this as an offering for the floor in line 12; however, this turn-at-talk could not be transcribed. In line 13 there is a further DIU (ibid) combined with rising intonation to again signal that the instructor is seeking a response from learners, this time in relation to what the woman in the listening exercise is doing. After 1.1 seconds of wait-time, L31 offers that the woman doesn't know how to use a cellphone in line 14. In line 15 the instructor offers a latched turn, accepting L31's offering and extending her turn with a question about what happened next. In line 15 the teacher also offers repair of L31's 'don't' and using the discourse marker 'right' signals a question is directed to L31. There is a pause of 0.9 seconds before the instructor asks this question; wait-time of 0.7 seconds then occurs in line 16. In line 17 L32 then becomes involved in the interaction, stating that the man teaches the woman how to use the cellphone. In line 18 the instructor once again shows agreement (using yes) and backchannels the learner's utterance and formulates it as a question. The teacher also extends the discourse by asking what the first step in using a cellphone is. After a 0.7 second pause in line 19 L32 is able to relate that unlocking the phone is necessary in line 20. In line 21 the instructor shows strong affiliation with L32's answer, emphasizing the word 'yes' and 'that', stating that this is what she had been thinking, a clear indication to L32 that she has fulfilled her role in the interaction by offering the information the teacher was seeking.

It is evident in this segment of interaction that the instructor is focused on providing wait-time to learners in order to facilitate the responses they might offer. While this is a broad aim, the focus here will be on how this is specifically achieved in the sequential organization of the interaction and how this impacts on the quality of the utterances offered by learners. In this extract, how the teacher goes about using language to involve learners in the discourse and shapes their turns through wait time will be analyzed. When asked to explain how and why she affords wait-time to learners,

Participant C observed that

Well some students they they don't answer straight away doesn't mean they don't have the answer. You know it could be they are trying to form the answer. And also if you give them wait-time they do know that you want them to speak. If you don't give them wait time they they don't speak at the first you know moment they might not speak at all.

It is clear that the wait time offered by the instructor functions to provide space for processing the instructor's utterances, in particular when questions are asked. In turns 1, 5, 7, 9, 13, 15 and 18 wait-time is afforded by the instructor to the learner. In each example the teacher is seeking further information and in providing wait time is allowing the learner to process the question and formulate a response. If the responses of the learner are evaluated in response to the question asked (in other words, examining the interaction as adjacency pairs), it is clear that the learner is able to offer a response (though it must be noted that not all of the learner responses have been transcribed for reasons outlined above). The learner is aware of the interactional demands at work here (providing a response to a question) and is able to do so. As noted above, in lines 1 through 5, the instructor is scaffolding L30 through the interaction, leading her to the response 'cellphone'. In this section, wait-time is consciously provided by the instructor. In line 1, almost three seconds is offered to enable L30 to process the question and offer a response. In line 5, the teacher attempts to repair the learner's utterance by means of a question and waits 0.7 seconds for a correct response, which L30 is able to provide. In turns 9 and 11 the teacher employs wait-time in tandem with rising intonation to direct learners towards offering a more developed response. The instructor's interactional goal in these two adjacency pairs is to extend the contribution of the learner. The function of this is to develop learner language and also fulfill interactional needs that arise out of the localized context. Learners need direction as to what the instructor is seeking; particular information that will serve the interactional needs of the moment and so fulfill the interactional agenda. In lines 15 and 18 the teacher performs backchanneling as has

been mentioned above. However, it is the function of the questions that follow that will be analyzed. Each question serves to further the discourse, requiring the learner to develop the ideas that have previously been expressed, once again extending learner language and maintaining intersubjective relations and the context in which the discourse takes place. As outlined above, line 1 serves to establish the overall aim of this sequence of interaction, in terms of describing what the conversation is about. The questions asked in lines 5 and 7 are related, in that, in line 7 the question requires the learner to extend the answer provided earlier in line 5. This is also the case in the sequence of interaction that occurs in lines 15 to 20. The questions asked by the teacher arise out of the answers offered by the learner and serve to extend and shape learner discourse. In the extract above the teacher affords the learners the opportunity to use the target language and participate in classroom discourse through the employment of wait-time and questions that occur as a result of backchannelling. In lines 14 and 15 and 17 and 18, the teacher utilizes recipient design, reshaping the learners' offerings to provide linguistically correct input and also incorporate the previous learner offering into her response. This shows learners that their turn-at-talk has been attended to and used to renew the discourse; the instructor attends to what the learner has said, uses this offering to shape what will be said next and then engage the learner further in interaction. Thus, it can be seen that teachers can use an utterance to serve multiple functions in an episode of interaction.

What this reveals about interactional competence is that wait-time is a necessary offering for learners to process the questions asked by teachers and formulate a response. It is also clear that interactional competence by language teachers is awareness that a turn-at-talk serves multiple functions – attending to a previous utterance, reconstituting a learner turn (recipient design) as part of a response to that turn-at-talk and extending learner output through further questioning. In order to coordinate utterances with a

learner, teachers are required to perform complex and sophisticated interactional work; this work is predicted on awareness of what is required at that moment, as this data extract shows.

A broad perspective on interactional competence argues for being able to co-ordinate utterances with an interlocutor. If this is achieved, one could be said to be interacting 'competently'. In other words, an interlocutor is following an implied set of rules in the interaction. This process of co-ordination is dependent upon awareness of how and when to involve oneself in spoken discourse. Recipient design arises out of an awareness of the needs of a fellow interactant. Tailoring one's speech in order to co-ordinate turns-at-talk (and so achieve intersubjectivity) is a sophisticated process that is not purely instinctual; understanding of previous utterances and the manner in which they have affected the discourse are taken into account and acted upon. This sounds similar to repair. However, when discussing repair it is clear that sources of interactional trouble are identified and attended to. With regard to recipient design, the process at work is not directed towards a specific feature of the interactional process, other than maintaining spoken discourse. It is the interactional process itself that is attended to. Recipient design in tandem with extended wait-time arises out of a perception by one interlocutor that utterances need to be reshaped in order to achieve both pedagogical goals and also maintain intersubjectivity. In the context of the Taiwanese English as a foreign language classroom, this differs from intersubjectivity in daily life, as understanding is displayed and space is provided to learners to employ the target language for communication. Extended wait-time allows for an interlocutor to process the modified language being offered and develop a response based on the ongoing interactional needs of the moment. Allied with recipient design extended wait-time is intertwined with the utterance that has preceded it for the purpose of affording learners space in classroom discourse and is an indicator and display of interactional

competence.

5.4.2 Repair

Given that language is the resource in and through which language instructors and learners negotiate classroom events, it is credible to assume that communicative difficulties may arise. This can occur for a variety of reasons (unintelligible utterances for example). An interlocutor, may, therefore, attend to, and offer repair, of such interactional trouble. Repair is, therefore, a resource available to both instructor and learner in second language classrooms. Repair is a mechanism available to interactants to maintain intersubjectivity, as noted by Sidnell (2010). Like Hellermann (2011a) I would argue that repair is a competency. In order to facilitate communicative flow with learners and also attend to interactional trouble manifest in learner language, instructors are required to display both understanding of the context in which trouble arises and facility in organizing and performing repair. Conversation Analysis holds that repair is intrinsic to turn-taking (Schegloff 1979). Hellermann (2011, p148) states that repair is seen as:

one of the competencies that language users can access to maintain the course of action in their talk when some source of interactional trouble arises

Interactional trouble in second language classrooms can be described as follows:

1. Medium-oriented: a focus on the forms and/or functions of the target language
2. Message-oriented: a focus on the transmission of thoughts, information and feelings
3. Activity-oriented: a focus on the organization and structure of the classroom environment and rules for conducting activities (van Lier 1988)

In the examples to follow it is to medium and message-oriented repair that will be discussed with regard to the construct of interactional competence. Language forms and the content of utterances form the basis of the repair that will be analyzed.

In this sequence of lessons Participant A was focused on introducing vocabulary related to sports. In the extract below the teacher wants students to explain which sports are popular in Taiwan and provide a reason for their selection. Participant A observed that there was an underlying concern at work as he interacted with learners. When asked, ‘So is that your goal, to let the students express themselves fully before you give any feedback?’ Participant A stated that he was conscious of a need to afford learners interactional space because

it is so very very difficult for them to to use English to express themselves. So if I interrupt them it’s...I will have more difficulty to try to convince them to speak.

This concern raises the question of how and when to offer repair of interactional trouble in the context of the second language classroom. Repair may be deemed face-threatening by the interlocutor whose utterance is being repaired and may engender anxiety on the part of language learners lacking confidence in expressing themselves in the target language. While this section is not specifically concerned with preference (due to concerns regarding space), it should be noted that there is often a tension at work between allowing communication in the target language to flow and repairing learner utterances for pedagogical purposes, as in the case of targeting a specific grammatical form as part of classroom instruction, for example.

Extract 10: Participant A, Lesson Seven 46:14 – 46:48

- 1 T: right (.) you are young people right (.) yeah good (.) 很好 anyone else? (.)
(very good).
- 2 還有嗎?好,來 cmon (.)
(Anyone else? OK, come on)
- 3 L13: oh we (0.8)
- 4 T: (xxx)
- 5 L12: we (.) [we
- 6 L13: [we ((laughter)) (.)

- 7 T: we think ↑ (.)
- 8 L13: we think socc- soccer is popular with children (0.8)
- 9 T: oh children- is popular with children (.) right (.) do you think soccer is
- 10 popular in Taiwan? (.)
- 11 L13: no (.)
- 12 T: n:o? (.) what- what sports is popular in Taiwan? >>what do you think>>? (.)
- 13 L13: uh 因為 (0.4)
- (because)
- 14 T: what- what- what sport is popular in Taiwan?=
15 L13: =u:h u:h=
16 T: =what (0.2)
17 L13: u:m (1.1)
18 T: yoga? (.)
19 L13: no.hh (.)
20 T: no? what (.) what (.)
21 L13: .hhh. basket .hh. ball (.)

This sequence of interaction begins with an offering of the floor to the class as a whole in lines 1 and 2. This is done in the learners' L1, Mandarin Chinese, a clear signal from the teacher as to what he expects from students. L13 seizes upon this opportunity to share information with her classmates and enters into the interaction in line 3. Her initial contribution is an incomplete sentence followed by 0.8 seconds of wait-time that the teacher interprets as interactional trouble in need of repair. The teacher's offering in line 4 is unintelligible and could not be transcribed. In line 5 L12 chooses to enter into the interaction, taking the floor in conjunction with L13, leading to overlap in lines 5 and 6. Both students have begun their turn with the word 'we'. In line 7 the teacher intercedes with repair of both utterances, which like line 4 are incomplete, due to

overlapping turns. In line 7 the instructor provides the verb ‘think’, signaling that learners provide an opinion and utilize this particular verb, an example of scaffolding. The use of rising intonation also supports this goal. It can be seen that this strategy is successful as in line 8 L13 takes the floor and offers an utterance of greater linguistic complexity that also utilizes the verb that has been targeted. After waiting 0.8 seconds, in lines 9 and 10 the teacher backchannels the offering of L13 and employs a referential question to extend the learner’s contribution (do you think soccer is popular in Taiwan?). L13 responds in line 11 after a micro-pause; the response is brief but functions to provide a personal view and maintain communicative flow. Line 12 is of note as the instructor employs a particular form of questioning to extend learner discourse by placing a greater cognitive burden on the learner. Two questions are asked and each functions as a unified piece of discourse as the first question (what sports is popular in Taiwan?) states the topic and the second (what do you think?), which is delivered rapidly, provides the learner with a cue as to what she is required to achieve in this sequence of interaction; provide a personal opinion. ‘What do you think?’ is a direct appeal to the learner to involve herself in the interaction and affords her the opportunity to provide a contribution that is personal. However, in line 13 L13 is not able to do so as she utilizes her L1 as a preamble, offering ‘because’ in Chinese. The teacher identifies this as interactional trouble after a 0.4 second pause and attempts repair by restating his earlier question. In the interaction that follows in lines 15 to 21 the trouble source is identified by the instructor as a lack of a particular vocabulary item that will allow L13 to maintain her role as an interlocutor. In line 15 the learner is not able to articulate a response and in line 16 the instructor attempts to further the interaction. The word ‘what’ serves multiple functions at this point in the interaction. It is a prompt to remind L13 of the form of content she needs to provide and a linguistically brief offering that arises out of the interactional trouble that is occurring. The teacher has recognized that the learner

cannot process too much linguistic input and needs space to formulate a response. There is a pause of 0.2 seconds. In line 17 the learner is still unable to provide a response, offering 'um' followed by a pause of 1.1 seconds. The instructor fills the gap with an example of what he believes L13 is trying to say (yoga). In line 19 the learner is attending to the instructor's offering and is able to explicitly disavow his selection, with the word 'no'. In line 20 the teacher incorporates this into his turn, repeating 'what' twice to signal to L13 that she is required to contribute to the discourse. In line 21 she is finally able to do so after a brief pause, offering 'basketball' as a popular sport in Taiwan, in a laughing tone of voice.

Deciding how and when to repair is as much an interactional decision as it is a pedagogical one. Examining the extract above makes clear that the instructor bases his decision of how and when to repair on the needs of the moment. Line 5 is an example of this. Lacking the verb 'think' impedes learner production. Affording learners this vocabulary item leads to output, as seen by L13's offering in line 8. Turns 17 to 23 are a further example of repair as an affordance to promote interaction. In this sequence the instructor offers limited turns in order to position L13 within the interactional sequence that is unfolding so that she can respond to the question that has been asked (What sport is popular in Taiwan?). The use of the word 'what' along with an example (yoga) serve to direct the learner towards an appropriate response based on the interactional requirements of the moment.

