

**INTERACTIONAL AND INTERCULTURAL
COMPETENCE IN TANDEM LEARNING: A MICRO-
ANALYTIC PERSPECTIVE**

Angela Sabbah-Taylor

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Newcastle University

School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences

February, 2017

Abstract

This thesis is an investigation into the characteristics of interactional and intercultural competence in a tandem language learning context between English and Chinese postgraduate students. It examines idioms meaning exchanges through the adoption of a conversation analytical perspective. The characteristics of interactional and intercultural competence are established in this thesis by applying the principles of conversation analysis using the same set of data. The first application examines the characteristics of interactional competence whilst the second investigates the characteristics of intercultural competence through the lens of conversation analysis and interactional competence.

This thesis is a contribution to the existing body of knowledge on interactional and intercultural competence and on tandem language learning. However, unlike previous research in this field (e.g. Bennett, 1986; Byram, 1997; Bennett, 1998; Hofstede, 2001; Brammerts, 2003; Lewis, 2003; Stickler and Lewis, 2003; Hosoda, 2006; Park, 2007; Van Compernelle, 2011; Kitzinger and Mandelbaum, 2013; Bolden, 2014), this thesis focuses on the interactions in tandem learning sessions using a microanalysis account of ‘repair’, ‘turn taking practices’, and ‘preference organisation’. By using conversation analysis, this thesis highlights the different interactional resources used by the participants that promote interactional competence and by examining these same interactional resources from a conversation analytical perspective, this thesis was able to identify intercultural moments in conversation and the ways in which the participants oriented to them.

The findings show that the maintenance of intersubjectivity through repair-initiations and repair-accomplishments as well as asymmetrical orientation to knowledge can enhance interactional competence. On the other hand, cultural differences between the participants were manifested via these same interactional resources and through these resources, the participants attributed to each other the identity of an expert and a novice (not as bona fide co-member).

Acknowledgment

First of all, I would like to thank all the participants that took part in my research. Without their enthusiasm and dedication, this research would not have been completed. Similarly, I would like to thank Dr. Robin Humphrey for his support during my research.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Steve Walsh. His support, feedback, and guidance have helped me develop greatly as a researcher. I would also like to thank Dr. Peter Sercombe and Dr. Tom Morton for agreeing to be my examiners in the viva and for their feedback which helped me develop a stronger thesis. I wish to also vocalise my gratitude to the Micro-Analysis Research Group at Newcastle University who gave me the opportunity to present my data and subsequently prompted helpful analysis and discussion.

More thanks go to:

My husband Mark, for his support and love all throughout this process. Thanks for listening and for the constant discussion over my data which helped me develop a better analysis.

My sister Diana, in which her great love and confidence in me makes everything possible in this world.

My brother Simon, his wife Tina, and their three children Rebecca, Gideon, and Jonathan, whose love have made this process much easier.

My grandmother Rose. Her love of, and importance she places upon, learning is something I admire as well as being something she instilled in me from an early age.

My Aunt Maha and Uncle Bill. Your unlimited love, kindness, guidance and support have encouraged me to keep my head up high and never give up.

And finally, to my parents Nabila and Gideon, two people to whom I owe everything. Thank you for your incredible support and unconditional love without which I would have been unable to complete my PhD. You have supported me throughout not just this process but my whole life and enabled me to overcome every hurdle.

Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgment	iii
Contents	v
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Context.....	1
1.3 Theoretical framework.....	2
1.4 Statement of the problem/s	2
1.5 Aims of the study	4
1.6 Methodology.....	5
1.7 Thesis outline	5
Chapter 2. Interactional Competence.....	7
2.1 Introduction.....	7
2.2 Interactional Competence.....	9
2.2.1 Repair	10
2.2.2 Turn-taking system.....	22
2.2.3 Dis/alignment	27
2.2.4 Knowledge and epistemic access, primacy, and responsibility	29
2.2.5 Intersubjectivity	33
2.3 Summary	34
Chapter 3. Intercultural Competence	35
3.1 Introduction.....	35
3.2 Tandem language learning and intercultural competence.....	36
3.3 Bennett’s model of intercultural development sensitivity	38
3.4 Bennett’s intercultural communication model.....	42
3.5 Hofstede’s model of cross-cultural communication	45
3.6 Byram’s model of intercultural competence	47
3.7 Dialectical approach.....	50
3.8 Further critique of the conceptualization of intercultural competence.....	52
3.9 Intercultural competence through the lens of interactional competence	53
3.10 Summary	64
Chapter 4. Research Methodology	65
4.1 Introduction.....	65
4.2 Research purpose.....	65

4.3 Background of the problem.....	65
4.4 Conversation analysis	66
4.5 Justification for method	77
4.6 Limitations of CA.....	77
4.7 CA’s attitude towards context.....	79
4.8 Validity	79
4.9 Reliability	81
4.10 Research Design	82
4.10.1 Background.....	82
4.10.2 The participants.....	85
4.10.3 Data collection.....	86
4.10.4 Use of audio and video.....	87
4.10.5 Camera and recorder positioning.....	88
4.10.6 CA transcription.....	88
4.10.7 Data Analysis	93
4.11 Summary.....	93
Chapter 5. Findings: Interactional Competence.....	94
5.1 Introduction.....	94
5.2 Maintenance of intersubjectivity through asymmetrical orientation to knowledge.....	94
5.3 Maintenance of intersubjectivity through repair initiations and accomplishments.....	113
5.4 Maintenance of intersubjectivity through situated understanding of ‘Okays’	134
5.5 Lack of situated understanding of ‘Okay’, ‘oh’, and assessments.....	139
5.6 Summary of analysis of interactional competence	151
Chapter 6. Findings: Intercultural Competence	153
6.1 Introduction.....	153
6.2 Intersubjectivity and asymmetrical orientation to knowledge	153
6.3 Intersubjectivity and repair-initiations and accomplishments.....	165
6.4 Summary of analysis of intercultural competence.....	174
Chapter 7. Discussion	177
7.1 Introduction.....	177
7.2 Dimension 1: A summary of the findings of the characteristics of interactional competence. 177	
7.2.1 Intersubjectivity, asymmetrical orientation to knowledge and alignment.....	177
7.2.2 Intersubjectivity and repair	180
7.2.3 Management of the turn-taking system	182
7.3 Dimension 2: A summary of the findings of the characteristics of intercultural competence .	183

7.3.1 Intersubjectivity, asymmetry and identity	184
7.3.2 Intersubjectivity, repair and identity.....	186
7.4 On the methodology and context	188
7.5 Summary	189
Chapter 8. Conclusion	190
8.1 Introduction.....	190
8.2 Pedagogical implications	193
8.3 Limitations of the study	194
8.4 Contribution to knowledge	194
8.5 Recommendations for future studies	195
Appendices	197
Appendix A: CA Transcription Conventions	197
Appendix B: Availability schedule	198
Appendix C: Chinese language syllabus	199
Appendix D: English language syllabus	202
Appendix E: Informed Consent	206
Appendix F: Goal setting chart	209
References.....	210

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This research is an exploration of the characteristics of interactional and intercultural competence in a tandem language learning context (Chinese and English). I have conducted this study by investigating the characteristics of interactional competence and of intercultural competence by using the same set of data. I analysed the data using conversation analysis (CA) as my main method for analysis. I chose to conduct this study on interactional competence because I wanted to investigate the different interactional resources used by the participants. In addition, my choice of investigating the notion of intercultural competence stems from the fact that this concept is defined in various ways by different scholars and there is no clear understanding as to what makes one interculturally competent. Thus, by using CA and through the lens of interactional competence, I am hoping to be able to show how cultural differences are displayed between the interactants. However, it is important to emphasise that the focus in this thesis is on interactional competence.

Moreover, the choice of using CA as the main method for analysis stems from the fact that I wanted to look at the data at its micro level by examining the accounts of ‘repair’, ‘the turn taking system’, and ‘the preference organisation’. Lastly, I have chosen to conduct my research under the context of tandem learning because it is claimed that this context can promote language learning, and hence interactional competence, and at the same time can enhance learners’ intercultural competence. Due to this, tandem learning was the most suitable for this study.

The key components of this chapter are to give an overview of the context of this study, the theoretical framework, the statement of the problem, the aims of this study, the methodology used, and the outline of the thesis.

1.2 Context

Tandem language learning, as a context, has been widely used in order for language learners to come together in order to collaborate, helping each other learn the other person’s language. Tandem language learning can be done either face-to-face or through asynchronous tandem exchanges. Various universities have purpose-built centres that are dedicated to tandem

language learning. As an example, Sheffield University has a centre dedicated to students who want to participate in face-to-face tandem language learning and within the centre there are various worksheets that have been developed for the tandem learners to select and use. Additionally, these worksheets are divided into languages and are targeted specifically towards tandem language learning exchanges.

Within tandem learning exchanges, learners have the opportunity to improve their communication skills within the studied language through authentic communication (Brammerts, 2003) and promote their intercultural competence abilities (Stickler and Lewis, 2003; Woodin, 2003). One of the ways the tandem partners improve their communicative skills is via asking for corrections and initiating ones when needed (Brammerts and Calverts, 2003). Conversely, one of the ways to promote intercultural competence is through finding the opportunity to encourage the tandem partner to talk about a culturally related issue (Stickler and Lewis, 2003). In the current study, tandem learning was selected for its capacity to shed light on both interactional and intercultural features.

1.3 Theoretical framework

Whilst various studies have been conducted on tandem language learning, very few have used CA as their method of analysis. I have chosen CA as the theoretical framework for analysing my data for two reasons. Firstly, as a researcher, the use of CA would allow me to understand not only the organisation and order of social action in a tandem learning context but also the ways in which this order is produced and oriented to (Seedhouse, 2004b) by the tandem learners, as well as unravel how the tandem learners use and rely on competences in order to socially organise their interactions (Heritage and Atkinson, 1984). Secondly, its usage would enable me to trace how the tandem learners interpret and analyse each other's actions in order to reach mutual understandings (Seedhouse, 2004b).

1.4 Statement of the problem/s

Intercultural competence as a concept has been highly debatable. For instance, Bennett (1986, 1998) calls it 'intercultural communication sensitivity' and divides the concept into several stages. He argues that within one of the later stages (the adoption), the interactant displays intercultural communication sensitivity through 'empathy'. Empathy, according to Bennett (1998), is demonstrated through relating to the other person by imagining how he/she

feels/thinks from their own perspective. Thus, empathy is a key issue for successful intercultural communication according to Bennett (1998).

Whilst Byram (1997) names it ‘intercultural communicative competence’, he divides the concept into five *savoirs*. The five *savoirs* relate to our curiosity towards other cultures, our explanations when facing misunderstandings, our interpretations of documents from different cultures, our ability to critically evaluate our own practices and those from different cultures, and the ways in which we obtain new knowledge from a different culture and our ability to use it. Different studies, when investigating the concept of intercultural communication/intercultural communicative competence, have used either Bennett or Byram’s model.

On the other hand, Hofstede (2001) divides his cross cultural communication model into different dimensions (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism versus collectivism, masculinity versus femininity, and long-term versus short-term orientation). These dimensions are based on a study in which he collected data from 50 countries, and they are supposed to help us understand the differences between different countries. These dimensions, according to Hofstede (2001), were set so they can enable us to communicate better on an intercultural level.

In his study, Traffon (2003) used Bennett’s (1986) six stages of intercultural sensitivity. Within the interviews he conducted with students attending an international school, he concluded that the students who were the most interculturally sensitive were the ones that fell at the adoption stage, and thus were the ones who were able to see things from the other person’s point of view. On the other hand, within a telecollaboration project, Helm (2009) analysed the students’ intercultural competence by studying their diaries. She concluded that the students who showed that they are interculturally competent were those who used words such as ‘view’ with the combination of ‘point of’, as these students showed curiosity and openness towards other cultures (Byram, 1997). While, within their studies, Traffon (2003) and Helm (2009) tried to fit Bennett (1986) and Byram’s (1997) models into their data, this is considered problematic as these models contain various flaws. To conclude, although there are various models of intercultural competence and although these models have been applied in different contexts, there is still no clear understanding of what it means to be interculturally competent. A more detailed discussion of the different intercultural competence models and the problems they pose will be included in chapter 3.

On the other hand, although the concept of interactional competence has been developed and investigated by various scholars, the concept has been widely related to specific contexts. For instance, Young (2008) discusses the concept of discursive practices, and he argues that discursive practices are repeated routine talk activities and the ways we mutually co-construct the knowledge we possess in a discursive practice is what makes us interactionally competent. Piirainen-Marsh (2011) argues that interactional competence is the joint management of a complex task, whereas Sahlström (2011) claims that what makes participants in a discursive practice interactionally competent is their agreement on who has more access to what. It is Van Compernelle (2011) who argues that repair-initiations are essential in a discursive practice as they allow an opportunity for learning, and thus enhance interactional competence. As interactional competence can mean different things depending on the context, it was important for me as a researcher to investigate the characteristics of interactional competence and what they mean in a tandem language learning context, as this area has not been investigated before.

The main goal of tandem learning is to enable learners to improve their communicative skills in the target language (e.g. Brammerts, 2003) and enhance their intercultural competence (e.g. Stickler and Lewis, 2003; Woodin, 2003). Brammerts (2003) and Lewis (2003) argue that, in a tandem language learning setting, tandem learners are encouraged to correct each other, because as error corrections promote learning. Little (2003) discusses the importance of mutual commitment by both tandem partners in order to ensure that there is an equal dedication to each language and thus both partners can benefit equally from these sessions. Additionally, Stickler and Lewis (2003) claim that in a tandem learning context, intercultural competence can be promoted by the tandem learners encouraging each other to elaborate and to further discuss a culturally related topic that their partner mentions. Although there are various suggestions as to how to promote intercultural competence and how to enhance the tandem learners' communicative skills, there are very few studies that use CA in order to unravel tandem learning interactions.

1.5 Aims of the study

My aim in this study is to use CA in order to identify the characteristics of interactional competence and also examine the notion of intercultural competence through the lens of

interactional competence and CA in a tandem language learning context between English and Chinese postgraduate students.

The research questions of this study are:

- 1) What are the characteristics of *interactional competence* for Chinese and English postgraduate students studying in the UK in a tandem learning context?
- 2) What are the characteristics of *intercultural competence* for Chinese and English postgraduate students studying in the UK in a tandem learning context?

1.6 Methodology

I will be analysing the interactions in these tandem language learning sessions using a micro-analytical account of the turn-taking system, preference organisation, and repair system. Through the usage of the turn-taking system, I will be able to understand how turn-taking occurs in these tandem learning sessions, whether tandem learners speak one at a time, if there are any gaps or overlaps between turns, and what roles they play (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). At the same time, through the preference organisation, I will be able to resolve ‘the structural features of the design of turns associated with particular activities, by which participants can draw conventionalized inferences about the kinds of action a turn is performing’ (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: p. 44). Lastly, through the repair system, I will be able to uncover the sources and the types of repairs in the tandem learning sessions.

1.7 Thesis outline

The thesis is divided into eight chapters. Chapter one provides a general introduction to the thesis, from the context to the theoretical framework to the statement of the problem to the aims of the study, as well as to the methodology used. Chapter two is dedicated to the literature review. It starts by giving an in-depth view of the concept of interactional competence, how different interactional resources are used to examine it, and how it is related to tandem language learning. In chapter three, I provide an overview of the concept of intercultural competence, how it is defined and studied by different scholars, what problems these definitions constitute, and how I am proposing to overcome the problems that are associated with the investigation of the concept of intercultural competence.

Chapter four focuses on the research methodology and research design. This chapter includes a literature review on CA. It covers all the methodological aspects of this study from the research purpose, to the background of the problem, to the research questions, and to the validity and reliability of the study. This chapter also details the research design aspect of this study, from the participants, to the data collection, sampling, use of audio and video, camera and recorder positioning, CA transcript, and data analysis.

Chapter five and chapter six summarise the findings of interactional and intercultural competence whilst chapter seven covers the discussion of the findings. This is achieved by dividing the discussion chapter into different dimensions. Dimension one summarises the findings of the characteristics of interactional competence in relation to the literature and dimension two summarises the findings of intercultural competence in relation to the literature.

Chapter eight forms the conclusion, and this chapter covers the pedagogical implication of the study, its limitations, the contribution to knowledge, and the recommendations for future studies.

Chapter 2. Interactional Competence

2.1 Introduction

In this section, I will be defining and investigating the concept of interactional competence. I will first elaborate on the context of ‘tandem learning’ and what ‘learning’ means in this context. Second, I will examine the relationship between interactional competence and context. Third, I will look into the different interactional resources, such as ‘repair’ and ‘turn-taking system’, and how these resources are linked to the promotion of interactional competence. Fourth, I will discuss how the concept of ‘alignment’ in relation to ‘epistemic access’, ‘epistemic primacy’, and ‘epistemic responsibility’ is related to interactional competence. Lastly, I will review the notion of ‘intersubjectivity’ and the ways in which it contributes to the understanding of interactional competence.

I will start by elaborating on the context of ‘tandem learning’ and thereafter on the meaning of ‘learning’ in this context.

The concept of tandem language learning was developed by Henri Holec in the late 1970s, and since then it has been considered a very popular concept in the field of second language learning (Lewis, 2003: p. 15). The idea behind tandem language learning is that two people with different mother tongues come together in order to learn from each other. The objectives of tandem language learning are:

- to work on improving their ‘communicative ability’ in their partner’s mother tongue
- to get to know the other person and learn about their cultural background
- to benefit from the knowledge that their partner can provide them with, such as, in the area of work, education and leisure (Brammerts, 2003: pp. 28-29)

Tandem learning has two principles: **reciprocity** and **autonomy**. Reciprocity means that both partners benefit equally from each other, and the ‘tandem partnership’ will last as long as both partners benefit from it equally. Thus, as it has been found essential for both partners to feel that they are benefiting equally from that experience, half of the time during these sessions will be dedicated for one partner, and the other half for the other partner.

The principle of autonomy on the other hand:

gives learners the responsibility for their own learning and, therefore confers on them the obligation and the opportunity to set their own goals for their own goals may be reached in collaboration with tandem partners who are, both native speakers of the partner's foreign language, yet learning of their partner's mother tongue. (Brammerts, 2003: pp. 31-33).

Learning in tandem means that two native speakers of different languages come together to teach each other their native language. Learning in tandem allows student-based learning rather than tutor-centred teaching (Walker and Lewis, 2003). Tandem learning has various goals, one of the most vital being learning from the partner's corrections as it allows a 'learning' opportunity. However, how and when the tandem learners choose to correct each other and what they choose to correct can vary as learners' needs and teaching styles can have an effect on this (Brammerts and Calvert, 2003). For instance, when it comes to corrections, Otto (2003) argues that some learners choose to correct all mistakes in pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary, whereas others choose to correct only a few (e.g. one mistake per session). Additionally, Otto (2003) explains that the moment during interaction where the tandem learners choose to correct each other is important to examine, as some tandem learners might choose to wait until their partner finishes his/her sentence or until the idea has been expressed and then they initiate a correction, whereas others when correcting each other choose to 'break the rhythm of the conversation' (p. 83). On the other hand, some try to distinguish between small mistakes that need to be corrected immediately and mistakes that are more serious and thus require detailed explanation.

The ways the tandem learners correct each other is also important as corrections can be done in different ways (e.g. orally or by writing) and sometimes mistakes can be indicated by the native speaker without them being corrected (Otto, 2003). Another goal of the tandem learning sessions is learning through co-operation (Brammerts and Calvert, 2003). Lewis (2003) argues that collaboration between the tandem partners is essential as this would help develop their autonomy and would promote language learning.

To conclude, Walker and Lewis (2003) argue that it is essential for the tandem learners to identify areas within L2 (second language) they would like to develop, and also to agree for their partners to correct them when needed. Brammerts (2003) claims that the issue of error correction is important in a tandem language learning context as it promotes learning. Brammerts and Calvert (2003) agree that error correction is a vital aspect in a tandem learning context, however they argue that, when it comes to error corrections, it is important for the

learning partner to take the initiative as learners needs ‘will differ according to their individual level of knowledge, learning habits, etc.’ (p. 53).

In the next section I will discuss the notion of interactional competence.

2.2 Interactional Competence

Interactional Competence is a field that was firstly discussed by Kramersch (1986). Kramersch (1986: p. 367) defines ‘interaction’ as the ‘relationship between the sender, the receiver, and the context of situation’, and she explains that in order to have successful interaction, the speakers have to create ‘a shared internal context’, for example through ‘negotiating intended meanings’ (Kramersch, 1986), but also establish a shared knowledge of the world between speakers. Hall and Pekarek-Doehler (2011: p. 2) emphasise this by claiming that interactional competence is context-specific and is the ability to navigate with others, mutually coordinate our actions, and ‘to deploy and to recognize context-specific patterns by which turns are taken, actions are organised and practices are ordered’. Furthermore, they illustrate that we approach interactional activities such as greetings, doctor-patient interactions, and business meetings etc., in various different ways and that our approach toward these context specific activities is drawn from the knowledge that we possess (Hall and Pekarek-Doehler, 2011).

Similarly, Young (2008: p. 101) argues that interactional competence is not the knowledge that a person possesses but rather how this knowledge is mutually co-constructed in a ‘discursive practice’. Excerpt 2.1 below illustrates this point.

Excerpt 2.1 [(Young, 2008: p. 101)]

- 1 Ms Allen: How are you?
2 Mr Bunch: Fine.
3 Ms Allen: That’s good.

The conversation in excerpt 2.1 occurred between two acquaintances who are teachers in a school in America. When Ms Allen starts talking in line 1, she displays an understanding that a previous turn has ended or had not occurred, and when Mr Bunch replies, he displays an understanding that the previous turn has finished and he can now start talking. In addition, when Mr Bunch says ‘fine’ in line 2, he demonstrates an understanding that Ms Allen’s previous turn was a question, and, as a result, he provides her with an answer. When Ms Allen replies in line 3 ‘that’s good’, this demonstrates that she acknowledges Mr Bunch’s answer as

he provided her with an answer to the question she posed. In this interaction, both teachers are displaying interactional competence. They display it as they both share an understanding of the turn taking system in this specific discursive practice. Excerpt 2.1 also reflects that these two participants display ‘intersubjectivity’. Intersubjectivity is the shared knowledge that the participants have and demonstrate in a discursive practice (Young, 2008: p. 102).

What these scholars agree upon is that interactional competence is context specific and is the ability to negotiate meanings, create shared internal context, and mutually co-construct knowledge. Thus, in this research, I will be examining the concept of interactional competence within the context of tandem learning. I will be doing so by investigating the usage of the interactional resources that the participants use and the ways in which they use them. Following this, I will be examining the relationship between the concept of intersubjectivity and interactional competence.

2.2.1 Repair

Young (2008) discusses the concept of discursive practices, which he defines as talk activities that are repeated on a routine basis, and he argues that repair is one of the interactional resources that are used in these discursive practices. Repair is defined as the ways in which participants respond to interactional trouble during the practices in which they are participating. In order to analyse interactional trouble, we should examine the source of trouble, then the participant who initiates the repair, and finally the one who resolves it. There are four types of repair possibilities: other-initiated self-repair, other-initiated other repair, self-initiated self-repair, and self-initiated other repair. Moreover, interactional competence is defined by Young (2008) as the ways in which repair and other interactional resources are used to co-construct knowledge in a specific discursive practice. The following study by Van Compernelle (2011) helps demonstrate how repair-initiations and repair-accomplishments are linked to interactional competence.

In his study, Van Compernelle (2011) examines L2 learner interactional competence during language proficiency interviews. The interviews are between US university learners of French as a second language and the examiner. What he tries to show through his study is that the ability to repair trouble in understanding is part of developing L2 interactional competence. In excerpt 2.2, there is a problem in understanding the teacher, and thus the student initiates self-

repair. This allows a learning opportunity and a potential development of the student's interactional competence.

Excerpt 2.2 [(Van Compernelle, 2011: p. 130)]

- 1 T: et après les cours;, (.)
and after classes
- 2 qu'est-ce que tu faisais [(.)] d'habitude.
what did you do [(.)] typically
- 3 S: [uh-]
[uh-]
- 4 d'habitude (.) uh pour les cours,
typically uh for the courses
- 5 c'est um (1.8) encore (.) le (.) le classe
it's um still the the class
- 6 c'est très [(um)]
it's very [(um)]
- 7 T: [<non non non] non <°je veux dire°
[no no no] no I mean
- 8 après les cours.
after classes
- 9 (1.0)
- 10 a[près] (.) l'après-midi: ou le soir:
a[fter] the- the afternoon or the evening
- 11 S: [après?]
[after]
- 12 oh. après le cours.
oh after class
- 13 ((S continues to discuss what he did after classes in high school))

In excerpt 2.2, the student struggles to provide the teacher with an answer (from lines 3 to 6) regarding her after-class activities. The student's answer from lines 3 to 6 mainly focus on the courses themselves as she says *d'habitude uh for the courses* 'typically uh for the courses', and as a result the teacher stops the answer-in-progress and clarifies his question from lines 7 to 8. However, the student does not display understanding as there is a long inter-turn pause of 1.0 seconds in line 9, and thus the teacher in line 10 repeats the word 'after' and then adds some clarification to the original question by 'giving time-relevant information' (Van

Compernelle, 2011: p. 131). The student then in line 11 repeats the word *après* ‘after?’ ending it with rising intonation which indicates that she is not clear about what the teacher means by *après* ‘after’. However, as the teacher gave the time relevant information (in line 10), the student does eventually demonstrate her understanding in line 12, as she first produces ‘oh’ as a change of state of token (Heritage, 1984) which indicates that an understanding has now been reached, and then she repeats part of the original question by the teacher by saying *après le cours* ‘after class’ and she does so by stressing the word *après* ‘after’. In line 13, the student begins elaborating upon her answer by providing the teacher with an appropriate answer to the original question that was asked regarding the activities that she does after class.

In summary, it is quite difficult to pinpoint exactly what this learner has ‘learned’ in this incident: whether she has, for example, learned the word *après* through her repair-initiation and repair-accomplishment in lines 11-12, or whether the teacher’s interactional ability to mediate his answer has led to language learning (Van Compernelle, 2011). Nonetheless, ‘these types of interactions do have the potential to lead to language learning’ (p. 131).

Another example is provided below (excerpt 2.3). The student in this excerpt uses self-initiation as he/she does not understand the teacher’s previous turn. As a result of the repair-initiation, the teacher accomplishes the repair which then results in him/her providing the teacher with an answer. According to Van Compernelle (2011), this type of self-initiation other-repair has a potential for developing interactional competence, as instead of the student just providing any answer to the question that was imposed by the teacher, he/she chooses to initiate a repair in order to clarify the question.

Excerpt 2.3 [(Van Compernelle, 2011: p. 131)]

1 T: et: um: tu peux decrier: um
 and um can you describe um
2 ta routine euh (0.8) quotidienne,
 your daily routine
3 (.)
4 cést-à-dire ce que tu fais tous les jours
 that is what you do everyday
5 du matin au soir et tout ca,
 from morning to night and everything
6 (0.8)
7 S: um (.) excusez?

um excuse (me)
 8 T: la:-ta routine quotidienne:=
 the your daily routine
 9 S: =ta routine.
 your routine
 10 (.)
 11 ((S continues to talk about his daily routine))

In excerpt 2.3, the teacher asks the student to describe his daily routine in lines 1 and 2. However, the pause in line 3 suggests that the student did not understand the question, and as a consequence, the teacher orients to this by clarifying it in lines 4 and 5. After the student initiates a repair in line 7, when she says *um* (.) *excusez?* ‘um excuse me’, this results in the teacher repeating the phrase *la:-ta routine quotidienne* ‘the your daily routine’. Due to this, the result is that the student answers the question and discusses their daily routine in line 11.

More examples to illustrate how repair-initiations are linked to the development of interactional competence are illustrated below. In excerpt 2.4, the student displays understanding after some negotiated interaction with the teacher. However, although her responses appear relevant, they are not appropriate. In turn, the teacher allows the student to finish her response and then reformulates his question in order to pursue a relevant answer.

Excerpt 2.4 [(Van Compernelle, 2011: p. 126)]

1 T: et:: tu viens d'où.
 and where are you from.
 2 (3.5)
 3 S: °je viens°
 I come
 4 T: tu viens d'où.
 where are you from
 5 t'as habité:: (.) ici=
 have you lived here
 6 S: = °oh.° j'habite à (1.0) Honor's Hall
 oh I live in Honor's Hall
 7 (.)
 8 mais:
 but
 9 T: mhm,
 mhm

10 S: °um° (.) j'habite à Little Town,
um I live in Little Town

11 (.)

12 pour l'été.
during the summer

13 T: d'accord. d'accord.
okay okay

14 et tu viens de là:,
and are you from there

15 de Little Town,
from Little Town

16 S: mhm
mhm

17 T: d'accord. d'accord.
okay okay

18 ((T begins a new question))

In excerpt 2.4, the teacher's question in line 1 is considered the trouble source for two reasons. First, after the teacher produces the question, the student in turn does not provide him with a response but rather there is a long inter-turn pause of 3.5 seconds in line 2 which can indicate that the student is being hesitant. Second, the student partially sounds out a reformulated form of the question in line 3 which emphasizes the fact that she (the student) did not comprehend the question that the teacher posed in line 1. In turn, the teacher orients to the 'sounding out' (Van Compernelle, 2011: p. 127) by repairing his talk, thus initiating self-repair in which he repeats the question in line 4 and then in line 5 he reformulates it by asking *t'as habité:: (.) ici* 'have you lived here'.

The student then provides the teacher with several inappropriate answers. She (the student) starts in line 6 by producing 'oh' as a change-of-state particle indicating that she now understands what the teacher has been asking. After the 'oh', she then provides the teacher with an answer to the question by saying *j'habite à Honor's Hall* 'I live in Honor's Hall'. However, this answer is considered inappropriate because of its content as the student here is saying where she lives now at the time of the LPI (Language Proficiency Interview), whereas the teacher's question refers to where she is originally from. The teacher though does not comment and instead produces a continuer 'mhm' in line 9 and a sequence closing third ('okay okay') in line 13. However, he (the teacher) reformulates the question in lines 14 ('and are you from there') and 15 (from Little Town) as he tries again to pursue an answer to the

original question that was posed in line 1. The student then in line 16 produces an acknowledgment token ‘mhm’, and through that she confirms the answer, and in line 17 the teacher again produces a repeated sequence closing third *d'accord. d'accord* ‘okay okay’. In this excerpt, interactional competence was promoted as the teacher oriented to his role appropriately through the identification of the trouble source. As the student was not providing the teacher with the appropriate answer to the question he posed, the teacher initiated repair through his reformulation of his question in order to help the student provide the right answer.

In the next excerpt (2.5), there are a series of inappropriate answers by the student when there is an absence of a preceding question. In other words, the student provides answers to a turn that was preceded by the teacher in which the teacher does not ask a question. However, the student provides an answer as he is used to this type of discursive practice the ‘LPI’ one, in which he was expected to provide answers to the questions posed by the teacher.

Excerpt 2.5 [(Van Compernelle, 2011: pp. 127-128)]

- 1 T: et um: (0.6) là parce que c'est la fin du semestre,
and um because it's the end of the semester
- 2 °et tout ça° c'est fini,
and all that it's over
- 3 on peut se dire tu. okay,
we can call each other tu okay
- 4 S: m.
m
- 5 T: ouais,
yeah
- 6 S: oui (.) c'est (.) le semestre (.) fini? uh:
yes it's the semester over uh
- 7 T: mais:: je veux dire on- on peut se dire tu.
but I mean we we can call each other tu
- 8 ((T continues a brief explanation that S can use tu))

This excerpt (2.5) took place at the beginning of a LPI. After the teacher and the student exchanged pleasantries, the teacher tells the student from lines 1 to 3 that since the semester is over, they can now address each other using *tu* as an address pronoun which is the more informal way of addressing a person in French. In turn, the student produces an acknowledgment token ‘m’ in line 4 and then proceeds in line 6 by addressing the teacher’s

question through the production of a confirmation token *oui* ‘yes’ and then he proceeds by orienting to the contextualisation of the teacher’s offer by saying *c’est (.) le semestre (.) fini?* *uh*: ‘it’s the semester over uh’ rather than producing a response to the offer itself *on peut se dire tu. okay* ‘we can call each other tu’ (line 3). Furthermore, the confirmation token (‘yes’) that was produced by the student in line 6 indicates that the student heard the previous turn (lines 1 to 3) of the teacher as a yes/no question. This confusion can be due to the fact that the teacher’s ‘okay’ (line 3) was produced in a slightly rising pitch and/or the production of the confirmation token *ouais* ‘yeah’ in line 5. As a result, the teacher initiates repair as he reformulates his ‘offer to switch to the more familiar *tu* form’ (Van Compernelle, 2011: p. 128).