When going over the transcript of the lesson from which this extract is taken, Participant A said that

because students say only one sentence so I tries to use this sentence and try to give more hint related to this sentence to students and also tries to you know make the students' sentences more clear

What is being related here is an example of developing awareness of pedagogical strategy and language use. Participant A is describing the reflexive relationship between

teacher language and learner language and how learner language feeds into how teachers respond to learner turns. In this case he is describing backchanneling. This awareness in turn affects practice. In the extract below the instructor offers extended wait-time on several occasions (lines 5, 9 and 17). Extended wait time allows learners to process the information contained in the previous turn and formulate a response. In other words, extended wait time functions as a means of achieving intersubjectivity with an interlocutor. While not wishing to overstate this, silence is an affordance that creates space for learners to participate in classroom discourse. Li and Walsh (2013, p.256) observe that ‘when space for learning is created by a teacher, it is immediately filled by learners’. Participant A was aware that length of wait time can and does affect learner participation, stating that

maybe I give them too too little time to think about the sentence so they don’t think...they think about quite a short sentence.

For this participant it appears that greater wait time creates space for more complex and meaningful learner contributions. This quote shows awareness on the part of the practitioner as to how a pedagogical strategy impacts upon classroom interaction and spoken discourse. As can be seen in the data extract, the teacher is able to put this awareness into practice, particularly with regard to when and how to offer repair, an example of interactional competence.

Extract 11: Participant B, Lesson Three 1.35.26 – 1.35.55. Clarification of a Vocabulary Item.

- 1 T: the general (1.0) °the gen°- (1.0) °hhh sh:oot° (2.0)
- 2 L12: shot (.)
- 3 T: hm ↑ (.)
- 4 L12: hhh sh:::ot (.)
- 5 T: shot or shoot? (1.7) [shoot
- 6 L12: [hhh

- 7 T: shot [shot
- 8 L12: [shot
- 9 T: yeah? (0.6)
- 10 L12: 啥?什麼? (.) shoot:uh (.)
(Huh? What?)
- 11 T: hm hm (.)
- 12 L12: oh sh- shoot uh (.)
- 13 T: its a (.) base form right? (0.4)
- 14 L12: 兩個 OO 喔? (.)
(Double O?)
- 15 T: shoot O O (.)
- 16 L12: O O (0.7) sh [oot
- 17 T: [shoot (2.5)
- 18 L12: shoot

The extract above has been included as an example of repair serving to achieve intersubjectivity in the classroom context. In line 1 the Participant B reads sotto voce a sentence that L12 has written. The verb ‘shoot’ is identified by L12 as in need of repair, stating ‘shot’ in line 2. In line 3 the teacher acknowledges this with a vocalization, the rising tone inviting enquiry. L12 again offers ‘shot’, with the instructor seeking clarification in line 5 as to which form is correct, repeating ‘shot’ twice in line 7 in response to L12’s failure to reply. In line 8 L12 reiterates ‘shot’ in overlap with the teacher’s own use of ‘shot’, with the teacher seeking clarification through the word ‘yeah’ as a question. In line 10 L12 uses his L1 to seek clarification, unsure as to what the teacher is asking with ‘yeah?’ and then utilizing ‘shoot’ as the verb form he believes is correct. In line 11 the instructor affords interactional space to L12 in order to let him process which word form he is seeking. In line 12 L12 demonstrates realization, with

'oh' delineating awareness as he reiterates 'shoot'. In line 13 the teacher shifts focus to a pedagogical agenda by identifying 'shoot' as a base form to which L12 responds by focusing on the spelling of 'shoot', confirmed by the teacher in line 15. Lines 16 and 17 involve overlap as the learner repeats the word after spelling out the O sound and the teacher repeats the word 'shoot'. The interaction ends with the learner repeating 'shoot' with emphasis, signaling that he has identified the correct word form.

In this extract there is a great deal of interactional trouble that occurs as the talk unfolds. However, this interactional trouble does not limit or impede communication between the two parties which form this dyad. In line 2 L12 initiates repair of the teacher's previous offering. Having heard the incorrect form of the verb, the learner elects to repair the teacher's contribution, doing so again in line 4 after the teacher fails to iterate the desired response, drawing out the sound to emphasize the desired verb form. The teacher's appeal for repair in line 5 is not seized upon by L12 leading the instructor to add to the information provided in line 5 by stating the form of the verb he believes is desired in line 7, through self-selection. As has been stated there is overlap occurring in lines 5, 6, 7 and 8. However, rather than impede communication, there is no significant pause in the sequence of talk. Both parties are providing the same information in tandem and each appears to feel an equal right and responsibility to further the interaction and so clarify which form of the verb is correct. It is only in line 9 that there is a pause as the teacher performs a comprehension check. Up to this point the interlocutors are co-constructing the discourse and each is fully able to participate. Of note is that turns are distributed equally, with the instructor ceding participation rights to L12, only asking two direct questions of the learner in lines 9 and 13. Each question serves a different role; in line 9 the teacher is seeking clarification of a word, while line 13 performs the role of a status check of L12's knowledge. The teacher is taking the opportunity to assess L12's understanding of 'shoot' as a base form from which 'shot' is

derived. In this extract the goal of each participant is to clarify which verb form is correct, with the discourse that unfolds being directed towards that point. Thus, participants are working in tandem to achieve this. The final sequence of this extract (lines 14 to 18) involve the teacher scaffolding L12 through how 'shoot' is spelled now that he is aware that this is the base form of the word he has been discussing. In lines 16 and 17 the overlap that occurs indicates that both teacher and learner wish to enunciate the word, though for different purposes. For the teacher this is to demonstrate the word that L12 needs, while for L12 stating the word is a form of practice and appropriation. There is extended wait-time in line 17 as L12 pauses to internalize the word form before stating it for the final time with a great deal of emphasis.

As has been discussed earlier, interceding in classroom interaction argues for a level of awareness on the part of the instructor. This is particularly cogent when discussing repair. In certain cases an instructor may choose to 'let it pass' (Firth 1997), possibly because the pedagogical focus of the moment is on communication rather than form. In the extract above, the pedagogical focus is on producing a correct word form. However, the initial source of interactional trouble arises when the teacher produces a word form that differs from that which L12 has written. Thus, it is the learner who initiates repair first. What follows is the instructor making use of repair as a resource for learning as he requires L12 to consider if the word he has offered is grammatically correct. What this reveals about interactional competence when repair is performed by an instructor is that repair is informed by an intention to perform repair with the minimum of disruption to the interaction. Participant B uses limited turns at talk and highly-focused questions to bring the learner's attention to the word form that is required. He also employs extended wait-time to allow L12 to process the information that is being provided. Thus, space is afforded the learner to attend to the source of interactional trouble and utilize the repair offered to produce an appropriate language

form.

Extract 12: Participant C, Lesson Eight. Describing how a Bride Dresses 1.12.30 – 1.12.49

- 1 L32: and the (xxx) (4.6) bridge (.) bridge (1.1)
- 2 T: bride↑ (.)
- 3 L32: bride (.) the bride wear (.) very (0.8) very white (1.2) [uh
- 4 L33: [very white
- 5 L32: uh and she has make up [for
- 6 T: [what do you mean she has very white?
- 7 L32: u:h=
- 8 T: =you mean she [dress
- 9 L32: [u:h she clothes
- 10 T: she wear a white dress?
- 11 L32: uh (0.8) but (.) but the (.) clothes like a (1.9) u::h (3.7)棉被(.)
(blanket)
- 12 T: oo::h like a blanket↑ (0.5)

Participant C had this to say regarding how she chooses to monitor student-student interaction.

It's just sometimes I pass and I just kind of caught you know catch um I heard I overheard you know something and I thought it's interesting so I decided I will join in for the discussion. Something like that. But sometimes it could be that when I heard them having difficulties for example

The role of the instructor in dyadic interaction has been discussed earlier in this chapter (see Extracts 2 and 3 for examples of this). However, the interaction above is not an example of dyads replicating the interaction they have rehearsed for the class. In this extract the instructor is intervening in learner interaction as that interaction is unfolding and developing. Of note here will be whether or not this interaction differs

from extracts analyzed earlier and if there are interactional features relating to interactional competence displayed by the instructor that are distinct from the interactional features commented on in previous extracts.

The pedagogical goal of this lesson was for students to discuss different types of festivals from around the world. L31 and L33 are engaged in a discussion related to wedding ceremonies. This extract begins with L32 attempting to describe who takes part in a wedding ceremony. Thus, she begins with an attempt to name this participant in her L1 (Mandarin Chinese: n.b. this section was not able to be transcribed) and after wait time of 4.6 seconds, to name this role in English. As outlined above, Participant C will intervene in learner dyads when she believes interactants are experiencing interactional trouble. L31 offers an approximation of the word she wishes to say ('bridge' instead of 'bride'), an error in pronunciation that may potentially lead to trouble later in the interaction as this word may hamper L32's comprehension of the turn offered by L31. In turn 2 the instructor intervenes, offering very quick repair of L32's incorrect utterance which is appropriated by L32 in her next turn and is used to introduce the idea of what a bride wears during a wedding ceremony.

Hm here I just think communication...communicating, delivering the idea is more important so you know in this case I would just give them the right word you know because like bridge of course their partner is not going to get it in that situation.

The instructor has made an interactional decision to intervene. This decision is informed by the belief that communication is the motivating force in interaction and influences the manner in which the instructor chooses to intercede. The teacher's utterance is brief and very much indexical in that the utterance offered serves the need to both repair L32's utterance and allow the interaction between the two learners to proceed without hindrance.

In line 3 L32 is focused on describing the colour of the bride's dress, which L33 repeats as she interrupts L32 in line 4, an example of L33 verbalizing the previous turn

to demonstrate affiliation and also process the information offered in the previous turn. In line 5 L32 develops her theme, relating that a bride will wear make-up. There is overlap as the teacher attempts to get L32 to clarify her earlier utterance and explain what aspect of the bride is white, leading the teacher to use a question in line 6 to achieve this aim, as well as an example in line 8. Lines 8 and 9 show overlap as L32 is able to provide an answer, that while is not linguistically correct, does show understanding of the question asked in turn 6.

If you interrupt generally students are a bit embarrassed. But at this time you know when she say she wear something very white I want them to further develop their ideas you know. Because she could have said like a white dress or you know instead of wears very white.

When asked about the overlap that occurred in this sequence of interaction, Participant C observed that her purpose was to extend the contribution offered by the learner and shape the thinking of that learner. In other words there was a pedagogical reason for doing so, meaning that language use is working in the service of a pedagogical agenda. As can be seen from the interaction that develops, the teacher's interruption does not hinder L32 in maintaining a position in the discourse and contributing to the interaction, as is evident in her offering in line 11. Repair functions in this extract as an interactional resource deployed by the instructor as a means of facilitating communication and affording the learner a linguistic term that will allow her to interact as part of a dyad, with less interactional trouble.

In line 10 the teacher asks a further question as a status check of L32's comprehension, combining the choice of colour offered earlier (white) with repair (dress in response to clothes as offered in line 9). In line 11 L32 chooses to shift the topic slightly, describing the clothes as worn by the bride as looking a certain way, utilizing Mandarin Chinese to do so after a nearly 4 second period of wait time. In line 13 the instructor orients to this turn, using the target language to clarify what L32 has attempted to describe; that the wedding dress resembles a blanket.

In comparing this interaction to the previous extract, for example, it is clear that the instructor's focus is less on developing learner interaction by means of referential questions and more to do with meeting the developing interactional needs of the moment. By this I mean the instructor is focused on repair in order to facilitate interaction between the dyad she has decided to monitor. The majority of teacher turns in this extract are in the service of getting L32 to provide a linguistically correct utterance. The strategy employed here is one of questioning. In line 6 it is clear that the instructor has likely misheard L32's offering in line 3, missing the word 'wear'. The instructor explicitly pursues an interactional agenda of clarifying L32's utterance in line 3; note the use of 'what do you mean', 'you mean' and 'she wear'. It is not uncommon for teachers to repair interactional trouble (see Johnson 1995 and Seedhouse 2004 for examples). However, in this extract, the teacher is engaged in this task because she has identified a potential source of trouble and is seeking to perform repair to facilitate later interaction within a dyad. The teacher turns in 6, 7 and 10 serve as affordances. These turns utilize repair to clarify a response offered by a learner so that interaction can proceed free of a source of interactional trouble. While repair is used here to encourage the learner to produce a linguistically correct utterance, I would argue that the instructor's language use relates to her goal when monitoring (identifying sources of trouble). With regard to interactional competence, the instructor is basing her language use on awareness of the interactional context at work here, a discussion that may be impeded due to trouble that may hinder comprehension. Thus, awareness informs language use and the deployment of an interactional resource (in this case repair) to facilitate learner interaction. The instructor is conscious of the context in which she has chosen to intervene and provides affordances to further interaction between the learners that form a dyad. She describes her approach this way:

Um again it it it's you know for Taiwanese students they they know what they want to say but they may not have the vocabulary or they at that moment they don't know how to

say it and you know so I...it's it's like when I ask a question I I do the same thing as well, I keep uh doing uh rephrasing or ask you know just keep asking more questions you know to get more things out of the student and to to help them get to the um the point

It can be seen from the above extracts that repair is an interactional resource that is deployed in service of maintaining intersubjective relations in the classroom. Given that classroom interaction is a collaborative enterprise, repair mechanisms serve the purpose of showing that interactants are attending to each other's contributions, but also working to ensure understanding. In the above extracts, it can be seen that repair is utilized by these language instructors to perform a function in the social world of the EFL classrooms described here. That is to maintain intersubjective relations. This is done with the minimum of disruptions to interaction and learner contributions. With regard to interactional competence, repair serves as maintenance of the order of relations, and ensures that learners are able to continue to contribute to the interaction.