To conclude, in this excerpt, the student’s answer is not considered relevant as the teacher did not project a question that required an answer-response. However, the teacher offered the student to use ‘*tu*’ which requires either an acceptance or a rejection on the part of the student. The student instead hears it as a yes/no question and thus produces an answer. This illustrates that the student’s understanding of this interactional framework of an LPI is based on a question-answer sequence in which the teacher produces a question, and in turn, the student provides an answer. Therefore, based on the student’s past experience in this specific context, he knows that if the teacher produces a turn then an answer is needed in the proceeding turn.

Excerpts 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 illustrate two characteristics of interactional competence within the context of an LPI. First, both the teacher and the student orient to this type of interaction as one ‘characterized by question-answer adjacency pair’ (Van Compernelle, 2011: p. 128). Second, the teacher orients to the responses of the student ‘in terms of conditional relevance and content appropriateness’ (Van Compernelle, 2011: p. 128). The student’s responses after the teacher’s turns demonstrate their competence as interviewees in this discursive practice, regardless of the content of the responses. Moreover, by identifying trouble in understanding, and by the teacher trying to repair their talk in order to pursue the right answer, the teacher displays interactional competence. The student’s understanding that a repair was initiated due to their responses not being appropriate and that an appropriate answer was requested demonstrates that they are interactionally competent.

Van Compernelle’s (2011) conclusion from his study is that the student rarely initiated repair and that it was up to the teacher to do so, although the student was still given the credit for being interactionally competent. However, Van Compernelle (2011) suggests that students

initiating repair is actually desirable during Language Proficiency Interviews (LPI). There are two reasons given for this. Firstly, repair is considered as a huge resource for managing interactions and as such, it is essential to encourage students to initiate repair when they do not understand what the teacher asks. This is important as it could promote learner's interactional competence. Secondly, by the learner initiating repair, he/she will be able to facilitate teacher mediation. This means that, when facing an interactional problem, the learner would be the best one to identify the actual problem in understanding the teacher's request/question. By the student so doing, there would be a potential for enhancing teacher mediation, and thus an opportunity for learning.

Van Compernelle (2011) also argues that the question-answer organisation within LPI interactions do indicate that they are what Young (2008) calls 'discursive practices'. This means that in this discursive practice (LPI), the teacher asks a question and the student's job is to answer. When the student provides an answer where appropriate, the student demonstrates their interactional competence in terms of 'their socially constructed knowledge of what it means to interact with an LPI interviewer' (Van Compernelle, 2011: p. 132) regardless of whether their answer is relevant or not.

Additionally, Hellermann (2011) conducted a study on adult learners of English, and he recorded these students' interactions in the classroom to examine the concept of 'repair'. In the excerpt (2.6) below, the students have been given instructions by the teacher to perform adjacency pairs in which the teacher provides them with a list of yes/no questions and two short answers in the format of 'yes I do' or 'no I don't' to choose from.

Excerpt 2.6 [(Hellermann, 2011: pp. 154)]

188 I: do you works part time?
189 Y: yes I am
190 I: → ((points to something on page))
191 Y: oh yes I do.
192 I: ye: [s((writing))
193 Y: [yes I do.
194 I: yes I do. okay thank you very much ((shifts posture))

In this excerpt, Inez initiates a repair in line 190 by pointing to a notebook page in order to help the other student (Ying) to repair his/her talk. As a result, in line 191, Ying accomplishes the repair by providing the right form of answer 'yes I do' which is what originally the teacher

lines 1026 and 1028 by providing more examples of other verbs for the action of ingesting ('eat the food', 'drink water'). Although this situation was resolved later by the teacher, this excerpt demonstrates the ways in which Inez is 'engaged in a longer sequence of talk to accomplish a correction that is oriented to a language form' (Hellermann, 2011: pp. 155-156). To conclude, in excerpt 2.7, Inez tries to accomplish a correction by isolating the trouble source word 'take' from a longer utterance, then she resays the word 'take' as a way of initiating a repair and then she continues by providing Minh with evidence in order to support her correction as Minh does not accept the first suggested correction (Hellermann, 2011).

Excerpt 2.8 is a discussion between Reinaldo and Valdimir in which they are both trying to engage in a question/answer task on sharing biographical information. Valdimir starts by asking Reinaldo what language he speaks, and in turn, Reinaldo answers without orienting to Valdimir's pronunciation of the word 'language'. Only after Valdimir reformulates his question is Reinaldo able to provide an answer with a different pronunciation of the trouble source word 'language' (Hellermann, 2011).

Excerpt 2.8 [(Hellermann, 2011: pp. 156)]

64 V: what lungin do you speak.
65 R: → I am speaking Spanish.
66 (.)
67 V: yes
68 R: I am speaking Spanish
69 V: oh Spanish (.) what do what is your lungin.
70 R: my my lang[uage is
71 V: [what is you your lungin
72 R: → my [my language is Spanish
73 V: [laungin
74 R: my language is Spanish
75 V: (my)?
76 R: yeah wh[at
77 V: [native langin? is Russian.
78 R: Russian yes okay what is your language language
79 V: lounge (.) what is your lounge
80 R: ((shifts posture, retrieves electronic dictionary))
81 °language°
82 ((30 seconds during which students write names on cards
83 and Reinaldo uses the electronic dictionary))

84 ED: → language
 85 T: bloh bloh herhm herhm
 86 V: loun ge
 87 R: language.language
 88 V: language
 89 R: language ((leans back))

In line 64, Valdimir starts with a question, and in turn, Reinaldo takes the opportunity to initiate a repair. However, as Valdimir reformulates his question in line 69, Reinaldo reformulates his answer in line 70 to match the formatting of Valdimir's change of pronunciation of the word 'language'. Reinaldo's response in line 70 overlaps with Valdimir's question in line 71 and this results in Reinaldo repeating his answer in line 74. In line 73, Valdimir changes his pronunciation of the trouble source word 'language' which results in the talk taking a different direction: an instructional sequential one. After Valdimir confirms his native language, Reinaldo twice repeats (line 78) the trouble source word 'language' as he asks Valdimir what is his language. This results in Valdimir altering his pronunciation (line 79) of the word 'language', and in line 80, Reinaldo finds another way to help Valdimir with the pronunciation which is the use of an electronic dictionary. After the pronunciation in line 84 by the electronic dictionary of the word 'language' and after the teacher's comments in line 85 on the electronic dictionary, in line 86 Valdimir resays the trouble source word 'language' in two syllables ('loun' 'ge'). In line 87, Reinaldo repeats the trouble source word 'language' twice and this results in Valdimir pronouncing it almost right for the first time (line 88). The sequence ends in Reinaldo resaying the trouble source word as a way of closing the sequence (Hellermann, 2011).

Excerpts 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8 show evidence of how sequences of repair can lead to the development of interactional competence. Inez and Reinaldo, for instance, oriented to different types of repair at different points in time. They used different practices in the beginning of their interaction than at a later point in the interaction. Inez, for example, used 'no' to upgrade his correction which was followed by him providing evidence for the correction, whereas Reinaldo was more concerned about spelling the trouble source word. However, what Hellermann (2011) emphasises is that these changes were probably influenced by context, as although these interactions took place in a language classroom, the interactions took place in the context of more experienced users of the language.

As discussed above, repair-initiations and repair-accomplishments are linked to the development of interactional competence, and since interactional competence is context-specific, I will detail below the relationship between error corrections and tandem language learning.

In a tandem language learning context, learners are expected to correct each other during the sessions in order to ensure that both partners benefit from the sessions in terms of language learning (Van Compernelle, 2011). Lewis (2003) emphasises the importance of error correction in a tandem learning context and claims that both partners in this setting should agree to ‘the provision of error correction with their native speaker partner’ (p. 21). Other-correction is essential in this context as it is considered as:

a device for dealing with those who are still learning or being taught to operate with a system which requires, for its routine operation, that they be adequate self-monitors and self-correctors as a condition of competence. (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977: p. 381).

Kötter (2003) is one of the few scholars who examined the issue of repair in a tandem learning context. The interactions he examined were between North American and German students. One of the aims of his study was to investigate the types of repair that are used between the interactants using corpus linguistics (the data was taken from the ‘electronic transcripts that the students created of their interactions either in the shape of log files (logs) or as “recordings”’ (p. 151) and questionnaires. The data was analysed in terms of repair types, frequencies, and the difference between the usage of different types of repair amongst the North Americans and the Germans. What his data show is that the most frequent type of repair used amongst all students was ‘requests for clarification’ and the least used type of repair was ‘repetitions’. Whilst Kötter’s (2003) study is one of very few that examines student repairs in a tandem learning context, the study does not indicate how this could be beneficial or how the type of repair was identified.

Error corrections are vital in a tandem language learning context, as well as other contexts, as they promote learning. However, I am unaware of a study that examines error correction in a tandem language learning context using CA as the method of analysis. Therefore, in my research I examine the repair types (covered in further detail in chapter 4) that are initiated by the participants, if any, and I analyse who accomplishes them and whether they achieve interactional competence in this specific context using CA.

2.2.2 Turn-taking system

According to Young (2008), the second interactional resource that is used in a discursive practice is the turn taking system. The turn taking system is used to describe how participants in a conversation know when to select the next speaker, when to end the turn, and when to start a new one.

According to Schegloff (2007), TCUs are considered the building blocks in which turns are managed. Grammar is one of the resources that both help us recognise a TCU and build one. In English, and in many other languages, sentences, clauses, phrases, and lexical items are considered as the basic shape of TCUs. Another organisational resource that shapes TCUs is established in the phonetic organisation of the talk. The third feature of a TCU is that during an episode of interaction, a speaker who begins to talk has ‘the right to produce and obligation to produce one TCU, which may realize one or more actions’ (p. 4).

In her research, Piirainen-Marsh (2011) examines interactional competence in gaming activities. She investigates the ways in which interactional resources are used to sustain joint attention to the game. In this study, she video records two Finnish 13-year-old boys playing a video game at the home of one of the players. Her findings suggest that the turn-taking system used throughout the game indicates that the participants display an understanding of how to manage and sustain their TCUs and know how to shift these TCUs. Moreover, these two players displayed multiple interactional competences through ‘joint management and enjoyment of the complex task’ (Piirainen-Marsh, 2011: p. 39). The findings of this study thus indicate that the two players displayed interactional competence through maintaining shared understanding all throughout the game by paying ‘close attention to the multiple linguistic, turn-constructural and other interactional resources available through the different semiotic fields of the game’ (Piirainen-Marsh, 2011: p. 40).

Sahlström (2011) conducts a study on a seven-year old multilingual child using video recordings over the period of a week to examine the concept of learning as a social action. Sara, the name of the participant, was recorded during post-school programs and at home. The excerpt below is between Sara and Hanna (the other participant). In this excerpt, Sara and Hanna are playing in the woods in the middle of a Harry Potter play. Sara asks Hanna whether she has her English notes and a pencil and this is followed by a discussion about the words one to ten in English. Through an elaboration of this excerpt, I will be able to show how

asymmetries in knowledge is sustained and how this is related to the development of interactional competence.

Excerpt 2.9 [(Sahlström, 2011: pp. 57-58)]

- 1 Sara: har du bly:ertspenna
did you bring a pencil
- 2 Hanna: °nä°
°no°
- 3 Sara: har du din engelskapapper
have you got your English note
- 4 Hanna: ja
yes.
- 5 (2.4)
- 6 Sara: du kan räkna nu.
you can count now
- 7 (0.5)
- 8 Sara: du kan nu räkn-försöka nu räkna utan de.
you can now count- try to now count without it
- 9 (0.2)
- 10 Sara: du kan läsa.
you can read
- 11 Hanna: nej du får läsa. fö ja sager efter okej
no you can read because I say after okay
- 12 (.) sådär som (0.7) som (.) Marina sa. (0.2)
(.) the way as (0.7) as (.) Marina said (0.2)
- 13 ([])
- 14 Sara: [alltså de där ga- när ga:tan gick sönder.
[that one where st- when the steet broke
- 15 Hanna: ((brings out the note))ja så kan du nu gör de
yes then can you now do this
- 16 här att vi räknar också samma sak.
here that we count also the same
- 17 Sara: °(okah)°
(okey)
- 18 (2.8)
- 19 Sara: ja måst först gör den här to att dofta brinn.
I must first make this to smell burn
- 20 ((pounds with a rock))

21 Hanna: ja för de där va va de blir (.) >nu säg.<
yes because that what what it is now say

22 Sara: one.

23 Hanna: one.

24 Sara: two.

25 Hanna: two.

26 Sara: vänta du måst säga efter mej ja säger
wait you must say after me I say

27 se- (.) one.
the- (.) one.

28 Hanna: t[wo]

29 Sara: [tw-] three f-

30 Sara: eiku du ska va tyst. (.) >one. two. three.
no but should be quite

31 four. five. six. seven. eight. nine. ten;
32 okej. din tur.<
okay. your turn.

33 Hanna: nununu säger vi tisammans.
nownownow say we together

34 Sara: nä du får försöka.
no you can try

35 Hanna: nä, (0.2)ja kan b [ara lite.]
no I only know a [little]

36 Sara: [försö:ka.]
[try]

37 Hanna: one. two.

38 (0.5)

39 Hanna: three.

40 (0.6)

41 Hanna: four.

42 (0.7)

43 Hanna: five. Längre kan ja int.
five I can't any further

44 Sara: o[kä:j].
o[kay

45 Hanna: [°s-° seven.

46 Sara: si- okej okej du kan [ba de.]
Si- okay okay you know [only that.]

47 Hanna: [(iti)]

48 Hanna: ja kan [ba-]
I know [on-]

49 Sara: [okej]säg one. two. three. four. five.
[okay]say

50 Sara: six. seven. eight. nine. ten.

51 Hanna: e ight. eight. nite.

52 (1.0)

53 Hanna: va kommer sen.
what comes next.

54 Sara: >ja kan- ja kan- ja kan, saga.
>I can I can- I can<say.

55 (0.4)

56 Sara: one. du får börja också
one. you can begin too.

57 Hanna: one.

58 Sara: two. three. four. five. six. seven. eight.

59 Hanna: our. five. six. seven.

60 Sara: ni(ght). ↑ten.

61 (2.0)

The questions by Sara in lines 1 and 3 regarding the pencil and the English note show that the activity connected to the ‘pencil’ and the ‘English note’ has already happened. Therefore, lines 1 and 3 project a ‘forthcoming activity’ and establish that the activity is a ‘longitudinal’ one (Sahlström, 2011: p. 59) with a relationship to previous situations (activities that occurred prior to excerpt 2.9). In addition, these prior situations are not only prior to the counting that is occurring in excerpt 2.9, but they have also caused a change in the counting practice. This means that when, for example, Sara says in line 6 *du kan räkna nu* ‘you can count now’, through the use of ‘now’ she is establishing that what was not possible before should be possible now.

However, although reading the words from one to ten can be straightforward, it appears to be challenging in this excerpt. In line 6, Sara suggests that Hanna should count from one to ten, and in line 8, she proposes the same offer in a more modified way *du kan nu räkn- försöka nu räkna utan de* ‘you can now count- try to now count without it’. In turn, Hanna refuses and then they discuss how to do it. Following this, they try again reading the list out loud, however they do not achieve success, and after a few elaborations, they come to an agreement (Sahlström, 2011).

According to Sahlström (2011: p. 60), in this excerpt there are ‘many examples of epistemic topicalization’. The first instance is found in lines 6-8, when Sara argues that Hanna can count. By Sara claiming that Hanna ‘knows’ how to count and by her use of the word ‘now’, she is indicating that Hanna ‘knowing how to count’ is not only a fact, but also a consequence of prior activities. In line 8, Sara suggests that Hanna should try to count without reading which might imply that Hanna can do it or it can imply that she cannot.

Sahlström (2011) continues to argue that in this excerpt there are subsequent examples of how epistemic stance is topicalized. For instance, in line 34, Sara asks Hanna *nä du får försöka* ‘no you can try’. In turn, Hanna answers in line 35 *nä,(0.2) ja kan b ara lite* ‘no I only know a little’. In line 43, Hanna says *five Längre kan ja int* ‘five I can’t any further’, and in turn, Sara replies by saying *si okej okej du kan ba de* ‘Si- okay okay you know only that’ in line 46. Finally, Sara says *ja kan- ja kan- ja kan,saga* (line 54) ‘I can I can- I can say’. To conclude, Hanna assesses her own competence (lines 33, 43 and 46) and Sara assesses Hanna’s competence (line 44).

In this excerpt, there is a sustainment of knowledge asymmetry between Sara and Hanna. By Sara requesting Hanna to count, she is thus encouraging her to do something that they both know that Sara knows how to do well. In turn, Hanna positions herself in an unknowing position and Sara in a knowing one all throughout the excerpt as she aligns with this proposed asymmetry. When Hanna says she cannot count any further, Sara replies by saying she knows that, ‘implying that this lack of knowledge is Hanna’s only’ (Sahlström ,2011: p. 60), and then she asks Hanna to repeat. Thereafter, Hanna asks Sara what is the next step, and through that she is suggesting that Sara is the one that would know and that she would not. This clear asymmetry between Sara and Hanna was sustained all throughout the expert.

In excerpt 2.9, Sara and Hanna’s asymmetrical orientation to knowledge is clear, as they are both aware of how to access and cede epistemic authority. This process is what Sahlström calls learning rather than the actual outcome of learning. Thus, Sahlström (2011) concludes that for ‘the studied children, teaching and learning are parts of their interactional competence’ (p. 62). Asymmetries of knowledge is important in a tandem learning context as for half of the session, the tandem partners play the role of teacher and in the other half, the role of a learner.

As mentioned above, in a tandem language learning context, knowing when to end the turn and when to start one is important, as there should be equal commitment by both tandem

partners in terms of devoting an equal amount of time for each language. By doing so, they therefore ‘experience in equal measure the roles of language learner and native speaker’ (Little, 2003: p. 37). Consequently, in order for both partners to benefit equally from the session, they should be able to know when and how to start and end a turn, and how to manage the epistemic asymmetry, as deciding when to teach each language and when to switch to the other one is totally the tandem learners’ responsibility (Kötter, 2003). Hence, in this study I will pay close attention to the turn-taking system and how it is used by the interactants and how they use words such as ‘Okay’ to close topics and move topics forward.

‘Okay’ is a device that can be used to close down a topic and to move it forward (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). It can be used as a pre-closing and ‘may constitute the first part of the closing section’ (p. 304). Schegloff and Sacks (1973) continue to argue that the placement of ‘Okay’ is also important in a conversation. Beach (1993) argues that participants can sometimes use ‘Okay’ as ‘partial solutions to ongoing interactional problems’ (p. 326). Thus, it would be essential to examine how the participants use and orient to ‘Okay’ during the tandem learning sessions, as misusing it could lead to the tandem learners not benefiting equally from the tandem learning sessions (Little, 2003).

2.2.3 Dis/alignment

Since interactional competence is the way in which we mutually co-construct our knowledge in a discursive practice (Young, 2008), and alignment is the way in which we cooperate and facilitate our responses, it is therefore essential to examine the issue of dis/alignment and how it is connected to the concept of interactional competence.

Through different interactions, we position ourselves vis-à-vis going from one moment to another and from one turn constructional unit (TCU) to another (Stiver, Mondada and Steensig, 2011). Now by positioning ourselves vis-à-vis, we convey the social relationship that we have with the speaker/recipient. For instance, when we announce personal news, we are treating the recipient as our friend. Alignment is the way in which we try to co-operate our responses by facilitating the sequence, ‘accepting the presuppositions and terms of the proposed action or activity; and matching the formal design preference of the turn’ (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011: p. 21). Stivers (2008: pp. 34-36) argues that in storytelling *mm*, *hm*, *uh huh*, and *yeah* are tokens that are used to acknowledge the fact that the story is still in progress and that the storyteller has the floor until the story is complete. The acknowledgment

9 AUR: =le t(h) (rain) (h) = ° ° le t(h) ra (in) (h) (h) ° °
 ((looking briefly up from his note-taking towards
 OLI, who is oriented to the instruction-sheet
 before her, and covering his mouth with his left
 hand))

trans the t(h) (train) (h) the t(h) ra (in) (h) (h)

As we can see in excerpt 2.10, there are various occasions where misalignments occur. For instance, in lines 6, 7, and 8, OLI tries to engage with AUR by asking for help and in return AUR (in line 9) does not reply back but stays engaged with the instruction-sheet. This indicates that there is misalignment between the two as there is no response to OLI's information gathering response. Instead, AUR ignores this request, does not acknowledge OLI's request, and continues reading the instruction sheet (Kohler and Thorne, 2011: pp. 82-83). Thus, the excerpt illustrates the claim of Keevallik (2011) and Asmuß (2011), which is to say that disaligning activity is a sign of non-collaboration.

One of the aims of tandem language learning is for the tandem partners to want to improve their language learning skills, for their partners to help them achieve this (Brammerts, 2003), and to display a mutual commitment towards the learning process (Little, 2003). Therefore, this research examines the concept of dis/alignment in tandem learning sessions in order to investigate how the tandem partners cooperate, how they facilitate the sequences, how they show their commitment to the tandem language learning process, and whether this leads to the development of interactional competence.

2.2.4 Knowledge and epistemic access, primacy, and responsibility

The concept of alignment is also associated with the concept of epistemic access, epistemic primacy, and epistemic responsibility. An elaboration on the concept of knowledge and on its three dimensions (epistemic access, epistemic primacy and epistemic responsibility) is given below.

There are three dimensions of knowledge in conversations (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011) and these three dimensions can have an effect on asymmetries in conversations. The first dimension is 'epistemic access' which includes the knowledge we have versus the knowledge that we do not have, the source of knowledge, how we address that knowledge in a conversation, and how certain we are of that knowledge. The second dimension is called

‘epistemic primacy’ and this includes the ‘relative rights to know’, the ‘relative rights to claim’, and the ‘relative authority of knowledge’. Finally, the third dimension is ‘epistemic responsibility’ and this includes the ‘type of knowable’, ‘the ‘recipient design of actions’ and the ‘recipient design of turns’ (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011: p. 9). Below is a more detailed discussion of these three dimensions.

Various scholars in social interaction have been giving attention to the field of epistemic access. For instance, conversation analytic studies examine the ways in which epistemic access in conversation is used to manage, elicit, and claim access to knowledge. As an example, if a speaker in a conversation offers the recipient a news announcement, this would signify that they are treating the recipient as someone that has not heard this news. On the other hand, if a speaker requests information, this would mean that they are treating the recipient as ‘knowing’ (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011: pp. 9-10). Thus, in most cases, recipients of news announcements have no primary epistemic access unlike recipients of information requests can be said to be positioned as having primary epistemic access. Achieving this is referred to as ‘epistemic access congruence’, which means the mutual agreement of who has an access to what. However, this is not always achieved. For instance, Stivers, Mondada and Steensig (2011) provide an example (Excerpt 2.11) of an exchange where the recipient does not treat the announcement of news as news.

Excerpt 2.11 [(Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011: 11)]

1 TARA: My mom left me this who:le long message on my cell
2 phone last night about thuh directions,
3 KRIS: → Yea(h)h I kn(h)ow, I was there.
4 (1.0)
5 TARA: #huh# ((cough))
6 TARA: #heh heh# ((laughter))

The response in line 3 does not align with the previous turn, and thus there is no ‘epistemic congruence’ in this exchange. For this exchange to reach epistemic congruence, Kris in line 3 could have said ‘oh really’ which is a newsmark, and this newsmark treats announcements as news. Stories prefaces can also be used to examine whether the teller has mentioned the story before and the recipient’s response will determine whether that teller has accessed this information before or not and thus can continue with the telling as illustrated in the example below (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011).

Excerpt 2.12 [(Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011: 11)]

1 LAN: → Did I mention to you that I got yelled at by
2 one of our neighbour today?
3 (0.2)
4 GIO: No,
5 (0.8)
6 LAN: Yeah I was ... ((continues))

These pre-tellings in conversation are essential as they can lead to agreements on who has access to what. Claims to access should not be made without sufficient access, and this is why speakers are usually cautious about claiming access (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011). Moreover, access could be made direct or indirect and could sometimes indicate a level of certainty. This is when participants downgrade assessments (Heritage and Raymond, 2005), such as using words like ‘seem’ as shown in the excerpt below.

Excerpt 2.13 [(Heritage and Raymond, 2005: p. 18)]

1 Bea: hh hhh We: ll, h I wz glad she c'd come too las'ni:ght=
2 Nor: → =Sh[e seems such a n]ice little [l a dy]
3 Bea: [(since you keh)] [dAwf'ly] nice l*I'l
4 p*ers'n. t hhh hhh We:ll, I[: j's]
5 Nor: [I thin]k everyone
6 enjoyed jus...

Epistemic access can thus be direct vs. indirect or substantial vs. minimal and it is related to the individual's knowledge. However, epistemic primacy is different as it can be relative (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011).

Epistemic primacy is the asymmetries in social interactions and how we orient to them. Asymmetries can be defined as someone who has the ‘relative rights to tell, inform, assert or assess something’ (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011: p. 13) where the emphasis would be on the word relative. For instance, if two people went to Tokyo and the first person had lived in Tokyo for ten years and the second one had just visited, even though both have an access to knowledge (the knowledge of being in Tokyo), one would argue that the first person has a greater access to this knowledge than the other one (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011). In this way, having more epistemic authority in a specific domain gives you more authority to access it. An example of this is illustrated below.

Excerpt 2.14 [(Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011: p. 15)]

1 DON: The point is you wouldn't take that course

2 if you weren't determined in the
3 first [place.
4 TER: [(I'm nna [go mo: [my)
5 JOH: [Mm hm, [
6 DON: → [They ju[st-just give you that=
7 ANN: [Well,
8 DON: → =bit of support.
9 JOH: => Th't's right.

In excerpt 2.14, it is clear that Joh has greater authority than Don as Joh is assessing the situation by saying in line 9 'Th't's right'. Even though Don is the one who was sharing his experience, that does not give him an epistemic authority because it is clear that Joh has more epistemic authority in that domain than Don as he is the one who is giving the assessment. It is important to note, however, that if participants in a conversation all agree that one person has greater authority and rights than them, they would reach 'epistemic primacy congruence' in that interaction. If they do not agree on who has more rights, then the situation would be 'epistemically incongruent' (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011: p. 16).

Epistemic responsibilities refer to the responsibilities that we have over certain knowledge, such as our names, what we have done or are going to do, and our feelings. On the other hand, we are not responsible for what we do not know, for instance the arrivals or departures of other people. However, epistemic responsibilities can be more than just the responsibilities over our personal information. In social interaction, for instance, 'conversationalists attend not only to who knows what, but also to who has a right to know what, who knows more about what, and who is responsible for knowing what' (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011: p. 18).

In his article, Heritage (2012b) examines the issue of epistemic seesaw and how it is managed by the interactants. When discussing the term 'epistemic seesaw', Heritage uses the term 'epistemic status'. Epistemic status is considered a relative concept which concerns 'the relative access to some domain of two (or more) persons at some point in time' (Heritage, 2012a: p. 4). Moreover, the epistemic status of each person involved in the interaction would be relative to others, will be different from one domain to another, and can change according to different interactional contributions (Heritage, 2012a). When discussing the issue of 'territories of knowledge in sequence organization' (Heritage, 2012b: p. 33), Heritage (2012b) claims that two main issues emerge. First, speakers can position themselves in an unknowing

position (K-) by, for instance, trying to elicit information from a more knowing recipient (K+). On the other hand, knowing speakers (K+) can launch a sequence by projecting their recipients in an unknowing position (K-). Thus, it is important to explore how the epistemic seesaw is driven in any interaction.

As the tandem language learning sessions are between two different native speakers (English and Chinese), it is essential to examine how the two tandem learning partners play their roles accordingly during these sessions (the role of the teacher and the role of the learner) as well as how they manage to switch these roles when needed (Heritage, 2012b). In this research, the tandem language learning sessions will be designed so both partners benefit equally from the sessions, as 45 minutes will be dedicated to teaching the Chinese student some English and 45 minutes will be dedicated to teaching the English student some Chinese. This principle, according to Brammerts (2003: p. 29), is called ‘reciprocity’. This principle means that both tandem partners make sure that they support each other equally in the process of learning the other partner’s language. Consequently, in one half of the session, the Chinese student will be playing the role of the teacher and the English student will be playing the role of the learner and vice versa in the other half. Due to this, the ways in which the tandem partners access and orient to knowledge in the tandem learning sessions is important to investigate.

2.2.5 Intersubjectivity

Intersubjectivity is a concept that has been linked to interactional competence and L2 learning. It is a term that is associated with the concept of adjacency pair, and it means reaching mutual understanding between the interactants. Adjacency pairs are the building blocks of intersubjectivity, as the interactants use them to show their understanding of each other’s turns, ‘and this permits analysts to follow the progress of their intersubjectivity’ (Seedhouse, 2004a: p. 22). According to Tarplee (2010), collaborative talk is a fundamental issue for achieving mutual intersubjective understanding, and this can be displayed by the participants, specifically in next turn position, through ‘an understanding of how a prior turn has been received and what its import has been taken to be (p. 19).

Repair is one of the interactional resources that might be helpful for language learners when acquiring a second language (Markee, 2000) and when repair initiations and accomplishments resolve misunderstanding between speakers, this would result in achieving mutual understanding and thus intersubjectivity (Schegloff, 1992). Kasper (2009) conducted a study

with an L1 speaker and an L2 speaker of English in order to locate cognition in second language learning using CA as her method of analysis. She concluded from her study that repairs during talk-in-interaction ‘serve to maintain and restore intersubjectivity’ (p. 29), however her main argument is related to self-initiated self-repair (by the L2 learner) and she claims that this type of repair does not happen in a vacuum and that through it, the L2 learner embodies ‘socially shared cognition’ (Kasper, 2009: p. 29) with the native speaker. Furthermore, Potter and Edwards (2013) emphasise this point by arguing that when trouble arises during an interaction that threatens the mutual understanding between the interactants, repair can then be used to maintain intersubjectivity as the ‘display of ‘misunderstanding’ or ‘confusion’ can be identified, formulated and fixed’ (p. 689).

Supporting this is Alterman (2007) who states that intersubjectivity occurs when, during the interaction, the interactants display an understanding of each other and an understanding of their shared field of activity which enables them to work together effectively. Thus, intersubjectivity should be examined through focusing on how the interactants demonstrate a shared understanding (Alterman, 2007). The explanation by Schegloff (1992) of the concept of intersubjectivity continues to emphasise this point as he argues that it is the procedure of creating a shared and common ground, and it is the set of practices in which the actions display ‘grounding in, and orientation to, “knowledge held in common” – knowledge that might thereby be reconfirmed, modified, expanded, and so on’ (p. 1298). Intersubjectivity thus means that the participants ‘stay on the same page’ during their talk-in-interaction (Alterman, 2007).

2.3 Summary

As a summary, in this chapter, I have looked at the different interactional resources that promote interactional competence and examined the importance of context in relation to it. I have also reviewed the notions of ‘alignment’, ‘knowledge’, and ‘intersubjectivity’, and their importance when discussing interactional competence. Therefore, within my excerpts I will be examining my data in order to see how the different interactional resources are used and what roles alignment, knowledge, and intersubjectivity play in the promotion of interactional competence.