5.4.3 Concluding Focus Group

Upon completing the stimulated recall interviews with the participants a final focus group was held. This was done in order to provide a culminating point for the research project and also to glean participants' final thoughts regarding their involvement in this research and perceptions on classroom practice. The prevalent theme to emerge was noticing. In this context noticing refers to observations made related to classroom practice and a subsequent shift in acuity. It must be stressed here that such a shift in acuity would not necessarily lead to changes in classroom practice; data was not subsequently collected from the participants' classrooms so no such claims can be made. However, a change in awareness of language use may lead to changes in practice.

Participant C made the point that the stimulated recall process had an impact on how she approached subsequent lessons during the data collection phase. She stated that

I I guess you get the uh time to reflect between the time uh you know I was trying to do this but it doesn't work you know and also before the next uh thing you kind of...when you

know it's time to record again you know you kind of try to plan the lesson you know hoping that it will work better

What is being described here is an awareness that develops through a process of reflection and evaluation of practice. It also indicates what has been alluded to previously. There is a bind (though not dichotomy) inherent in teaching English as a second or foreign language. Lessons are shaped and informed by pedagogical goals but classroom language use is largely an improvised performance that arises within particular micro-contexts of classroom interaction. As such, a pedagogical goal serves to frame a micro-context but it is through language that this micro-context is brought into being and advanced as a sphere for language use and learning. With regard to this particular research, the above quote may appear to argue for this process of reflection influencing classroom practice and therefore the data collected. I would argue that this does not undermine claims made in this thesis with regard to interactional competence. As the discussion of what interactional competence is will elucidate, interactional competence cannot be understood without relating this construct to the notion of awareness.

Participant C also discussed the issue of teacher-talk as an inescapable part of classroom life. She held that

Teacher's talk is not always a bad thing. Uh as it's a listening and speaking class you need to give students you know sometimes a model of the language that you want them to produce. Yeah if while you are talking they are listening so it's still you know doing some kind of practice. It's you know whether you can provide enough uh chance for them to speak

This view of classroom practice contends that language is employed in the service of teaching and learning, both as input and output. The primary concern is to afford learners the opportunity to use the target language. The phrase 'provide uh enough chance for them to speak' is of note. What is being expressed here is an idea that teachers are able to promote the use of the target language by learners. However, this is

dependent upon employing a strategy (or offering an affordance) such as extended wait-time in order to do so.

Later in the focus group Participant B discussed this issue of teacher-talk, offering the view that

Yeah. Hm because the language in class I think we use would be...it seems that I I have the concept in my mind that OK and my goal is to let you talk so I would like to use you. I would like to guide them to guide them to catch one or two words from their mouth

Like Participant C, Participant B is focused upon allowing learners to utilize the target language. This concern informs and shapes practice to the extent of being expressed as being an overall pedagogical goal. Within the micro-contexts in which interaction occurs, Participant B sees his role as one of a facilitator of learner language. This implies that Participant B is willing to cede participation rights to learners and afford learners space in which to use the target language. What this suggests about interactional competence with regard to Participant B is that a global perspective shapes and frames the development of micro-contexts of interaction in his classroom. In other words, awareness is translated into language use and practice.

Participant A stated that this research project had engendered greater awareness as to both the use of wait-time and how employing questions functions as an affordance for promoting learner output. Awareness of how questions extend learner output and language use suggests that Participant A was engaged in a process of redeploying interactional resources (in this case questions) to afford greater language use by learners in micro-contexts of interaction. Interactional competence in this case is awareness leading to a change in language use – employing referential questions to extend learner language rather than employing display questions that will lead to limited learner output.

Hm the change for me is like uh I start to incorporate more time...uh to more activities for them to practice. And as for the... I ask them questions, I tend to use more wh questions than...And uh before this research I know I I need to use wh questions more for them to

talk more. Not after this. Yeah. But I start to figure out I realize I I tend to use more wh questions in my class. After compared with the first class to be developed.

The following chapter will focus on placing the findings of this research in a larger context. Therefore, what follows here is a brief overview of the findings of this research.

5.5 Summary

The following chapter will focus on placing the findings of this research in a larger context. Therefore, what follows here is a brief overview of the findings of this research.

The chapter began with a broad description of what interactional competence appears to be in the classroom context being investigated. In general terms this can be described as interlocutors fitting utterances together. This argues for the achievement of intersubjective relations between interlocutors, though given the institutional setting the research took place in and the fact that there are pedagogical goals at work, this differs from intersubjectivity as occurs in daily life. Three assumptions were outlined in relation to this epistemological position. However, a broad overview of interactional competence does not fully encompass how interactional competence is manifest; specifically it does not describe in detail how interactional features function within the broad remit of turn-taking and sequential organization. The following questions are then raised: what characterizes interactional competence within micro-contexts of classroom interaction and what features of interaction delineate interactional competence?

The subsequent section of analysis focused on these questions. The ecological perspective put forth by van Lier (2009 a) was adopted as a frame of reference for analyzing micro-contexts of classroom interaction and the interactional features that occur in these micro-contexts. It was demonstrated that the achievement of intersubjectivity indicates interactional competence but how this is done is endemic to

the micro-context in which interaction occurs. In other words, it is the goal of the interaction but it is through the deployment of interactional resources such as recipient design, repair and extended wait-time as a function of these, that this is achieved. These resources are affordances (van Lier 2009 b) that promote further action on the part of an interlocutor, in this case, language learners. The deployment of the interactional resources outlined above provides learners with interactional space which fosters intersubjectivity and facilitates language production. They are the mechanisms for fitting utterances together in the service of language teaching and learning.

In the chapter to follow findings of this research will be summarized and placed in a context beyond that of the research itself and how these findings relate to the teaching of English as a second or foreign language. The implications for teacher training and development will also be discussed.

Chapter 6. Discussion

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the methodological and pedagogical implications of this research. The data presented in the previous chapter will be discussed in relation to established literature on the construct of interactional competence. This initial section will be concerned with describing interactional competence in a general way; this is the purpose of the first research question that informs this thesis; what characterizes interactional competence within micro-contexts of interaction? In accordance with this aim, the analysis in this section examines interactional competence from the perspective of how the participants in this research manage interaction with learners in order to achieve and maintain intersubjective relations within the classroom setting. Due to the fact that interactional competence may vary from one teaching and learning context to the next, a general description provides a basis for examination of the features specific to interactional competence in micro-contexts of interaction, and in particular, the teaching and learning context the corpus of data examined here is drawn from (that of the Taiwanese English as a foreign language classroom). This will be the basis of section 6.2. In section 6.3 the discussion will shift to the interactional features that delineate interactional competence. The examination of these features will be informed by the notion of ‘affordances’ (van Lier 2000). Recipient design and repair will be addressed. It will be argued that these interactional features are deployed in tandem with wait-time and that it is wait-time that furnishes learners with interactional space to act upon the affordance offered by the instructor. Section 6.4 will focus on defining what interactional competence is, within the context of this study. This serves as a summation of the content of the research questions in this thesis. After describing interactional competence in general terms and the features ascribed to this construct, this section of discussion argues for a new definition of interactional competence with regard to the language learning classroom

that is comprehensive in scope, taking into account context (the English as a foreign language classroom), language use and the role of interactants (in this case teacher and learner), a departure from previous research into this construct. This will be done through revisiting previous definitions of interactional competence in relation to the data analyzed in this thesis. A more comprehensive definition of interactional competence is proposed which accounts for the role of participants in interaction, a significant contribution of this thesis to the ongoing discussion regarding interactional competence.

Discussion will then shift to the wider implications of this research with regard to professional development for teachers of English as a second or foreign language. The idea of data-driven learning (Johns 1991) as a method of professional development vis a vis interactional competence will be examined. This section of discussion directly relates to the preceding sections with its emphasis on awareness as the impetus for displays of interactional competence on the part of language instructors. A data-driven approach also offers the potential to raise the awareness of instructors with regard to how interactional competence is developed and manifest in classroom settings and, as it will be argued, awareness is an initial step in making changes to practice in order to interact in a more competent manner with learners.

6.1 The Characteristics of Interactional Competence

This section addresses the first research question of this thesis, ‘What characterizes interactional competence?’ Here, I will discuss the problematic issue of describing interactional competence, given that micro-contexts of interaction vary from setting to setting. Classroom settings in particular vary according to the profile of students and instructor. However, classroom interaction, like interaction in other settings, is goal-oriented. As Seedhouse (2004) observes, the institutional goal of the second or foreign language classroom is the teaching and learning of the target language. Yet, I

would argue, there is a further goal on the part of language instructors informing and influencing interaction in language classrooms during episodes of interaction. This is the achievement and maintenance of intersubjectivity. This allows learners to display understanding of interaction as it occurs and participate using the target language. Thus, intersubjectivity in this institutional setting differs from intersubjectivity as demonstrated in daily life. As was argued in 5.3 the minutiae of interaction (interactional features such as recipient design, repair, and wait-time) are employed to further this overall aim. Interactional resources are deployed by teachers for a purpose. It is argued in this thesis that this purpose is to achieve and maintain intersubjectivity with learners in episodes of interaction. The situation was described in 5.3 as follows:

1. Turn-taking is the mechanism (and resource) by which interactional competence can be examined.
2. This in turn implies that in broad terms interactional competence is the business of interactants coordinating these turns to achieve imperatives which guide the interaction. This process is influenced by the roles interactants possess.
3. The major imperative guiding interaction is the achievement of intersubjectivity; by this it is meant how interactants display understanding to each other.

Achieving and maintaining intersubjectivity is a process of co-construction between interactants. An analysis of a brief sample of the data in extract 2 shows how this is done.

Extract 1

- 27 T: >>oh come from a small family>> (.) I- I- come from right lai (.) use the
28 complete sentence (.) right (.) ok (.) I come from (.) go*
- 29 L9: xxx
- 30 T: I↑ (.)

31 L9: I comes (.) uh-
32 T: all right (.) so (.) >>if you come from a small family how many people are
33 there in your family>> (.)
34 L9: five (.)
35 T: oh there are ↑ (.) lai go?
36 L9: there are five people in my family=
37 T: = >>oh there are five people in your family (.) so you come from a small
38 family>> (.) good good good (.) right?

It can be observed in the above extract that achieving intersubjectivity is a complex and dynamic process that is contingent upon an awareness of the interactional needs of the moment. As can be seen, the teacher deploys resources such as recipient design in lines 32 and 33 when becoming aware of interactional trouble on the part of L9 in line 31, utilizing a DIU (Koshik 2002) (designedly incomplete utterance) in line 35 and back-channeling and an evaluation of L9's contribution in lines 37 and 38.

This extract illustrates that involving learners in episodes of spoken interaction requires intention to inform action. What I am describing here is 'awareness in action'. In line 27 the instructor provides information to the learner as to the form the next contribution should take, both in linguistic content and form. In line 31 L9 offers an utterance that differs from what is required. However, in line 32 the instructor accepts L9's offering and shifts focus, incorporating L9's offering into his turn-at-talk and requesting a further contribution from L9, which is provided in line 34. In line 35 the teacher scaffolds the learner, providing an example to further the next turn at talk. According to Young (2008), 'Interactional competence is a relationship between participants' employment of linguistic and interactional resources and the contexts in which they are employed'. As can be seen above, the deployment of resources (recipient design, DIU's) by the instructor is contingent upon attending to his own language use

and also that of the learner and managing the interaction to include the learner.

Therefore, there is a reflexive relationship at work for the instructor between being both participant and instructor; the instructor's language use is, therefore, goal-oriented.

Intersubjective relations must be achieved and maintained within the interaction to enhance learner participation. The above extract provides evidence for the claims of this thesis that interactional competence is concerned with achieving and maintaining intersubjective relations and this aim is in turn informed by awareness of the interactional needs of the moment. The deployment of interactional resources is likewise influenced by awareness and it is to this that the next section of this discussion now turns.

6.2 Features of Interactional Competence

The literature chapter of this thesis discussed the idea of 'affordances' (van Lier 2000). In brief, these are resources that promote action on the part of an interlocutor. The affordances identified in the corpus of data analyzed in this research were recipient design and repair. It was decided to treat wait-time as a function of the affordances recipient design and repair, rather than as an affordance in and of itself (for more on wait-time see section 2.4.3). Evidence has been presented in this thesis that wait-time is the creation of space for learners to participate in interaction. Wait-time plays a significant role in providing learners with time to process an affordance and formulate a response. A close analysis of data extracts such as extracts 5 and 7 shows that wait-time is extended to learners as part of recipient design. Extract 7 is a particularly strong example of this. Below is a modified section of this data.