Chapter 3. Intercultural Competence

3.1 Introduction

The term ‘intercultural competence’ or what other scholars refer to as ‘intercultural communicative competence’ has been used in an academic and non-academic context over three decades; however, the definition of its precise meaning is still unclear. The reason for this could be because the concept of intercultural competence/intercultural communicative competence has been used in different contexts, such as: educational, political, business, etc. (Guo, 2010). Another reason might be the fact that different scholars use different terminology to describe it. For instance, in trying to define the concept of intercultural competence, Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) claim that it is important to first try to define the meaning of the word ‘competence’ or ‘adaption’. The term ‘competence’, Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) claim, can be associated with a set of abilities or skills. However, this approach can be problematic as the same behaviours/skills can be perceived as competent in one context but not competent in another context. Despite this problem, Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) argue that:

any competence conceptualizations are considered relevant that attempt to account for the process of managing interaction in ways that are likely to produce more appropriate and effective individual, relational, group, or institutional outcomes. (p. 6).

Thus, despite the fact that Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) point out that the term ‘competence’ is context specific, they still claim that any way of conceptualising competence is considered significant even if it is not related to specific contexts. However, what Deardorff (2009) notes is that most of the Western models tend to view intercultural competence as a construct that operates in a vacuum and one that is detached from context. Deardorff (2009: p. 268) concludes that placing intercultural competence within specific contexts is fundamental in trying to understand the complexity of this term.

Thus, in the first section I will examine the context that is used in this research which is ‘tandem language learning’ and its relation to intercultural competence. Second, I will study the different models of intercultural competence/intercultural communicative competence, the ways in which different scholars named and defined it, and how these models have been applied in different research. Third, I will explore the ways in which these models have been critiqued. Finally, I will discuss how I am going to study this concept. My aim in this research

is not to try to fit the different models of intercultural competence/intercultural communicative competence into my data, but rather to examine the different interactional resources that are used by the participants and discuss what these resources tell us about the participants' intercultural competence.

3.2 Tandem language learning and intercultural competence

According to Woodin (2003), when language learning/teaching is discussed, it is usually linked to culture and nationality. However, this has some limitations, as a retired Liverpool docker might have nothing in common with an 18 year old educated British female, whereas, he/she might have a much common ground with a German docker counterpart. On the other hand, youth culture, for instance, is regarded as 'international phenomenon', which means that youngsters from different countries might share the same interests and activities regardless of their cultural background. In this way, culture can be all relative. For instance, Spanish culture is viewed differently by an Italian than by a Briton where, as an example, overlapping in conversations might be considered rude by a Briton but an Italian or a Spaniard may not consider it so (pp. 71-73).

A cross cultural approach to language teaching/learning that describes, for instance, what the British do and what the Spaniards do, can be quite problematic as it can lead to stereotypes and can encourage learners to view culture as static. This can be avoided by encouraging learners to view culture as relative. Tandem activities that allow participants to relativise both their own and their partner's culture, and at the same time allow them to learn from each other, can enable them to perceive their own culture and that of their partner differently. Only when this happens, learning in tandem becomes intercultural. Woodin (2003) continues to argue that awareness and knowledge of our own culture and the culture of the foreign/second language we are learning can be acquired in the classroom. However, what tandem learning offers is something that can sometimes be lacking in a traditional classroom setting. Tandem learning can help participants improve their ability to 'act appropriately within a culture' as it gives them the opportunity to interact with people from other cultures. Since in tandem learning the learning environment is a non-threatening one and both partners are usually motivated, this can enhance and improve the participants' intercultural competence (Woodin, 2003).

There is no doubt that tandem learning and intercultural learning go hand in hand as the nature of the closeness of the two people participating in tandem learning creates

automatically cultural awareness of the target language they are learning (Lewis, 2003). Furthermore, because tandem learning deals with individuals rather than systems, each individual participating in it represents multiple cultural identities (Stickler and Lewis, 2003: p. 97). These identities include: ethnic origin, regional affiliation, nationality and citizenship.

Hence, tandem learning meets all the following criteria:

- Individuals who participate in it benefit from communicating with someone who is a representative of the target culture.
- These individuals know most about the origin of their culture and can be ‘used as cultural informants’.
- Individuals have the opportunity to negotiate intercultural meaning.
- ‘Participants share one form of sub-culture’, for instance, similar age, interests, occupation, etc.
- It gives participants the opportunity to practice their social skills in the target culture as they would be able to get feedback from an L2 representative of the target culture (Stickler and Lewis, 2003: pp. 97-98).

According to Stickler and Lewis (2003), one of the aims of tandem language learning is for the tandem partners to help each other with language learning, and learn about each other’s culture. Tandem learning is an opportunity for both partners to be exposed first hand to the culture of their partner, and thus it would enable both partners to negotiate intercultural meaning as well as learn about their partners’ cultures. If communication is successful, some development on an affective level will take place. The best outcome of this would be that it would allow a positive experience of affectionate access to the culture of the other participant. As tandem language learning deals with individuals rather than system, it is thus ‘particularly capable of dealing with the issue of multiple cultural identities’ (Stickler and Lewis, 2003: p. 97), and it meets all the criteria for intercultural communication.

Stickler and Lewis (2003) provide an example of a tandem language learning session between an English person and a German person. In this session, the German tandem learner mentions a city in Germany in an affective way as a response to a discussion that she and her partner were having. However, as her English tandem partner does not ask questions about the reference to this city, this shows that she had an opportunity to ask but did not, and thus she has ‘missed out on a different kind and quality of information from anything that might be

obtained from an impersonal source' (Stickler and Lewis: p. 99). Stickler and Lewis's (2003) analysis of what it means to be interculturally competent in a tandem learning context demonstrates that being affective towards the tandem partner and asking the tandem partner culturally related questions can indicate that the tandem learner is interculturally competent. Some scholars (e.g. Bennett, 1998) have made similar arguments by relating intercultural communication to the concept of 'empathy', hence I will be examining later on the issue of empathy in relation to intercultural competence and I will argue why this model might be considered problematic.

3.3 Bennett's model of intercultural development sensitivity

Bennett (1986) uses the term 'intercultural communication sensitivity' to refer to an intercultural situation and he examines the ways in which we approach differences and how we react to them. She divides the concept of 'intercultural communication sensitivity' into six stages. Each stage examines the ways in which we approach differences; differences towards other cultures, and how this is related to our level of intercultural communication sensitivity. The stages are: denial, defence, minimisation, acceptance, adaption, and integration. The first stages such as denial and defence are considered as 'ethnocentric stages', and the later stages such as adaptation and integration are considered as 'ethnorelative stages'.

Bennett (1986) tries within each stage to 'describe' what would happen and how the person would act. As an example, when discussing the stage of 'denial', Bennett (1986) claims that a person at this stage would be prejudiced toward cultural differences. Whereas in the second stage, which is the 'defence', Bennett (1986) argues that the person at this stage would, for example, 'feel' superior when it comes to his/her own culture. Furthermore, at the 'minimization' stage, a person would acknowledge only 'cultural similarities' and ignore 'cultural difference'. At the 'acceptance stage', Bennett (1986) states that the person involved would accept cultural differences without him/her evaluating them. Within the last two stages, 'integration' and 'adaptation', a person would be considered more 'interculturally sensitive' than in the previous stages. For instance, within the 'adaptation stage', the person would show empathy towards other cultures, and within the 'integration stage', a person would experience cultural differences as a positive aspect in life (Bennett, 1986).

As we can see, Bennett's (1986) model of 'intercultural communication sensitivity' is based on how people should or would be feeling in each stage, thus this model tries to put people

into different categories and ignores many other issues such as 'context'. I will elaborate on the different scholars that have used Bennett's (1986) model and then argue why this model is considered problematic.

Pusch (2009) uses Bennett's model to analyse the intercultural communication competence of global leaders. Pusch (2009) argues that being interculturally competent is one of the most important factors when it comes to global leadership. Therefore, a leader in a global setting should be an effective intercultural communicator due to this setting usually involving people from different cultures who would be behaving and thinking differently.

Pusch (2009) explains the difference between ethnocentrism and ethnorelativism and their importance when talking about an interculturally competent person, specifically in relation to a global leader. The difference between ethnocentrism and ethnorelativism, Pusch (2009) explains, is that an ethnocentric person is a person that dismisses other cultures, is prejudiced towards other cultures, and sets clear distinctions between his/her own group and other groups. Conversely, an ethnorelativist person is one who accepts and respects cultural differences, relates with different cultures, and 'is able to function between and among many cultures' (p.75). Pusch (2009) continues to argue that a global leader needs to be an ethnorelativist person as global leadership 'requires crossing national borders and encountering many different cultures both within and among those borders' (p. 72). Moreover, a leader is one who looks ahead, defines the path, and helps guide others. As a global setting involves people from different cultures who think and behave differently, a global leader should therefore be an efficient intercultural communicator. To conclude, an effective global leader is one who is ethnorelativist and thus embraces differences between people/cultures (Pusch, 2009).

Straffon (2003) also conducted a study based on Bennett's (1986) six stages of intercultural sensitivity in order to assess the intercultural sensitivity of high school students attending an international school. He conducted interviews with these students in order to examine the stage they are at according to Bennett's interpretation of intercultural sensitivity. In response to the question 'what do you think is more important to pay attention to, cultural differences or cultural similarities?' (Straffon, 2003: p. 495), thirteen of the students' answers were represented at the minimisation stage. For instance, one student's answer was 'cultural similarities because if you focus on the negative parts of why cultures are different you achieve nothing'.

Seven students indicated in their answers that cultural differences and similarities are equally important, which means that they are going through a cognitive shift towards the acceptance stage. They would still be considered at the minimisation stage, however according to Straffon (2003: p. 495), they are moving towards the acceptance level. One student's answer was 'I think both, you can look at both in a positive way because if you don't have differences, then you don't have anything to learn from each other', and this answer places that student at the lower end of the acceptance stage. Five students indicated that it is more important to pay attention to cultural differences, which places them more towards the acceptance stage.

Straffon (2003: p. 496) points out that individuals in the acceptance stage not only acknowledge differences but are also able to understand them. Moreover, individuals at this stage find cultural differences interesting. For instance, when the researcher asked 'when you encounter a cultural difference, what is your first reaction?', one student answered by saying 'my first reaction would be sort of "wow this is interesting"'. This is a good example of an answer that places one at the acceptance stage. A Japanese student answered this question by saying 'because Japan is a very small country, only Japanese live there, so I don't know other people going there [sic]. I thought all people in the world are the same culture'. This answer places this student between the denial and the defence stage because she is unable to discriminate cultural differences (Straffon, 2003: p. 497).

In order to understand how these students view culture, the question 'what does the word culture mean to you was asked?' in which two student's responses indicated a superficial understanding of this concept as they have answered this question by saying 'culture means country and lifestyle' and 'culture shows each country's characteristics'. These two answers place the two students at the denial and the defence stage. Other students have answered this question by saying: 'your upbringing and what you believe in' and 'how somebody identifies themselves as a group'. These two answers indicate a high level of understanding of what the word culture really means. These answers show that the two students understand other cultures as much as they do theirs, and that places them at the adaptation stage (Straffon, 2003: p. 498).

The highest score fell in the cognitive adaptation stage, and a person operating within this stage, Straffon (2003: p. 497) explains, is able to see things from the other person's cultural

point of view. 'Individuals in this stage are not completely bicultural, but they are moving in that direction'. In addition, people at this stage usually have spent some time in and among other cultures. For instance, in this study, the participants that fell in the adaptation stage have spent an average of 6.7 years abroad living outside of their home country, which is between one third and one half of their lives.

As we can see, Pusch (2009) and Straffon's (2003) studies are quite descriptive as they describe to us how people 'feel' in certain situations or what people 'should' be doing or 'saying' in order to be considered intercultural competent. They both relied on Bennett's (1986) DMIS model to analyse their data. However, this model has been criticised for its lack of efficiency. According to Friedman and Antal (2005), Bennett's (1986) model suggests that intercultural efficiency would be mostly achieved by engaging with cultural differences and this would occur in the last two stages (adaptation and integration). However, Friedman and Antal (2005) argue that there are serious issues with Bennett's adaptation stage. One problem with this stage is that it assumes that if one knows enough about different cultures then one will be able to shift and modify one's behaviour accordingly. This model treats the issue of intercultural adaptation and its application as unproblematic due to the assumption that the process of breaking out from one's own cultural framework to adapt to a different culture is easy. However, this argument can be countered as most people lack the training to be able to achieve this successfully.

Moreover, Friedman and Antal (2005) continue to note that if we are examining things from a practical point of view, the success of an international manager on an intercultural level, for instance, should not be assessed in terms of whether he/she can eat/greet according to the cultural norms within a country but rather by the outcomes of the interactions. It is thus important for managers to develop the ability to engage with people from different cultural backgrounds in order to achieve an understanding, and jointly generate ideas, decisions, and actions.

Thus, instead of talking about 'adaption', Friedman and Antal (2005) discuss the concept of 'negotiating reality' (p. 77) in which they relate it to successful interactions in an intercultural context. The idea behind 'negotiating reality' is that two or more people from different cultural backgrounds come together in order to negotiate a particular issue or a problematic situation. Thus, through this process, individuals become more aware of their own cultural beliefs and perceptions.

3.4 Bennett's intercultural communication model

Bennett (1998) also attempts to relate the two concepts of sympathy and empathy to intercultural communication and originally discussed these two concepts in 1979. He first tries to differentiate between the two concepts. Sympathy, he claims, is used in face to face interaction and what it means is when interacting with others we sometimes tend to imagine how we would have felt if the same situation has occurred to us. For example, if a friend is describing how he/she feels after the death of his/her auntie, when sympathising with the situation, we would imagine how we would have felt if our auntie died and as a result, the emphasis is on the aspect of 'similarities'. On the other hand, what empathy means is imagining how the other person feels/thinks from their own perspective (Bennett, 1998). When discussing 'intercultural communication', what we are more concerned with is the notion of 'empathy'. According to Bennett (1998), there are two focal points when it comes to empathy and these are 'participation' and 'placement. This means when empathising we are 'concerned with "experience" and "perspective" rather than "position"' (Bennett, 1998: p. 207).

Therefore, the emphasis when empathising is not only on the similarities between us and the other person, but rather there is also the participation aspect of it, meaning to get inside the head and heart of the other person and to get involved in their experience. Bennett calls this process 'perspective taking' (Bennett, 1998: p. 207). As an example, if trying to help a friend overcome a problem he/she is facing, when empathising we would not try to help him/her solve this issue by seeing the solution from our own perspective, but we would try to understand how he/she would like to solve it and then help him/her do so. Hence, empathy within intercultural communication is a shift in perspective from our own to an acknowledgment of the experience the other person is going through. This shift means a willingness to participate in the other person's experience, and the participation would be appropriate according to this experience.

There are six steps for developing empathy. Each step, according to Bennett (1998), is essential for developing the next, thus the order of the steps is important and they are developed as an approach for understanding differences. The first step, according to Bennett (1998) is where one starts 'assuming difference' which means that at this stage one would be able to think, imagine, and see things from a different perspective. Within the second step,

called 'knowing self', one would be aware of his/her individual and cultural values and according to Bennett (1998), this would be considered as our identity. Step three is called 'suspending self' and within this step one suspends oneself in order to expand on one's boundaries in order to eliminate the 'separation between self and environment' (p. 210). Thus, the emphasis in this step is not on suspending our identity but rather on testing and expanding our boundaries. Within the fourth step, 'allowing guided imagination', one would allow his/her imagination to be captured by the other person and thus experience what they are going through. This can only happen when awareness occurs. Step five is 'allowing empathetic experience', and the person at this stage would allow himself/herself not only to imagine things from the other person's perspective but also experience what the other person is going through as if that person was himself/herself. Lastly, in the final step which is 're-establishing self', we find our way into the other person's experience but after doing so, we have to remember to go back to our own selves. This process is necessary for empathetic communication and failure to re-establish ourselves can cause ego-loss and an identity problem. Moreover, separating our sympathy towards the other person from our empathy towards them is important as this separation will reinforce the importance of empathy (Bennett, 1998). However, the problem with Bennett's (1998) steps is that it is claimed that in order for them to develop, they have to occur in the same order. An issue with this is the assumption that how people feel and behave is predetermined as well as that all people are the same when it comes to developing 'empathy'. Before discussing this in further detail, I will show how Bennett's (1998) model of empathy in relation to intercultural communication has been used in different studies.

In her paper, Houghton (2010) examines the concept of intercultural communication competence and she tries to show through her study the importance of 'empathy' within intercultural communication competence. Houghton (2010) conducted her study in a university in Japan where she taught English as a foreign language. Thirty-six students participated in this study and they were split randomly. The study was split into three courses with three different approaches. Course one's approach was for the author to try to help students adopt to cultural differences without being judgmental and try to develop empathetic stance. Course two's approach was to try to help the students develop critical awareness without the teachers trying to change the students' view. Lastly, course three's approach was to follow course number two but in combination with trying to promote a democratic stance by trying to change the learners' views when appropriate.

Once the data were collected and gathered and a ‘relationship between the bodies of data generated’, the three courses were treated as one case study (Houghton, 2010: p. 203). When examining the data, the issue of empathy emerged and how the students empathised with others when encountering cultural differences in class. The data seemed to indicate that empathy is essential for improving communication skills, although some students did indicate that overdoing it could be too risky.

Houghton (2010) claims that the example above illustrates that empathising with others depends on the similarities and differences between ourselves and the others. Thus, she emphasizes that empathy is an important aspect for enhancing foreign/second language students’ communication skills. In this way, language teachers are advised to be aware of what makes empathy difficult, which is two aspects: ‘information-gathering and judging’ (p. 210). These two aspects are interrelated which means that in order for the students to empathise with people from different cultural backgrounds, they would need to gather enough information and to be able to identify key points and reject elements that are not as important. This process will help them be less judgmental towards others.

Houghton’s (2010) study is one that relied on Bennett’s (1998) model of empathy. However, as we can see from her study, her interpretation of the data was based on how the students ‘felt’ thus making the analysis descriptive. In addition, some scholars critiqued associating intercultural communication competence with the notion of empathy. Broome (1991: p. 247), for instance, claims that our aim should not be to try and understand the other as a ‘separate objective entity’ but rather the focus should be on ‘co-creating with the other a shared reality’ and thus a third culture. Broome (1991) continues to argue that the focus in intercultural encounters should be on creating what he calls ‘relational empathy’ which is the process of developing shared meaning. When discussing the issue of ‘empathy’ within intercultural encounters, DeTurk (2001: p. 377) points out that trying to examine or predict another person’s existing thoughts and emotions is not very realistic (as Bennett claims), and various scholars suggest that it is impossible for members of one social group to understand the experiences that other social groups go through particularly when there are power divisions between them. Thus, the dialogic approach to empathy is the solution to some of the problems (e.g. psychological viewpoints) that are presented here, as it stresses that, rather than trying to predict the thoughts and feelings of another person, what would be more realistic is trying to consider empathy in order to build and create shared meaning. I will discuss this approach in greater detail later on in this chapter.

What Broom (1991: p. 247) concludes regarding Bennett's (1979, 1998) description of the two concepts of sympathy and empathy in relation to intercultural communication is that although Bennett's work makes a great contribution to intercultural communication as he was able to critically identify and distinguish 'between the self-focus of sympathy and the other-focus of empathy', his model 'fails to move beyond what is essentially a psychological view of empathy'. Broom (1991: p. 247) argues that the emphasis should be on the development and creation of shared meaning which then would 'move the focus beyond both self and other to the interaction between communicators'.

3.5 Hofstede's model of cross-cultural communication

Hofstede (1979, 1980, 1991, 2001) developed a framework for cross cultural communication and based his framework on a large research project that investigated the differences in cultures in more than 50 countries. These studies identified five dimensions of national culture differences. These differences indicate that every culture has problems which it has to cope with. These dimensions are:

1. *'Power distance*, which is related to the different solutions to the basic problem of human inequality.
2. *Uncertainty avoidance*, which is related to the level of stress in a society in the face of an unknown future.
3. *Individualism versus collectivism*, which is related to the integration of individuals into primary groups.
4. *Masculinity versus femininity*, which is related to the division of emotional roles between men and women.
5. *Long-term versus short-term orientation*, which is related to the choice of focus for people's efforts: the future or the present' (Hofstede, 2001: p. 29).

Hofstede (2001) notes that understanding these different dimensions will help us communicate better at the intercultural level. Moreover, Hofstede (2001) points out that there are other factors that can affect a person's intercultural communication competence. He claims that some people are more naturally gifted than others, for instance people with big egos, low tolerance towards uncertainty, emotionally unstable, or racist are considered bad risk when it comes to intercultural competence and training them to be interculturally competent would be more challenging.

Various scholars used Hofstede's model of intercultural communication such as Gudykunst and Nishida (1994). Gudykunst and Nishida (1994: p. 19) stress that studying the differences and similarities between cultures can help us promote communication across cultures. However, claiming that 'Yuko communicates indirectly because she is a Japanese' and that 'Robin communicates directly because she is from the United States' would not by itself help us understand cultural differences. This might make us aware of the ways in which people in Japan and the United States communicate but this does not reveal to us why there are differences between the ways in which Japanese and Americans communicate. Thus, Gudykunst and Nishida (1994: p. 19) explain that there are variables that need to be taken into account when examining communication across cultures that will enable us to understand the aspects of cultures that are different.. Examples of such variables are: individualism versus collectivism, low and high context communication, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, and masculinity and femininity. These variables can help us examine the similarities and differences in communication across cultures which would then help us with the examination of cross-cultural communication (Gudykunst and Nishida, 1994).

However, Macfedyen (2011: p. 283) argues that the ways in which Hofstede developed the above discussed model of intercultural communication competence was 'through analysis of a pre-existing set of attitude surveys completed in 1967 and 1973 by marketing and sales employees of IBM in 66 countries'. This model by Hofstede has been widely used by many human sciences investigators and by intercultural educators all around the world. However, it has been criticised by many scholars. For instance, Signorini, Wiesemes and Murphy (2009) note that by Hofstede referring to culture as a collective programme, he is stressing that culture has social nature whereas Signorini, Wiesemes and Murphy (2009) claim that culture is actually a social product. By social product, they mean that it is 'formed, nurtured and shared by a group' (p. 258). In addition, it seems that Hofstede fails to notice the messiness of a culture, as through his analysis it seems apparent that he sees each individual to have a clear and independent cultures/value sets which are part of the group he/she belongs to. However, Signorini, Wiesemes and Murphy (2009) point out that this is not an adequate description as each individual is different and thus they would rather not put each individual in a box.

Signorini, Wiesemes and Murphy (2009) continue to critique Hofstede's model by arguing that his data was collected before many countries have been through 'radical political, social and educational structural reforms' (p. 258) and this means that his research ignores the

Vygotskian theory which stresses the relationship between tools, elements of culture, and individual's activity. Thus, through his study, Hofstede ignores the two-ways relationship between values and other cultural components. McSweeney (2002: p.113) suggests that instead of trying to identify a 'national uniformity', the emphasis should be on trying to engage in theories of action which can deal with issues such as: power, change, variety, and the 'complexity and situational variability of the individual subject'.

In their article, Signorini, Wiesemes and Murphy (2009) conclude that Hofstede's model is questionable for several reasons:

1. Associating culture with nation is extremely problematic.
2. Does not consider the fact that culture is flexible and has a changing nature.
3. Hofstede's research does not differentiate between different educational levels: in his research, he refers to both schooling and an HE setting but does not show how the results of the two settings can be applied differently.
4. Hofstede's model has been over-applied in many research, however as the data for his research have been collected in the 1960s and 1970s, it is thus considered problematic to apply Hofstede's model in internationally mixed higher education settings in the 21st century.

In considering the flaws of Hofstede's model, Signorini, Wiesemes and Murphy (2009) offer some alternatives to his model which help examine the concept of culture and the concept of intercultural learning in specific contexts. They advocate starting by examining micro-cultures, for instance one particular learning setting in higher education in combination with an individual's suitable experiences. This will help develop small models and these small models will gradually be developed into larger models of culture and intercultural learning. Thus, culture needs to be considered as flexible and dynamic (Signorini, Wiesemes and Murphy, 2009).

3.6 Byram's model of intercultural competence

Byram's model of intercultural communication competence consists of five *savoirs*. The first *savoir* is '*savoir etre*', and this *savoir* relates to our attitudes, meaning how curious and open we are towards other cultures, and to what extent we are ready to suspend disbelief about other cultures and beliefs about our own (Byram, 1997: p. 91). Moreover, Byram claims that the objective of this *savoir* is to study whether the intercultural speaker:

is interested in the other's experience of daily life contexts not usually presented to outsiders through the media or used to develop a commercial relationship with outsiders; is interested in the daily experience of a range of social groups within a society and not only that represented in the dominant culture. (Byram, 1997: p. 91).

The second *savoir* is the *knowledge savoirs*, and this *savoir's* aim is to test the intercultural speakers' knowledge of how they explain themselves and their world when they face misunderstandings between them and other members of different cultures (Byram, 1997: p. 97). The third *savoir* (*savoir comprendre*) is related to our 'ability to interpret a document or event from another culture, to explain it and relate it to documents or events from one's own' (Byram, 1997: p. 98). Moreover, Byram claims that this *savoir* can be assessed in combination with the fourth *savoir*, which is the *savoir apprendrel/faire*. This *savoir* relates to our ability to obtain new knowledge of a culture and cultural norms and the ability to use this knowledge in real-time communication (Byram, 1997: pp. 98-99). These two *savoirs* can be examined through, first, eliciting information from the intercultural speaker regarding certain concepts and values that they come across with and how these can be applied to other phenomena that is unknown to them. It is also considered as the ability to identify similarities and differences between the new phenomena and the unknown one and 'to relate particular instances to general principles' (Byram, 1997: p. 100). The last *savoir*, is *savoir s'engager*, which relates to the ability to critically evaluate practices in one's own culture and that of other cultures. Furthermore, it is the ability to communicate effectively and to be able to clarify ideological perspectives while 'engaging with others consciously on the basis of that perspective'.

In her paper, Helm (2009: p. 97) examines students' intercultural competence through studying their diaries and by applying Byram's (1997) *savoir etre* to her analysis. The students that participated in her project were taking part in a project called telecollaboration. Helm (2009) analysed these students' diaries by investigating the usage of certain words that are used in Byram's (1997) description of the *savoir etre*. As an example, she looked at the use of the words 'view' and 'point of' and in what context they were used. She looked at these words specifically because Byram defines *savoir etre* as the ways in which we show openness and curiosity towards other cultures. One of her findings was that the students she conducted the research on used the word 'view' with 'point of' and the use of these two words indicated that the participants showed concern with different points of view as well as their own (Helm, 2009).

However, according to Matsuo (2012), Byram's model of intercultural communication competence is overly 'aspirational' and 'even pious-seeming' (p. 364) as this model is considered as a list-type model which means that it is an individual-oriented model in which it cannot conceptualise communication and the interactional process is not discussed:

therefore, the nature and role of communication in determining and developing communicative, and thus intercultural communicative competence, is not theorized at all, and competence is located, de facto, in the individual. (Matsuo, 2012: p. 363).

Hence, according to Matsuo (2012), these types of individual models do not assist language teachers into helping students to enhance their intercultural competence, but rather they only allow the teacher to determine whether the mentioned competences are absent or present within an individual.

Another criticism of Byram is that he refuses within his model of intercultural communicative competence to define the term 'culture' and instead equates culture with national culture or nation-states. Byram has defended these criticisms against his model by claiming that his model is based on national cultures. However, his association of 'culture' with 'national culture' is faulty and inaccurate as it is based on the fact that cultures are 'spatial entities' and with 'internal territory' and have more or less clear boundaries (Matsuo, 2012: p. 365).

This assumption can be problematic as we live in a globalised, hyper-connected, and multipolar world which makes defining 'culture' more complex. Moreover, equating culture with national culture can be considered as misleading as 'it is not the nations that are doing the communicating but individuals (Matsuo, 2012: p. 366). Spencer-Oatey and Kotthoff (2007: p. 2) elaborate further on this point by drawing on the work of Schutz (1972) and they argue that no one's experience exactly matches another's, and 'each person processes new information within their own horizon'.

Furthermore, instead of basing intercultural communicative competence pedagogy on national cultures, Matsuo (2012: p. 367) stresses that the focus should be on the interactional processes of communication and on the various dynamic of communication that occur, for instance, in the FL (foreign language) classrooms. Thus, by the teacher understanding 'that all communication is an act both of differentiation and co-orientation' (Matsuo, 2012: p. 367), this will empower her/him to use their identity as an intercultural speaker as the 'basis for an embodied and on that basis systematic intercultural communication competence pedagogy' (Matsuo, 2012: p. 367) which then would enable her/him (the teacher) to develop both their

and their students' intercultural communication competence. This pedagogy is based more on dialogue because it requires the students to come up with creative responses.

A further critique of the different intercultural communication competence models is made through the dialectical approach by Martin and Nakayama (2015). This approach will be discussed further below.

3.7 Dialectical approach

In their article, Martin and Nakayama (2015) argue that the majority of intercultural communication competence models are individual-centred and they are national-culture focused which means that they view cultures as static and bounded and ignore issues such as 'power' and 'larger structures' that might 'impact individual attitudes and actions' (p. 14). However, they have been arguing that more recent scholarship has been challenging these claims by claiming that culture is more dynamic rather than static. Thus in their paper, Martin and Nakayama (2015) try to show how adapting a dialectical approach is essential in order to examine the concept of intercultural communication in a workplace. By adapting the dialectical approach, Martin and Nakayama (2015) show how global workplaces are dynamic which constitute unequal participation by different actors. They argue that through the dialectical approach, the context becomes dynamic and is shaped by both local and global forces. By making intercultural actors aware how inequities in power relations can be caused by cultural attitudes associated with race, age, class and gender, as well as economic differences, this will help a better understanding of the equities that are part of any intercultural interaction and will enable them to understand why these interactions can at times fail or succeed.

In their paper, Martin and Nakayama (1999) discuss the dialectical approach through the examination of the concept of intercultural communication. They note that a dialectical approach to culture and communication present the possibility of engaging in multiple research paradigms as it gives us the opportunity to see the world in various ways and thus enables us to be better prepared in engaging in intercultural interactions. Moreover, a dialectical approach assists us in viewing intercultural interactions as a dynamic and changing process, and 'emphasizes the relational, rather than individual aspects and person' (p. 14). For further clarification, 'relational' here means the creation of shared meaning in intercultural interactions (Broom, 1991). Within intercultural communication research, the dialectical

approach stresses the importance of relationship which means that ‘one becomes fully human only in relation to another person’, however at the same time, it reminds us that we are group members and at the same time individuals (Martin and Nakayama, 1999: p. 14).

In addition, Martin and Nakayama (1999) continue to point out that a dialectical perspective stresses the relationship between personal and contextual communications. This means that on one hand, there are aspects of communication that stay constant across various contexts, and on the other hand, there are aspects that are contextual. People communicate in specific ways in specific contexts, such as students and lecturers in classrooms, and messages can be interpreted in specific ways. However, outside the classroom, students and lecturers would be communicating and expressing themselves differently. Hence, intercultural communication competence is characterised by both personal and contextual communication.

Martin and Nakayama (1999) discuss the dialectical approach in relation to differences and similarities and their importance within the concept of intercultural communication competence. They argue that many scholars who investigated the concept of intercultural communication competence have looked into the differences that exist between various cultural groups, and these scholars invested a great deal of research into trying to identify these differences. However, in real life, there are many behavioural similarities across many cultures and many cultural communication researchers have emphasised the similar patterns across different cultures. Thus a dialectical approach suggests examining ‘how differences and similarities work in cooperation or in opposition in intercultural interaction’ (p. 16).

Various intercultural researchers (e.g. Hofstede, 1979, 1980, 1991, 2001) have stressed the stability of cultural patterns such as cultural values, however the dialectical approach views culture and cultural practices as both static and dynamic as culture has an ever-changing nature. Therefore, thinking of culture and cultural practices as both static and dynamic can help us navigate in a world that is full of diversity and would help us find new ways in order to understand intercultural encounters. When investigating intercultural interactions, researchers could examine how these contradictory forces operate in such interactions and how individuals work with the static/dynamic aspects of intercultural interactions (Martin and Nakayama, 1991). What Martin and Nakayama (1999) conclude in their paper is that in order to proceed forward (within intercultural communication practices), we need to think of ways of letting go of the rigid knowledge that we have about others and try to adapt more open ways of thinking which would allow us to approach others with an open mind.

3.8 Further critique of the conceptualization of intercultural competence

According to Spitzberg and Changnon (2009), adaptability is a concept that seems to be discussed in many of the intercultural communication competence models, however in terms of measurement, it does not seem that this concept has been measured validly as it has not been conceptualised carefully. In addition, adaptability has subcomponents (e.g. sensitivity, empathy and perspective taking) in which these have not been conceptualised with much reflected validity. For instance, Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) continue to point out that adaptability is a process in which there is a shift or change, however it is not clear from what. If adaptation is an important feature of competence, and if a sojourner is expected to adapt to the host culture, there is no clear understanding as to what extent both need to adapt to one another. Moreover, if both are adapting, it can be possible that both interactants will end up not knowing which target pattern to adapt to, and if adaptation means that there should be a compromise in terms of personal identity, this might affect other aspects of the interactants' performance. Finally, adaptation is considered as a process of variability, however most approaches treat it as a trait. Thus these issues associated with the concept of adaptability have to propose some solutions to the discussed problems.

Another concern that Spitzberg and Changnon (2009) discuss is the potential ethnocentricity in the intercultural communication competence models as most of these models have been developed in Western/Anglo contexts, and as such it is not clear how much of a bias these contexts may have. For instance, empathy, perspective taking, and adaptability, all continue to be part of most of the intercultural communication competence models regardless of the cultural origin of the model. Thus, authors that are studying the concept of intercultural communication competence from various areas that are outside of Europe (e.g. Central and South Americas, India, South Korea, Japan and Africa) are now 'rethinking the relevance of Western concepts of competence' (p. 44).

In rethinking the relevance of Western concepts of competence, it is advised to revisit arguments that have been ignored in the competence literature, as 'competence' is still viewed as an individual and trait concept. Many models of intercultural communication competence locate 'competence' in the individual's possession rather than in the interaction itself. This could be considered problematic from a theoretical perspective as this raises questions about

‘where competence is located’ (Spitzberg and Changnon, 2009: p.44) which is yet to be resolved within the competence literature.

As a final consideration, it would be challenging to try to identify the best model of intercultural competence available. It is tempting to argue that because there are a variety of models of intercultural competence, this can be a sign of postmodernism diversity, the definition of which is to say that different models of intercultural competence put emphasis on different criteria. As an example, Western models put emphasis on assertiveness skills whereas Eastern models put emphasis on empathy, sensitivity, and conformity. Conversely, U.S social scientists favour skills such as empathy, perspective taking, and adaptability over assertiveness when examining social skills. Furthermore, countries like the Central and South America, India, South Korea, Japan, and Africa are now reconsidering the importance of Western concepts of competence. Additionally, various models argue for a partner but define skills and knowledge as something that is possessed by the individual.

Although the impact of postmodernism diversity can indicate that intercultural competence is not a concept that can be clearly defined, it is clear that there is common basis of theoretical metaphors that is shared amongst most models. For instance, developmental models (e.g. Bennett, 1986), ‘draw attention to integrate the time element of relationships’ and on the other hand, relational models put emphasis on the interaction process and on the participants involved. Spitzberg and Changnon (2009: p.44) conclude that a model would be more advanced if it tries to incorporate interactants’ motivation, knowledge, context, outcome, and skills as an ongoing relationship.

As we have seen in the above argument, intercultural competence models can have various drawbacks. Thus, I will discuss below my approach to examining the concept of intercultural competence.

3.9 Intercultural competence through the lens of interactional competence

Intercultural competence can be named and defined differently according to different authors. Various authors ‘described’ it in different ways, and in various instances the concept of intercultural competence does not go beyond the descriptive part and we do not have an exact idea of what it means to be interculturally competent. Thus, for the purpose of this research I will be using CA to examine the concept of intercultural competence through the lens of interactional competence. I will be looking at the different interactional resources that are

used by the participants in order to study the concept of intercultural competence. The choice of using CA (a further discussion of its core principles is in chapter 3) stems from the fact that CA's main focus is on the sequential development of interaction and on the observation of what happens and what happens next. Thus:

a conversation analyst examines what some detail of talk reveals about how that participant, there and then, understood and acted on what was happening, and made some new contribution by doing something new. (Nevile and Rendle-Short, 2009: p. 78).

Moreover, CA shows how turns at talk emerge and are understood in relation to one another:

within the rich sequential context of a developing trajectory of interaction. New talk is fitted to and built upon prior talk, and becomes a resource for forming subsequent talk. (Nevile and Rendle-Short, 2009: p. 76).

The rationale for using CA is that it works on detailed interactional activities such as recordings which are made into detailed transcripts and therefore pays great attention to the details of human interactions that in other practices might be lost. In addition, CA's view on human interaction is that it is organised and procedural. This means that people interacting with each other is not seen as individual actions but rather as a collective organised event (Ten Have, 2007). Thus, the aim of CA is to study how participants organise their interaction to overcome a various organisational problems, such as a problem in understanding and the distribution of turns at talking. This means that CA's focus is not to look at the 'why' but rather at the 'how'. Lastly, the research is data-driven as in there is no place for theoretical preconceptions or ideological preferences (Ten Have, 2006).

Recent research on intercultural competence has started to shift the analytic focus from the participants' categorical attributes (e.g. nationality, ethnicity, gender, age) to studying the interactional moment in conversations in which the interactants' cultural identities become manifested (Bolden, 2014). For instance, in her study, Bolden (2014) puts forward an interactionally sensitive, emic view of intercultural communication by studying the organisation of 'intercultural moments' in conversation that expose cultural and linguistic differences between people. Bolden (2014: p. 208) uses CA to analyse video recorded conversations between Russian-American immigrant families. Her article focuses on sequences in which the interactants deal with problems in understanding either actual or

anticipated ones, and on how the interactants' assumptions 'about their asymmetric cultural and linguistic expertise are revealed in their actions'.

Bolden (2014: p. 209) notes that the question of what makes a communication 'intercultural' has been widely debatable as it is not clear 'how researchers are to recognize when communication should be treated as "intercultural" and along what cultural axis (or axes)'. Thus, unlike others who rely on different scholars' (e.g. Bennett, 1986; Byram, 1997; Bennett, 1998; Hofstede, 2001) definitions of intercultural competence/intercultural communication competence, Bolden (2014) shows in her paper that by using CA to focus on moments in interaction when the interactants orient to differences in their cultural and linguistic knowledge, she was more able to pinpoint what makes a communication 'intercultural' and what cultural consists of. Within her data, Bolden (2014) shows moments in interactions which are considered 'intercultural' through showcasing how the participants treat asymmetry in their expertise, meaning how the participants show unequal competencies by treating each other not as bona fide co members and thus ones that do not share the taken for granted knowledge.

Bolden (2014) examines these asymmetries in knowledge between the participants by showing how repair and intersubjectivity are manifested in the interactional sequences. She addresses the question of how intercultural communication is observed in action and what practices within social interaction are considered 'intercultural moments'. Thus, Bolden (2014: p. 233) first studies the ways in which participants orient to the addressees' lack of knowledge/expertise of a word they have used and how they might check the addressees' knowledge of this word before proceeding with the conversation. Second, she looks at moments in interaction where the participants act upon the fact that the addressees lack competency (novice) and repair their talk or others' talk. Finally, she examines the ways in which participants 'act on the assumption of competency but then revise that assessment when the addressee initiates repair'. Bolden (2014) claims that, in these three occasions, the interaction might be considered 'intercultural'. It also demonstrates that in these three situations, the interactants treat misunderstandings by delaying the conversation in progress to deal with problems in understanding and in so doing, they 'ascribe to their co-conversationalist the identity of an outsider or a novice' and, through that they uncover some cultural and linguistic differences between them (Bolden, 2014: p. 212). Below is an example that Bolden (2014) provides in her article. In this excerpt, the speaker stops the progress of her talk in order to check whether the addressee has the knowledge of a word she has

mentioned. Mira, which is Lena's grandmother, discusses the needlework that she is hoping to make for Lena's parents. In line 1, Mira offers to make *natjurmort* ('still-life') for them. Aaron and Zhenya are Mira's elderly relatives and are also present during this conversation.

Excerpt 3.1 [(Bolden, 2014: pp. 214-215)]

01 MIRA: Ja gavarju davaj ja tebe kakojnibut' natjurmot/
I say let's I you some still-life
I say let me ((make)) a still-life for you
02 (0.5) ((Mira turns from Aaron to Lena))
03 => MIRA: Nu- (.) natjurmort zna?esh |sho takoe/
PRT still-life know what that
Do you know what still-life is?
| (Lena shakes her head
"no"))
04 LENA: [°Net°/
no
05 MIRA: [.h Eta znachit vot- (.) na primer [sto:,l/
that means such for example table
It means well for example table
06 ZHE: [fru:kty,/
fruits
07 (.)
08 LENA: A-
09 MIRA: Stol (.) i na stale vot raznye fru:kty lezha[::,t/
table and on table PRT various fruits lie
A table and on the table are various fruits
10 LENA: [Ah hah
11 MIRA: o:va[schi,/ja znaju
vegetables I know
vegetables I don't know
12 ZHE: [kufshin s:: eh: [::
pitcher with
a pitcher with
13 MIRA: [kufshi:n mozh**e**t byt'
pitcher may be
a pitcher may be
14 ZHE: s vino::m/=tam[:/
with wine there

with wine or

15 MIRA: [eh::

16 ZHE: baka,l/=

wineglass

17 MIRA: =baka:ly/ [Kufshin s vino,m/
wineglasses/ a pitcher with wine

18 AAR: [Da:
Yes

19 MIRA: Vot takoe |vot
PRT such PRT
Things like that
|((Lena nods))

After Mira reports that she would like to make a ‘still-life’ for Lena’s parents, she then turns from Aaron to Lena (it is important to mention that up until this point, Aaron was the primary addressee of Mira’s talk), and she checks whether Lena knows or has the knowledge of the word *naturmort* (‘still-life’) in line 3. Through Mira checking whether Lena has the knowledge of the word *naturmort* (‘still-life’), she is demonstrating her orientation to the possibility that Lena might not have that knowledge of this word, and thus she is treating Lena as someone who is not fully competent in Russian or in the domain of art. Lena then in lines 3-4 confirms that she indeed does not know the meaning of the word *naturmort* (‘still-life’) and this is followed by Mira starting to explain the meaning of the term. As Mira does this, Zhenya then joins Mira, as from line 6, he co-explains the terms and through that enacts Mira’s expertise in Russian or in this specific domain of art. By Zhenya co-explaining the term, he is acting as a co-member in the identity of competent speaker in Russian. Aaron also joins the conversation in line 18 as he confirms what Mira and Zhenya are saying. In this excerpt, the participants joined together (Mira, Zhenya, and Aaron) as they aligned themselves along the expertise lines, and through that displayed a joined cultural expertise (Bolden, 2014). To elaborate on this point further, Bolden (2014) provides another example (excerpt 3.2).

Excerpt 3.2 [(Bolden, 2014: pp. 218-219)]

01 GRM: A Serëzha sidit tam na diva, ne/i shtõ:paet/
PRT NAME sits there on sofa and darns
Sergey is sitting there on the sofa and darning
((clothes))

02 >U menja es'gribok< do six por/
with me is mushroom till this time
I still have a mushroom ((darner))

03 Esli Gena vytasche,t/
if NAME take-out
if Gena ((Grandpa's name)) takes it out

04 .hh £i shtopaet ej kalg|otki£/ heh (.) heh-heh-heh
PRT darns her stockings
and he's darning stockings for her
|((Lena smiles))

05 GRM: (.HH[H])

06 → GRP: [Zn-|Znaesh sh'o takoe gribo?k/ ((to Lena))
know what such mushroom
Do you know what a mushroom ((darner)) is?
|((Lena turns to GRP))

07 (0.8)

08 LENA: N:et/
No

09 GRM: Nu k[ak
PRT how
Well

10 GRP: [(Tak)Nastajaschij gri [:b derevjanyj,/]
real mushroom wooden
It's a real wooden mushroom

11 GRM: [Nu (grib)]da/
PRT mushroom yes
(Mushroom) Right

12 GRM: Tok[a derevjanyj/
only wooden
only it's wooden

13 GRP: [.h i vot na-nat[jagivajut/
PRT PRT stretch
and you stretch

14 LENA: [A::
oh

15 Ja znaju/ Ja znaju/
I know I know

16 GRP: Natja,givajesh/ I shtopajesh/

stretch and darn
You stretch and darn

In line 2, Grandma puts the progress of her telling on hold as she mentions that she still possesses a mushroom darning (a mushroom darning is a darning in the shape of a mushroom and in Russian it is referred to as *gribok* ('mushroom')). Subsequently, in lines 2 to 3, Grandma starts delivering the punch line of the story and then she laughs (it is important to mention here that the laughter is produced by the Grandma because a man is darning his wife's stockings and in Russia this is traditionally considered more of a woman's job, thus Grandma found this to be very funny that a man is doing this job). Grandma does not orient to the word *gribok* ('mushroom') as something that Lena would struggle with, and while Grandma laughs, Lena smiles (line 4) along too, and in this case Lena does so as a way of claiming understanding and as a way of affiliating with Grandma's stance towards the telling. However, the smile does not display that Lena indeed understood the story or what was funny about it, and it could have simply been prompted by Grandma's laughter. In line 6, Grandpa asks Lena whether she knows the meaning of the word *gribok* ('mushroom'). By doing so, Grandpa is displaying that Lena has relatively low linguistic/cultural expertise and this suggests that Lena might not know or have the knowledge of the word *gribok* ('mushroom'). This inquiry by Grandpa shows that he was observing Grandma's talk so he can ensure that it is properly designed so for the recipient which in this case is Lena. By doing so, Grandpa treats himself as a consociate in Grandma's telling. In addition, this shows that Grandpa has been observing Lena's reaction to the story told by Grandma.

In line 8, Lena responds by saying that she does not know the meaning of the word *gribok* ('mushroom'), and just after, Grandma and Grandpa jointly start explaining what it means (lines 9 to 13). It is important to note that they explain the meaning of the word 'darning' and they leave the word *gribok* ('mushroom'), which could mean that they assume that Lena knows the everyday meaning of it. By doing so, Grandma and Grandpa treat Lena as someone who is not familiar with the word 'darning' and through that they display asymmetries in knowledge between them and Lena. This asymmetry in knowledge is attributed to both generational (old vs. young) and cultural (old country vs. new country) differences. This excerpt (3.2) is similar in some ways to the previous one (3.1) as in both excerpts, experts assert themselves in a collective way and together they instruct a novice. This excerpt also shows that not all participants involved in an interaction orient to novicehood in the same way

as Grandma initially did not treat Lena as one who is less knowledgeable in the area which Grandpa did.

The conclusion that Bolden (2014) makes from her study is that, unlike other interactional resources such as ‘repair’ and ‘turn taking’, ‘novicehood’ is shown to be used as an interactional resource to achieve a range of social actions which are beyond intersubjectivity. For instance, identifying potential problems in understanding can be done to pursue one’s own expertise in the area and to join in on the action in progress. In other words, while the participants try to achieve intersubjectivity, practices for resolving intersubjectivity problems ‘have a range of (not yet fully described) interactional payoffs beyond ensuring understanding’ (Bolden, 2014: p. 235). Thus, although large research on intercultural communication is concerned with ‘invisible misunderstandings’ that might affect communication, the study by Bolden (2014) is more concerned with ‘visible misunderstandings’ as they give ‘a front row view of “misunderstandings” as participants’ problem and resource for social action’ (p.235).

Bolden’s (2014) work has been built on similar line of research such as Park (2007), Hosoda (2006), and Kitzinger and Mandelbaum (2013). Park (2007), for instance, examines discursive practices in which the identity of non-native speakers (NNSs) is constructed in relation to the identity of native speakers (NSs) in naturally occurring conversations by using CA as her main method for analysis. In the excerpt (3.3) below, Park illustrates her point by showing how NS/NNS identities are invoked during a discussion about Spanish and English meals schedules.

Excerpt 3.3 [(Park, 2007: p. 345)]

1 James: Do you drink tea:::,in Spain?=Is it like tea, like
2 tea time, like they have in Britain?
3 Maria: No(h)o(h)
4 James: ((unintelligible))
5 Maria: we haven’t-tea ti:me
6 James: You don’t?
7 Maria: And de:: the schedule, [the timeta- the timetable=
8 James: [Mm hm,
9 Maria: =the schedule in de:::- the meal:s,
10 James: Mm hm,
11 Maria: Milsiz? ((gazing at James, slightly tilting her upper
12 body backward))

13 (.)
 14 Maria: Oumit? ((maintaing her gaze at James))
 15 James: Yeah, [yeah.
 16 Maria: [°(Yea(h)h, meals(h)?)
 17 ha-ha-ha it's different. <Because we- ah::: we have
 18 break fast, at de: nine, for example,
 19 James: HOLLY CRAP, NINE O'CLOCK! > °Sorry about that.<
 20 Maria: Nine o'clock. Right.

In excerpt 3.3, through James's question to Maria in line 1 to 2, he treats her as someone who is representative of the Spanish culture. In turn, Maria exercises her expert identity by producing long turns (lines 3, 5, 7, and 9) which are expanded upon more than what is requested from her. However, Maria repositions herself as a non-expert as she struggles to pronounce the word 'meals', and she turns to James, the NS, for a resolution of the trouble source (lines 11 and 14). This insertion converts the cross-cultural interaction into an NS/NNS one. However, the participants return to the original framework from line 17 as Maria resumes the interrupted talk and converts the framework from a NS/NNS one to a cross-cultural one. To conclude, in excerpt 3.3, the participants re-categorise themselves as NS/NNS as the NS demonstrates uncertainty about a pronunciation of an English word through her repair-initiations. Thus, the conversation is converted from a cross-cultural one to a NS/NNS one. The asymmetry associated with the NS/NNS category gets sustained until the resumption of cross-cultural interaction (Park, 2007).

Park (2007) notes that NS/NNS identities are social categories that are made relevant to the interaction and thus cause asymmetrical alignment between the participants. However, Park (2007) clarifies that within her study she does not take the position of attributing NS/NNS identities with culture, ethnicity, or national identity, but instead she establishes 'an empirical basis for the notions of NS/NNS as members' categories instead of a priori labels externally imposed on the participants' (p. 340).

Moreover, CA objects to imposing a certain identity to a person prior to examining their talk (Schegloff, 1997). Identity is not pre-determined but rather it is a 'social product that is jointly created by interactants' (Park, 2007: p. 341) and is co-constructed through social interactions which are characterised by the turn-taking system (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974) and participation (Goodwin, 1986). Identity is ascribed highly as context specific (Antaki, 1998) and highly negotiable (Aronsson, 1998). Thus, within her study, Park (2007) asks several

research questions: first, how NS/NNS identities are invoked through making and granting requests and how, through that, the maintenance of asymmetrical alignment is achieved; second, how the NS/NNS's identities are sustained during assessment proffering; and third, how NS/NNS identities are negotiated in which the asymmetry between them is shown not be static but dynamic.

In short, Park's (2007) findings reveal that when the NNS speaker was uncertain about how a certain word is pronounced, and thus would turn to the NS for a resolution of the trouble source, the NNS would instantly be converting the interaction from a cross-cultural one to a NS/NNS one. Additionally, she also found that the result of a negative evaluation by the NS towards the NNS's linguistic performance is that the asymmetry between them was sustained, and this asymmetry sustaining move was at times made by a NNS. At times, the participants, specifically the NNS, would resist an action by others that ascribes a NNS identity to them, and through that, it is shown that the identity is something that is highly negotiable (Park, 2007).

The conclusion that Park (2007) comes up with from her study is that second language learners develop a NNS identity by learning how to function, through socialisation, as competent member of community despite the fact that their linguistic ability is limited. In addition, the NNS's identity is developed in relation to the NS identity during social interaction. Asymmetry is not something that is immediately attributed to NS/NNS interaction but rather is highly negotiable and is locally occasioned. It is highly negotiable as the hierarchal relationship between NS and NNS is redefined on a constant basis such as when the 'NNS reclaims authoritative access to her expertise relevant to the on-going interaction' (p. 355). Lastly, there is a power structure within the NS/NNS interactions which affects the ways in which the participants perceive themselves and each other.

Hosoda's (2006) study also examines the differential language expertise amongst speakers of Japanese as first and second language. Hosoda (2006) adapts a conversation analytical perspective to study ordinary conversations and his main focus is on other-repairs through which the interactants show different linguistic knowledge. Hosoda's (2006) findings demonstrate that, for example, when L1 speakers pursue L2 speakers' uptake, they display their orientation to the expert identity, and on the other hand, when L2 speakers repeat words in response to L1 speakers' pursuit, they demonstrate their orientation to the novice identity.

serious identity implications as it will indicate that the speaker is not a fully competent member of some domain of expertise.

3.10 Summary

To conclude, in this chapter I have examined the concept of intercultural competence and how it has been defined and studied by various scholars such as Bennett (1986), Byram (1997), Bennett (1998) and Hofstede (2001). Within their approaches, they try to pre-determine what intercultural competence means and try to fit people from different cultures into boxes. As I have shown in this chapter, this is considered problematic as instead of trying to determine people's intercultural competence by the outcome of the interaction, these approaches determine the competence prior to the interaction in labelling people from different cultural backgrounds. Moreover, these approaches treat a person as a separate objective entity and see an individual as having a clear and independent culture and value set which are part of the group this individual belongs to. However, the reality is that each individual is different and not all individuals from a certain cultural background would behave in a similar way. Therefore, what my study offers is a different method to studying the concept of intercultural competence, as in this study I will be using a conversation analytical approach to examine my data and I will be doing that through the lens of interactional competence. By doing so, I will study how the interactants attribute to each other different identities and whether this can manifest any intercultural moments in conversation.

Chapter 4. Research Methodology

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will elaborate on; the principles of CA, why CA has been chosen as the main method for analysis, CA's limitations, and this research's validity and reliability. I will also discuss how this research has been designed and provide information on; the participants, how the data were collected, the use of audio and video, the camera and recorder positioning, what is involved in transcribing, and the software that was used to collect the data.

The research questions that I am hoping to answer in this research are as follows:

- 1) What are the characteristics of *interactional competence* for Chinese and English postgraduate students studying in the UK in a tandem learning context?
- 2) What are the characteristics of *intercultural competence* for Chinese and English postgraduate students studying in the UK in a tandem learning context?

4.2 Research purpose

This research uses CA as its theoretical framework for analysing the data. According to Heritage and Atkinson (1984: p. 1) 'the central goal of conversation analytic research is the description and explication of the competences that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participating in intelligible, socially organized interaction'. Thus, the aim of CA is to study the order and organization of social action in interaction (Seedhouse, 2004a). This order is produced by the participants and oriented to by them.

To restate the aims of this research therefore, I will identify the characteristics of both interactional and intercultural competence by examining the same set of data from an interactional point of view and then from an intercultural point of view. I will do so by, first, identifying the characteristics of interactional competence, and second, by identifying the characteristics of intercultural competence through the lens of IC and CA.

4.3 Background of the problem

As stated in the literature review chapter, interactional competence is a concept that has been studied by various scholars (e. Kramsch, 1986; Young, 2008; Hall and Pekarek-Doehler, 2011; Piirainen-Marsh, 2011; Sahlström, 2011; Van-Compernelle, 2011) and it has been

examined in various contexts such as; amongst colleagues at work, amongst friends, during one to one tutorials, and in classrooms. Moreover, the development of it has been associated with ‘repair’ and the understanding and the management of the ‘turn-taking system’.

However, there is no research that shows what the characteristics of interactional competence are and what interactional resources are used in a tandem language learning between English and Chinese students.

In addition, intercultural competence/intercultural communication competence is a notion that has been widely investigated by many scholars (Bennett, 1986; Byram, 1997; Bennett, 1998; Hofstede, 2001) and these scholars have tried to define it and build models that demonstrate what makes one interculturally competent or not. As discussed in the literature review chapter, these models contain various problems such as the fact that they try to fit people into boxes and ignore the fact that although we are all group members of different societies, we are still individuals and thus have our individual differences (Martin and Nakayama, 1999).

Lastly, whilst intercultural competence and the development of the communicative skills have both been linked to tandem learning (Brammerts and Calvert, 2003; Lewis, 2003; Stickler and Lewis, 2003; Walker and Lewis, 2003), it remains unclear both what the characteristics of intercultural and interactional competence are in this specific context.

4.4 Conversation analysis

CA is a ‘source of inspiration for current conceptualization of interactional competence’ (Hall and Pekarek-Doehler, 2011: p. 5) and, as delineated above, it is a method that has been used to study the concept of affiliation/empathy through vis-à-vis interactions (Heritage, 2011; Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011).

CA originated from ethnomethodology which was pioneered by Harold Garfinkel (1967). According to Wooffitt (2005) ‘the fundamental tenet of ethnomethodology is that the sense of social action is accomplished through the participants’ use of tacit, practical reasoning skills and competences’ (p. 73). The study of language is one of the core principles of ethnomethodology (Wooffitt, 2005). Seedhouse (2004) argues that ‘the basic relationship between ethnomethodology and CA is that the first subsumes the second’ (p. 3). Ethnomethodology studies the ways in which people base their social actions, whereas CA examines the ways in which people use ‘language in interaction’ to interact with each other.

However, an interesting aspect of this is that ethnomethodology and CA are very different approaches used to study linguistics, so the question remains why ethnomethodology is used to study human interaction when it is so different from a linguistic approach. Seedhouse (2004) provides an example of why ethnomethodology and CA are used to study human interaction. He explains that if we take an alien, for example, who has a different civilisation to ours and who has no concept of language and who tries to communicate with us, he/she may try to communicate with us through images and may find language complicated and puzzling. Thus, in order for the alien to be able to communicate with us, we would need to explain to him/her how people act and use language to interact, which is the core principle of ethnomethodology and CA (Seedhouse, 2004b). Sacks was one of Garfinkel's colleagues and their works shared many concerns such as analysing social actions and their norms. However, Sacks' work focused on the aspects of communicative competences that helped inform everyday conversation. Thus, CA has emerged as the study of how interaction is patterned (Wooffitt, 2005). CA is therefore the method that I will be using to analyse my data, and as a result, further discussion of its core principles is elaborated on below.

Adjacency pairs consist of two turns conducted by different speakers, the turns occur one after the other, and they are ordered by FPPs and SPPs (FPPs are first pair parts, and SPPs are second pair parts in conversations). FPPs are usually utterances that initiate some sort of exchange such as questions or offers whereas SPPs are utterances that are responsive to the prior turn such as answers or declines of offers. It is important to note that on many occasions, the second pair parts do not immediately follow the first pair parts. SPPs do not occur randomly, as the SPPs in some way would match or would ideally deliver what the FPPs are querying. Thus:

The components of adjacency pairs are "typologized" not only into first and second pair parts, but into pair types which they can partially compose: greeting-greeting ('Hello,' 'Hi'), question-answer ("Do you know what time it is?", 'Four o'clock'), offer-accept/decline ("Would you like a cup of coffee?", 'No, thanks,' if it is decline). (Schegloff, 2007: pp. 13-14).

SPPs occur when FPPs are completed. Therefore, when a speaker produces an FPP and he/she completes it, then he/she would ideally stop and allow the production of a SPP. However, it is essential to state that these rules are not necessarily rigid, which means that they can change. Examples of such incidents are, first, where adjacency pairs do not necessarily consist of two turns as intervening talk can occur between them, and this is called 'inset expansions'. Second, some utterances can be FPP and SPP at the same time. For instance, a complaint can

be produced as an initiation of a turn and can be produced as a response to an inquiry (Schegloff, 2007).

The relationship between components in most types of organisation is that each component should come next after the prior. ‘In articulating a turn-constructive unit, each element – each word, for example – should come next after the one before’ (Schegloff, 2007: p. 14). In order for ‘progressivity’ to occur, a turn-constructive unit one next to the other would be produced without intervention. Progressivity here means is ‘moving from some element to a hearable-next-one’ (Schegloff, 2007: p. 15) without any intervention. If an intervention that affects ‘progressivity’ occurs then this intervention would be investigated in order to examine how the understanding of the previous turn-constructive unit has caused it. Thus each element within a TCU will be examined in order to investigate how the element/s (an element could be, for an example, a word or a syllable) within a TCU was/were understood and how it/they caused the production of the next TCU (Schegloff, 2007).

The relationship between turns is very important to enable us to understand how talk-in-interaction is constructed and understood. Next turns are produced according to the understanding of prior turn and when a turn comes to a possible completion, either the current speaker selects the next speaker or any participant self-selects themselves. Either way, it is important to examine how prior turns were understood and the type of response they embodied (Schegloff, 2007).

The relationship between first and second parts within adjacency pairs is important as when first pair parts occur, the occurrence of second pair parts become relevant, and this ‘relevance is conditioned by the FPP’ (Schegloff, 2007: p. 20). When a SPP is produced, it is heard as a response to the FPP that precedes it. However, if a SPP was not produced after a FPP, this ‘non-occurrence’ is as noticeable and important as if it did occur. For instance, if person *x* produces a question (FPP) and person *y* does not produce an answer (SPP), the lack of answer by person *y* would be an important moment for investigation. (Schegloff, 2007).

A relevance rule means that something is noticeable in an interaction and thus would be considered relevant, for instance when someone is being selected as the next speaker but they do not speak, and thus we would call this a ‘relevant absence’. ‘The turn-taking organization, then, constitutes (among other things) a set of relevance rules’ (Schegloff, 2007: p. 20). To elaborate, silence after a question could be heard as ‘not answering’ and talk after a question

could be heard as answering even if it is done indirectly. Therefore, when we provide a SPP as an answer that means that we have treated the FPP as a question. What can be puzzling, though, is sometimes when we produce an answer that is not related to the question, it can still be heard as an answer. An example of this is the answer 'It's raining' to the question 'Are we going to the game?' (Schegloff, 2007: p. 20).

Pre-expansions occur before the first parts are produced. 'The parties to pre-expansion exchanges display an orientation in them to a base adjacency pair which may subsequently develop' (Schegloff, 2007: pp. 28). It is important to note that all pre-expansions are themselves constructed of adjacency pairs. They are called pre-expansions because they come before the actual sequence/expansion. For instance, they could be produced before an invitation, a request, or an offer, and they would be then called pre-invitations, pre-requests, and pre-offers. Moreover, a base FPP might be produced such as an invitation, request, or an offer after a pre-expansion, which then makes the production of a second pair part essential. However, on other occasions, pre-expansions can be produced without any base FPP occurring. One type of pre-expansion is called pre-announcement/pre telling which is discussed below (Schegloff, 2007).

The role of announcement sequences in CA is to convey news. There are two types of SPP announcement type responses. First, those that indicate whether what has been announced is in fact news, and second, ones that assess them. Although there are two types of SPP announcement type responses, it is most likely that the pre-announcements are directed towards the first type of SPP announcement, which is an indication as to whether the 'news' is indeed 'news' (Schegloff, 2007: pp. 37-38). The function of pre-announcement and pre telling is to avoid rejection by the recipient, although they can have different functions. Therefore, in this case, one characteristic of the 'recipient design' of the telling is that the speaker is not supposed to be telling the recipient something that he/she already knows (Schegloff, 2007). 'Recipient design' is defined as the talk by a party in a conversation being designed in ways in which it demonstrates 'an orientation and sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are the co-participants' (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974: p. 727).

There can be two types of pre-announcements: minimal and extended. The minimal can have the format of 'guess what' and the extended version can be demonstrated in a challenged way, an example would be 'you'll never guess....'. This is usually done in order to examine

whether the recipient knows about the ‘news’ to be told or not (Schegloff, 2007: p. 39). Such pre-announcements can have different functions. First, they can alert the recipient that what is about to be said is a telling of news. Second, they may serve as a sort of assessment of the coming news (good or bad). Third, they may implement some evidence towards the worthiness of the upcoming news. Fourth, ‘they make the actual telling a contingent next step’ (Schegloff, 2007).

Pre-sequence expansions do not necessarily need to occur, as the ‘news’ could be told straight away without the pre-sequences. However, this could cause certain consequences, as by not delivering the pre-sequences, ‘there is the issue of the on-delivery recognizability of the news’ (Schegloff, 2007: p. 39). Schegloff (2007) provides an example to illustrate what could happen in cases where there are no pre-sequence expansions. He explains that in such cases a failure to hear/understand could occur, and in so doing, he emphasises what pre-sequence expansions could accomplish. One of the common SPPs to the pre-sequences is go-ahead responses which go hand in hand with this FPP. Repeating the question is a very common SPP, such as ‘guess what?’ or ‘what’. Moreover, the aim of pre-announcements is to assess the fate of the FPP, as in whether there will be an encouragement or discouragement towards the base sequence (Schegloff, 2007).