Extract 7

1 T: how do you describe how he is sitting? (2.5)

2 L50: uh (3.2)

3 T: its very easy right? (.) how do you call this? (1.8) ((crosses thumbs))

4 LL: close (.)

The instructor is engaged in eliciting a particular piece of vocabulary from learners and it is of note here how the questions asked in line 1 is modified in line 3 in response to the 3.2 second pause offered by L50. This example of recipient design is offered in concert with 1.8 seconds of wait-time in order to provide space for the learners to process the affordance and formulate a response. Maroni (2011, p.2081) states wait-time ‘fosters the pupils’ involvement and the quality of their answers’. The importance of this in regard to interactional competence is that the employment of interactional space for learners is necessary to involve learners in interaction. Learners require time to consider what the instructor is requiring of them and offer an appropriate response. Given that affordances promote action within learning contexts, this research shows that wait-time is an integral element of the provision of affordances and a significant factor in the construct of interactional competence.

Repair was also identified as a feature of interactional competence in the data. Hellermann (2011) describes repair as a competency; attending to interactional trouble so as to not impede interaction can be a problematic endeavour (for more on repair in second language classrooms see Seedhouse 2004). An analysis of the data in section 5.3.1 showed that repair was performed in order to further learner interaction; recall that extracts 13, 14 and 15 all involve learners attempting to communicate personal meanings in relation to the topics under discussion. Of note in each extract was that repair did not impede interaction or end learner participation in the spoken discourse. Rather, learners were provided with the linguistic input they needed to continue with their turns at talk. Extract 12 exemplifies this claim. L32 is able to continue describing what brides wear at weddings and provide a personal perspective on a wedding dress occasionally resembling a blanket. The learner is still engaged in the interaction (and therefore utilizing the target language which in turn provides opportunities for learning).

This coincides with the instructor's goal as stated in the interview data that goes with this extract that learners develop their ideas through using the target language. This is an example of language use and pedagogical goal working together, which Walsh (2002) posits facilitates opportunities for learning. This makes clear that utilizing repair in a manner which furthers learner participation in interaction is an example of interactional competence.

6.3 Defining Interactional Competence

It is difficult to categorize interactional competence (recall the wide range of definitions mentioned in this thesis), and I would argue that this plethora of definitions exists owing to the fact that interactional competence is context-specific. Therefore, it is imperative to describe and analyze the context where this research took place in broad terms by outlining pedagogical goals and also in relation to the micro-contexts of interaction (the episodes of interaction themselves) in order to construct a definition of interactional competence that takes context and participants into account.

After having examined and described the interactional resources that delineate interactional competence, discussion will now turn to interactional competence itself. What interactional competence is in the context of the Taiwanese EFL higher education classroom will be considered. In order to do so it is necessary to consider other definitions of interactional competence and how these definitions explain and account for interactional competence. Of particular importance is how interactional competence is described and related to context and interactional roles. Before continuing this discussion it is pertinent to remind the reader that interactional competence is a construct; that is, it is a synthesis of a disparate group of elements (in this case, various interactional resources and phenomena) in order to explain and account for episodes of interaction appropriate to the moment. As such, it is an attempt to describe and explain interactional competence in one particular local context, rather than account for

interactional competence in all EFL contexts. Given that interactional competence is a construct, it is a *representation* (italics mine) of the interplay and relationship between interactional resources and context. This much is agreed on in most definitions of interactional competence. What will be discussed in the following section is how the definition of interactional competence developed here differs from other examples.

The reader is reminded that in broad terms interactional competence is the business of sequencing utterances together to achieve intersubjective relations.

Recall that Young's (1999) definition argues for knowing how to participate in interactional practices, with interaction itself serving as the venue for displaying such knowledge. Chaloub-Deville (2003) makes a similar case. Kelly-Hall (1995) describes interactional competence as 'interactive practices' that are predicated on the episodic nature of interaction. Young (2008, p.100) devised a new definition of interactional competence that is worth reiterating. 'Interactional competence is a relationship between participants' employment of linguistic and interactional resources and the contexts in which they are employed'. Kelly-Hall (1999) offers a further description of interactional competence that emphasizes language use as being dynamic as it arises in and out of evolving contexts. Hellermann (2007) asserts that interactional competence is an evolving level of participation where facility in deploying interactional resources increases over time. It is, therefore, an inherently social process. Markee (2008) describes interactional competence as the performing of an increasingly complex range of interaction dependent on an expanding level of fluent and accurate language use. It is worth noting that these definitions are describing interaction as it occurs between interlocutors in general terms. These definitions do not, for example, take into account specific roles such as teacher and learner. Terms such as 'more competent interlocutor' are used when describing what is felt to be an unequal level of language ability (see Nassaji and Swain 2000 for more on this, in particular distinctions between native and

non-native English-speaking interlocutors). Previous research on interactional competence has focused on learners of English as a second or foreign language becoming interactionally competent. Thus, language learners and how interactional competence demonstrates learning of the target language have been given precedence. While this is a useful approach to examining the construct of interactional competence, it fails to consider the role of the language instructor as the instigating force behind much of the interaction that occurs in second language classrooms. As has been previously discussed, the second language classroom is a site of an institutional form of discourse; in short, the language employed is largely in service of furthering teaching and learning. This is in no way arguing that the language classroom is not also a site of social relations. However, unlike social relations as they occur in the world at large, social relations in the classroom are predicated on teaching and learning. Thus, the language use of the instructor is informed and influenced by this imperative. Given that this is the case, language use on the part of the instructor is based on awareness of multiple factors. These include the needs of the learner (encompassing the deployment of interactional resources such as recipient design, wait-time and repair), and as a corollary to this maintaining and attending to micro-contexts as a site of interaction (ensuring that turns-at-talk are maintained and evenly distributed), and therefore, creating space for learning.

The definition of interactional competence I wish to offer applies to the context of the second language classroom and is as follows:

Interactional competence is the deployment of interactional and linguistic resources informed by an awareness of the needs of an interlocutor in order to maintain intersubjective relations.

The emphasis here on awareness is not merely semantic. I would contend that awareness is a crucial factor for interacting competently with others. Awareness argues

for a deployment and display of interactional resources based on being conscious of what is appropriate to the interaction of a given moment. Unlike many studies that employ Conversation Analysis, this research also utilized stimulated recall interviews to gain participants' perspectives on their classroom interaction. Through hearing the thoughts and opinions of participants it is possible to gain insight into how awareness of how micro-context and language use are inter-related and reflexively, participants are also made aware of their own thought processes and increased awareness. An example of this is Participant C's feedback in Extract 12. In reflecting on how and when she offers repair the informant is iterating a perspective on practice and what informs her language use. Thus, I would argue that awareness is predicated on a process of evaluation and reflection. Gaining the views of participants strengthens, rather than weakens, claims made by the classroom data. Further, in the case of language use by teachers in the second language classroom, this awareness is shaped by the nature of the interaction that is to occur; interaction is goal-oriented in as much as it is directed towards the teaching and learning of the target language. As micro-contexts of interaction are formed and developed, teachers go about interaction with a goal in mind. This does not mean that interaction is pre-formulated by the teacher; as stated earlier, language use in classrooms is largely an improvisational performance. However, language use in the second language classroom by teachers is informed and shaped by awareness of pedagogical goals and the arising needs of the learner as interaction develops.

Recall that recipient design, extended wait-time and repair were described as interactional resources that indicate interactional competence (see section 5.3 for more on this). Taking recipient design as an example, it is clear that this is an affordance that is employed by language instructors based on awareness. Utterances are recast in order to maintain and further intersubjectivity. The instructor is aware that the language he or

she has employed is not furthering the agenda of teaching and learning. Deployed in tandem with extended wait-time, recipient design is a display of awareness of the needs of an interlocutor. The same can be said of repair. Each affordance is offered based on the needs of an interlocutor; in the context of the second language classroom the learners are the interlocutor the instructor develops classroom discourse with. Interactional competence is, therefore, what I would term 'awareness in action'.

As has been discussed throughout this thesis, a definitive definition of interactional competence cannot be said to exist. However, this does not appear to have arisen due to widely varying epistemological perspectives regarding this construct; when examining and discussing interactional competence, the notion of context is axiomatic and a determining factor in how interactional competence is expressed and enacted (see Hellermann 2006, Kelly-Hall 1995). In other words, interactional competence is shaped in and of the distal and proximate context in which it occurs. Therefore, as outlined above, defining interactional competence is highly problematic. Contexts differ as do the interactional resources employed in those contexts. Current definitions of interactional competence diverge in several crucial aspects and this argues for an evolving view of this construct within the academic community. An example of this is Young who developed alternative views of this construct (1999, 2008 respectively). The 2008 perspective on interactional competence explicitly describes context as a vital factor in how interactional competence is manifest, while the earlier version described interactional competence as a form of 'knowing', an ability to participate in spoken discourse. 'Knowing' implies attainment based on prior experience and this theme will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter when professional development of language teachers is undertaken. However, there appears to be a tension at work between participation in spoken discourse as an activity that indicates interactional competence and the deployment of interactional resources to achieve interactional

competence. This echoes another debate when discussing interactional competence; the notion of interaction denoting learning itself (knowing how to participate) and interaction as the forum for the teaching and learning of objects of knowledge (vocabulary items or grammar patterns for example). This debate is not a concern of this thesis but this issue is raised to highlight the contentious nature of the construct of interactional competence. This also raises the question of whether there is a dichotomy at work when attempting to define interactional competence. Is interactional competence a display of instinctive ‘knowing’ or a conscious deployment of interactional resources on the part of interlocutors? In using the term ‘instinctive’ I am describing a display of knowledge that is based on prior experience but that is not informed by a deliberate or strategic application of interactional resources.

In broad terms the context being discussed in this thesis is the English as a second or foreign language classroom in Taiwan. In common with all classrooms where languages are taught and learned, the form of discourse at work is institutional in nature and is focused on the goal of teaching and learning the target language. Classroom interaction is inherently goal-oriented discourse and it is pedagogical goals that define and shape the interaction that occurs. Therefore, language is ‘the vehicle and object of instruction’ (Seedhouse 1996) and it is the study of the language employed in such a setting that is the concern of this thesis with regard to the construct of interactional competence. As with any research that draws upon the sociocultural perspective of learning as a social activity, it is to displays of language use in the service of learning that attention is drawn. This is the justification for the use of Applied Conversation Analysis as part of the methodology of this research. In examining the architecture of micro-contexts of interaction wider claims regarding interactional competence can be made. These claims are also supported by the use of focus group and stimulated recall interview data.

Current definitions of interactional competence identify interlocutors as a general category for interactants engaged in spoken discourse. As stated earlier the term ‘more competent interlocutor’ is often used to describe or account for any disparity between language ability with regard to participants in spoken discourse. When describing interactional competence and its place in the English as a second or foreign language classroom, research has focused on this construct with regard to language learners. What this particular research has argued for is an emphasis on the role the instructor plays on facilitating classroom interaction, given that the teacher is the shaping force of the interaction that unfolds in language classrooms. Owing to this, there is a gap in the literature with regard to interactional competence and, therefore, a greater need to consider the role the teacher plays in classroom interaction, which this research helps fill; in particular, how interactional competence as manifest by the instructor leads to further opportunities for learner involvement in classroom discourse.

Chapter Two began with the justification that it was in episodes of interaction between the teacher and individual language learners that interactional competence was displayed (and could therefore be analyzed). Walsh (2011) holds that interactional competence is a collaborative enterprise, which entails co-construction of discourse. This in turn suggests that interactional competence is more than the business of interlocutors fitting utterances together. This ‘fitting together’ is informed by a purpose - to achieve intersubjectivity. It was claimed in section 5.3 that this is what characterizes interactional competence in micro-contexts of interaction. As has been illustrated throughout this thesis, within micro-contexts of interaction, this concern frames episodes of interaction and as should be clear to the reader, is a somewhat broad perspective on interactional competence. However, this in no way undermines the claims made. Interaction is an inherently social activity that is shaped by the need to achieve intersubjectivity.

To date definitions offered in the literature refer to interactional competence in a variety of ways. As has been stated earlier this is hardly surprising given the highly-contextual nature of interactional competence and indeed some definitions relate interactional context to context (for example Young 2008 and Kelly-Hall 1995). However, this thesis adopts a different position with regard to how interactional competence can be defined. It has been made clear to the reader that when analyzing classroom discourse, the role of the instructor is vital in instigating and shaping the interaction that occurs. Language use on the part of the instructor is influenced by both pedagogical goals and the needs of learners as interaction unfolds. Therefore, instructors are required to take a varying perspective on, and role in, interaction. Needs of the learner and the maintenance of micro-contexts of interaction determine how and when the instructor is engaged in interaction with learners. Therefore, a new perspective on second language classroom interactional competence has been offered here which differs from earlier definitions as it takes the role of the instructor as its chief concern. The importance of this is that awareness is made the central factor in interacting competently with others. Awareness determines how interactional resources are deployed and for what purpose. In the extracts that make up this thesis the purpose being discussed is the teaching and learning of English as second or foreign language. This is a new perspective on interactional competence as it is manifest by language instructors at the site of the second language classroom and takes into account the role of the instructor with regard to the use of interactional resources in relation to pedagogical goals and the interactional needs of a given moment. It is 'awareness in action' and therefore, a display of knowing that functions according to an awareness of the interactional needs of the moment. This is significant as other definitions of interactional competence do not discuss or account for how awareness informs action within spoken discourse.

This research makes use of Applied Conversation Analysis as one of the methods of data analysis. As with previous work on the construct of interactional competence, this method was employed to reveal the micro-details of interaction as it unfolded. Given that interactional competence involves multiple interlocutors, turn-taking is the mechanism by which interactional competence is displayed, and thus, manifest and observable. This renders interaction able to be analyzed. In Chapter Three a case was made that Conversation Analysis alone would not reveal how interactional competence comes into being. Focus group data and stimulated recall interview data were also analyzed, in a further departure from other studies of interactional competence (though Dings 2007 is an exception). In utilizing these research methods, the reasoning of participants with regard to how interactional decisions were taken and interactional resources deployed is made visible to participant and analyst. While not wishing to undermine the claims made of Conversation Analysis as a method that allows data to speak for itself, I would say that it provides a surface view of the interaction from the perspective of participants; it reveals what interactants have done but will not necessarily afford insight into why interactants have behaved as they do. Therefore, stimulated recall interviews permit participants to gain a deeper understanding of the interactional processes that inform their classroom practice and through a process of questioning, develop an awareness of context and interactional processes that are displayed. As this thesis is arguing that interactional competence is a display of awareness, such awareness can only develop through a dialogic process whereby practitioners are able to analyze their classroom practice in conjunction with examining evidence (in this case transcripts of classroom discourse) of how interaction unfolds within their own classroom context. Due to the fact that this research is concerned with the role of the teacher in shaping classroom discourse, the teacher could not be divorced from the research process. The perspective of participants on classroom interaction and

interactional competence within their classroom context allowed for a further level of reflexivity regarding the classroom data and also served to consolidate the arguments concerning interactional competence. Thus, unlike other research into the construct of interactional competence, a multiple-methods approach may proffer richer data that yields greater insight into how interactional competence develops and is manifest.

6.4 Pedagogical Implications

The final section of this chapter is concerned with the utility this research has regarding language teaching. Kramsch's (1986) call for the teaching of interactional competence to language learners focused on the needs of learners to know how and when to interact. What was not overtly discussed in this paper was the role of the teacher in facilitating this process. Thus, this work fills a gap in research into interactional competence with regard to the language teaching in general and teacher education in particular. This research has shown that a process of reflection and self-evaluation facilitates a deeper understanding of classroom language use on the part of instructors. What is being described here is the construct 'reflective practice', a term coined by Schon (1983). This is generally accepted as action in a professional setting informed by a process of reflection; with regard to classroom practice, it infers a change in teaching based upon an awareness of some shortcoming in classroom performance. However, as this thesis has illustrated, it is awareness and a developing understanding of classroom language use that underpin the notion of interactional competence offered here. It is to this notion of possible problems in classroom practice and developing an awareness of context and classroom language use that discussion will now turn.

Walsh's (2006) SETT Framework provides language teachers with a tool for being able to describe the micro-contexts of interaction in which language is employed to further opportunities for language learning. In providing a method for teachers to describe what is occurring in episodes of interaction, awareness of context and language

use is raised. In turn this leads to a greater understanding of the reflexive relationship between context and language use. This may promote changes to practice at a later date. If reflective practice is regarded as an internal process rather than a dialogic one, as in the case of Moon (2004) who states

‘reflective practice is a form of mental processing with a purpose and/or an anticipated outcome that is applied to relatively complicated or unstructured ideas for which there’s not an obvious solution’

questions are then raised as to how effective reflective practice is as a means for engendering more effective teaching and learning. If instructors are engaged in an internal process without recourse to concrete examples of classroom practice, I would argue that such a process of reflective practice is largely ineffective. This form of reflection is based upon retrospective intuition regarding classroom events, not the reality of what actually occurred in, for example, an episode of interaction with a learner. Mann and Walsh (2013) argue for a ‘rebooting’ of the construct of reflective practice, with samples of data serving as the means by which classroom practice is reflected on. Utilizing a data-driven approach (Johns 1991) grounds reflective practice in the reality of classroom events and thus renders this process more effective. This thesis has employed video-recorded samples of classroom data and transcripts of that data in conjunction with a process of reflective practice through stimulated recall interviews as part of the SETT Framework (2006). This research shows a way forward for practitioners to reflect on interactional competence in their own context. Chomsky (1965) makes a distinction between competence and form in communication, describing competence as having and applying a set of rules. Using this metaphor, this research offers classroom practitioners insight into how to develop and manifest interactional competence; in other words, knowing when and how to apply these rules. Interactional competence can be acquired through a process of reflection and analysis of classroom data, either alone or with a peer. One method of doing this would be to record a small

corpus of classroom data and then examining the video in order to find examples of episodes of interaction where the teacher feels he or she is manifesting interactional competence. This method could also be utilized to uncover examples where interactional competence is not manifest. This would then lead to a process of transcribing these brief episodes and comparing the similarities and differences in the quality of the interaction with regard to how participation by learners is enhanced. Through this process, awareness of language use and context is raised.

However, this also raises a series of questions regarding what awareness instructors gain of this relationship between language use and context. In order to facilitate the process of reflective practice informed by data, I would suggest the following questions as a means of focusing the attention of instructors on interactional competence as they examine filmed classroom data. Practitioners wishing to reflect on interactional competence could focus on questions such as:

1. How is intersubjectivity with learners achieved? What affordances does the instructor provide to enhance learner participation?
2. Is the instructor able to tailor language use to involve learners in spoken discourse? Is recipient design employed to include learners in spoken interaction?
3. How is repair dealt with? Is the instructor able to utilize repair in a way that does not impede learner contributions to spoken discourse? If so, why not?
4. How is wait-time extended to learners? Is this done in conjunction with, and therefore contingent upon, affordances such as recipient design and repair? Does the instructor provide too little wait-time?
5. What language resources does the instructor utilize to provide opportunities for learners to be part of interaction? For example, how does the instructor deal with learner contributions in order to demonstrate affiliation? Is back-channeling of a

learner's contribution one such example?

6. Is the instructor able to articulate an understanding of interactional competence within their own teaching context and so demonstrate an awareness of the impact of interactional competence on teaching and learning?

This research also has relevance to CA-for-LT (Conversation Analysis for Language Teaching), a term used by von Compennolle (2011) to describe the use of Conversation Analysis as a method for displaying discourse options available to instructors within classroom interaction. What will be discussed here is similar in intent, though focused specifically on the construct of interactional competence.

Given that this thesis argues for a definition of interactional competence as based on awareness of the needs of an interlocutor and the interaction of a given moment, it is logical to assume that such awareness can be developed. The routine nature of language teaching in the classroom context has been described in great detail in literature related to this field (see Johnson 1995, Walsh 2005 and 2010). This implies that much of classroom practice is a form of 'knowing' based on experience that is largely instinctual. However, I would argue that awareness can be fostered and developed and so influence classroom practice with regard to interacting competently with learners. In other words, the research in this thesis has a practical application. Conversation Analysis has been proposed as a potential method for fostering teacher development (see von Compennolle 2011a, Seedhouse and Sert 2011) and for developing authentic teaching materials (Bowles 2011). The benefits of using Conversation Analysis as a means of teacher development tend to focus on the fact that Conversation Analysis utilizes empirical data taken from authentic examples of language in use within classroom contexts. Rather than an artificial description of classroom language, such examples show how interaction develops and unfolds. I would argue that the research in this thesis will engender greater understanding on the part of language instructors as to how

interactional competence develops and is manifest in the language classroom, so furthering professional development. My perspective on professional development with regard to this research is that interacting competently with learners can be taught to instructors. This can be done through utilizing brief extracts of classroom data as stated above, such as those that form the analysis section of this thesis and examining the analysis of this data. Thus, concepts such as affordances (recipient design/repair in conjunction with extended wait-time) can be examined and potentially internalized and then manifest in classroom practice. This research could also be employed in teacher-training programmes that employ the analytic framework of Conversation Analysis. It would then be possible for instructors to monitor and evaluate their own practice with these concepts in mind. As the findings of this research have shown, affordances such as recipient design and repair are deployed based on awareness and so provide a starting point for instructors in analyzing their own practice. I am not arguing for these affordances as the only possible expressions of affordances in classroom interaction; they offer a starting point for examining interactional competence in dyadic interaction between teacher and learner. It is probable that other affordances (back-channeling was found to occur often in the data collected for this research, for example, but due to space limitations was not included) occur in dyadic interaction of this nature and further research would need to be performed to determine what other affordances relate to interactional competence in the context of the English as a second or foreign language classroom. This research can aid in raising awareness of the interactional resources deployed by language teachers as they interact with learners and how intersubjective relations are achieved and maintained. This in turn will lead to a greater awareness of how interactional competence develops and is manifest in interaction. This research provides greater insight into how interactional competence is developed and manifest in dyadic interaction between teachers and learners.

There are, however, some caveats regarding the approach I have outlined above. In arguing that teachers can and should develop interactional competence, it may be felt that I am implying that there is a deficiency in the practice of instructors that must be compensated for. That is not the intention of this research. Rather, I would suggest that ongoing professional development is a concern of language instructors and will, in turn, benefit language learners.

The methodological and pedagogical implications of this research have been discussed. In the following chapter conclusions will be drawn regarding this research. The limitations of this research project will also be addressed, as well as directions of future research in the field of interactional competence.

Chapter 7. Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the arguments made in the preceding chapters of this thesis regarding interactional competence, referring to the literature and data that has been presented. This will be done by examining the research questions that informed this research and summarizing the points relevant to these questions. Suggestions for further areas of research will conclude the chapter.

7.1 Research Questions

Two research questions were presented in this thesis. In the discussion to follow they will be summarized. The first question posed was, ‘What characterizes interactional competence within micro-contexts of classroom interaction?’ Inherent in this question is the notion that interactional competence can be seen to be displayed in classroom interaction and, therefore, can be described and characterized. Given that interaction is a social accomplishment, the idea of context is of importance here in that it frames the environment in which interaction occurs. In other words, the setting being analyzed is that of the English as a second or foreign language classroom. Therefore, the discourse that occurs here is institutional in nature and directed towards a purpose – that of teaching and learning the target language, as put forth by Seedhouse (2004). While this differs from interaction in social settings, there is a similarity at work as the language is the means by which intersubjectivity is achieved. More specifically, in this setting intersubjectivity refers to the coordination of turns at talk (Matsuo 2001). Learners are provided opportunities for learning in and through the target language and interaction is an affordance through which learners can both test out hypotheses about the language being learned and use the language itself to communicate personal perspectives. To do so, instructors and learners must co-construct spoken discourse and take turns at talk. Therefore, interaction is directed toward achieving intersubjectivity.

To answer this first research question, a sample of data from each instructor's classroom containing several turns-at-talk between the teacher and learners was analyzed to determine how interaction was organized and managed by the instructor. It was seen that the interaction was directed towards coordinating turns at talk, with the instructor shaping interaction and the turns offered by the learner to achieve this, suggesting that the imperative guiding interaction in micro-contexts of episodic interaction is achieving intersubjectivity, though this differs from how this is achieved in daily life, for example completing an interlocutor's turn-at-talk. This argues for initially assuming a broad view of interaction in micro-contexts of spoken discourse (see section 5.3) in order to characterize interactional competence before attending to the features of interaction that delineate interactional competence.

The second research question of this thesis was, 'What features of interaction delineate interactional competence?' In order to answer this question several extracts of classroom data were analyzed to determine which interactional features were recurring and how the deployment of these features on the part of instructors provided learning opportunities for learners. It was discovered that recipient design, repair, and extended wait-time as a function of these affordances were features of interaction that delineated interactional competence. With regard to extended wait-time, in a departure from previous research into interactional competence, it is argued that wait-time does not in and of itself function as an affordance. Rather it is employed in tandem with an affordance such as recipient design (modifying one's speech according to the needs of an interlocutor) and repair. It is these affordances that impel the use of extended wait-time. Wait-time is the means by which learners are given space to process and act upon the affordances offered by the instructor. This thesis was also concerned with offering a more comprehensive definition of interactional competence. After describing interactional competence in broad terms and analyzing the features that delineate

interactional competence in the context being investigated, this served as a means of encapsulating the aims of this research; to characterize interactional competence, describe the features of this construct and then define this construct in light of the data collected. The definition of interactional competence offered is as follows:

Interactional competence is the deployment of interactional and linguistic resources informed by an awareness of the needs of an interlocutor in order to maintain intersubjective relations.

In proposing this definition of interactional competence, unlike previous definitions of this construct (see Kelly-Hall 2005, Hellermann 2008, Markee 2008, Young 2008) awareness is a key facet in this reconceptualising of interactional competence. This notion of awareness is important as it emerged through the process of reflection and evaluation participants underwent through focus groups and stimulated recall interviews. In reflecting on their teaching practice and language use participants displayed a perspective on and awareness of the interactional decisions that informed turns-at-talk in micro-contexts of interaction. Instructors evaluated and examined their own use of language and how it then influenced the language use of learners. Unlike previous research, this thesis was concerned with interactional competence as displayed by language instructors and how space for learning occurred as a result of this.

7.2 Pedagogical Implications

This thesis has been concerned with examining how interactional competence is manifest and developed by language teachers in the higher education context in Taiwan. The findings suggest that interactional competence can be examined and described. Further interaction between teacher and learner is informed by an overall aim of achieving intersubjectivity as pedagogical goals are promulgated through interaction. This is done through the deployment of interactional resources that include recipient design and repair. What this means for second or foreign language teaching is that

interactional competence can be taught to language teachers through a process of reflective practice that has at its heart a concern with empirical data collected from the classroom and analyzed with regard to affordances such as recipient design and repair and extended wait-time playing a supportive role to these affordances. Reflective practice can be fostered by analyzing data through a reflective lens that concerns itself with how interactional competence is developed by specifically examining features such as recipient design and repair in relation to achieving intersubjectivity with learners in episodes of interaction. Practitioners can approach interaction from a perspective of achieving higher-quality interaction with learners. This means using language to promote and maintain intersubjective relations as the pedagogical goals of interactional episodes are gone about.