An offer, invitation, or a request all can be accepted or declined. If the response is +, then it would embody an alignment with the FPP, and if the response is -, it will cause distancing with the FPP. However, this is not necessarily a distancing from the speaker but from the project of the FPP ‘and the course it is designed to implement’ (Schegloff, 2007: p. 60). Interactional projects are implemented in sequence organisation where responses such as acceptances, grantings, and agreements are regarded as preferred responses, and rejections, declinings, and disagreements are regarded as dispreferred responses. However, there are some exceptions as agreements are not always preferred responses and disagreements are dispreferred responses. For example, ‘some offers (“Would you like the last piece of pie?”) may more cogently be understood as preferring rejections (and may be termed “pro forma” accordingly)’ (Schegloff, 2007: p. 60).

Dispreferred responses can have different features (Schegloff, 2007: pp. 64-71). First, they can be mitigated in order to avoid too much of a disalignment. Second, unlike preferred responses, dispreferred ones are elaborated, and they are usually accompanied by accounts, excuses, and disclaimers. Third, dispreferred responses can be defaulted, which means that on

the surface, they can appear to be functioning like preferred responses but they are not.

Fourth, the positioning of dispreferred second pair parts can be accompanied with:

- ‘Inter-turn gap’: which means that there is an overlong gap between the first pair turn and a dispreferred second pair part,
- ‘Turn-initial delay’: this means that once the response turn begins, the recipient tries to delay the response by, for instance, using ‘pre-pausals’ such as ‘uh’, hedges such as ‘I dunno’, or discourse markers such as ‘well’,
- ‘Anticipatory accounts’: dispreferred responses are also accompanied by accounts (“I got a lot of things....”), excuses, and appreciations, and they all come early in the turn in order to delay the second pair part,
- ‘Pro forma agreements’: in this case, preferred responses are produced in order to delay the dispreferred responses. An example of this would be ‘yes, but....’.
- ‘Pre-emptive reformulation with preference reversal’: this means that if, for instance, there is a silence after the production of a dispreferred first pair part, then the speaker might produce another turn by reversing the first pair part and producing a preferred next turn which might allow the recipient to produce a turn with no delay (Schegloff, 2007: pp. 67-70).

Similar to pre-expansions, insert expansions are constructed of adjacency pairs, and these adjacency pairs can ‘take the form of insert sequences’ (Schegloff, 2007: p. 97). There are two types of insert expansions, the first one is ‘post-firsts’ and the second one ‘pre-second’. One of the features of post-firsts insert expansion is ‘repair’. Repair could be a result of problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding the talk. However, Schegloff (2007: p. 100) notes that ‘anything in the talk may be treated as in need of repair. Everything is, in that sense, a possible repairable or a possible trouble-source’.

There are four different types of repair:

- *Self-initiation self-repair* where the speaker of the trouble source initiates and repairs his/her talk.
- *Other-initiation self-repair* where any party other than the speaker of the trouble source initiates a repair and the speaker of the trouble source accomplishes it.
- *Self-initiation other-repair* where the speaker of the trouble source initiates a repair and any party other than the speaker of the trouble source accomplishes the repair.

- *Other-initiation other-repair* where any party other than the speaker of the trouble source initiates and accomplishes the repair (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977).

The most common of all these three types of repair is the self-initiation self-repair, and the least common one is other-initiation other-repair (Schegloff, 2007).

Other-initiation repairs could use not very specific forms, such as ‘Huh?’, ‘What?’, or ‘Pardon me’. More specific forms are when using ‘Who?’, ‘Where?’, etc. and the most specific form is when the person, other than the one who produced the trouble source, offers confirmation. These sorts of other repairs usually come in the form of questions. Other-initiated repair turns ‘can occur in the next turn after any turn-at-talk’ (Schegloff, 2007: p. 102). In some cases, other-initiated repairs can act as pre-rejections or pre-disagreements. These pre-rejections or pre-disagreements can be initiated in order to give the speaker who initiated the problem a chance to back down and formulate an alternative (Schegloff, 2007).

In addition, there can be multiple pre-expansions which come before the base first part, and multiple insert expansions which come between the first and the second base part. These multiple expansions can consist of very stretched talk. However, even though the expansions that can occur before the first pair part and between the first pair part and the second pair part can be quite long, the extent of expansion after the second pair part can even be longer (Schegloff, 2007).

According to Schegloff (2007), ‘preferred responses tend to lead to closing the sequence, while dis-preferred responses regularly lead to expansion of the sequence’ (p. 117). There are two types of post-expansion, the first one is minimal post expansion and the second one is non-minimal post expansion.

Minimal post-expansion refers to when the preferred and dispreferred sequence closure is sustained by all participants. However, after this closure a ‘sequence-closing third’ might occur which can have numbers of forms, such as: ‘oh’, ‘okay’, and assessments (Schegloff, 2007: pp. 118-148). These are discussed in greater detail below.

The ‘oh’ that is referred to here is the one that proposes a possible end of the sequence after the first and second part. ‘Oh’ can occur whether after securing information through requesting it or after confirmation, or in repair sequences (which in this case it can function as closing the repair sequence) after repetition or clarification (Schegloff, 2007).

‘Okay’ can serve different functions. It can, for instance, claim acceptance of a second pair part or it can act as a closure for sequences after a dispreferred second pair part (Schegloff, 2007). Schegloff and Sacks (1973) and Mondada (2006) argue that ‘okay’ is used as a way of closing the sequence and moving the topic forward. Beach (1993) also argues that ‘okay’ can function as a pre-closing in phone calls. However, there are other environments, apart from phone calls, in which participants rely on ‘okay’ to close down topics.

Assessments such as ‘good’ or ‘that’s good’ can function as SCT (sequence-closing third), and thus can close the sequence. Some types of assessments can function as a repair sequence closing, and in this way, move the sequence forward (Schegloff, 2007).

A common composite is ‘oh’ combined with ‘okay’ which can function as a sequence-closing. ‘Oh okay’ can function as an acceptance of decline or rejection. In this example, ‘oh’ would register as a token of receiving the information and the ‘okay’ would register as an acceptance of this rejection. This ‘oh okay’ would therefore function as SCT and would close the sequence. It should be noted that ‘Oh okay’ could also act as a sequence closing of other-initiated repair, depending on the occasion. ‘Oh good’ could also function as SCT. In this case, ‘oh’ would register as a recipient of information and ‘good’ as a reassurance of assessment. Another example is ‘oh I see’ which can function as a registration of information (Schegloff, 2007).

Post-completion musings (PCM) can function as an analysis of prior sequence or an assessment of it. Many times post-completion musings can be produced by someone who has not been a main participant in a previous sequence, for example someone who has been an observer who formulates ‘the result or upshot of what appears to have been completed’ (Schegloff, 2007: p. 143). It can also be produced by a main participant in a sequence, for instance, after rejecting an invitation the rejecter could produce a PCM ‘by launching a reciprocal sequence’ (Schegloff, 2007: pp. 144-145).

Minimal post-expansions are usually finished with a single turn after the second pair part is produced. However, non-minimal post-expansions are different in the sense that the turn followed by the second pair part is itself a first pair part. There are different non-minimal post-expansion instances (Schegloff, 2007: pp. 148-151). First, other-initiated repair in which it is created after a second pair part. At this point, the post-expansion would start and this repair itself would be a first pair part (Schegloff, 2007). Second, there is the ‘disagreement-

implicated other-initiated repair'. Disagreement-implicated other-initiated repair can create a sequence expansion whereas 'preferred second pair parts are sequence-closure-relevant' (Schegloff, 2007: p. 152). Moreover, a disagreeing second part in the form of a question can function as post-expansion. Third, there is the so called 'topicalization'. Topicalization means that after the base second pair part, a form of partial repeat, repeat, or pro-repeat occurs. Examples of this include 'he is', 'really', 'oh really', and use of topicalization allows for a post-expansion to occur. Fourth, there is 'rejecting, challenging or disagreeing with the second pair part'. In this case, when rejection or disagreement occurs after the base second part, sequences could be expanded 'and result in quite different shapes of sequence structure' (Schegloff, 2007: p. 161). Lastly, there is the issue of 'first pair part reworkings post-expansion'. In this case, post-expansions can occur by elaborations, renewals, reworkings, re-doings, etc. of the second pair parts.

Repair is considered as one of the ways of causing non-minimal post-expansion and, as Schegloff (2000) explains, is combined of practices that are dealing with some sort of trouble in talk. 'Episodes of repair activity are composed' of repair initiation and repair outcome (p. 207). Repair initiation means that there might be a possibility of disjunction with the preceding talk and repair outcome means that there is either the possibility of giving a solution or abandoning the problem.

There are two things that are important to take into account when examining the issue of 'repair'. First, when discussing 'repair initiation', it is essential to distinguish between a repair initiated by the speaker of the problematic talk and a repair initiated by others. Second, it is important to examine *where* the repair was initiated. Repair initiation usually occurs very close to the trouble source as in either it occurs within the trouble source turn or in the next turn (just after the trouble source turn) or in the turn after it. Who initiates the repair and where it is initiated are two related aspects within the repair system (Schegloff, 2000).

Within the repair system, there is what is called *self-initiated repair* and *other-initiated repair*. Other-initiated repair is a repair that is initiated in the turn following the trouble source by someone other than the speaker of the trouble source. 'Self-initiated repair, on the other hand, occurs in all the other positions' (Schegloff, 2000: p. 208). Usually, self-initiated repair involves the speaker of the trouble-source initiating the repair and then prosecuting it within the same turn. On the other hand, other-initiated repair usually involves the recipient of the trouble-source initiating a repair but leaving it to the speaker of the trouble-source to

prosecute it in the next turn. Furthermore, other-initiated repair involves a sequence and this sequence is a combination of two organisations, which is turns-at-talk and action.

Thus, the organisation of repair is an organisation of action. The organisation of action is composed of initiation and solution or abandoning it. The actions of the repair organisation can abandon or replace other actions, which means that these actions could replace or delay whatever was coming next. Next could mean ‘a next sound in a turn-constructive unit, a next turn-constructive unit in a turn, a next turn in a sequence, a next element of a story-telling, and so forth’ (Schegloff, 2000), and it is the only action that has this characteristic. Due to the unique characteristic of this action, it is considered to have a unique privileged effect which restricts the repair occurrence. This means that repair-initiation is likely to occur within a limited space around the trouble source, and all repair initiations (solutions) occur within a narrowed space after the repair initiations (Schegloff, 2000: p. 208).

On many occasions, other-initiated repair occurs after the trouble-source turn. However, repair can occur later on in conversational exchanges. Thus, Schegloff (2000) discusses four types of repairs that occur later on in conversations. Some of these occasions are where a repair is mitigated, and in other occasions it is assimilated or deferred.

The first instance is what Schegloff (2000) calls ‘multiples’ (p. 212). ‘Multiples’ is referred to when, for instance, other-initiated repair occurs after the trouble-source. However, the response to the other-initiation does not resolve the problem, thus creating a deployment of another repair-initiation. Moreover, a second repair sequence may still not resolve the trouble, and could result in a deployment of a third repair initiation attempt.

The second instance is called ‘larger unit in progress’ (Schegloff, 2000: p. 213). ‘Larger unit in progress’ means that the other repair-initiation occurs after a large unit of expanded turn and not within the next turn of the trouble source. This is demonstrated in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 4.1 [(Schegloff, 2000: p. 215)]

01 Dir: TS→ Now look [tell Jack that these people are
02 Sue: [Mh hm?
03 Dir: reporting as far as =
04 Dir: =the lake front’s concerned to Ely-to Canal
05 Boulevard, and the lake front.
06 Sue: Mh hm,

07 Dir: So somebody should be there to pick 'em up.
 08 Sue: Reporting to Canal Boulevard?
 09 Dir: A::nd, the the lake front.
 10 Sue: OI→ Who-who are these people [that're repor-
 11 Dir: [These are the
 12 volunteer::rs,
 13 Sue: Oh, I see.

In excerpt 4.1, we are able to see that the delayed other-initiated repair in line 10 occurred to target an earlier trouble source (line 1). Thus, what occurs from lines 2-8 is considered as episodes of larger unit in progress which means that this 'larger unit' was 'designed to be in some sense a single, expanded turn' (Schegloff, 2000: p. 214), however instead it turned into an extended multi-unit utterance.

The third instance is called 'addressed other goes first'. 'Addressed other goes first' means that other initiated-repair can be delayed due to respect for another person who is due to allocate a turn after the trouble source. An example of that is demonstrated in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 4.2 [(Schegloff, 2000: p. 217)]

01 Al: [what time is it?
 02 Roger: [Turn the tape recorder on.
 03 Ther: Ten thirty.
 04 Al: What happened to Looey. Is she not coming
 05 this week?
 06 Ther: She-*nn* she won't be coming in.
 07 Al: TS→ Where's Jim Reed? Somebody ()-
 08 Ther: Jim Reed will be late.
 09 Roger: OI→ Who's Jim Reed.
 10 Al: New guy is coming.
 11 Roger: Aaaghoooh ehah huh hah heh heh

In excerpt 4.2, the trouble source is in line 07 although the repair is initiated not in the subsequent turn but in line 09. This is because Roger respects the 'allocation of that turn to another' (Schegloff, 2000: p. 217) and in this case the turn is allocated to Ther in line 08 as a response to the question in line 07.

The fourth instance is called ‘post response’. By ‘post response’ it is meant that after the trouble source turn, a response is produced and other repair initiation follows that.

4.5 Justification for method

For this research, CA was chosen as the primary method for analysing the data. There are various reasons why CA was chosen over other methods of analysis. For instance, according to Markee (2000: p. 21):

CA attempts to explicate in emic terms the conversational practices that speakers orient to (i.e., the rules of talk they deploy for each other and, by extension, for analysts) by “unpacking” the structure of either single cases or collections of talk-in-interaction.

According to Drew (2005), CA tries to identify patterns through which talk-in-interaction is arranged and coherent. Thus, these patterns that the analysts examine in talk-in-interaction are not statistical patterns but rather as a result of how the speakers orient to what they should do and say in certain situations. For instance, if we take the rule of adjacency pair, the production of a second pair part means that the first pair part was heard (Drew, 2005). Moreover, CA uses very detailed transcriptions and uses a set of conventions. The aim of these CA transcriptions is to transcribe what and how things are said, and by doing so, this will help the analyst to highlight phenomena that he/she might examine later on in more detail. The transcribed data is additional evidence for the audience to access and examine independently. Therefore, the combination of the transcribed data and the recording being played would help highlight the specific phenomena ‘and create a ‘shared focus’ among audience and analyst’ (Ten Have, 2007: p. 32). The conventions that are used within CA were developed by Gail Jefferson and these conventions are highly detailed. The details of these conventions are added to the textual transcriptions in order to complete the picture by noting the pauses, overlaps, slower, faster, latched, or stretched speech.

4.6 Limitations of CA

CA has been criticised for its approach towards transcription and these criticisms are on two levels: epistemological and practical. The epistemological concerns question whether transcriptions as research tools are valid or not and the degree to which the transcriptions go hand in hand with the researcher’s theoretical orientations (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013). For

instance, Bogen (1992) argues that researchers who use CA as their method of analysis claim to use ‘ordinary conversations’, however when the data is transcribed using CA conventions, it looks far from being ‘ordinary’ and the detailed transcripts can get in the way of the actual analysis of the data. Moreover, Bucholtz (2000) claims that reflexive transcription practice is mandatory as the transcripts by themselves are not enough. She finds that we as analysts should rely on the recordings rather than the transcriptions and we should seek reaction from the speakers in these recordings. The response of conversation analysts to this is that ‘there are different things that can be encoded in a transcript’ and what ‘the researcher chooses to encode will depend on their research questions and analytic perspective’ (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013: p. 93). However, researchers using CA would need to justify their choice of encoding certain features over others using grounded argument and materials (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013).

The practical concerns on the other hand are related to the inadequacy of CA transcriptions. This issue has been criticised by two groups of people. The first group are people who use English language orthography such as qualitative social scientists, and the other group are linguists who prefer using a standard phonetic transcription system. The first group claims that CA transcripts are too complicated to read and CA analysts use ‘comic book’ orthography which makes speakers look stupid’ (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013: p. 93). In addition, linguists criticise CA transcriptions for being unsystematic in terms of the ways in which they represent the phonetic details and thus argue that it is better to use standard phonetic transcription system (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013). Conversation analysts’ response is that:

orthographic transcription imposes the conventions of written language designed to be broadly independent of specific speakers. Such a transformation systematically wipes out evidence of intricate coordination, talk as action and recipient design. It encourages the analyst to interpret talk by reference to an individual speaker (e.g. perception) or focus on abstract relations between word and world (e.g. discourses). If talk is a medium for action, then forms of representation that try to capture elements of action rather than ‘just the words’ are needed. (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013: p. 93).

On the other hand, the use of International Phonetic Alphabet can emphasise various features of speech production at the expense of not including any information on delays, overlaps and gesture (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013). The basic principle of CA is to ‘to get as much of the actual sound as possible into our transcripts, while still making them accessible to linguistically unsophisticated readers’ (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974: p. 734) and thus CA analysts should always aim to highlight the limitations of the transcription system

and aim to contribute for a better one in order for it to keep evolving (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013).

4.7 CA's attitude towards context

Since CA is the method that is used in this research to analyse the data, it is important to note CA's attitude towards context. Within CA, it is important to determine which aspects of the context are essential to the interactants (Seedhouse, 2004a). 'A basic assumption of CA is that contributions to interaction are context-shaped and context-renewing' (p. 42). Moreover, CA views interactions as both context-free and context-sensitive. For instance, the structural organisation of CA such as the 'turn taking' system is considered context-free as this organisation would be occurring with no regard to a specific context. On the other hand, this same organisation would be considered as context-sensitive because the interactants use this organisation, such as the turn-taking system, to orient their understanding of that context (Seedhouse, 2004a). 'By tracing how context-free resources are employed and manifested locally in a context-sensitive manner, we are able to uncover the underlying machinery' (Seedhouse, 2004a: p. 43).

4.8 Validity

Validity is essential in any piece of research as it the key to an effective and valid one (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011: pp. 179-215). A piece of research would be considered valid if it met the criteria of different types of validity, such as 'generalizability', 'replicability', and 'controllability' (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011). Validity within a piece of research asks two questions, firstly 'whether the means of measurement are accurate' and secondly, whether they are actually measuring what they are intended to measure' (Winter, 2000: p. 3).

There are two types of validity: external and internal validity. Internal validity means that the findings that emerged from the research are caused by and related to the phenomena investigated. Internal validity within qualitative research is partially needed. Unlike quantitative research, it does not try to examine the relationship of cause and effect, and it does not try to isolate the 'particulars within the phenomena' (Winter, 2000: p. 8). Moreover, internal validity according to Yin (2009) is when the researcher tries to explain through his/her data how and why x led to y . However, the results would not be valid if the researcher

is not aware of other factor/s affecting the results and does not acknowledge them (Yin, 2009).

External validity means the extent in which the results of a research can be generalised. External validity is essential in quantitative research but not as much in qualitative research, as trying to achieve external validity in qualitative research would affect the overall validity within a piece of research (Winter, 2000). In addition, external validity is when a study's findings are generalisable beyond the analysed single cases (Yin, 2009). When it comes to validity within qualitative research, the most crucial aspects to discuss would be how representative the description of the research is and how justifiable the findings are (Winter, 2000).

Validity is concerned with one's notion of truth. However, it does not try to investigate what is less or more valid, but it tries to examine the research process as a whole. 'Therefore, 'validity' appears to reside within the appropriation of research methodologies to those systems of truth that their processes best represent' (Winter, 2000: p. 12). One could ask whether a piece of research is valid or not by asking the question of whether the research is testing what it actually claims to test and the truth it hoped to measure (Winter, 2000).

Thus, in terms of internal validity within this research, CA is the only method that is used in this piece of research in order to analyse the data. CA does a turn-by-turn analysis, thus uncovering 'the "machinery" which is able to produce the individual instances and hence the organisation of the institutional variety of talk' (Seedhouse, 2004b: p. 214). CA works on the micro level (Seedhouse, 2004b) and:

the attention of CA is not directed at uncovering hidden meanings, strategic projects, and the like, but in the meanings that actually and observably are produced in and through the interaction, in order to describe the technology used to bring those about. (Ten Have, 1990: p. 11).

As a result, there is internal validity due to the use of CA since researchers who use it as their method of analysis do not make any claims beyond what is demonstrated by the interactional details (Seedhouse, 2007).

In terms of external validity, CA is a method that works on two levels, the particular and the general, and since this study's aim is to examine both interactional and intercultural competence, although these two concepts have been defined differently by different scholars,

it is the use of CA that will enable me to understand how the tandem participants co-construct encounters as they unfold (Plug, Sharrack and Reuber, 2009), and what this will demonstrate in terms of interactional and intercultural competence.

4.9 Reliability

Reliability means that if a piece of research is carried out in a similar context and with a similar group of people, then the results would be the same (Cohen and Manion and Morrison, 2011). Thus, reliability ‘is the extent to which a measurement procedure yields the same answer however and whenever it is carried out’ (Kirk and Miller, 1986: p. 19). Moreover, reliability is the extent to which the findings of a piece of research are not affected by any accidental circumstances (Kirk and Miller, 1986).

In terms of reliability in this study, I recorded the participants using audio and video recordings and I transcribed the data using CA conventions. I then organised the transcribed data and put it under different collections in order to create themes. After doing so, I chose to use for my research data that included mostly cultural related topics in order to examine how the participants dealt with these incidents. The choice of using CA in this research is what enhances this study’s reliability as, first:

CA operates *closer to the phenomena* than most other approaches, because it works on detailed renderings of interactional activities, recordings, and detailed transcripts, rather than on coded, counted, or otherwise summarized representations; because of this it can take into consideration details and subtleties of human interaction that are lost in other practices and that have proven to be important for participants. (Ten Have, 2007: p. 9).

Second, CA has preference towards naturally occurring data rather than experimental data or a study that is provoked by the researcher. Third, CA views human interaction as organisational and procedural, meaning that CA does not view ‘people talk’ as an individual act but rather as a ‘collectively organized event’ (Ten Have, 2007: p. 9). Therefore, CA is not interested in ‘why’ people say certain things but rather ‘how’ they do it (Ten Have, 2007).

Moreover, Seedhouse (2007) argues that many research methodologies do not present their data within their publications ‘and hence the reliability of major sections of the researchers’ analyses is not available for scrutiny’ (p. 254). However, within CA studies, it is quite a normal practice to include transcripts of the data, and even to make the video and audio recordings available on the web. This increases the data’s reliability, as the reader would be

able to analyse the data and test the analysis that the researcher has provided. ‘In this way, all of the analyses of data in this collection are rendered repeatable and replicable to the reader in so far as this is possible’ (Seedhouse, 2004b: p. 255).

Wooffitt (2005) concludes that conversation analytical studies of interaction have a consistency which makes CA a reliable method of analysis. To this end, the data that was chosen for this study was analysed and this analysis was shared with my supervisor and discussed in regular meetings. Additionally, the data was presented at MARG, a Micro-Analysis Research Group which provides an informal analysis and support for researchers who are using CA as their method of analysis. Both of these mechanisms allowed me to present and discuss the data in order to obtain feedback and this shared insight was invaluable when analysing and compiling my discussion chapter. The data proved reliable due to consistent findings even when using external sources to review the data.

4.10 Research Design

This section discusses the ways in which this research was designed and how the data were collected and analysed. CA studies record naturally occurring talk and the data is then transcribed and analysed using CA conventions and CA principles, therefore it is essential to detail every step that was involved in this procedure.

4.10.1 Background

In this research, each pair consists of 1 Chinese postgraduate student and 1 British postgraduate student studying at the same university. I will be video recording each pair during their 6 sessions of tandem language learning together and I will be using CA as my main method for analysis. Due to the use of CA, I will be investigating each deviant case within my data in depth in order ‘to build a general account of a phenomenon or interactional organization’ (Seedhouse, 2004b: p. 259). Then I will be uncovering ‘the norms to which participants are orienting and the emic logic or rational basis for their action’ (Seedhouse, 2004b: p. 259). This means that deviant cases are helpful and they should be investigated in great detail. The deviant case, for instance, is what pushed Schegloff to reach a deeper analysis as a result of an identification of a summons-answer sequence. What Schegloff found was that the telephone ringing functioned as the summons, and the next action was a response

by the receiver of the call. The response, however, is not provided immediately in a deviant case which results in the caller repeating the summons in a verbal form. This resulted in the formulation of the adjacency pair rather than a single-speaker norm (Seedhouse, 2004b). As I have used CA in order to identify the logic behind the participants' actions and to understand the interactional organisation in a deeper sense, the small sample size is justified.

I chose for my research Chinese and British students as I am an English language tutor myself and I mainly teach Chinese students and thus I am aware of various problems that can arise because of cultural misunderstandings. Therefore, in order to find the right participants, I had to go to the library at my university where students advertise their names in order to search for a partner to learn from him/her his/her mother tongue and in order for him/her to teach the other person his/her mother tongue. In other words, these students advertise themselves with their contact details in order to learn a language they desire. It is essential to emphasise that this section in the library is designed for students to teach each other their native language and it is done under the context of 'tandem language learning'.

After getting permission from the library, I collected around ten names of Chinese students who wanted to learn English and vice versa. It is important to note that the ratio was not 50:50 as there were many more Chinese students who wanted to learn English rather than English students wanting to learn Chinese. I then contacted the Chinese and the English students via email to ask whether they would be interested in participating in my tandem language learning research and whether they were postgraduate or undergraduate students. I had a reply from almost all students, who all turned out to be postgraduate students although some of them had already found a partner. This meant that I was left with 6 Chinese postgraduate students but no English students.

In order to find English postgraduate students at the university who wanted to learn Chinese, I contacted one of the faculty directors and he was able to help me by circulating an email to all postgraduate students in the university asking them if they were interested in learning Chinese. My details were in the email, and therefore all who might have been interested were able to contact me. After receiving four replies I arranged a meeting with every English postgraduate student who was interested in learning Chinese in order to explain the procedure. I then met both the Chinese and the English students at the library at separate times and I explained to them exactly what would be required from them whilst additionally talking them through the concept of language tandem learning and its benefits.

At the end of these meetings I asked each student whether he/she thought that he/she would be able to be committed to this research and if they were happy to participate in it. I then handed an empty schedule to all these participants (appendix B) where they had to tick in the days and times they were available, meaning that I would be able to match up Chinese and English students depending on availability. I also gave the participants a syllabus that I had prepared. The material and the ideas for both the English and the Chinese syllabus (Appendix C) were adapted from two books by Lewis and Walker (2003) and Greenwood (2007). Lewis and Walker's book is one of the very few books dedicated to explaining different theories and approaches behind the idea of tandem language learning, and in addition provides worksheets for students to use during tandem language learning sessions. These worksheets have been used previously at Sheffield University as at Sheffield University there is a centre dedicated to tandem language learning. On the other hand, the book by Greenwood (2007) is a book that teaches Chinese to beginners. I used material from this book in order to design the Chinese Syllabus as all the English students were at a beginner level unlike the Chinese students that have been studying at a UK university at Masters level which indicated that their English was advanced. I went through the syllabus with the English and Chinese students, explained to them the idea behind it and why it was designed. This was done by showing the students the syllabus in advance and by handing it to them so they would have time to go through it before the start of the sessions. Another reason behind this was that I did not want the students to be in a position where they would not find any material, and thus would not know what to teach and might even stop attending the sessions altogether.

I took the time to explain to the participants that the sessions would take an hour and a half, where forty five minutes would be dedicated to teaching Chinese and forty five minutes will be dedicated to teaching English, therefore supporting the concept behind tandem learning wherein both partners are able to benefit equally from the session. I explained that I would provide participants with a timer so they would not feel obliged to keep looking at their watches and that there would be audio and video recordings during the session. I did this in order to ascertain whether anyone felt uncomfortable with that concept. All participants were in full agreement with this and they were all told that for ethical purposes that during their first session, they would be asked to sign an informed consent form (Appendix D).

In terms of how the rooms for these sessions were set up, I contacted the secretary of the faculty so she would be able to help me find vacant rooms for my sessions. After the secretary agreed to help me with this task, it was agreed between me and her that I would send her an

email a few days beforehand with the specific days and times required for the sessions and then she would reply back with the vacant rooms available for the requested days and times. Thus, this procedure would occur every week in order to plan for the upcoming sessions. It is important to mention that for every pair, the day and time were pre-arranged but that the room itself used for the session would change. As a result, I had to stay in touch via email with the participants in order to update them with the room number. In addition, at times the participants would send an email to me to cancel a meeting, and thus this meant that the research took longer than the anticipated length which was originally five weeks.

In the first session for every pair, I would go to the appointed room ten minutes earlier in order to set up the room by positioning the video camera where it would be facing both participants and by placing the timer and the audio recorder on the table next to where the two participants would be doing their tandem language learning tasks. After the arrival of each pair, I handed them the informed consent forms so they would be able to read it carefully and sign it. In addition, I handed them a goal setting chart (Appendix E) which was adapted from a book on tandem language learning by Lewis and Walker (2003). The aim of this goal setting chart was to enable the participants to set up goals and targets for themselves in terms of what they will be getting out of these sessions. After doing so, I would leave the room so the participants would be able to start their session and at the end of each session I would wait outside until they signalled to me that they had finished. At this point, I would enter the room, collect the video and audio recorders, and upload everything that was recorded on my user area onto the university's network.

4.10.2 *The participants*

The participants are all students in the same university. The gender of the participants is mixed; three males and five females. All of the participants were of similar age - between 22 and 24 – except one aged 39. All participants are postgraduate students but at different levels (the four Chinese participants are Masters students whereas all the English participants are PhD students). Three pairs (designated for the purposes of this research as En1 and Ch1, En2 and Ch2 and En4 and Ch4) consisted of one male and one female and only one pair (designated as En3 and Ch3) consisted of two females. Below is a table that contains the participants' age, gender, nationality, native language, and the level of the course they are doing.

Participant	Age	Gender	Nationality	Native Language	Undergraduate or Postgraduate
En1	24	Male	British	English	Postgraduate-PhD
Ch1	23	Female	Chinese	Chinese	Postgraduate-Masters
En2	23	Female	British	English	Postgraduate-PhD
Ch2	24	Male	Chinese	Chinese	Postgraduate-Masters
En3	39	Female	British	English	Postgraduate-PhD
Ch3	24	Female	Chinese	Mandarin	Postgraduate-Masters
En4	22	Male	British	English	Postgraduate-PhD
Ch4	24	Female	Chinese	Chinese	Postgraduate-Masters

4.10.3 Data collection

Within CA, the emphasis when collecting data is on ‘naturally occurring occasions of everyday interaction’ (Heritage and Atkinson, 1984, p. 2) and the means that is used to collect data within CA is audio and video recordings. CA is different from methods that are used in social sciences (such as interviews, experiments and field observations) as, for instance, with experimental methodologies in social sciences, the researcher could find himself/herself intervening and manipulating the subjects’ behaviour. Within the application of the CA method, however, this would not be allowed to happen as CA examines only naturally occurring interactions (Heritage and Atkinson, 1984).

There are various reasons why CA uses recording technologies to collect data over observers’ notes, subjects’ reports, or unaided intuitions as there are various limitations of recollection in generating data with comparison to the richness of empirically occurring interaction.

Therefore, CA’s way of examining transcripts is not a product of recollection or intuitive

invention (Heritage and Atkinson, 1984) but rather ‘the purpose of a CA transcription is to make *what* was said and *how* it was said available for analytic consideration, at first for the analyst who does the transcribing, and later for others, colleagues, and audiences’ (Ten Have, 2007: p. 32) and that is how CA collects its evidence. Thus a CA analyst uses the transcriptions to highlight phenomena and then would use that evidence he/she has got from the transcriptions to share with an audience, and by sharing it, the audience would get an independent access to the data being analysed (Ten Have, 2007).

As a summary:

the use of recorded data serves as a control on the limitations and fallibilities of intuition and recollection; it exposes the observer to a wide range of interactional materials and circumstances and also provides some guarantee that analytic conclusions will not arise as artifacts of intuitive idiosyncrasy, selective attention or recollection, or experimental design. (Heritage and Atkinson, 1984: p. 4)

The availability of the recorded data allows for the data to be repeated and heard as many times as possible and would allow for a detailed examination of specific events in interaction, enhancing the process of observation (Heritage and Atkinson, 1984).

4.10.4 Use of audio and video

For this research, I have used both audio and video recordings. In all 24 sessions (each pair of students had 6 sessions), the camera video was positioned by me so it would face both participants, and the audio recorder would be placed on the desk that both participants would be working on. The camera was positioned to face the participants and captured the participants’ body language and their usage of tools while interacting. The audio recorder was placed on the desk both participants worked on, with the purpose of recording their interactions with a greater quality of audio.

It is important to note here that CA was originally developed from audio recordings only, and the recordings would either be of face-to-face interactions or telephone conversations. However, the analysis of the face-to-face interaction was not considered complete as audio recordings would not be able to capture non-vocal exchanges. Thus, later video recordings were incorporated in order to capture every non-vocal exchange, and one of the very first to use video camera and to examine non-vocal accompanying activities was Charles Goodwin in collaboration with Marjorie Harness Goodwin. Even if a researcher does not want to examine the participants’ visual and vocal conduct, it is still advised to use video recording on top of

audio recording 'because video recording provides a wealth of contextual information that may be extremely helpful in the analysis of interactional talk-as-such' (Ten Have, 2007: p. 72).

4.10.5 *Camera and recorder positioning*

The camera and the audio recordings were positioned by me at the beginning of every session. The camera would be positioned in the front of the room facing the participants, however I made sure that there would always be quite a space between the participants and the camera in order to neutralise the participants' fears. The audio recorder was positioned by me on the desk that the participants would work on in order to capture every single bit of the interaction in case I was not able to hear everything when using the camera.

4.10.6 *CA transcription*

CA generally uses specific transcript symbols for visual and verbal interaction. The symbols that are used in this thesis were first developed by Gail Jefferson and they are still evolving (Schegloff, 2007). It is essential though to mention that although these transcript symbols were used when transcribing the data, the recordings still need to be used alongside the transcriptions as the transcriptions can sometimes be selective. There are various issues that are involved in transcribing data using CA conventions, hence below I will discuss every stage that I had to deal with when transcribing my data, from what is involved in transcribing, to the functions of transcripts, the elements in constructing transcript files, formatting issues, adding visual information, practical issues, software support, and lastly learning to transcribe.

The process of transcribing data can be seen by some a relatively easy process since the transcriber would only need to transcribe what is being said by the interactants (Ten Have, 2007). However, according to Ten Have (2007), this is just the starting point as the process can be quite difficult for various reasons. One problem that the transcriber might face is that the recordings might not be of a high quality and this could turn the transcribing process into a very difficult one. Another problem is when the transcriber tries to transcribe an interaction which includes two or more people talking at the same time. Arguably, the biggest problem is that CA analysts would want to write down not only what has been said by the interactants but how it has been said, 'and that is why transcription is so important and difficult for a

research tradition like CA' (Ten Have, 2007: p. 94). Although there is no such a thing as a perfect transcript, the more one transcribes using CA conventions, the more one becomes better at it. Moreover, 'it takes time and practice not only to learn to *make* transcriptions according to a specific system, but also to learn to read them' (Ten Have, 2007: p. 95).

The functions of transcripts are that they are convenient to capture a phenomenon in which the researcher is interested in a written form. Until recently, transcripts were the only option available in publications and thus was the only way of representing the data. The phenomena in which the researcher is interested are not usually available from first hearings/viewing of the recorded and videoed data. It is only after repeated listening/viewing and a huge effort put into transcribing 'that certain phenomena 'present themselves' to the ears, eyes, and minds of the tape's audience' (Ten Have, 2007: p. 95).

In addition, it is recommended that the researcher transcribes his/her own data even if the work is tiresome and boring. This is recommended because listening to the audio recordings over and over whilst transcribing gives the researcher 'a kind of access to the 'lived reality' of the interaction that is not available in any other way' (Ten Have, 2007: p. 95). Once the transcripts are made, they provide an access to a vast range of interactional phenomena and these phenomena can be used for comparative purposes. Thus, transcripts allow the researcher to build his/her own archive of data.

As the system of transcribing data using CA conventions has been developing over the past years, more and more details of talk-in-interaction have been added to the basic 'text'. This system has been developing since the work of Harvey Sacks in the 1960s, however the main contribution goes back to the work of Gail Jefferson (Ten Have, 2007).

Within a transcript file, various information is usually available as is detailed below.

It is essential to record the time, date, and place of the original recordings used in one's research in order for them to be added to the research archive. However, it is important to note that when the recordings are made public, the researcher should be using an opaque coding system as this information cannot be shared with the public (Ten Have, 2007).

Participants are identified within transcriptions on the left column by a letter code. When transcribing institutional talks, for instance, the participants are identified through categorical identification, such as in a classroom, where the students would be identified as S and the teacher would be identified as T. However, all this is dependent on the research analysis and its analytic consequences. Thus the decision on whether to identify participants through, as an example, gender or profession, will depend on the basis for the analysis itself (Ten Have, 2007). In my research the participants were identified as En (English student) and Ch (Chinese student) as this is what my research analysis is on.

When transcribing using CA conventions, one might face the dilemma of how to transcribe, as accurately as possible, *what* has been said and *how* it is has been said. Ten Have (2007) suggests some solutions to this problem. The first solution is to use standard orthography throughout the transcriptions, ignoring any language variations. By doing that, one may miss out on the opportunity of studying interesting phenomena. A second solution would be to use standard orthography but additionally to mark ‘some specially significant ‘deviations’ (p. 99). This second solution though might not be ideal as the CA researcher might struggle with making a decision on why he/she would choose one option over the other, and plus this type of transcript might create huge variations within the transcript which would not reflect upon the variation in the talk. The third solution, which is the one that I have tried to adopt, is to use modifications consistently and continuously all throughout the transcripts (Ten Have, 2007).

All sounds such as ‘eh’, ‘oh’, ‘uhm’, ‘erm’ and any aspiration and laughter should be transcribed as they might play an important role in an interaction. All these vocalisations might have an interactional role such as a claim to start a turn (Ten Have, 2007). Hearable aspiration (breathing) is marked as ‘h’, and the more h’s there are, the longer the aspiration. On the other hand, hearable inhalation (in-breath) is marked as (.hh). Aspirations have their significance as they could convey different types of emotions from extreme upset to hysteria. Laughter on the other hand is marked as huh, hah, heh, or hih. It can be produced on its own or within a word, and if the latter, it would be transcribed as followed: ‘thi(h)nk’ (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013).

Inaudible sounds/words means sounds or words that the researchers find it difficult to comprehend and thus would not be able to transcribe. In this case, the researcher might try to listen to the sound/word several times and if he/she still finds it incomprehensible then he/she

might leave the sound/word blank using single brackets. However, Ten Have (2007) claims that this issue is usually resolved when one returns to the data later on, or alternatively one can ask someone else to listen to it. I have faced this problem when transcribing my data, and there were sounds/words that I could not transcribe even after several hearings, however this occurred only a few times.

Pauses can be significant in interactions, although their significance might not be clear at first. Pauses do occur when one party stops speaking and no one else initiates a turn. If, after a pause, the same speaker continues talking, this would be called an 'intra-turn pause'.

However, if the pause occurs after a speaker finishes talking and no other speaker is expected to speak, this would be called an 'inter-turn pause'. In any case, pauses are important to note when using CA, but it is difficult to exactly define the meaning of a pause. Moreover, when using CA, one should note pauses in a certain way using brackets and include within the brackets the length of the pause which is usually measured in tenths of a second. For example, (0.7) would mean one seventh of a second. There are various ways of measuring pauses, such as using a stopwatch or using a specific computer software (e.g. SoundEdit, CoolEdit) (Ten Have, 2007). For the purpose of this research I have used 'Audacity' to measure the pauses within my data.

Overlapping talk is a talk that happens simultaneously by two or more speakers and it is marked with square brackets. 'Overlap onset is marked with the left square bracket ([); overlap offset, when marked, is indicated with the right square bracket (])' (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013: p. 81). Overlaps are very important to mark when using CA as when the researcher analyses them, he/she could understand the turn-taking system in a better way and account for the fact that speakers do not wait usually for one another to start a turn. A careful transcription of the overlaps is essential as this would help give the researcher a greater insight into the turn-taking system and the way it works (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013).

Latching, which is represented by equal sign (=), is used in transcriptions to indicate that there is no silence between two turns or parts of one turn. Latching can occur between different speakers' turn or within the same speaker's turn and is essential to examine latched production as it 'can be critical for understanding what is being accomplished interactionally' (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013: p. 82).

In this section I will discuss how final-intonations, stretches, cut-offs and jump-starts, emphasis, volume and pitch are represented when using CA conventions, and then I will draw on their interactional relevance (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013).

Unit-final intonation can convey various important information, specifically in terms of epistemic stance and epistemic access to information. Therefore, it is essential to note all the different unit-final intonations when transcribing (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013).

Turn-constructive unit final intonation is marked using period, comma, question mark, inverted question mark, or an underscore. Each one of them indicates something different. First, a period (.) indicates a falling intonation contour although it is not necessarily an assertion. Second, a question mark (?) indicates a strong rising intonation but it is not necessarily an interrogative. Third, a comma (,) indicates a slightly rising intonation but it does not necessarily indicate that the speaker is continuing to speak. Fourth, an inverted question mark followed by a comma (?.) indicates that there is a pitch rise which is stronger than a comma and weaker than a question mark. Fifth, an underscore (_) means level intonation (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013).

Stress and emphasis is indicated in a transcription using underlining (Why). Moreover, the longer the underlining, such as in ‘pa:::tners’, the greater the emphasis. However, one point to bear in mind when marking stress/emphasis is that there are words that naturally carry stress with them, such as ‘information’ and ‘interruption’. Thus, when transcribing it is essential to distinguish between words that naturally carry stress with them and words that are actually stressed and emphasised by the speaker (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013).

Speed of speech indicates whether a talk is compressed or rushed, and this is marked by using the symbols greater than and less than (><). For instance, if talk is slower than the other talk surrounding it, then the symbols <> would be used and the talk will be inserted between them (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013).

Originally, CA transcription conventions were developed to capture the interlocutors' vocal conduct only. However, since the 1970s, Charles Goodwin pioneered the idea of incorporating video recordings when using CA to capture the interlocutors' visible behaviour as well: ‘in face-to-face interactions, participants' visible conduct is instrumental to how

social actions are accomplished and coordinated, which means that it has to be represented on a transcript' (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013: p. 90). When it comes to transcribing talk alone, one has to be selective and this applies even more so when transcribing visible behaviour. This is due to the various parameters. It is argued that the simplest way of transcribing visible behaviour is through using transcribers' comments (Hepburn and Bolden, 2013). I have done so in my data by using double brackets (()) in which I have transcribed the visible behaviour of the interactants when I have found them to be relevant.

4.10.7 Data Analysis

I have used Audacity to help analyse the data. Audacity is a software for audio recordings, and it enables one to examine recordings in great detail, for instance to measure pauses and overlaps. In addition, through Audacity, one can create loops of talk in order to enable one to re-listen to the same loop over and over again for a detailed examination. Thus, Audacity has helped me to analyse the data and to notice things in much greater detail. Another tool that was used was Windows Media Player in order to view the video of the participants' actions and their use of body language in order to display social interactions. After the data was transcribed, each unit was studied and put under different collections/themes at which point they were examined more closely.

In this chapter of the research design I have covered two parts, the theoretical part of CA and the ways in which the research was undertaken which includes the research procedure, data collection, sampling, and data analysis. In the next chapter, I will be discussing the findings of my study.

4.11 Summary

In this chapter I have tried covering all aspects that are involved within this research's methodology, from the research purpose to the background of the problem, the principles of CA, and its limitation as a method. I have also justified the use of CA, elaborated on CA's attitude towards context, and lastly discussed this research's reliability and validity. I have also provided information on how this research has been designed and all the steps that were included within that process.

Chapter 5. Findings: Interactional Competence

5.1 Introduction

All the excerpts that are used in this research are taken from the English teaching session of the language tandem learning exchange. This is the case because the themes of ‘empathy’ and ‘intersubjectivity’ have emerged in these sessions, and both these themes are linked to interactional and intercultural competence. It is important to note that the worksheets given to the participants to use during the tandem sessions were adapted from Brammerts and Kleppin’s (2003) tandem learning task suggestions (see appendix C). These tasks were created over the years by colleagues from various universities (Bochum, Oviedo, Sheffield and Mitthögskolan) for the EU’s ODL and LINGUA programs, and since 1996, these tasks were freely accessible for tandem courses.

The tasks include expressions and proverbs that are connected to animals and body parts and the main objective of these sessions is to attach these expressions with images and to be able to find similarities and differences when comparing them to Chinese proverbs/expressions (Brammerts and Kleppin, 2003).

This first set of findings will look into answering the first research question which is:

1. What are the characteristics of *interactional competence* for Chinese and English postgraduate students studying in the UK in a tandem language learning context?

This will be done through dividing this section into four different themes which will be discussed below. The total excerpts that are used in this chapter are 35.

5.2 Maintenance of intersubjectivity through asymmetrical orientation to knowledge

As established previously, within a tandem language learning context, the sessions are usually divided into two halves in which the first half would be dedicated to teaching one language and the other half would be dedicated to teaching the other. As a consequence, the tandem learners play the role of the teacher during half of the session and in the other half they would play the role of the learner. The tandem participants’ understanding of their roles and how to orient to them is essential for a successful session. Below are extracts that demonstrate how participants have maintained intersubjectivity through asymmetrical orientation to knowledge and alignment.

Excerpt 5.1 is taken from the English teaching part of the session and En1 is teaching Ch1 some English idioms. He starts by saying that the next idiom ‘is a good one’ (line 1) and then he continues by checking whether Ch1 has heard of it before. Ch1 in turn plays the role of the learner all throughout the excerpt.

Excerpt 5.1

1 En1: ➔ ne- next one is a good one
 2 (0.2)
 3 Ch1: ➔ ↑uh ↓huh
 4 (0.3)
 5 En1: erm:: (0.5) <↑don't ↓look ↑at ↓gift horse (0.2) in
 6 the ↓mouth>
 7 Ch1: ➔ .hhh hehe
 8 (0.9)
 9 En1: you're heard this one be↑fore or not?=
 10 Ch1: =n↑o:: [never heard] of ↑that
 11 En1: ➔ i[t's is a good one]
 12 (0.3)
 13 En1: ➔ yeah >ish ↑use ish use< (0.1) ish useful
 14 (0.3) yeah (0.3) ↑I ↓WOULD ↑USE ↓IT erm: .hhh (0.8) SO
 15 (1.0) ↑YOU ↓DON'T ↑LOOK (0.1) so you don't look at
 16 ↑something .hhh

En1 claims epistemic rights (Heritage and Raymond, 2005) by accessing his domain of knowledge, which in this case is the English idiom. In lines 1, 9, 11, and 13, he uses pre-expansions by claiming that the idiom is quite a good and a useful one, and in line 14 he emphasises this by saying that he himself would use it. Pre-expansions affect the ways in which the talk will unfold (Liddicoat, 2011: p. 163) and they are essential as they can lead to agreements on who has access to what (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011). Due to this, it is important to examine the pre-expansions in excerpt 5.1. In this excerpt, there are multiple pre-expansions (Liddicoat, 2011: p. 176). The first example in this excerpt is in line 1, where En1 tries to assess the idiom that he is going to discuss by saying the ‘next one is a good one’. This is followed by an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds, which is followed in line 3 by a ‘go-ahead’ response by Ch1 ‘uh huh’. In line 5, En1 tells Ch1 the idiom he is going to discuss, and this is followed in line 7 with an in-breath and a smile by Ch1 which could indicate another go-ahead response. En1 produces another pre-telling in line 9 by asking ‘you’re heard

this one before or not?’ which is immediately followed with a ‘no’ by Ch1. From lines 13-14, En1 produces another pre-expansion by again assessing the idiom by saying ‘ish useful I would use it’, which is followed by En1 saying out loud the actual idiom.

The aim of pre-announcements is to assess the fate of the FPP, as in whether there will be an encouragement or discouragement towards the base sequence (Schegloff, 2007: pp. 39-41). This was determined when Ch1 did ‘same evaluation’ (Liddicoat, 2011: p. 153) by acknowledging in line 3 (‘uh huh’) what En1 is saying and then saying in line 10 ‘no never heard of that’. In addition, in lines 1, 9, 11, and 13, En1 assesses the idiom by claiming that the idiom is ‘a good one’ and ‘useful’. By assessing the idiom that he is going to use, he is inviting a subsequent agreement (Pomerantz, 1984) which Ch1 produced in lines 3 and 7 when she said ‘uh huh’ and smiled.

The aim of this session in excerpt 5.1 was for the English student to teach the Chinese student some English idioms, and, as seen in the above excerpt, there is an asymmetrical orientation to knowledge between the two participants. There is a clear agreement between the English and the Chinese student that it is the English student’s turn to access and cede epistemic authority (Sahlström, 2011). Moreover, there is an alignment between the two participants as while the English speaker is talking, the Chinese student in turn uses vocal continuers to treat his turn as still in progress (Stivers, 2008). Therefore, in this discursive practice the two participants mutually co-construct the knowledge they possess which makes them in this specific excerpt interactionally competent (Young, 2008).

In excerpt 5.2, En1 continues elaborating on the idiom ‘don’t look a gift horse in the mouth’ while playing the role of the teacher and Ch1 in turn plays her role as a learner accordingly.

Excerpt 5.2

1 En1: (0.7) ah gift horse (0.9) erm::: (0.6) a (0.1) gift
2 (0.1)and a horse (0.2)
3 Ch1: .hh heheh
4 En1: (0.3) in the mouth and it (0.1) basically just
5 ↑mea:ns (0.4) don’t (0.1) be <ungrate↑ful> (0.7)
6 Ch1: →mhm
7 En1: (0.2) for <receiving a pre↑sent>
8 → (0.3)
9 Ch1: →↑uh:::
10 → (0.2)

11 En1: so:: (0.1) it ↑say:: (1.3) someone bought you a
12 birthday present (0.1)
13 Ch1: →↑uh ↓huh

En1 starts by saying the actual idiom, and even though there are a few pauses within En1's TCUs from line 1-2, Ch1 recognises the fact that they were not TRPs, and thus does not produce a turn (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998; Seedhouse, 2004a). In lines 4-5, 7, and 11-12, En1 continues to explain the idiom and Ch1 on the other hand produces acknowledgment tokens (Clayman, 2013a) such as 'mhm' (line 6), 'uh' (line 9) and 'uh huh' (line 13) to treat En1's turns as still in progress (Stivers, 2008). The acknowledgement and understanding between Ch1 and En1 indicates that there is an alignment between the two (Stivers, 2008).

En1 is still demonstrating that he has the main access to the epistemic authority in that context, since English language is his first language, he therefore demonstrates that he owns it and he is acting as the one who is knowledgeable in that matter. Moreover, in line 9, Ch1 upgrades (Heritage and Raymond, 2005: p. 18) En1's explanation of the idiom by indicating that she understands what he has just said, and thus En1 continues accessing his epistemic authority. Thus, in providing an example of how the idiom can be used in line 11-12, Ch1 produces an acknowledgment token 'uh huh' (line 13) which indicates that she wants En1 to continue with the example he is providing.

The emphasis in excerpt 5.2 is on the process of 'learning/teaching'. Learning, when associated with interactional competence, means having the knowledge and awareness to access and cede epistemic authority, and in this way, teaching and learning are parts of Ch1 and En1's interactional competence (Sahlström, 2011). Moreover, there is an alignment and asymmetrical orientation to knowledge between them, as the turns are facilitated by both participants as they matched the formal design preference of the turns (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011). For instance, Ch1 (as the learner) used acknowledgement tokens in lines 6, 9, and 13 to acknowledge the fact that En1's (as the teacher) turns are still in progress as he is still explaining the meaning of the idiom.

In excerpt 5.3, while En1 is continuing to elaborate on the meaning of the idiom, Ch1 in return provides him with acknowledgment tokens, and when he is done explaining the idiom, he uses a confirmation check in order to get a confirmation from Ch1 on whether she understood his explanation or not.

Excerpt 5.3

1 En1: (0.7)a:::nd (0.9) <you didn't seem happy to receive
2 ↓it> or you didn't >o yit o yit o yit o yit< (0.2)
3 you didn't say ↑thank ↓you ↑for ↓it
4 Ch1: →yeah
5 (0.6)
6 En1: someone may ↑say (0.4) well (0.1) don't look
7 (0.1) don't look (0.1) at gift (0.2)don't look at
8 gift horse in the [mouth]
9 Ch1: [hhh]
10 →(0.8)
11 En1: like you should be G↑RATEFUL (0.2) for
12 [re]ceiving
13 Ch1: →[°mhm°]
14 En1: some↑thing=
15 Ch1: → =°mhm°
16 →(0.5)
17 En1: yeah?
18 Ch1: →↑uh ↓huh
19 →(0.2)

In line 1, there is quite a long pause of 0.7 seconds and the silence is attributed to En1 as it is considered as a within-turn pause (Ten Have, 2007: p. 101). In line 1, En1 breaks the silence by elaborating upon the example he is providing. Within En1's TCUs from line 1-3, En1 pauses three times, however Ch1 does not produce a turn as she acknowledges the fact that En1's turn is still in progress. After the multiple TCUs from line 1-3 by En1, Ch1 produces an acknowledgment token ('yeah') in line 4. This could indicate that Ch1 views En1's prior talk as incomplete and is expecting him to continue talking (Goodwin and Heritage, 1990: p. 288). In line 5, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.6 seconds, and just after, from line 6-8, En1 continues elaborating on the example by continuing to access his domain of knowledge. From line 11-12, En1 continues with the explanation of the idiom, and in lines 12 and 13, there is an overlap where Ch1 produces an acknowledgment token 'mhm' before En1 completes his turn which could indicate that Ch1 is again acknowledging what En1 is saying (Goodwin and Heritage, 1990: p. 288). In line 14, En1 continues with his clarification and in line 15, Ch1 produces another acknowledgment token. In line 16, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.5 seconds, and just after that in line 17, En1 produces a confirmation check ('yeah?') which is preceded by an acknowledgment token ('uh huh') by Ch1.

We can see that in lines 10 and 16, there are quite long inter-turn pauses. After each pause, En1 is the one who proceeds with the conversation. This could be an indication of the fact that En1 and Ch1 are aware that at this point in the conversation that it is En1's right to access that information and thus they are both acknowledging this. Ch1's usage of 'yeah', 'mhm', and 'uh huh', and the design of her turns can indicate that she agrees that En1 has the primary rights to access and assess this idiom (Raymond and Heritage, 2006: p. 688). Despite all the inter- and intra-turn pauses in this specific discursive practice, the two participants are demonstrating 'intersubjectivity' (Young, 2008: p. 102). The two participants display interactional competence through maintaining shared understanding as there is a clear asymmetrical orientation to knowledge by both participants (Sahlström, 2011). For example, Ch1 produces acknowledgment tokens such as 'mhm', 'yeah', and 'uh huh' during En1's explanation of the idiom which indicates that she views En1's turns as incomplete and expects him to continue talking (Goodwin and Heritage, 1990: p. 288). Moreover, by the end of the explanation, En1 uses 'yeah?' as a confirmation check. Thus, in excerpt 5.3 both participants demonstrate an understanding of this discursive practice, as it is designed so En1 could teach Ch1 some English idioms, and therefore En1 plays the role of the teacher and Ch1 plays the role of the learner.

Excerpt 5.4 is an exchange between En2 and Ch2. Prior to this excerpt, En2 explained to Ch2 what the idiom 'sweep her off her feet' means and in excerpt 5.4, she provides Ch2 with an example by incorporating a drawing to help him understand the idiom and, in response, Ch2 produces acknowledgment tokens.

Excerpt 5.4

- 1 En2: that uhm:: °you know the the girl° (0.4)
- 2 Ch2: →[°↑uhu ↓huh°]
- 3 En2: [((drawing))] [°here's the girl°] ((0.5 seconds
- 4 [((drawing))]during which En2
- 5 is drawing))
- 6 En2: →standing here ·hhh and the GUY comes in
- 7 ((0.7 seconds during which En2 is drwaing))
- 8 [and like] ((1.2 seconds of which En2 is
- 9 [((drawing))] he's all amazing and ((0.2
- 10 seconds of which En2 is drawing))strong ()
- 11 great and HE RUNS IN=
- 12 Ch2: →=<°↑uhu ↓huh ↑uhu ↓huh ↑h[uh°>]

13 En2: → [w]o:: and then like
 14 ((0.2 seconds of which En2 is drawing)) sweeps her
 15 up into his arm so he's holding her °like this°
 16 ((1.3 seconds of which En2 is drawing)) °and she's°
 17 °there° ((0.5 seconds of which En2 is drawing))
 18 () °there in his arms°

In line 1, En2 produces a turn and within her turn she elaborates on the idiom ‘sweep her off her feet’ by saying ‘you know the the girl’, and in line 2, Ch2 produces an acknowledgement token which overlaps with En2’s drawing which starts in line 3. It is important to mention that the acknowledgment token that is produced by Ch2 in line 2 indicates an aligning activity (Stivers, 2013) as he is acknowledging that, although En2 is drawing, her turn is still in progress as she is trying to incorporate drawing in order to explain the idiom ‘sweep her off her feet’ to Ch2. From line 3 to 11, En2 proceeds with her TCUs as she also incorporates drawing, and within her TCUs she stresses two words: ‘amazing’ and ‘runs in’. En2 stresses the words ‘amazing’ and ‘runs in’ which invoke ‘a connection, a pairing, with something else’ (Schegloff, 1998: p. 249) which in this case is the drawing. In line 12, Ch2 once more produces acknowledgment tokens (‘uhu’, ‘huh’, ‘uhu’, ‘huh’), which are again followed by En2’s production of another long turn from line 13-18 accompanied by a drawing.

En2 is claiming epistemic authority throughout this excerpt. Ch2 is also ceding the epistemic authority to En2 by using acknowledgment tokens such as ‘uh huh’ in the 2 turns he produces. These two turns that Ch2 produces in lines 2 and 12 align with En2’s turns. All throughout the excerpt, there is an alignment between En2’s and Ch2’s TCUs, as the acknowledgement tokens that are produced by Ch2 align with En2’s TCUs (e.g Asmuß, 2011; Keevallik, 2011) as they are helping with the progressivity of En2’s explanation of the idiom (Stivers, 2008). Thus, there is epistemic primacy congruence between the two participants as they have reached mutual alignment (Kohler and Thorne, 2011) in this discursive practice. They are both demonstrating ‘intersubjectivity’ through their identification of TCUs and through their projection of TRPs (Young, 2008: p. 102).

In excerpt 5.5, En4 is trying to explain the idiom ‘to have a chip on one’s shoulder’, and he tries to provide Ch4 with some examples that illustrate the idiom.

Excerpt 5.5

1 (0.2)
2 En4: er:m(0.9) so the general idea is that there is
3 some↑thing (1.7) er::m (0.8) ((0.2 of which En4 does
4 tongue clicking)) (0.4) <it's like something that
5 ↑you> (0.9)>overly:::< (0.6) >bitter at the ↑world<
6 (0.2) ↑about (0.3) I think
7 →(1.1)
8 En4:→ so:::: erm:::: (0.2)a eh:: (0.8)okay another
9 Example might be::: a someone from a very poor
10 family say(0.9) it's quite often used in that (0.3)
11 ↓case
12 →(0.5)
13 En4:→ cause (0.4) if someone (0.1) is from a very poor
14 family and then (1.2)when they're socializing with
15 people who are richer (0.7)
16 Ch4:→ °↑uh ↓huh°=
17 En4: =will like make make it awk↑ward make an issue out
18 Of the fact that like (0.6)they're [↑ri]↓cher and
19 Ch4:→ [°but°]

In this excerpt in line 1, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds which is followed by En4's turn production from line 2 to 6 as he tries to explain the idiom in greater detail. Although in En4's turn from line 2-6 he pauses a great deal, Ch4 does not produce a TCU as she acknowledges the fact that En4's turn is still in progress. Additionally, within En4's turn, he stresses 5 words (line 5) and the emphasis on these words can be due to the fact that they relate directly to the example he is providing (Sidnell, 2013) of the idiom. In line 7, there is quite a long inter-turn pause of 1.1 seconds and it is followed by En4 initiating multiple TCUs from line 8 to 11 which is an illustration of how the idiom can be used. Within En4's turn from line 8 to 11, he pauses 4 times, and he uses 3 pause fillers ('so', 'erm', 'eh') while stretching them. These stretches can indicate that he might be trying to think of a better way of explaining the idiom and thus he is delaying the production of his turn (Kitzinger, 2013). Ch4 does not produce a turn in line 12 which can indicate that she acknowledges the fact that En4 has a greater access than her in this specific domain, and as a result En4 continues with the example he is providing her with (line 13-15). This is followed by Ch4 producing an

acknowledgment token ‘uh huh’ in line 16 which is followed by En4 continuing with his turn production from line 17 to 18.

The two participants have reached epistemic primacy congruence in this excerpt (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011) as there is an agreement between them in terms of who has more of an access to the idiom that is discussed, as after the two inter-turn pauses in lines 7 and 12, En4 is the one who proceeds with the turn sequence and Ch4 is the one who produces an acknowledgment token (line 16). There is asymmetry in terms of the orientation to knowledge (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011) in excerpt 5.5 as in this discursive practice, En4 is playing the role of the teacher and Ch4 is playing the role of the learner.

Prior to excerpt 5.6, En2 provided Ch2 with an explanation of the English idiom ‘sweep her off her feet’ and she then asked Ch2 whether there is a similar idiom in Chinese. Ch2 has told En2 the equivalent Chinese idiom, however he indicated that its meaning is slightly different, and in the following excerpt, En2 starts by indicating her surprise in terms of the meaning of the Chinese idiom.

Excerpt 5.6

1 En2: →really?
2 Ch2: uh huh
3 (0.2)
4 Ch2: which (0.1) means (0.4) you guess you guess it
5 (0.5)
6 En2: →THAT (0.5) they really don't like?
7 Ch2: (0.7) yes
8 (0.1)
9 Ch2: they hate him (0.3) [too]much
10 En2: [↑uh:::]
11 (0.5)
12 En2: → you can't even live under the sa[me WEATHE]R
13 Ch2: → [((mumbling))]
14 En2: →[is the]
15 Ch2: →[I] yes we (0.1) can't (0.4) uh::: we can't
16 (0.1) you know uh::: (0.1) wear (0.5) the same
17 weather
18 (0.1)
19 Ch2: we [can't] [take it] on

In excerpt 5.6, En2 starts by producing a turn ‘really?’ with high intonation ‘which treats the answer as news—as worthy of comment—and invites possible elaboration’ (Stivers, 2013: 205). In line 2, Ch2 produces a third-turn receipt token ‘uh huh’ which indicates that he agrees with En2’s previous turn (Clayman, 2013a) and thus proposes a sequence closure (Stivers, 2013). In line 3 there is an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds which is followed by Ch2 producing another turn as he tells En2 that she guessed the meaning of the Chinese idiom. In line 5, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.5 seconds which is followed by En2 producing a question as she tells Ch2 what she thinks the Chinese idiom means and she ends her turn with a rising intonation. After an intra-turn pause of 0.7 seconds in line 7, Ch2 provides En2 with a confirmation token by saying ‘yes’ (Levinson, 2013). In line 8, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds which is followed by Ch2 producing another turn as he explains the meaning of the Chinese idiom. Within Ch2’s turn in line 9, there is an overlap that occurs in the middle of his turn when En2 says ‘uh’ with high-pitched voice. The ‘uh’ could indicate ‘a change-of-state from not-knowing to knowing’ (Sidnell, 2013: 112). In line 11, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.5 seconds which is followed in line 12 by En2 summarising the information that Ch2 has provided her with and by the end of her turn there is an overlap as Ch2 starts producing a turn. In lines 14 and 15, there is another overlap where both Ch2 and En2 start with their turn productions at the same time which can be problematic although an overlap is usually repaired when one party drops out and lets the other speaker continue talking (Hayashi, 2013). This happens in line 15 as En2 dropped out and Ch2 continued with his turn. From lines 15 to 17, Ch2 elaborates more on what En2 said in line 12 and by the end of his turn, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds. This is then followed by Ch2 producing another turn in line 19 in which he summarises again the meaning of the Chinese idiom. Ch2’s turn in line 19 overlaps with En2’s turn in line 20 as she (En2) produces an acknowledgement token ‘uh huh’. This kind of overlap could indicate that En2 is acknowledging and understanding what Ch2 is saying (Hayashi, 2013) and thus proposing a sequence closure (Stivers, 2013).