7.3 Limitations and Further Research

As was discussed earlier in Chapter Three, this research examined the language classrooms of three language instructors. While approximately 24 hours of data was examined, this represents a small participant sample. Therefore, this research provides a starting point for analyzing interactional competence on the part of language teachers. A larger cohort of teachers needs to be examined, as well as a sample of instructors in differing educational contexts; it would be interesting to see how interactional competence is manifest in settings outside higher education, such as at primary or secondary school level. The data sample utilized in this thesis is relatively homogenous (three instructors from the same higher education institution); greater validity to the claims made here with regard to interactional competence would be lent by examining this construct in other context and with a larger and less homogenous sample of participants.

In arguing for awareness as a force that shapes how classroom discourse is co-constructed between instructors and learners (towards the goal of achieving

intersubjectivity), this research adopts the position that learning how and when to interact is the primary goal of interactional competence. Arguing for the importance of awareness is a new perspective on the construct of interactional competence and as has been stated above, is based on the idea of considering the perspective of participants in the interaction being analyzed, rather than solely attending to the details of the interaction itself. As shown in this thesis, language instructors possess goals that shape interaction and use language to achieve those goals. Therefore, in examining how interactional competence is displayed and embodied in classroom interaction, future research should consider the role of the instructor in shaping classroom discourse and examine the language use of instructors in conjunction with the perspective of the instructor on that language use. This would allow for a greater understanding of the English as a second or foreign language classroom and the role the instructor plays in providing space for learning. Given that language is the means by which teaching and learning are achieved, language use on the part of the instructor is in need of further research in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning that occurs in the context of the language classroom. However, this is not the only context in which further research into the interactional competence is required. The implications of this study are also relevant to other situations in which language learning take place. How interactional competence is developed and manifest in other learning situations is in need of investigation. An example of this is in regard to content classrooms; though language learning is not the specific goal in this context, it is in and through language (in other words, interaction) that opportunities for learning are created. Therefore, an examination of interactional competence in content classrooms or in CLIL (Content Learning in Language) settings is of importance. What interactional competence is in other language learning contexts is also a further area worthy of research. The data collected for this thesis while large in size (approximately 24 hours) is based on the

classroom practice of three teachers and is limited to three classes in the same university. This is in general terms a relatively homogenous reference sample and surely does not account for how interactional competence is developed and manifest in other contexts. Research conducted in other settings is necessary to encapsulate and test the findings of this thesis, given the limitations described. Settings such as small group English language tutorials which possess no predetermined topic, Chinese language classes, English language oral proficiency interviews either with an instructor or with a peer, classes in which learners are English as a lingua franca users (though the instructor is not) and English-Chinese language exchange sessions between native speakers of those languages are all areas in which I have begun collecting data in order to examine interactional competence in other contexts. Initial findings suggest that interactional competence is achieved in a manner that differs from that described in this thesis. This indicates that context is a pivotal factor in interacting competently. These are settings in which language learning is the explicit motivation for the encounters which occur; research into how interactional competence develops ‘in the wild’ (in settings in which language learning is not the overt reason for interaction) is an area requiring further research.

References

- Albers, S., Hellermann, J. and Harris, K. (2008) 'A case of a student with little prior formal education: success and interactional practices in the language classroom', *Low-educated Second Language and Literacy Acquisition. Proceedings of the Thrid Annual Forum*, Newcastle University, pp. 109-125.
- Allwright, R. (1980) 'Turns, topics and tasks: patterns of participation in language learning and teaching' in Larsen-Freeman, D. (ed.) *Discourse analysis in second language research*, Massachusstes, Newbury House.
- Allwright, R. (1984) 'The importance of interaction in classroom language learning', *Applied Linguistics*, 5 (2), pp. 156-171.
- Andrews, S. (2001) 'The language awareness of the L2 teacher: its impact upon pedagogical practice', *Language Awareness*, 10 (2,3), pp. 75-90.
- Anton, M. (2009) 'Dynamic assessment of advanced second language learners', *Foreign Language Annals*, 42 (3), pp. 57-598.
- Arminen, I. (2000) 'On the context sensitivity of institutional interaction', *Discourse & Society*, 11 (4), pp. 435-458.
- Atkinson, D. (2002) 'Toward a sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition', *The Modern Language Journal*, 86 (4), pp. 525-545.
- Atkinson, J. and Heritage, J. (1984) *Structures of social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barraja-Rohan, A. (2011) 'Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence', *Language Teaching Research*, 15 (4), pp. 479-507.
- Barton, D. and Tusting, K. (2005) 'Introduction' in Barton, D. and Tusting, K. (eds.) *Beyond communities of practice: language, power, and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-14.

- Bax, S. (2003) 'The end of CLT: a context approach to language teaching', *ELT Journal*, 57 (3), pp. 278-287.
- Billig, M. (1999) 'Conversation analysis and the claims of naivety', *Discourse & Society*, 10 (4), pp. 543-558.
- Boeijie, H. (2010) *Analysis in qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- Borg, S. (2003) 'Teacher cognition in language teaching: a review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe and do', *Language Teaching* 36 (2), pp. 81-109.
- Borg, S. (2006) *Teacher cognition and language education research and practice*. London: Continuum.
- Bowles, H. (2011) 'The contribution of CA to the study of literary dialogue', *Novitas –ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 5 (1), pp. 161-168.
- Breen, M. and Candlin, C. (1980) 'The roles of the teacher, the learners, and the content within a communicative methodology' in Richard – Amato, P. (1988) *Making it happen: interaction in the second language classroom – from theory to practice*. New York: Longman, pp. 294-301.
- Brooks, L. (2009) 'Interacting in pairs in a test of oral proficiency: co-constructing a better performance', *Language Testing*, 26 (3), pp. 341-366.
- Brooks, L. and Swain. M. (2009) 'Languaging in collaborative writing: creation of and response to expertise' in Mackey, A. and Polio, C. (eds.) *Multiple perspectives on interaction: second language research in honor of Susan M. Gass*. New York: Routledge, pp. 58-90.
- Bygate, M. and Samuda, V. (2009) 'Creating pressure in task pedagogy: the joint roles of fields, purpose, and engagement with the interactional approach', in Mackey, A. and Polio, C. (eds.) *Multiple perspectives on interaction: second language research in honor of Susan M. Gass*. New York: Routledge, pp. 90-117.

- Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980) 'Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing', *Applied Linguistics* 1, pp. 1-47.
- Carruthers, J. (1990) 'A rationale for the use of semi-structured interviews', *Journal of Educational Administration*, 28 (1), pp. 63-68.
- Cazden, C. (2001) *Classroom discourse: the language of teaching and learning*.
Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Cekaite, A. (2007) 'A child's development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2 classroom', *The Modern Language Journal*, 91 (1), pp. 45-62.
- Chalhoub – Deville, M. (2003) 'Second language interaction: current perspectives and future trends', *Language Testing*, 20 (4), pp. 369-383.
- Chiu, L. (2003) 'Transformational potential of focus group practice in participatory action research', *Action Research*, 1 (2), pp. 165-183.
- Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Coyle, Y., Yanez, L. and Verdu, M. (2010) 'The impact of the interactive whiteboard on the teacher and children's language use in an ESL immersion classroom', *System* 38 (4), pp. 614-625.
- Cullen, R. (1998) 'Teacher talk and the classroom context', *ELTJ*, 52 (3), pp. 179-187.
- Cullen, R. 2002) 'Supportive teacher talk: the importance of the F-move', *ELT Journal*, 56 (2), pp. 117-127.
- Day, D. (2007) 'In a bigger, meso context', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, pp. 979-996.
- Dings, A. (2007) *Developing interactional competence in a second language: a case study of a Spanish language learner*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Texas.
- Dings, A. (2014) 'Interactional competence and the development of alignment activity', *The Modern Language Journal*, 98 (3), pp. 742-756.
- Dinsmore, D. (1985) 'Waiting for Godot in the ESL classroom', *ELT Journal*, 39 (4), pp.

225-234.

- Donato, R. (2000) 'Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom' in Lantolf, J. (ed.) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 27-51.
- Doughty, C. (1991) 'Second language instruction does make a difference: evidence from an empirical study of SL revitalization', *Studies on Second Language Acquisition* 13 (4), pp. 431-469.
- Drew, P. (2005) 'Foreword' in Richards, K. and Seedhouse, P. (eds.) *Applying conversation analysis*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. xiv-1.
- Edwards, A. D. and Westgate, D. P. G. (1987) *Investigating Classroom Talk*. Sussex: The Falmer Press.
- Ellis, N. (2008) 'The dynamics of second language emergence: cycles of language use, language change, and language acquisition', *The Modern Language Journal*, 92 (2), pp. 232-249.
- Ellis, R. (1997) *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fallon, G. and Brown, R. (2002) 'Focusing on focus groups: lessons from a research project involving a Bangladeshi community', *Qualitative Research*, 2 (2), pp. 195-208.
- Firth, A. (1996) 'The discursive accomplishment of normality: on 'lingua franca' and conversation analysis', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26 (2), pp. 237-259.
- Firth, A. and Wagner, J. (1997) 'Communication strategies at work', in Kasper, G. and Kellerman, E. (eds.) *Communication strategies: psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Essex: Pearson Education, pp. 323-345.
- Firth, A. and Wagner, J. (2007) 'Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: elaborations on a reconceptualised SLA', *The Modern Language Journal: Focus Issue: Second Language Acquisition Reconceptualized? The Impact*

- of Firth and Wagner, 91, pp. 800-819.
- Foster, P. (1998) 'A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning', *Applied Linguistics*, 19 (1), pp. 1-23.
- Frawley W. and Lantolf, J. (1985) 'Second language discourse: a Vygotskian perspective', *Applied Linguistics*, 6 (1), pp. 19-44.
- Gan, Z. (2010). 'Interaction in group oral assessment: a case study of higher – and lower – scoring students', *Language Testing*, 27 (4), pp. 585-602.
- Gardner, W.P., & Rogoff, B. (1982). 'The role of instruction in memory development: Some methodological choices', *Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory for Comparative Human Cognition*, 4, 6-12.
- Garfinkel, H. (2008) 'Studies of the routine grounds of everyday activities' in Hutchby, I. (ed.) *Methods in language and social interaction volume II: ethnography and conversation analysis*, London, Sage Publications, pp. 86-118.
- Garfinkel, H. and Sacks, H. (2008) 'On formal structures of practical actions', in Hutchby, I. (ed.) *Methods in language and social interaction volume II: ethnography and conversation analysis*, London, Sage Publications, pp. 198-228.
- Gass, S. and Varonis, E. (1985) 'Variation in native speaker speech modification to non-native speakers', *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 7 (1), pp.37-57.
- Gass, S., Mackey, A. and Pica, T. (1998) 'The role of input and interaction in second language acquisition: Introduction to the special issue', *The Modern Language Journal* 82 (3), pp. 299-307.
- Gass, S. (2003) 'Input and interaction', in Doughty, C. and Long, M. (eds.) *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 224-256.
- Gillham, B. (2000) *The research interview*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

- Guk, I. and Kellogg, D. (2007) 'The ZPD and whole class teaching: teacher-led and student-led interactional mediation of tasks', *Language Teaching Research*, 11 (3), pp. 281-299.
- Gumperz, J. (1992) 'Contextualization and Understanding' in (eds) Duranti, A. and Goodwin, C. *Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomenon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 229-253.
- 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), pp. 145-166.
- Hall, J. K. (1995) '(Re)creating our worlds with words: a sociocultural perspective of face-to-face interaction', *Applied Linguistics*, 16 (2), pp. 206-232.
- Hall, J. K (1997) 'A consideration of SLA as a theory of practice: a response to Firth and Wagner', *The Modern Language Journal*, 81 (3), pp. 301-306.
- Hall, J. K (1999) 'The prosaics of interaction: the development of interactional competence in another language' in Hinkel, E. (ed.) *Second language teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 137-152.
- Hall, J. K. and Walsh, M. (2002) 'Teacher-student interaction and language learning', *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, pp. 186-203.
- Hall, J. K. (2004) 'Language learning as an interactional achievement', *The Modern Language Journal*, 88 (4), pp. 607-612.
- Hall, J.K, Hellermann, J. and Paekarek-Dohler, S. (eds) (2011) *L2 interactional competence and development*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Hammersley, M. (2003) 'Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: methods or paradigms?', *Discourse & Society*, 14 (6), pp. 75 -781.
- Harrogate Data, year unknown.
- He, A. (2004) CA for SLA: arguments from the Chinese language classroom', *The*