In excerpt 5.6, in lines 1 and 6, En2 ends her turns with high intonation and therefore upgrades Ch2’s epistemic access and downgrades her own (Raymond and Heritage, 2006) due to Ch2 being more knowledgeable in the area as he is Chinese. There are a few overlaps in the excerpt, such as in lines 12 and 13 as well as in lines 14 and 15, which could indicate that there is a competition for the floor and disalignment between the two (Stivers, 2008).

However, these overlaps are resolved when, in line 14, En2 stopped talking and let Ch2 hold the floor. There is a clear alignment in terms of asymmetrical orientation to knowledge as En2 is the learner and Ch2 is the teacher (as Ch2 is informing En2 about a Chinese idiom and its meaning) in this excerpt and they are both orienting to their roles from the beginning accordingly.

Prior to excerpt 5.7, En1 has explained to Ch1 the meaning of the idiom ‘to fly off the handle’. In excerpt 5.7, Ch1 tries to find out how often En1 uses this idiom.

Excerpt 5.7

1 Ch1: ➔ do ↑you::: (0.2) use (.) that a lot?
2 En1: (0.6) erm:: (1.6) ↑yeah like (0.1) ↑yeah (0.19) if
3 you said that to someone they'd defiantly know what
4 you meant (0.5) I WOULDN'T USE IT THAT OFTEN (0.1)
5 but(0.3) I've (.) I've definitely used it before
6 (0.3)so uh (1.2) my mum uses it quite a lot (1.6)
7 erm but yeah that's (0.2)quite a well known one (.)
8 yeah °[definite]ly yeah (0.5) definitely°
9 Ch1: [hmm]

In line 1, Ch1 produces a turn by asking about the usage of the idiom that En1 has explained to her and she ends her turn with a rising intonation which can indicate her uncertainty towards the subject (Hayano, 2013). In line 2, En1 starts by pausing for 0.6 seconds, following this he uses a stretched pause filler (‘erm’) which is used to delay the production of his turn (Kitzinger, 2013). He pauses again for 1.6 seconds and he starts producing his turn which involves a number of intra-turn pauses. Within his turn in line 4, En1 says that he would not use the idiom often and he says it louder than the surrounding talk (Walker, 2003). En1 then pauses again and this is followed by him telling Ch1 that he actually used this idiom before (line 5). After another intra-turn pause, he says how his mum uses it a lot and how it is a quite well known idiom. He then ends his turn by saying that it's ‘a well-known one’ and he repeats the word ‘definitely’ twice and says ‘yeah’ which are both produced as confirmation tokens (Levinson, 2013). In line 9, Ch1 produces an acknowledgment token (‘hmm’) which displays her alignment (Stivers, 2013) with En1's telling.

Both En1 and Ch1 are orienting to their roles accordingly. Ch1's rising intonation at the end of line 1 indicates her uncertainty towards the subject, thus she is placing herself as the less knowledgeable in the area. Moreover, while En1 produces a long turn (from line 2-8) and

even though he pauses a great deal, Ch1 does not produce a turn and thus plays the role of the learner accordingly. On the other hand, En1 is playing the role of the teacher in that he pauses a great deal during his turn as he is displaying that while his turn is not complete, he would not be cut off (McHoul, 1978) before he provides Ch1 with the information she has requested (Stivers, 2013).

Prior to excerpt 5.8, En3 has explained to Ch3 the meaning of the idioms ‘to buy a pig in a poke’, ‘grin like a Cheshire cat’, ‘eat like a bird’, ‘be in the dog house’, ‘play chicken’, ‘slip of the tongue’, and ‘break a neck’. Thus in excerpt 5.8, she starts by repeating all the idioms and then she asks Ch3 whether there are similar idioms in Chinese.

Excerpt 5.8

1 En3: >to buy a pig in a poke< (0.3) >grin like a
2 Cheshire cat eat like a bi::rd be in a dog house
3 play chicken< and slip of the tongue ·hhh
4 in Chi↑ne:se oop sorry break your neck yeah well
5 done ·hhh are there (0.2) is there anything
6 →similar?
7 Ch3: ((1.5 seconds during which Ch3 is gazing at the
8 handout))
9 En3: →in Chinese?
10 Ch3: ((1.2 seconds during which Ch3 is gazing at the
11 hand-out)) °eat like a bird°
12 En3: →eat like a bird?
13 Ch3: ((0.3 seconds in which Ch3 is gazing at the hand-out
14 while nodding))
15 En3: →°yeah:°?° is it the same?
16 Ch3: ((0.3 seconds in which Ch3 is gazing at the hand-out
17 while nodding))
18 En3: →the same meaning?
19 Ch3: ((0.5 seconds during which Ch3 is nodding)) ·hhh
20 En3: anything else?
21 Ch3: ((5.1 seconds during which Ch3 is moving her head
22 from side to side))

In line 1 En3 starts by producing a turn as she repeats the first idiom in a rushed talk and after there is an intra-turn pause of 0.3 seconds, followed again by her continuing to repeat the rest

of the idioms, again in a rushed talk. From line 4 to 6, En3 continues with her TCUs and she starts by saying 'in Chinese', ending it in a rising pitch while emphasising the word 'Chinese'. The rising pitch here is produced as a way of indicating that En3 is asking a question or at least intending to do so (Enfield, 2013). En3 continues with her turn and in line 6, she ends her turn when emphasising the word 'similar'. By emphasising and stressing the word 'similar', En3 is suggesting a relationship between 'similar' and another reference which is in this case the word 'Chinese' (Sidnell, 2013). From line 7 to 8, Ch3 gazes at the hand-out for 1.5 seconds. In line 9, En3 produces another turn by saying 'in Chinese' and by ending her turn in a high pitch which indicates that she has again produced a question (Enfield, 2013). The turn production by En3 in line 9 is a self-initiated self-repair as she realised that since Ch3 has not provided her with an answer from line 7 to 8, she needed to add the words 'in Chinese' to clarify her question that is addressed to Ch3. From line 10 to 11, Ch3 again gazes at the hand-out, and at the end of her turn she says the English idiom 'eat like a bird' suggesting that it is similar to a Chinese idiom. In turn, in line 12, En3 produces a turn by repeating the idiom and ending it again in a rising intonation which is produced here as a question that is inviting an answer (Heritage, 2013).

From line 13 to 14, Ch3 produces a nod as an answer while gazing at the hand-out. Nodding in this case is interpreted as a recognisable answer (Goodwin, M. H. and Goodwin, C., 1986) for the question En3 has asked. Thus, nodding here is equivalent to the production of 'yeah' which means that an answer has been produced as a confirmation token (Lee, 2013; Levinson, 2013). En3 poses another question in line 15 by asking again 'is it the same' ending it with rising intonation. From lines 16 to 17, Ch3 nods again while gazing at the hand-out. Subsequently, En3 produces another turn in line 18 by saying 'the same meaning', and again ending her turn in a rising intonation. This leads Ch3 in line 19 to nod. Nodding in this case is recognised as a confirmation answer for the question En3 has posed which is equivalent to 'yeah'. After, En3 produces another turn as a question that requires an answer ('anything else?'), and in turn, Ch3 moves her head from side to side which is equivalent to a 'no' in this case. This means that in this excerpt, En3 is adopting the role of the teacher and she has done so by selecting Ch3 with questions (McHoul, 1978) such as in lines 9, 12, 15, 18, and 20. In turn, Ch3 adopts her role as a learner and orients to it by providing En3 with answers and by waiting for En3 to produce turns. They are both orienting to their roles accordingly without any competition for the floor, thus leading to their turns to align with each other.

In excerpt 5.9, En3 is still adopting the role of a teacher by trying to elicit from Ch3 more information regarding the similar idioms in Chinese to the English ones they have discussed.

Excerpt 5.9

1 En3: no?
2 Ch3: ((0.1 seconds during which Ch3 is moving her head
3 from side to side))
4 En3: →they are very different?
5 Ch3: ((0.8 seconds during which Ch3 is nodding))
6 En3: →°yeah?° ·hhh
7 Ch3: (2.7) °yeah°
8 (0.1)
9 En3: yeah?
10 Ch3 ((0.2 seconds during which Ch3 nods while directing
11 her gaze at En3 and then redirects her gaze at the
12 hand-out))
13 En3: →·hhh (.) <do you have anything else that> >DO YOU
14 HAVE ANYTHING AT ALL< that's links to animals?
15 Ch3: ((0.4 seconds during which Ch3 is gazing at the
16 hand-out))
17 En3: ·hhh
18 (0.1)
19 En3: would you say:::
20 Ch3: ((0.4 seconds during which Ch3 is nodding)) °yeah°
21 (0.1) °a lot°

In line 1, En3 ends her turn with a rising pitch which indicates her uncertainty towards the subject and thus it is formulated as a question (Enfield, 2013) in order to get more explanation from Ch3 regarding the similar Chinese idioms. Ch3 then moves her head from side to side in lines 2-3 which is considered as an answer to the question En3 has produced (Goodwin, M. H. and Goodwin, C., 1986). In line 4, En3 produces another turn by again ending it with a rising pitch as she says 'they are very different?', which results in Ch3 nodding in line 5 which is considered equivalent to her saying 'yes' (Goodwin, M. H. and Goodwin, C., 1986). In line 6, En3 produces a minimal, questioning 'yeah?' which Ch3 confirms with 'yeah' (Mandelbaum, 2013) in line 7 after an intra-turn pause of 2.7 seconds. In line 8, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds which is followed by En3 producing another minimal, questioning 'yeah' in line 9. From lines 10 to 12, Ch3 directs her gaze at En3 while nodding as a way of saying 'yes',

and then she redirects her gaze to the hand-out. In line 13, after an in-breath, En3 produces a slowed utterance, and then she produces another rushed turn ('do you have anything else at all?'), and she ends her turn with a rising pitch which is produced here as a question (Enfield, 2013) that is directed towards Ch3. Ch3 in turn gazes at the hand-out which is then followed by an in-breath by En3 and an inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds in line 18. En3 then produces another turn by saying 'would you say:::' while stretching the word 'say'. This action by En3 can be seen as other-repair initiation (Kitzinger, 2013) as Ch3 did not yet provide her with the answer to the question she has asked in lines 13-14. In line 20, Ch3 repairs the talk by nodding and by producing a confirmation token 'yeah' and then she ends her turn with 'a lot'.

To conclude, En3 is still adopting the role of the teacher and Ch3 is adopting the role of the learner in this excerpt. They are both orienting to their roles accordingly as there is asymmetrical orientation to knowledge between them as they are not competing for the floor (Stivers, 2008; Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011). En3 keeps selecting Ch3 to answer her questions and Ch3 in turn provides En3 with the answers she is requesting (McHoul, 1978).

In excerpt 5.10, En3 continues to elicit information from Ch3 regarding similar Chinese idioms, thus continuing to produce questions.

Excerpt 5.10

1 En3: ➔°like what?°
 2 Ch3: ((10.4 seconds during which Ch3 raises her eyebrows
 3 while looking up then down then up again then down
 4 and finally she gazes at the hand-out)) ·hhh ((0.9
 5 seconds during which Ch3 is gazing at the hand-out))
 6 °uhm:° °like maybe° (0.3)°people will say
 7 something like° (·hhh) (0.4) °in English maybe it is
 8 like° (0.5)°u:hm° (0.9) °your° (0.4) °your not°
 9 (0.1) °very grateful° ·hhh
 10 (0.2)
 11 En3: °r↑ight°
 12 Ch3: °and° (0.2) °they may use like° ·hhh (0.1)
 13 °compare us dogs and wolves°
 14 (0.2)
 15 En3: ➔↑u:::↓h:[↑o↓kay]
 16 Ch3: [()] ·hhh ((0.5 seconds during which
 17 Ch3 is coughing))

18 (.)
 19 Ch3: [()]
 20 En3: [(ye)]ah?
 21 (.)
 22 En3: →CAUSE EACH ANIMAL does each animal have a
 23 Characteristic?
 24 Ch3: (0.8 seconds during which Ch3 raises her eyebrows
 25 while looking up)) °yeah°=
 26 En3: =kind of so you could do it that way

In line 1, En3 starts by producing a turn ‘like what?’ which she ends it in a rising intonation. In turn, Ch3 raises her eyebrows to look up and down and then gazes at the hand-out. She then produces a turn in line 6 and she starts it with a stretched pause filler (Hayashi, 2013) ‘uhm:’ which could be an indication that she is trying to delay her production (Kitzinger, 2013) while still trying to ‘think’ of an example. She then continues with her turn from lines 6 to 9 and within her turn she pauses a great deal while providing En3 with a similar Chinese idiom to the English ones they have discussed. There is then an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds in line 10 in which none of them produces a turn and just after, in line 11, En3 produces an acknowledgment token ‘right’ (Clayman, 2013a). This results in Ch3 continuing with her elaboration of the Chinese idiom from line 12 to 13. In line 14 there is another inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds which is then followed by En3 producing an acknowledgment token ‘uh’ which in this case is produced to indicate a change of state from an unknowing to a knowing one (Sidnell, 2013). She then produces at the end of her turn ‘okay’ as a sequence closing third (Schegloff, 2007). In line 18 there is another inter-turn pause of (.) and this is followed by an overlapping talk in line 19 and 20. This overlap is resolved when Ch3 stops talking, and thus En3 continues with her solo production as she produces a confirmation token which she ends in a rising intonation. The rising intonation here can indicate that En3 is requesting a confirmation of understanding from Ch3 regarding the explanation she has provided her with so far. From line 22 to 23, En3 produces another turn by again asking Ch3 whether ‘each animal has a characteristic?’, and in turn, Ch3, from line 24-25, raises her eyebrows while looking up which indicates her thinking face. She uses a confirmation token ‘yeah’ at the end of her turn, and just after, in line 26, En3 produces another turn.

In this excerpt, En3 plays the role of the learner by selecting Ch3 as her informant to answer her questions (line 1 and 22 to 23) regarding the Chinese idioms, and in turn Ch3 provides her with answers in lines 2 to 9, 12 to 13, and 25. In addition, there is an overlapping talk in lines

15 to 16 and 19 to 20 which can indicate a problem in the talk. However, when the latter occurred, Ch3 stopped talking and allowed En3 to continue with her turn production, thus resolving the issue. In this excerpt, both En3 and Ch3 have reached epistemic primacy congruence (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011) as they are not competing for the floor but rather orienting to their roles accordingly.

In the next excerpt, 5.11, En3 is telling Ch3 about how similar the Chinese idioms are to the English ones, as Ch3 has told her before that in China they compare humans to animals, thus En3 is explaining how, in English, things are done in the same way.

Excerpt 5.11

1 En3: ·hhh (.) we do things as well like to say you're a
 2 strong as an ox (0.8)you::::r a strong person so is
 3 is that's the similarity?
 4 Ch3: ((0.5 seconds during which Ch3 is nodding)) ((0.2
 5 seconds of background noise))
 6 En3: →↑fan↓tas↑tic anything else?
 7 Ch3: ((19.0 seconds during which Ch3 is gazing at the
 8 hand-out then looking up and raising her eyebrows
 9 and then looking down while raising her eyebrows))
 10 ·hhh °and also° (0.6)°if you want to say two
 11 persons were very bad and then° ·hhh (° °)
 12 °together you are° (0.2) °compare them is like°
 13 ·hhh °wolves and ah° (0.1)·hhh (0.7) °like°
 14 °another very bad animals maybe
 15 (0.1)
 16 En3: →°↑uh::↑o↓kay°
 17 (0.4)
 18 Ch3: ·hhh
 19 (0.1)
 20 Ch3: [°yeah°]
 21 En3: [°↑erm°]

In line 1, En3 produces multiple TCUs. She explains from line 1 to 3 how things are done in the same way in English in terms of comparing humans to different types of animals. Within her turn, En3 emphasises the words 'strong' and 'ox', and she stretches the 'you::::r' as a way of delaying the production of her turn (Kitzinger, 2013). At the end of En3's turn, she asks

Ch3 'is that's the similarity?' and ends her turn with a rising intonation. In turn, Ch3 produces a turn as a reply in line 4 by nodding, which in this case is considered equivalent to 'yeah' and thus a recognisable answer (Goodwin, M. H. and Goodwin, C., 1986). En3 then produces another turn ('fantastic') as a response cry and after she produces a question by saying 'anything else?', ending her turn with a rising intonation. From line 7 to 9, Ch3 produces another 'thinking face' while looking up and down and gazing at the hand-out. She then continues by producing a turn from line 10 to 14 in which she explains to En3 how in Chinese if 'two persons were very bad....compare them is like wolves', thus providing En3 with the answer for the question she asked regarding the similarities between the usage of the idioms in Chinese and English. Within her turn from line 10 to 14, Ch3 pauses few times and at the end of her turn, she stresses the words 'very, bad animals, maybe' as a way of showing a connection (Schegloff, 1998) to the Chinese idioms that are used to compare bad humans to bad animals. In line 15, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds which is followed by En3 producing an acknowledgment token 'uh' and just after a sequence closing third 'okay'. After the sequence closing third, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.4 seconds in line 17 which is followed by an in-breath by Ch3 and another inter-turn pause. In line 20, Ch3 produces a confirmation token 'yeah' which overlaps with En3's turn.

At this point, there is still an understanding between Ch3 and En3 as Ch3 is allowing En3 to be the one who produces questions. En3 asks more about whether there are similar idioms in Chinese to the English ones they have discussed, and in turn, Ch3 provides her with answers accordingly. In addition, although in line 2, En3 pauses for 0.8 seconds, Ch3 does not interrupt her and waits for her turn to be complete. The same thing occurs from line 10 to 14 when Ch3 pauses a great deal within her turn and En3 understands that her turn is not complete and does not interrupt her. Finally, the fact that En3 is the one who produces all the FPPs and Ch3 in turn produces SPPs indicates their understandings of their roles as a student/teacher and thus displays their understanding of their asymmetrical orientation to knowledge in this discursive practice. However, it is important to note that the roles are reversed here. Although En3 is the one who initiates the questions, in this excerpt she is the learner and Ch3 is the informant as the latter provides En3 with information regarding the Chinese idioms.

In the next excerpt, 5.12, En3 starts by saying to Ch3 how in English it is common to compare humans to different types of animals as in Chinese, thus trying to emphasise the similarities. It is important to clarify that when En3 and Ch3 started working on this task (discussing the

English idiom), En3 suggested for Ch3 to pick the idioms she has not heard of and the ones she would like to learn about, and thus this is what Ch3 does from line 15 to 16.

Excerpt 5.12

1 En3: °↓erm°(0.3)↑yeah it's real interesting cause we weak
2 we kinda do the same thing ((0.4 seconds during
3 which En3 is sniffing)) (0.2) e::rm (0.9)·hhh for
4 exam↑ple:: (0.6) () my dog does something
5 ↑wrong (0.3) ·hhh () stop it you cheeky monkey
6 (0.7)so I call her a monkey when she's not a monkey
7 she is a dog heh heh
8 (0.2)
9 En3: heh heh
10 (0.1)
11 En3: do you do si- similar kinda of thing?
12 Ch3: ((0.3 seconds during which Ch3 is nodding))
13 En3: ·hhh fantastic ·hhh okay let's keep going with
14 these
15 Ch3: ((2.1 seconds during which Ch3 is gazing at the
16 hand-out and pointing at it))
17 En3: PIGGYBACK (0.6) <you know what ↑piggy↓back
18 is?>

From line 1 to 7, En3 starts by producing a long turn, and within her turn she uses words like 'yeah' as a confirmation to the fact that it is 'real interesting' that both the English and the Chinese compare humans to animals. She then continues with her turn by providing Ch3 with an example of how this is done and while doing so she stresses the words 'cheeky' and 'monkey' as she refers to how she calls her dog a 'cheeky monkey'. In line 8, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds which is followed by another laughter produced by En3. In line 11, En3 produces another turn and she ends her turn with a rising intonation which indicates that she has produced a question (Enfield, 2013). Ch3 in turn provides her with an answer as she nods in line 12. In line 13, En3 starts with an in-breath which is followed by a response cry ('fantastic') and she then uses a sequence closing third ('okay') to close down the topic and move it forward (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). This is followed by Ch3 gazing and pointing at the hand-out as she chooses another English idiom so En3 can explain to her what it means. Thus from lines 17 to 18, En3 says the expression 'piggyback' and it is followed by her again ending her turn with a rising intonation ('you know what piggyback is?').

In excerpt 5.12, En3 is the one who produces a FPP and Ch3 is the one who in turn produces a SPP. This indicates that their roles again as a student/teacher are clear. There are no overlaps between them and although within En3's turn there are a few intra-turn pauses, Ch3 does not take the opportunity to produce a turn. Through this excerpt, both participants show their respect to each other's territories (Heritage and Raymond, 2005) and thus an understanding of their roles.

5.3 Maintenance of intersubjectivity through repair initiations and accomplishments

Maintaining intersubjectivity during tandem learning is important, as through it the tandem learners display their mutual understanding of one of the goals of tandem learning which is helping each other learn each other's language. Repair is one of the resources that can be used to achieve that goal and to maintain intersubjectivity. These cases will examine the concept of intersubjectivity in relation to repair and consist of thirteen excerpts.

Prior to excerpt 5.13, En1 has just finished explaining to Ch1 the meaning of the idiom 'don't look a gift horse in the mouth', and thus in the following excerpt, Ch1 takes the opportunity to initiate a repair (twice) which leads En1 to accomplish the repair and thus they both through that maintain intersubjectivity.

Excerpt 5.13

1 Ch1: .hh
 2 (0.1)
 3 Ch1: →uh:::m (0.6) uh (0.1) ↑gift horse?
 4 En1: YEAH ERM=
 5 Ch1: →=that's st↑RAnge
 6 En1: →YEAH THERE'S A gift (0.4)and a horse (1.0)
 7 .hhh and look (0.6) do (0.2) don't look at a gift
 8 horse in the mouth
 9 (0.3)
 10 En1: →erm::: (0.1) I don't know where it came from
 11 nei↑ther
 12 (0.3)
 13 En1: bu- erm::: (0.7) °it basically mean don't be grateful
 14 when you receive a gift°
 15 Ch1: ((taking notes then looking at M's hand-out and then

16 taking notes again))
17 En1: is there something similar in Chinese is there?
18 Ch1: (0.5) ↑uh::m

In line 2, there is a (0.1) second of inter-turn pause which is followed by Ch1 initiating a repair in line 3 by saying ‘gift horse’ in rising intonation as an indication of a surprise. En1 then produces a turn in line 4 by saying ‘yeah erm’ and in line 5, Ch1 initiates another repair by saying ‘that’s strange’. This type of repair is called other-initiated self-repair (Schegloff, 2007) as En1 tries from line 6 to 14 to resolve the problem. From lines 6 to 8, En1 tries to explain the idiom by saying it again, and in line 9 there is another inter-turn pause of 0.3 seconds. From line 10 to 11, En1 continues with the repair accomplishment by telling Ch1 ‘I don’t know where it came from neither’, and from line 13 to 14, En1 continues carrying out the repair. En1 claims upgraded rights in the matter by carrying out the repair (Raymond and Heritage, 2006). In line 17, En1 asks Ch1 ‘is there something similar in Chinese’ and this is where En1 cedes the epistemic authority to Ch1.

Initiating repair in the context of learning a second/foreign language is desirable as repair initiation promotes interactional competence (Van Compernelle, 2011). In line 3, Ch1 says ‘uh::m (0.6) uh (0.1) ↑gift ↑horse’ using high intonation at the end of her turn which indicates that she needs more clarification. En1 treats it as a repair initiation when he tries to accomplish the repair in line 4 in saying ‘YEAH ERM’. This indicates their understanding that Ch1’s previous turn was a way of asking for a clarification. In line 5, Ch1 continues with the repair initiation, indicating again that she ‘does not get it’ by saying ‘that’s st↑Range’, and again En1 treats it as a repair initiation as he tries to accomplish the repair from line 6 to 14. These other initiated repairs by Ch1 (the learner in this discursive practice) are desirable and help facilitate teacher (En1) mediation in this discursive practice, as the learner would be the best to identify the actual problem in understanding the teacher’s explanation (Van Compernelle, 2011).

In excerpt 5.14, Ch1 tries to answer En1’s question regarding whether there is a similar idiom in Chinese to ‘don’t look a gift horse in the mouth’ and thus explaining to him the equivalent idiom in Chinese and how it is used differently. This then results in En1 initiating and accomplishing a repair.

In excerpt 5.15, En1 continues with the repair accomplishment while trying to still explain to Ch1 the actual meaning of the idiom in order to reach mutual understanding and be ‘on the same page’ with Ch1.

Excerpt 5.15

1 En1: [be]
2 Ch1: [((face tilted, eyebrows raised and mouth open))]
3 En1: a gift
4 (0.1)
5 Ch1: uh::
6 (0.2)
7 En1: →WELL I THINK (0.3) initially it meant just a gift
8 because in the title [it says a]gift horse
9 Ch1: [yeah there’s ah]
10 (0.3)
11 En1: → but (0.2) it could be used day to ↑day
12 (0.8)
13 Ch1: mhm
14 (0.2)
15 En1: → as in (0.3) °erm::<° (2.5)°I can’t think erm°
16 (0.3)°well° (0.8) °I think of
17 sporty ones like° heh heh .hhh in like rugby .hhh heh
18 [heh heh]
19 Ch1: →[heh heh] heh

En1 tries to accomplish the repair in lines 1 and 3. In line 2, Ch1 raises her eyebrows and opens her mouth which can indicate that she is surprised. After En1 accomplishes the repair in line 3, there is a 0.1 seconds of an inter-turn pause which is then followed by Ch1 producing an acknowledgement token as she acknowledges the repair that En1 has carried out in the previous turns. In line 6, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds which is then followed by En1 producing another turn in line 7. Within En1’s turn from line 7 to 8, he continues accomplishing the repair and through that he explains the idiom ‘don’t look a gift horse in the mouth’. He explains to Ch1 where initially the misunderstanding occurred, which is in the word ‘gift’. Within En1’s repair accomplishment from line 7 to 8, Ch1 produces a confirmation token ‘yeah’ which overlaps with En1’s talk and this could indicate her understanding of what he is trying to tell her at that point. En1 produces another turn in line 11 in which he continues with his repair accomplishment. At the end of En1’s turn and after a

TRP, there is a long inter-turn pause of 0.8 seconds which is followed by Ch1 producing an acknowledgment token in line 13. In line 14 there is another inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds, which is again followed by En1 producing another turn from line 15-18 as he tries to provide Ch1 with an example in which the idiom can be used.

In excerpt 5.15, when En1 realised that there was a need for a repair (after Ch1 elaborated on the similar Chinese idiom), he shifted the epistemic authority back to his in order to initiate and accomplish the repair. Since this part of the tandem language learning session was dedicated to teaching English to the Chinese student, the English student ceded his epistemic authority back in order to initiate and accomplish the repair. Thus, En1 initiates and accomplishes the repair by claiming back his epistemic authority which is beneficial for language learning/teaching in the context of tandem learning, as one of the purposes of tandem language learning is for both partners to agree to the provision of error correction by the native speaker (Lewis, 2003) as that is what this specific discursive practice requires them to do. Furthermore, this repair that was accomplished by En1 achieves the aim of this session in terms of teaching and learning, and thus both participants displayed mutual understanding of this discursive practice.

In excerpt 5.16, En1 continues with the repair accomplishments by trying to continue with the illustration of the idiom ‘don’t look a gift horse in the mouth’ as Ch1 has not indicated yet that she understands the illustration he is providing her with.

Excerpt 5.16

1 (0.3)
2 Ch1: .hhh
3 En1: →but say you had the opportunity to do some↓thing
4 but you said not ↑to
5 →(1.5)
6 En1: →°but you should have°
7 →(1.5)
8 En1: →<°that doesn’t make sense°> ERM::: (0.2)
9 Ch1: heheh
10 →(0.9)
11 En1: →°can’t think of another example erm:° (0.7) will
12 come back to it will think of one and I will come
13 back to it=
14 Ch1:→ =°yeah sure°

15 (0.5)
16 En1: → °okay°

From line 3 to 4, En1 produces a turn as part of the repair accomplishment he has started in the previous excerpt and he continues to try to provide an example of when the idiom ‘don’t look a gift horse in the mouth’ can be used, and he ends his turn with a high intonation. High intonation at the end of a turn can ‘be a resource for projecting completion, signalling that the next syntactic ending will be a possible turn ending’ (Clayman, 2013a: p. 171). However, Ch1 does not produce a turn and instead there is, in line 5, an inter-turn gap which is again followed by En1 producing another turn in line 6 as he still tries to explain how the idiom can be used. In line 7, there is another long inter-turn pause of 1.5 seconds which is followed by En1 producing another turn in line 8 as self-initiated repair as he realises that his explanation ‘doesn’t make sense’. In line 10, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.9 seconds which is followed by En1 producing another turn from line 11 to 13 which is where En1 accomplishes the repair initiated in line 8 as he realises that he cannot provide Ch1 with an example. In lines 13 and 14, there is a latch at the end of En1’s turn when Ch1 produces a turn which then in line 15 is followed by another inter-turn gap followed by En1 producing a turn in line 16 when he says ‘okay’ as a sequence-closing third (Schegloff, 2007).

In this excerpt 5.16, En1 is still trying to accomplish the repair that he has initiated in the previous excerpts since the point he realised that he needed to provide Ch1 with further explanations regarding the idiom ‘don’t look a gift horse in the mouth’. Through his repair accomplishments in lines 3 to 4 and 6, he provides Ch1 with more explanation regarding the idiom, and although in line 8 he initiates a self-repair as he realises that his explanation is not right, he accomplishes the repair from lines 11 to 13 as he tells Ch1 that he ‘will come back to it later’ and thus moves the topic forward as he produces a sequence closing third in line 16. Through the repair-initiations, En1 displays an understanding of his role as a teacher and in turn, Ch1 displays an understanding of her role as a learner.

In the following excerpt 5.17, En1 explains to Ch1 the meaning of the idiom ‘fly off the handle’.

Excerpt 5.17

1 En1: so you can lose lose control (0.4) so if you’re an
2 angry person and you just go mad (0.7) you can
3 say:::(0.1) ↑fly ↓off ↑the ↓handle

4 (1.7)
5 Ch1: °ok°
6 (0.6)
7 En1: do you understand?
8 Ch1:→(0.2) yes erm:: (0.7) and if you:: (0.8) go fly off
9 the handle which means (0.3) you angry or not?
10 En1:→(0.19) yeah you're ff YOUR'RE ↑ANG↓RY::=
11 Ch1: =[yeah]
12 En1: [and you've] lost ↓control::: and (0.5) erm=
13 Ch1: =pretty much °angry°
14 (0.3)
15 En1: <yeah> (0.19) <yeah> (0.15) very angry
16 (0.2)
17 Ch1: [°yeah°] angry
18 En1: [°yeah°]

En1 starts in line 1 by elaborating on the idiom. He explains to Ch1 from line 1 to 3 how this idiom is related to being an 'angry person'. After an inter-pause of 1.7 seconds in line 4, Ch1 produces a sequence closing third 'ok' which is followed by an inter-turn pause of 0.6 seconds. There is then a follow up by En1 in line 7 when he produces a FPP to ask Ch1 whether she understands his explanation ending his turn with a rising intonation. After a pause of 0.2 seconds, Ch1 starts her SPP by producing a confirmation token 'yes' and she pauses twice. This is followed by her repeating the actual idiom and then she initiates a repair as she says 'means angry or not?' ending her turn with a rising intonation as a question that is addressed to En1. En1 then in line 10 produces a SPP after a pause of 0.19 seconds by using a confirmation token 'yeah' and by saying out the definition of the idiom 'you're angry' as a repair-accomplishment. In line 11, Ch1 produces a confirmation token 'yes' to En1's repair accomplishment. This confirmation in line 11 that is produced by Ch1 overlaps with En1's turn production when he starts in another turn in line 12 by continuing with the idiom explanation. This overlap is not considered problematic as Ch1 stopped talking to allow En1 to continue with his turn (Hayashi, 2013). In line 13, Ch1 repeats the meaning of the idiom as a confirmation of her understanding and thus allowing herself to access this domain (Lee, 2013) of the English language. In line 14, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.3 seconds and it is followed by En1 producing a confirmation token 'yeah' twice and then repeating again the meaning of the idiom 'very angry'. Again, this repetition could have been used to reconfirm the meaning of the idiom. This is then followed by another inter-turn pause and in lines 17

and 18 both En1 and Ch1 produce overlapping confirmation token ‘yeah’ which indicates their acceptance and agreement with what has been discussed (Clayman, 2013a).