- Modern Language Journal, 88 (4), pp. 568-582.
- Hellermann, J., Cole, K. and Zuengler, J. (2001) 'Developing thinking communities through talk: two case studies from science classes', CELA Research Report Series 14001, pp. 1-35.
- Hellermann, J. (2003) 'The interactive work of prosody in the IRF exchange: teacher repetition in feedback moves', *Language in Society*, 32, pp. 79-104.
- Hellermann, J. (2005) 'Syntactic and prosodic practices for cohesion in series of three-part sequences in classroom talk', *Research of Language and Social Interaction*, 38 (1), pp. 105-130.
- Hellermann, J. (2006) 'Classroom interactive practices for developing L2 literacy: a microethnographic study of two beginning adult learners of English', *Applied Linguistics*, 27 (3), pp. 377-404.
- Hellermann, J. (2007) 'The development of practices for action in classroom dyadic interaction: focus on task openings', *The Modern Language Journal*, 91 (1), pp. 83-96.
- Hellermann, J. and Pekarek-Dohler, S. (2010) 'On the contingent nature of language learning tasks', *Classroom Discourse*, 1 (1), pp. 25-46.
- Hellermann, J. (2011) 'Members' methods, members' competencies: looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated repair', in Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J and Pekarek-Dohler, S. (eds) *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters, pp. 147-173.
- Hollander, J. (2004) 'The social context of focus groups', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 33 (5), pp. 602-637.
- Hopkins, P. (2007) 'Thinking critically and creatively about focus groups', *Area*, 39 (4), pp. 528-535.
- Howard, A. (2010) 'Is there such a thing as a typical language lesson?', *Classroom*

- Discourse, 1 (1), p. 82-100.
- Hudson, M. (michaelhudson1@hotmail.com) (7 June 2013) *Analysis for Evaluation* (shanedonald@gmail.com)
- Hutchby, I. and Woofitt, R. (2009) *Conversation Analysis*. London: Polity.
- Jenks, C. (2007) 'Floor management in task-based interaction: the interactional role of participatory structures', *System*, 35 (4), pp. 609-622.
- Johns, T. (1991) 'Should you be persuaded: two examples of data-driven learning materials', *English Language Research Journal* (4) , pp.1-16, University of Birmingham.
- Johnson, K. (1995) *Understanding second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, K. (1999) *Understanding language teaching: reasoning in action*. Canada: Heinle & Heinle.
- Kao, P. L. (2010) *Fostering foreign language learning among less successful learners: exploring the role of self-directed multimedia learning environments*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Kasper, G. (2004) 'Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning', *The Modern Language Journal*, 88 (4), pp. 551-567.
- Kasper, G. and Markee, N. (2004) 'Classroom talks: an introduction', *The Modern Language Journal*, 88 (4), pp. 491-500.
- King, N. and Horrocks, C. (2010) *Interviews in qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Kinginger, C. (2002). 'Defining the Zone of Proximal Development in US foreign language education', *Applied Linguistics*, 23 (2), pp. 240-261.
- Kitzinger, J. (1994) 'The methodology of focus groups: the importance of interaction between research participants', *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 16 (1), pp.

103-121.

- Koshik, I. (2002) 'Designedly incomplete utterances: a pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35 (3), pp. 277-309.
- Kramsch, C. (1986) 'From language proficiency to interactional competence', *The Modern Language Journal*, 70 (4), pp. 366-372.
- Kramsch, C. (1993) *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (1998) *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kreuger, R. and Casey, M. (2000) *Focus groups: a practical guide for applied research*. California: Sage Publications.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999) 'Critical classroom discourse analysis', *TESOL Quarterly*, 33 (3), pp. 453-483.
- Kvale, S. and Brinkmann, S. (2009) *Interviews: the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. California: Sage Publications.
- Lantolf, J. (1999) 'Second culture acquisitions: cognitive considerations' in Hinkel, E. (ed.) *Second language teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 28-47.
- Lantolf, J.(Ed) (2000) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2007) 'Reflecting on the cognitive-social debate in second language acquisition', *The Modern Language Journal*, 91 (1), pp. 773-787.
- Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation (learning is doing: social, cognitive and computational perspectives)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lazaraton, A. (2004) 'Gesture and speech in the vocabulary explanations of one ESL

- teacher: a microanalytic inquiry', *Language Learning*, 54 (1), pp. 79-117.
- Lazaraton, A. and Ishihara, N. (2005) 'Understanding second language teacher practice using microanalysis and self-reflection: a collaborative case study', *The Modern Language Journal*, 89 (4), pp. 529-542.
- Lee, W. and Ng, S.(2010) 'Reducing student reticence through teacher interaction strategy', *ELT Journal* 64 (3), pp. 302-313.
- Lei, X. (2008) 'Exploring a sociocultural approach to writing strategy research: mediated actions in writing activities', *Journal of Second Language Writing* 17 (4), pp. 217-236.
- Li, L, and Walsh, S. (2013) 'Conversations as space for learning', *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23 (2), pp.247-266.
- Linhorst, D. (2002) 'A review of the use and potential of focus groups in social work research', *Qualitative Social Work*, 1 (2), pp. 208-228.
- Mackey, A. and Philp, J. (1998) 'Conversational interaction and second language development: recasts, responses, and red herrings?', *The Modern Language Journal*, 82 (3), Special Issue: The Role of Input and Interaction in Second Language Acquisition, pp. 338-356.
- Malamah – Thomas, A. (1987) *Classroom interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mann, S. (2011) 'A critical review of qualitative interviews in applied linguistics', *Applied Linguistics*, 32 (1), pp. 6-24.
- Mann, S. and Walsh, S. (2013) 'RP or RIP: A critical perspective on reflective practice', *Applied Linguistics Review* 4 (2), pp. 291-315.
- Markee, N. (2000) *Conversation analysis*. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Markee, N. (2002) 'Language in development: questions of theory, questions of practice', *TESOL Quarterly* 36 (3), pp. 265-274.
- Markee, N. (2008) 'Toward a learner behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA',

- Applied Linguistics 29, pp. 404-427.
- Markee, N. and Kasper, G. (2004) 'Classroom talks: an introduction', *The Modern Language Journal*, 88 (4), pp. 491-500.
- Maroni, B. (2011) 'Pauses, gaps and wait time in classroom interaction in primary schools', *Journal of Pragmatics* (43) 7, pp.2081-2093.
- Matsuov, E. (2001) 'Intersubjectivity as a way of informing teaching design for a community of learners classroom', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, pp.383-402.
- Millan, R., Crute, V., and Hargle, O. (1992) *Professional interviewing*. London: Routledge.
- Miller, G. and Fox, K. (2004) 'Building bridges: the possibility of analytic dialogue between ethnography, conversation analysis and Foucault' in Hesser-Bibu, S. and Leavy, P. (eds) *Approaches to qualitative research: a reader in theory and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mondada, L. and Pekarek – Doehler, S. (2004) 'Second language acquisition as situated practice: task accomplishment in the French second language classroom', *The Modern Language Journal*, 88 (4), pp. 501-518.
- Moon, J. (2004) *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning*. London: Routledge.
- Morgan, D. (1997) *Focus groups as qualitative research*. California: Sage Publications.
- Mori, J. (2002) 'Task design, plan and development of talk-in-interaction: an analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom', *Applied Linguistics*, 23 (3), pp. 323-347.
- Mori, J. (2004) 'Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: a case from a Japanese language classroom', *The Modern Language Journal*, 88 (4), pp. 536-550.
- Mori, J. (2005). 'Why not why? The teaching of grammar, discourse, sociolinguistic and

- cross-cultural perspectives', *Japanese Language and Literature*. 39 (2), pp. 255-289.
- Morita, N. (2004) 'Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities', *TESOL Quarterly*, 38 (4), pp. 573-603.
- Nakamura, I. (2008) 'Understanding how teacher and student talk with each other: an exploration of how repair displays the co-management of talk-in-interaction', *Language Teaching Research*, 12 (2), pp. 265-283.
- Nassaji, H. and Swain, M. (2000). 'A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: the effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles', *Language Awareness*, 9 (1), pp. 34-51.
- Nathan, M, Eilam, B. and Kim, S. (2007) 'To disagree we must also agree: how intersubjectivity structures and perpetuates discourse in a socially mediated mathematics learning environment', *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 16 (4), pp. 523-563.
- Nguyen, H. T. (2011) 'Achieving recipient design longitudinally: evidence from a pharmacy intern on patient consultations', in Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J and Pekarek-Dohler, S. (eds) *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Toronto: *Multilingual Matters*, pp. 173-206.
- Ohta, A. (2000) 'Rethinking interaction in SLA: developmentally appropriate assistance in the Zone of Proximal Development and the acquisition of L2 grammar' in Lantolf, J. (ed.) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 51-79.
- Pekarek – Doehler, S. (2002). 'Mediation revisited: the interactive organization of mediation in learning environments', *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 9 (1), pp. 22-42.
- Philp, J. (2009) 'Epilogue: exploring the intricacies of interaction and language development', in Mackey, A. and Polio, C. (eds.) *Multiple perspectives on*

- interaction: second language research in honor of Susan M. Gass. New York: Routledge, pp. 254-275.
- Poehner, M. and Lantolf, J. (2005). 'Dynamic assessment in the language classroom', *Language Teaching Research*, 9 (3), pp. 233-265.
- Poehner, M. (2007) 'Beyond the text: L2 dynamic assessment and the transcendence of mediated learning', *The Modern Language Journal*, 91 (3), pp. 323-340.
- Rapley, T. (2001) 'The (art)fullness of open-ended interviewing: some considerations on analyzing interviews', *Qualitative Research*, 1 (3), pp. 303-323.
- Raschka, C, Sercombe, P, and Huang, C. (2009) 'Conflicts and tensions in codeswitching in a Taiwanese EFL classroom', *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12 (2), pp. 157-171.
- Richard – Amato, P. (1988) *Making it happen: interaction in the second language classroom – from theory to practice*. New York: Longman.
- Richards, K. (2007) 'Introduction' in Richards, K. and Seedhouse, P. (eds.) *Applying conversation analysis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-19.
- Roebuck, R. (2000) 'Subjects speak out: how learners position themselves in a psycholinguistic task', in Lantolf, J. (ed.) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 79-97.
- Rogoff, B. (1990) *Apprenticeship in thinking: cognitive development in social context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rowney, J. and Watts, M. (1987) *Interviewing in educational research*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Rubin, H. and Rubin, I. (1995) *Qualitative interviewing*. California: Sage Publications.
- Schon, D. (1983) *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in interaction*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schegloff, E. (1979) 'Identification and recognition in telephone openings', in Psathas,

- G. (ed) *Everyday Language*. New York: Erlbaum, pp. 23-78.
- Schegloff, E. (1986) 'The routine as achievement', *Human Studies* 9, pp. 111-151.
- Schegloff, E. (1992) 'In another context' in (eds) Duranti, A. and Goodwin, C. 'Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomenon', Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 191-229.
- Schwab, G. (2011) 'From dialogue to multilogue: a different view on participation in the English foreign language classroom', *Classroom Discourse*, 2 (1), pp. 3-19.
- Seedhouse, P. (1996) 'Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossibilities', *ELT Journal*, 50 (1), pp. 16-24.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004) 'Conversation analysis methodology', *Language Learning* 54 (1), pp. 1-54.
- Seedhouse, P. (2005) 'State-of-the-art article: conversation analysis and language learning', *Language Teaching*, 38, pp. 165-187.
- Seedhouse, P. (2005) *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: a conversation analysis perspective*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Seedhouse, P. (2007) 'Conversation analysis as a research methodology', in Richards, K. and Seedhouse, P. (eds.) *Applying conversation analysis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 251-266.
- Sert, O. and Seedhouse, P. (2011) 'Introduction: Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics', *Novitas-ROYAL* 5 (1), pp. 1-14.
- Sfard, A. (1998) 'On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one', *Educational Researcher*, 27 (2), pp. 4-13.
- Sidnell, J. (2010) *Conversation analysis: an introduction*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Swain, M. and Lapkin, S. (1995) 'Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: a step towards second language learning', *Applied Linguistics* 16 (3), pp. 371-391.

- Swain, M. (2000) 'The output hypothesis and beyond: mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue' in Lantolf, J. (ed.) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 97-115.
- Swain, M. (2001). Integrating language and content teaching through collaborative tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58(1), 44-63.
- Swain, M., Kinean, P. and Steinman, L. (2011) *Sociocultural theory in second language education: an introduction through narratives*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ten Have, P. (1999) *Doing conversation analysis: a practical guide*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ten Have, P. (2007) *Doing conversation analysis*. London: Sage.
- Theodorsdottir, G. 'Second language interaction for business and learning' in Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J and Pekarek-Dohler, S. (eds) *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters, pp. 93-117.
- Thorne, S. (2000) 'Second language acquisition theory and the truth(s) about relativity', in Lantolf, J. (ed.) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 219-245.
- Thornbury, S. (1996) 'Teachers research teacher talk', *English Language Teaching Journal*, 50 (4), pp. 279-289.
- Thunqvist, A. C. (2007) 'A child's development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2 classroom', *The Modern Language Journal* (91) 1, pps. 45-62.
- Tobin, K. (1986) 'Effects of teacher wait time on discourse characteristics in mathematics and language arts classes', *American Educational Research Journal* 23 (2), pp. 191-200.
- Tobin, K. (1987) 'The role of wait-time in higher cognitive level learning', *Review of Educational Research*, 57 (1), pp. 69-95.
- Tsui, A. (2001) *Classroom interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Tusting, K. (2005) 'Language and power in communities of practice' in Barton, D. and Tusting, K. (eds.) *Beyond communities of practice: language, power, and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 36-55.
- Ustinel, E. and Seedhouse, P. (2005) 'Why that in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus', *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15 (3), pp. 302-324.
- van Lier, L. (1988) *The classroom and the language learner: ethnography and second - language classroom research*. New York: Longman.
- van Lier, L. (1996) *Interaction in the language curriculum: awareness, autonomy & authenticity*. New York: Longman.
- van Lier, L. (2000) 'From input to affordance: social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective' in Lantolf, J. (ed.) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 245-261.
- Van Lier, L. (2002) 'An ecological-semiotic perspective on language and linguistics', in Kramsch, C. (ed) *Language Acquisition and Language Socialization: Ecological Perspectives*. New York: Continuum, pp. 140-165.
- von Compernelle, R. (2010) 'Incidental microgenetic development in second-language teacher-learner talk-in-interaction', *Classroom Discourse*, 1 (1), pp.66-82.
- Von Compernelle, R. (2011) 'Responding to questions and L2 learner interactional competence during language proficiency interviews: a microanalytic study with pedagogical implications', in Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J and Pekarek-Dohler, S. (eds) *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters, pp. 117-147.
- Vygotsky, L. (1988) 'Interaction between learning and development' in Richard – Amato, P. (1988) *Making it happen: interaction in the second language classroom – from theory to practice*. New York: Longman, pp. 342-353.

- Walsh, S. (2002) 'Construction or obstruction? Teacher talk and learner involvement in the ESL classroom', *Language Teaching Research*, 6 (1), pp. 3-23.
- Walsh, S. (2003) 'Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom through teacher self-evaluation', *Language Awareness*, 12 (2), pp. 124-142.
- Walsh, S. (2006) *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2011) *Exploring classroom discourse: language in action*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. and Li, L. (2013) 'Conversations as space for learning', *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23 (2), pp. 247-266.
- Walters, F. (2007) 'A conversation-analytic hermeneutic rating protocol to assess L2 oral pragmatic competence', *Language Testing*, 24 (2), pp. 155-183.
- Webb, B. (2002) 'Using focus groups as a research method: a personal experience', *Journal of Nursing Management*, 10 (1), pp. 27-35.
- Wei, L. (2002) 'What do you want me to say? On the conversation analysis approach to bilingual education', *Language in Society*, 31, pp. 159-180.
- Wertsch, J., del Rio, P., and Alvarez, A. (1995) *Sociocultural studies of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, J. (2002) 'Applying conversation analysis in applied linguistics: evaluating dialogue in English as a second language textbooks', *IRAL*, 40, pp. 37-60.
- Xiao, L. (2008) 'Exploring a sociocultural approach to writing strategy research: mediated actions in writing activities', *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, pp. 217-236.
- Young, R. and Milanovic, M. (1992) 'Discourse variation in oral proficiency interviews', *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, pp. 403-424.
- Young, R. (1992) *Critical theory and classroom talk*. Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Young, R. (1999) 'Sociolinguistic approaches to SLA', *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, pp. 105-132.

- Young, R. (2002) 'Discourse approaches to oral language assessment', *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22, pp. 243-262.
- Young, R. (2008) *Language and interaction: an advanced resource book*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Young, R. (2009) *Discursive practice in language teaching and learning*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Young, R. and Miller, E. (2004). 'Learning as changing participation: discourse roles in ESL writing conferences', *The Modern Language Journal*, 88 (4), pp. 519-535.
- Young, R. (2009) *Discursive practice in language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Transcription Conventions (Atkinson and Heritage 1984)

[[]]	Simultaneous utterances- (beginning [[] and (end]])
[]	Overlapping utterances- (beginning [] and (end])
=	Contiguous utterances
(0.4)	Represents the tenths of a second between utterances
(.)	Represents a micro-pause (1 tenth of a second or less)
:	Sound extension of a word (more colons demonstrate longer stretches)
.	Fall in tone (not necessarily the end of a sentence)
,	Continuing intonation (not necessarily between clauses)
-	An abrupt stop in articulation
?	Rising inflection (not necessarily a question)
—	Underline words indicate emphasis
↑ ↓	Rising or falling intonation (after an utterance)
◦ ◦	Surrounds talk that is quieter
hhh	Audible aspirations
·hhh	Inhalations
.hh.	Laughter within a word
>>	Surrounds talk that is faster
<<	Surrounds talk that is slower
(())	Analyst's notes

Appendix 2. Consent Form for Teachers

Dear Colleague,

I am now at the research stage of the PhD I am undertaking. My thesis topic is 'Developing Interactional Competence in the Taiwanese EFL Classroom'. Given that learning is a social process, negotiated between both teacher and learner, I am interested in evaluating how language is used as a tool for mediating learning. In particular I am interested in evaluating how interactional competence is developed over time, using Steve Walsh's SETT framework (Self-evaluation of teacher talk). Steve Walsh is my first supervisor, and my research takes his framework as a starting point (<http://www.ncl.ac.uk/ecls/staff/profile/steve.walsh.>) My study intends to examine how classroom talk is organized and negotiated between participants (teacher and learner) and how developing interactional competence on the part of language instructors leads to second language acquisition through reference to the system of modes posited by Walsh which are the managerial mode, classroom context mode, skills and systems mode, and materials mode. Learning is situational and therefore contexts are talked into being, as teachers and learners construct learning together and it is my aim to analyse how this is done within Taiwanese English language classrooms, through a micro-analysis of interaction between teacher and learner.

Therefore, my aim is to collect data from English as a foreign language classrooms at Feng Chia over the course of one semester and track how interactional competence is developed. (In my study I am interested in any form of language class, whether Freshman English, Conversation I or II or classes in the Honours Programme). To do so I would be seeking to film your EFL class on four occasions over the course of the first semester next academic year. After filming each class I would transcribe the talk that occurs in your classroom, from both the teacher and learner. I would be using broad transcription in this instance (writing down what is said) and later showing you the transcript and going over with you how interactional competence is developed by looking at features such as how linguistic resources are utilized to accomplish social action in classrooms, topic introduction, turn taking and the sequential organization of talk among other things. In the second session I would then begin to train you in using Steve Walsh's SETT framework and then film your class three more times, examining how your teacher talk is influenced by knowledge of this framework, again going over transcripts of your classroom talk.

To do this I would need to have two cameras in your classroom; one at the front to film you as you teach, and one at the back to focus on the learners. I would also need to place voice recorders on the desks of your learners when they are involved in group work, in order to have evidence that they are orienting towards the language you are using in class as the instructor. I would, of course, give your learners consent forms before beginning my study, in order to gain their permission to use the data collected from the class, as well as providing you with a different consent form as teacher. My goal would be to be as unobtrusive in your class as possible and at no time would I seek to disrupt your classroom practice. I would not need to remain in the classroom during filming if you do not wish me to do so. I realize that this is a large commitment on your part but there are benefits that you will gain as a practitioner such as greater awareness of how you utilize language to establish a pedagogical focus in lessons and how you organize shifts in topic, how language facilitates learning and how you organize classroom interaction based on decisions of the moment. Seeing a transcript of your classroom interaction may reveal things about your practice you were not aware of. Judgments will not be made about your practice and I hasten to add that at no time will my study be concerned with the teacher involved in the study beyond examining how language is employed. In my time here at Newcastle I have become much more aware of how the language I have employed in my practice has shaped and also hindered learning and through involvement in this study you may find yourself coming to similar realizations.

In the thesis I will be using a method called conversation analysis to examine the data collected. This method reveals the micro-details of interaction and how talk is ordered. My second supervisor is Paul Seedhouse and this area is the major focus of much of his research (<http://www.ncl.ac.uk/ecls/staff/profile/paul.seedhouse>). Therefore, the sections of transcribed classroom talk which go into my thesis will not be broad in scope but very highly detailed.

If you choose to be involved in this project, I will be enormously grateful, but you may also withdraw at any time and your data will not be used. I would also add that confidentiality is assured and that you or your students' names would not be used in this study.

I will return to Taiwan in June and I would hope to hold a focus group with all who wish to be involved in this study before the semester begins to discuss the role you see the language you use having in your practice. I would then wish to have a group training session for using the SETT framework. I would then agree on a schedule with each of you individually for filming your class and interviewing you with regard to your transcripts after each filmed session. Below please write your name next to the option

you have chosen (involvement or non-involvement) and please return this form to me at shane.donald@newcastle.ac.uk or shane.donald@gmail.com.

Many thanks for taking the time to read this. I look forward to seeing you on campus in September if not before.

Shane Donald

I agree to participate in this study _____ (Please put your name here).

I am unable to participate in this study _____ (Please put your name here).

Appendix 3. Consent Form for Students

Title of Research: Developing Interactional Competence in the Taiwanese EFL Classroom Shane Donald

September 5th, 2011

Dear student,

My name is Shane Donald. I am a teacher employed at Feng Chia University currently on research leave. I am enrolled at Newcastle University as a doctoral student of Applied Linguistics. The focus of my research is on the development of interactional competence in the Taiwanese EFL classroom, particularly the co-construction of learning opportunities between teacher and learner. In order to investigate this phenomenon I am seeking to film a series of English classes with different language teachers. As part of this process, I need the consent of learners to be filmed and recorded. I intend to film a total of four class sessions from each class selected during the semester. The data collected will be transcribed and analysed, using Conversation Analysis. This research is primarily concerned with the language teachers use in the classroom with regard to teaching and so the research focus is mainly on this facet of classroom interaction, though, as teachers and learners co-construct learning opportunities, some attention will be given to learner utterances. At no time will students need to be interviewed and one of the aims of this research is to be as unobtrusive as possible and limit any possible disruption to the classes in question. Your participation in this research is limited to your usual classroom involvement. The data collected will only be viewed by myself, your teacher, my supervisor Dr. Steve Walsh and the external marker of the doctoral thesis being undertaken.

I would like your permission to use the data collected as part of the PhD thesis I will be undertaking. All results will be reported anonymously. Please sign the consent form below to show your agreement with this.

Thank you very much.

Shane Donald

Signature: _____

Consent Form

I have read the information provided above about the research project conducted by Mr. Donald.

Agree

I hereby allow Mr. Donald to use my data anonymously for his research.

Agree

Appendix 4. SETT Framework

SETT: Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk Procedure

1. I will collect filmed data from your classroom and then provide you with a copy of that data. Watch a part of the lesson involving both you and your learners. You don't have to start at the beginning of the lesson; choose any section of interest to you but the section should be in sequence (a 15 minute stretch with no breaks).
2. As soon as possible after the lesson, watch the video of your lesson. The purpose of the first viewing is to analyse the extract according to classroom context or **mode**. As you watch the first time, decide which modes are in operation. Choose from the following:
 - (1) **Skills and systems mode** (main focus is on particular language items, vocabulary or a specific skill);
 - (2) **Managerial mode** (main focus is on setting up an activity);
 - (3) **Classroom context mode** (main focus is on eliciting feelings, attitudes and emotions of learners);
 - (4) **Materials mode** (main focus is on the use of text, tape or other materials)
3. Watch the extract you have selected a second time, using the SETT instrument to keep a tally of the different features of your teacher talk. Write down examples of the features you identify.

If you're not sure about a particular feature, use the SETT key (attached) to help you.

4. Evaluate your teacher talk in the light of your overall pedagogical aims and modes used. To what extent do you think that your use of language and pedagogic purpose coincided? That is, how appropriate was your use of language in this extract, bearing in mind your stated aims and the modes operating?
5. The final stage is a feedback interview with me where I will also go over areas of interest from my own viewing of the data relating to interactional competence in addition to discussing the extract of interaction you have selected. Please bring the completed SETT instrument with you.
6. In total, these steps need to be completed FOUR times. After the final self-evaluation, we'll organize a video-recording and interview and a final focus group with all participants.

Thanks again for your support.

SETT: Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk Lesson Cover Sheet

A. Lesson Details:

Name:

Number of
students:

Level:

Date:

Nationalities:

Materials:

Overall
aim:

B. Lesson Modes identified:

C. Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk

Evaluate your teacher talk in the light of your overall pedagogical aims and modes used. To what extent do you think that your use of language and pedagogic purpose coincided? That is, how appropriate was your use of language in this segment, bearing in mind your stated aims and the modes operating? Continue on the next page if necessary.

SETT: Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk

KEY

FEATURE OF TEACHER TALK	DESCRIPTION
A. Scaffolding	1. Reformulation (rephrasing a learner's contribution) 2. Extension (extending a learner's contribution) 3. Modelling (providing an example for learner(s))
B. Direct repair	Correcting an error quickly and directly.
C. Content feedback	Giving feedback to the message rather than the words used.
D. Extended wait-time	Allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for students to respond or formulate a response.
E. Referential questions	Genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer.
F. Seeking clarification	1. Teacher asks a student to clarify something the student has said. 2. Student asks teacher to clarify something the teacher has said.
G. Extended learner turn	Learner turn of more than one utterance.
H. Teacher echo	1. Teacher repeats teacher's previous utterance. 2. Teacher repeats a learner's contribution.
I. Teacher interruptions	Interrupting a learner's contribution.
J. Extended teacher turn	Teacher turn of more than one utterance.
K. Turn completion	Completing a learner's contribution for the learner.
L. Display questions	Asking questions to which the teacher knows the answer.
M. Form-focused feedback	Giving feedback on the words used, not the message.

SETT: Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk

FEATURE OF TEACHER TALK	EXAMPLES FROM YOUR RECORDING
A. Scaffolding	
B. Direct repair	
C. Content feedback	
D. Extended wait-time	
E. Referential questions	
F. Seeking clarification	
H. Extended learner turn	
I. Teacher echo	
J. Teacher interruptions	
K. Extended teacher turn	
L. Turn completion	
M. Display questions	
N. Form-focused feedback	