The repair initiation by Ch1 from lines 8 to 9 allowed a learning opportunity as she as a learner was able to identify a problem during the interaction and thus initiated repair to indicate that she needed this talk to be repaired. En1, in turn, adopts his role as a teacher and accomplishes the repair by confirming the meaning of the idiom in line 10. In line 12, he continues with his repair-accomplishment and this leads Ch1 to confirm her understanding by repeating back the meaning of the idiom which ends in lines 17 and 18 when they both produce confirmation tokens as an indication of their shared agreement.

In excerpt 5.18, En1 has just finished elaborating on the English idiom ‘fly off the handle’ and Ch1 takes the opportunity before moving on to the next idiom to ask about the difference between idioms and slang.

Excerpt 5.18

1 En1: °[definite]ly yeah (0.5) definitely°
2 Ch1: [mhm]
3 (0.2)
4 Ch1: yeah may I ↑aska what’s the difference of idioms
5 and a slungs?
6 En1:→ (1.2)idioms and ↑what sor[ry?]
7 Ch1:→ [and] a slung?
8 En1: (0.9) slung
9 Ch1: (0.1) ↑yeah
10 (.)
11 En1:→ s↑la↓ng
12 (0.1)
13 Ch1:→ slang heheh=
14 En1: =[↑all ↓right] [slang is just erm]
15 Ch1: [s] [orry bad pronunciation]
16 (0.5)
17 En1: idioms (0.14) are:: just phrases (0.6) that (0.4)
18 mean something

In line 1, En1 repeats the word ‘definitely’ and uses ‘yeah’ which are both produced as a confirmation (Lee, 2013) of what he and Ch1 have discussed previously in terms of the

meaning of the idiom ‘fly off the handle’. In line 2, Ch1 produces an acknowledgment token ‘mhm’ which overlaps with En1’s previous turn. However, this overlap is not problematic as Ch1 was acknowledging En1’s talk and she has dropped out to allow En1 to continue with the production of his turn. In line 3 there is an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds which is followed by Ch1 producing a turn in line 4 as she starts by again using a confirmation token ‘yeah’ and then she asks En1 about the difference between ‘idioms’ and ‘slungs’. In line 6, there is an intra-turn pause of 1.2 seconds and then En1 continues by producing another turn as a repair-initiation as he asks Ch1 to clarify what she has said before. In line 7, Ch1 produces a turn by trying to accomplish the repair through repeating the word ‘slung’ in a rising intonation which En1 treats as a question (Hayano, 2013) as he repeats the word ‘slung’ in line 8. However, repeating the word ‘slung’ is produced as another repair-initiation which is followed by a confirmation token by Ch1 when she says in line 9 ‘yeah’. After an inter-turn pause, the repair is accomplished in line 11 when En1 corrects the word by saying it out loud (‘slang’) in rising and then falling pitch. In line 12, there is another inter-turn pause which is followed by Ch1 repeating the word ‘slang’ the same way En1 did and she ends her turn with laughter. In lines 14 and 15, both En1 and Ch1 produce overlapping talk as En1 tries in line 13 to start explaining the meaning of the word ‘slang’ whereas Ch1 in line 15 apologises for her bad pronunciation which could mean that she recognises that En1’s repair-initiation in line 6 and repair accomplishment in line 11 was an error from her side. This overlap is resolved when Ch1 drops out and En1 continues with his elaboration from line 17 to 18 as he explains the difference between idioms and slang.

In this excerpt 5.18, when Ch1 produces a turn as a question from line 4 to 5, she thus downgrades her epistemic access as she is the learner in this context and she upgrades En1’s epistemic authority (Heritage and Raymond, 2005). In turn, En1 initiates a repair recognising a problem in the talk, however Ch1 does not accomplish it, but En1 does so in line 10 as he recognises what word she actually is referring to. In line 12, Ch1 repeats the right pronunciation of the word ‘slang’ which can indicate a confirmation of her understanding of his repair accomplishment. As this session is about teaching English to the Chinese participant, through the repair initiation and the accomplishment by the ‘teacher’ (En1), the student (Ch1) was able to learn the ‘right’ pronunciation of the word ‘slang’.

Prior to excerpt 5.19, En2 has asked Ch2 to guess the meaning of the idiom ‘sweep them off their feet’. Thus, in the following excerpt, Ch2 starts by saying the idiom and then he tries to guess its meaning.

Excerpt 5.19

1 Ch2: sweep (0.1) them (0.2)of (0.4) their f:: feet:
2 (0.4)
3 Ch2: heh heh
4 (0.7)
5 Ch2: °sweep them of° (0.5) °their feet°
6 (1.1)
7 Ch2: °uhu°::::
8 (3.8)
9 Ch2: →forget ↑some (0.5) ↑old ↓thing
10 (0.5)
11 En2: →no
12 (0.5)
13 Ch2: ·hhh uhm::: (0.1)
14 En2: →if you sweep somebody (0.1) of their feet
15 (0.4)
16 Ch2: ↑uhu ↓huh=

In line 1, Ch2 tries to guess the meaning of the idiom ‘sweep them off their feet’ and starts by saying the idiom. Within Ch2’s turn in line 1, he pauses three times which could be considered as a defective communication (Liddicoat, 2011). However, since English is not his first language, this could be due to speech production issues. After Ch2’s turn in line 1, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.4 seconds in line 2 which is followed by Ch2 producing laughter in line 3. Within his turn, Ch2 is still trying to guess the meaning of the idiom, and even though there are quite long inter-turn pauses in lines 2, 4, 6, 8, and 12, En2 does not produce a turn but allows Ch2 to guess the meaning of the idiom. After the long inter-turn pause of 1.1 seconds in line 6, Ch2 produces a turn in line 7 by saying ‘uhu’ in a stretched manner. ‘Uhu’ could have been used in that instance by Ch2 in order to delay the production (Kitzinger, 2013) of his talk, which means that since he is guessing the meaning of the idiom, he is showing hesitation as he is not sure what it means (Kitzinger, 2013). In line 10, there is another long inter-turn pause of 0.5 seconds, and in line 11, En2 produces a turn as she recognises that the end of Ch2’s turn in line 10 is a potential TRP. En2 accomplishes a repair in line 11 by saying ‘no’, and this type of repair is self-initiated other repair (Schegloff, 2007). Through her answer ‘no’, she shows her obligation as a teacher to comment on the sufficiency of Ch2’s answer (McHoul, 1978). However, by En2 answering ‘no’, she does not provide Ch2 with the actual answer (the meaning of the idiom). After the repair, there is an inter-turn pause

of 0.5 seconds in line 12, which is followed by Ch2 producing a turn by using ‘uhm’ as a way of showing hesitation and in order to ‘maintain an active claim on the turn space and indicate a continued commitment to the turn’s production’ (Kitzinger, 2013: p. 242) as he is still trying to guess the meaning of the idiom. In line 14, En2 produces a turn and thus does not wait for Ch2 to complete his previous turn as she starts explaining the meaning of the idiom ‘sweep them off their feet’.

To conclude, in this excerpt, En2 asks Ch2 to guess the meaning of the idiom. Thus, from line 1 to 13, Ch2 tries to guess the meaning of the English idiom ‘sweep them off their feet’. In line 11, En2 initiates a repair and this is when she reclaims the epistemic authority and uses the word ‘no’ to upgrade her epistemic authority in the matter (Raymond and Heritage, 2006: p. 688). In line 14, En2 starts to explain the actual meaning of the idiom and by doing so she is again upgrading her epistemic authority (Heritage and Raymond, 2006). En2 produces ‘no’ as a repair-accomplishment through an adoption of her role as a teacher as she decides at that moment to stop Ch2 from guessing (line 13) and decides to proceed with the actual explanation of the idiom (McHoul, 1978).

In excerpt 5.20, En2 proceeds by telling Ch2 the meaning of the idiom ‘sweep them off their feet’ and Ch2 in turn tries to get a confirmation regarding its meaning by repeating its meaning (he does that 3 times) and, in turn, En2 confirms its meaning.

Excerpt 5.20

1 En2: →°↑r↓ight°
 2 (0.6)
 3 En2: >it means you make them fall in love with you<
 4 (1.4)
 5 Ch2: → fall in love with you?
 6 (0.2)
 7 En2: →°ye[ah°]
 8 Ch2: → [y] ou make (0.2) you swep (0.2) them ·hhh
 9 (0.2) on (0.4) their feet
 10 (0.2)
 11 En2: → YEAH
 12 (0.2)
 13 Ch2: → means you make (0.1) them fall in
 14 love(0.2) °with°(0.3) you

15 (0.2)
16 En2: → yes
17 (0.1)
18 En2: ·hhh AND THE IDEA IS (0.5)

In excerpt 5.20, En2 explains in line 3 the meaning of the idiom and she explains it slowly. In line 4, there is quite a long inter-turn pause of 1.4 seconds and this is followed by Ch2 producing a turn by repeating the meaning of the idiom ‘falling in love with you’, and he uses high intonation at the end of his turn as an indication that he is posing a question (Enfield, 2013). In response, En2 produces a confirmation token ‘yeah’. It is important to note that what occurs from line 5 to 7 is other-initiated self-repair as Ch2 seeks confirmation from En2 regarding the correct definition of the idiom and En2, in turn, provides him with the answer. From line 8 to 9, Ch2 produces another turn by repeating the actual idiom ‘you swep them on their feet’ and he emphasises the word ‘feet’. By doing so, Ch2 requests a confirmation (Lee, 2013) regarding the meaning of the idiom and, in turn, En2 provides him with a confirmation in line 11 when she says ‘yeah’. From line 13 to 14, Ch2 produces another turn by repeating the meaning of the idiom that En2 has provided him with earlier, and again there is an emphasis on the last word at the end of his turn in line 14. This again could be a request for confirmation, which En2 provides him with in line 16 when she both says and emphasises the word ‘yes’. In line 17, there is an inter-turn pause which is followed by En2 initiating a TCU by starting to further explain the idiom. It is important to note that there are sequences of other-initiated self-repair in this excerpt in which Ch2 initiates a repair and En2 carries it out by providing him with confirmations such as ‘yes’ and ‘yeah’.

In this excerpt, Ch2 formulates his turn as questions to be answered rather than assertions to be agreed with, this indicates that he cedes epistemic authority in the matter to En2 (Raymond and Heritage, 2006: p. 688), and on the other hand, En2 is playing the role of the teacher by, for instance, carrying out the repair when needed, whereas Ch2 is playing the role of the learner by requesting confirmation from En2 in terms of his understanding of the idiom she has explained to him. This means that epistemic status is often a relatively ‘settled’ affair among participants (Heritage, 2012a).

Prior to excerpt 5.21, En2 has finished describing the English idioms that are related to animals and body parts and in the following excerpt, she is trying to get confirmation

regarding whether Ch2 understood the idioms, and just after she gets an answer, she asks him whether there is a similar idiom in Chinese.

Excerpt 5.21

1 En2: °that was cool° where there ↑any ↓that ↑you ↓don't
2 (0.6) feel that you understand properly? or are
3 they all okay now
4 (0.1)
5 Ch2: >°I will think about it°<
6 (0.6)
7 En2: also I meant to say erm (0.3)
8 Ch2: °uh huh°
9 En2:→if there is ah similar one in Chinese?
10 Ch2:→(0.1) uh huh
11 (0.3)
12 En2:→ so if there is you can=
13 Ch2:→ =m↑hm let me see:: (1.5) ·hhh (1.4)
14 ((1.1 seconds during which Ch2 is mumbling)) no
15 not (0.4) ((1.2 seconds during which Ch2 is
16 mumbling))

In this excerpt, En2 produces a turn in which she gives an assessment of the activity that was carried out (the explanation of the English idioms) by saying ‘that was cool’. In doing so, she is indicating that this activity is complete (Heritage, 2013). After the assessment, from lines 1 to 3, En2 requests a confirmation from Ch2 on whether he understood the idioms. In so doing, she is positioning Ch2 in ‘a K+ position from which s/he can ratify it’ (Potter and Edwards, 2013: p. 691). In line 4, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds which is followed in line 5 by Ch2 saying that he ‘will think about it’ as an answer to the confirmation request. This is followed by another inter-turn pause of 0.6 seconds in line 6, then by En2 producing a turn, and by the end of her turn there is an intra-turn pause of 0.3 seconds. In line 8, Ch2 produces an acknowledgement token (‘uh huh’), acknowledging that the telling activity is still in progress (Stivers, 2008). In line 9, En2 produces a turn by asking Ch2 whether there are similar proverbs in Chinese, ending her turn with high intonation indicating that she is asking a question directed towards Ch2. After an intra-turn pause of 0.1 seconds in line 10, Ch2 produces a SPP when he says ‘uh huh’. In line 11, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.3 seconds and in line 12, En2 produces a turn by asking Ch2 to share similar idioms in Chinese with her.

The turn in line 12 is other-initiated repair as Ch2 did not provide her with the answer to the question she posed in line 9, thus she rephrases it in line 12. In turn, Ch2 accomplishes the repair from line 13 to 16 as he starts his turn with an acknowledgment token ‘mhm’ and then proceeds with his turn, stretching the word ‘see’. Ch2 stretches the word ‘see’ in order to delay the production of his answer (Kitzinger, 2013), and after a long intra-turn pause of 1.5 seconds, Ch2 takes an in-breath which is followed by another intra-turn pause of 1.4 seconds. After the intra-turn pause, Ch2 proceeds by mumbling, subsequently saying ‘no not’, and he ends his turn by mumbling again.

As teaching and learning is part of this discursive practice, En2 and Ch2 are demonstrating that they are playing the role of the teacher/learner accordingly. From line 12 to 13, other-initiated self-repair occurs as Ch2 has not understood the request by En2. En2 provided him with more explanation and this repair helps promote interactional competence as it assists with the process of learning (Sahlström, 2011). Although Ch2 mumbles from lines 14 to 16, En2 does not produce a turn which indicates that En2 is treating Ch2’s turn as still in progress and this demonstrates that at this point there is an alignment between the two.

Prior to excerpt 5.22, En4 explains to Ch4 what the idiom ‘to have a chip on one’s shoulder’ means. He asks Ch4 whether there is a similar idiom in Chinese which she starts to elaborate in the excerpt below by describing how the Chinese idioms consist of ‘four characters’.

Excerpt 5.22

1 Ch4: yes
 2 (0.7)
 3 Ch4: AND (0.6) heh mhm:: they’re quite like (0.5)
 4 useful just ↑four ↑characters (0.5) to:: describe
 5 a:: long sentences
 6 (0.2)
 7 En4: [erm]
 8 Ch4: [peo]ple can under↑stand ↓it just in four
 9 cha[racters]
 10 En4:➔ [o↑kay] it’s exactly con↑densed
 11 (0.2)
 12 Ch4: yes
 13 (1.6)
 14 En4:➔ but do you have an idea that similar to (0.9)
 15 Ch4:➔ a[h:: ↑yeah]

16 En4:➔ [to that one]
17 (0.4)
18 Ch4:➔ kind of understand it
19 (1.4)

In excerpt 5.22, Ch4 produces a turn ('yes' line 1) as a confirmation for the request that was produced by En4 in the previous excerpt and as a repair accomplishment. This repair is other-initiated self-repair, as in the excerpt previous to 5.22, En4 initiated a repair, and Ch4 accomplished it in line 1 in excerpt 5.22. After the repair has been accomplished, an inter-turn pause of 0.7 seconds occurs in line 2 which is then followed by Ch4 producing a turn. Within Ch4's turn from line 3 to 5, she produces laughter and then she proceeds by using stretched pause-filler 'mhm::' which can indicate that she is trying to delay the production of her turn (Kitzinger, 2013) which is the meaning of the four characters. Within her turn from line 3 to 5, she also stresses the words 'useful', 'describe', 'long', and 'sentences', which is a way of creating a connection to the topic of 'idioms' and 'four characters'(Schegloff, 1998). In line 6, there is inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds which is followed by an overlapping talk in lines 7 and 8, where both Ch4 and En4 produce a turn at the same time. This overlap could have been problematic if both participants continued talking at the same time. However, this was repaired as En4 dropped out and let Ch4 continue with the turn production (Hayashi, 2013).

There is another overlap in lines 9 and 10 which occurs at the end of Ch4's turn when En4 produces a turn. This turn production by En4 (line 10) is a way of closing the sequence ('okay...') (Mondada, 2006; Schegloff, 2007) and moving the topic forward (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). After the sequence closure, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds in line 11 and it is followed by Ch4 saying 'yes' as a confirmation of En4's previous turn. In line 14, En4 initiates a repair which is considered as other-initiated repair, as he starts his turn with 'but' as an indication that repair is needed thus redirecting his talk from the 'four characters' to a 'similar idiom in Chinese'. In lines 15 and 16, there is an overlap talk as Ch4 accomplishes the repair in line 15, producing 'ah yeah' as a confirmation token. Ch4's confirmation overlaps with a turn production by En4 as he continues with his repair initiation in line 16 and in line 18, Ch4 accomplishes the repair.

En4 initiated repairs in line 14 and 16 for Ch4 to accomplish them, and these repairs are essential for this discursive practice. Through them, the two participants are demonstrating an understanding of their roles as student/teacher. En4 is displaying an understanding of his role as a teacher as he decided in this excerpt that Ch4's answer was not sufficient (McHoul, 1978)

or maybe not relevant, and that is the reason for his repair initiations. On the other hand, Ch4 demonstrates an understanding of her role as a learner through her repair accomplishment as she shows an understanding of the fact that in this discursive practice, En4 has the authority to redirect the talk, as one of the aims of the tandem language learning sessions is for all learners to be aware ‘that corrections by their partner are of vital importance’ (Brammerts and Calvert, 2003: p. 53) as they promote language learning.

Prior to excerpt 5.23, En4 asked Ch4 whether there is a similar idiom in Chinese to ‘to have a chip on one’s shoulder’. In response, Ch4 starts explaining to him how Chinese idioms consist of four characters. As a result, En4 in the following excerpt asks Ch4 the question again as a repair-initiation.

Excerpt 5.23

1 En4:➔ but uh:: is there I think (0.2) well I think the
2 question is (0.2)is there is there like a saying or
3 a proverb in Chinese:: (0.4) that [means] something
4 Ch4: [↑uh::]
5 (0.9)
6 En4:➔ it’s like the ↑same as ↑that
7 (1.0)
8 Ch4:➔ it should have I just (0.1) erm (0.3)heh(0.7)
9 e(hh)rm heh(0.5) I pro(hh)bobaly need the time
10 to thi-(0.4)
11 En4: yeah
12 Ch4: t(hh) thi(hh)nk about it
13 (0.8)
14 Ch4:➔ if if I wanna ↑use:ful: (0.5) characters (0.5) but
15 they’re longer(0.7) °you know °
16 (1.0)

Excerpt 5.23 starts with a repair initiation as En4 is requesting Ch4 to repair her talk. This repair is other-initiated self-repair. In lines 3 and 4, there is an overlapped talk which occurs when Ch4 produces an acknowledgment token ‘uh’ while En4 is still producing his turn. In line 5, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.9 seconds which is followed by another repair initiation and after a long inter-turn pause of 1.0 seconds in line 7, Ch4 accomplishes the repair (line 8-10) by saying ‘it should have’. Within Ch4’s turn, Ch4 produces multiple laughter as she is struggling to provide En4 with an answer. In line 11, En4 produces a confirmation token

‘yeah’ (Levinson, 2013), and by producing a confirmation token, En4 is indicating that he accepts Ch4’s previous turn and agrees with it (Clayman, 2013a). The confirmation token that was produced by En4 was not produced at a TRP, and therefore, as Ch4’s turn was not complete (line 10), she then continues with her turn production in line 12 which is a follow up of the repair accomplishment as she says ‘think about it’. In line 13, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.8 seconds which is followed by Ch4 initiating another turn as an elaboration on the repair accomplishment. Again in this excerpt, the repair-initiations by En4 emphasise his role as a teacher as he is trying through these repair-initiations to show that he has decided at this moment in the conversation that the answers that Ch4 is providing him with are insufficient (McHoul, 1978), and in turn Ch4 tries to accomplish these repairs by providing him with the answer to the question he posed.

Prior to excerpt 5.24, Ch4 was trying to explain to En4 how the Chinese proverbs consist of four characters and as En4 was struggling to understand the concept, she then asked him whether there is another word in English to mean ‘proverbs’. En4 then replies, explaining that ‘sayings’ could mean the same thing, and then proceeds in the following excerpt by saying that on his worksheet it says proverbs or expressions. Ch4 then provides an example of a Chinese proverb that consists of four characters and following this, En4 seeks an opportunity to initiate and accomplish a repair.

Excerpt 5.24

1 En4: <I don’t really know> I mean this is just it says
2 proverbs or expressions
3 (0.3)
4 Ch4: ((0.7 of which Ch4 is whispering))
5 (0.3)
6 Ch4: [uhm::]
7 En4: [uhm::]::
8 Ch4:➔ yes I remem- uhm proverbs is just like like the
9 third one it’s a sentence ·hhh (0.3) and::
10 (0.9) when I said four characters (0.1) is just like
11 (0.8) uhu::: like a prover- (0.2) castle in the ↑air
12 (0.2) it’s very ↑short
13 (0.3)
14 En4:right
15 (0.2)
16 Ch4: a::nd (0.3) it’s just (0.2) [four char]ac↑t[ers]

17 En4: [s-] [oh:]
 18 → sorry that's like a phrase
 19 (0.3)
 20 En4: that's ↑li[ke]
 21 Ch4: [uh:m] yes very short
 22 (.)
 23 En4: okay
 24 (0.6)
 25 Ch4:→ but proverbs usually: is a sentence
 26 (0.5)
 27 Ch4: longer
 28 (0.1)
 29 En4:→ right okay
 30 (0.1)
 31 En4:→ so I think maybe more the the f- the short one
 32 is the like an ↑expression
 33 (0.5)
 34 Ch4: °yes°
 35 (1.0)

In except 5.24, En4 produces a turn from line 1 to 2 by telling Ch4 that on his worksheet it says 'proverbs' or 'expressions'. In line 3 there is inter-turn pause of 0.3 seconds which is followed by Ch4 whispering for 0.7 seconds. Whispering could be considered as a search formula (Mazeland, 2013) which in this case Ch4 produces in order to hold the floor while trying to find the words to describe what she wants to say. In line 5, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.3 seconds and this is followed by an overlapping talk. Within this overlap in lines 6 and 7, Ch4 and En4 produce stretched pause fillers (Hayashi, 2013), which could indicate a delayed production (Kitzinger, 2013) as both try to hold the floor. This overlapping talk could also have been produced as a way of resolving the trouble from previous turns regarding the difference between proverbs, sayings and expressions, and how this difference is applied in the Chinese language. As Ch4 and En4 find themselves speaking simultaneously, one of them, which in this case is En4, drops out and lets Ch4 continue talking. En4's dropping out 'displays his orientation to one-at-a-time as the norm' (Hayashi, 2013: p. 189).

Ch4 continues with her turn from line 8 to 12 and within her turn, she initiates and accomplishes a repair which is self-initiated self-repair, as she explains the difference between 'four characters' and 'proverbs'. Ch4 ends her turn in line 12 with rising intonation, which is

followed in line 13 with inter-turn pause of 0.3 seconds. En4 then produces an agreement token ('right') in line 14 which indicates that he accepts the information that Ch4 has provided him with (Clayman, 2013a). In line 15, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds and it is followed by Ch4 producing a turn by explaining more about how the Chinese idioms are designed. By the end of Ch4's turn in line 16, En4 produces an acknowledgement token (Clayman, 2013a) which overlaps with Ch4's turn. The 'oh' that is produced by En4 in line 17 is used as an indication that the information that Ch4 provided him with has been delivered and received (Heritage, 1984). After the overlap in lines 16 and 17, Ch4 drops out and lets En4 continue talking, which displays her orientation to one-at-a-time as the norm (Hayashi, 2013). This also indicates that she understands that the 'oh' produced by En4 is an indication that he has received the information that she has provided him with.

In line 18, En4 initiates a repair and accomplishes it. En4 initiates a repair as he notices a trouble in what Ch4 has delivered to him. In the previous turn, she used the term 'proverbs' which En4 then corrects it by saying 'sorry that's like a phrase'. In line 19, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.3 seconds which is followed by En4 repeating the words 'that's like' which were used in line 18. This repetition by En4 could have been used as a way of obscuring 'a substantive shift in the focus of the response' (Clayman, 2013b: p. 619). After the repetition that is produced by En4 in line 20, there is an overlap which occurs when Ch4 produces an acknowledgement token ('uhm') and then uses a confirmation token ('yes') (Levinson, 2013). After Ch4's turn in line 21, there is a micro inter-turn pause which is followed by En4 producing a sequence closure (Schegloff, 2007) in line 23 ('okay'). After the sequence closure in line 23, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.6 seconds and this is followed by Ch4 producing a turn in line 25. Ch4 starts her turn in line 25 with 'but' and then proceeds by saying 'proverbs usually is a sentence'. This is other-initiated other-repair as Ch4 identifies a trouble in En4's previous turn when he uses the word 'phrase', thus she initiates repair and accomplishes it by using the word 'proverbs' instead.

In line 26 there is an inter-turn pause of 0.5 seconds, and it is followed by Ch4 continuing with her repair accomplishment by saying 'longer' in line 27. This is followed by another inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds in line 28. In line 29 En4 produces a sequence-closure ('right okay') (Schegloff, 2007) which is a way of ending the talk and providing an opportunity to move on and discuss a different topic (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). After the sequence closure, there is another inter-turn pause in line 30 of 0.1 seconds and then En4 produces a

turn from line 31 to 32. Within his turn, he initiates other-initiated other-repair in which he uses the word ‘expression’ while emphasising it. This is used to correct the trouble in talk that was produced in the previous turn when Ch4 used the word ‘proverb’. In line 33, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.5 seconds and this is followed by a confirmation token (‘yes’) which is produced by Ch4 in line 34.

Ch4 and En4’s asymmetrical orientation to knowledge is clear, as they are both aware of how to access and cede epistemic authority (Sahlström, 2011). En4’s and Ch4’s repair initiations and repair accomplishments indicate that both participants have a clear understanding of their domains and when to access them, for instance En4’s repair initiation and accomplishment and Ch4’s acceptance of it (the use of ‘yes’ in line 21) indicates that they are both aware of their domains and when to access them (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011). In this discursive practice, one of the aims of these tandem learning sessions is teaching and learning, and thus correcting each other when needed is one of the principles of tandem language learning (Brammerts, 2003). Equally, mutual correction is vital in this setting (Otto, 2003) as it serves ‘as a resource for negotiating and perhaps reformulating a current set of identities’ (Jefferson, 1974: p. 181). As is shown in excerpt 5.24, En4 takes the opportunity to initiate and accomplish a repair and so does Ch4, thus through their repair initiation they are both allowing a learning opportunity in identifying a trouble in each other’s talk and correcting it when needed. Moreover, the two participants in this excerpt display multiple interactional competences through ‘joint management and enjoyment of the complex task’ (Piiraninen-Marsh, 2011: p. 39) of explaining to each other the difference between ‘proverbs’, ‘sayings’ and a ‘phrase’ as they both had different understandings of what each term means.

In excerpt 5.25, En4 explains to Ch4 that English proverbs and expressions (the ones that are related to body parts and animals) can sound strange, however Ch4 has failed to answer the question in terms of whether there is an equivalent proverb in Chinese, thus En4 seeks another opportunity to initiate a repair.

Excerpt 5.25

1 En4: <it’s it’s a sort of> sort of strange thing that
2 people say I guess
3 (0.7)
4 En4: because it’s a †tra‡dition
5 Ch4: ((0.3 of which Ch4 opens her mouth))
6 (0.4)

7 Ch4: °↑uh ↓huh°
 8 ((0.3 of which there is a beeping sound))
 9 En4: heh heh
 10 (0.1)
 11 En4: ·hhh
 12 (0.2)
 13 En4:→ uhm:::(1.1)but I guess the question I think the
 14 question is ·hhh (0.3) uhm::: (0.6) is do you do
 15 you have like (0.5) a phrase or a saying in Chinese
 16 that similar idea (0.7) to this ↑idea
 17 (1.0)
 18 Ch4:→ uhu::: (0.5) I mean it should have (0.3)
 19 En4:→ should [have] [but you] just () ↑o↓kay
 20 Ch4: [but I] ju[st]
 21 (0.5)
 22 En4:→ wo uhu oh the next one is uhu::: (0.7) don't look a
 23 gift horse in the mouth

In line 1, En4 produces a turn by telling Ch4 that the English proverbs on the worksheet that they are working on are 'sort of strange thing that people say I guess'. In line 3, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.3 seconds and then in line 5, Ch4 produces a turn by opening her mouth which can indicate her surprise. This is followed with an inter-turn pause of 0.4 seconds in line 6 and then by Ch4 producing an acknowledgement token ('uh huh') in line 7 (Stivers, 2013). Ch4's acknowledgement token aligns with En4 previous turn as through that Ch4 'works to facilitate the progression of the telling' (Mandelbaum, 2013: p. 478). In line 9, En4 produces laughter as Ch4's surprise expression (mouth opening) in line 5 can indicate that she might not have found the English proverbs to be 'strange'. In line 10, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds which is followed by En4 producing an in-breath and this is followed by another inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds in line 12.

In line 13, En4 produces a turn by starting it with a stretched pause-filler ('uhm') as a way of indicating that he is still committed to the turn's production (Kitzinger, 2013) and is still trying to hold the floor. After a long intra-turn pause of 1.1 seconds, En4 then proceeds with his turn from line 13 to 16 in which he repairs the trouble source from previous turns and this repair is other-initiated self-repair. Within his repair initiation, he asks Ch4 again whether there is a similar proverb in Chinese, as until this point, Ch4 still has not answered the question. In response, Ch4 accomplishes the repair in line 18, by first using a stretched pause

filler ('uhu:::') which could have been used as a way of delaying her production (Kitzinger, 2013) so she can remember whether there is an equivalent Chinese idiom. After a long intra-turn pause of 0.5 seconds in line 18, Ch4 continues with her turn production by telling En4 that 'it should have'. In line 19, En4 produces another turn by repeating ('should have') Ch4's previous turn. This repetition could have been used by En4 as a way of obscuring 'a substantive shift in the focus of the response' (Clayman, 2013b: p. 619). En4 ends his turn in line 19 by saying 'okay' as a sequence-closure (Schegloff, 2007) and as a way of moving the topic forward (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). There is an overlapping talk between Ch4 and En4 in lines 19 and 20. However, this was resolved as Ch4 stopped talking and let En4 continue with his sequence closure (Hayashi, 2013). In line 21, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.5 seconds and it is followed by En4 producing a new sequence by moving to the next idiom.

The repair initiation from lines 13 to 16 was essential in this discursive practice, as by En4 initiating a repair, he thus redirects the topic of discussion which indicates his commitment to the process of tandem learning. Before En4's repair-initiation, Ch4 (in the excerpts prior to 5.25) was still discussing how Chinese proverbs consist of four characters although the question En4 has asked was whether there is a similar idiom in Chinese to 'to have a chip on one's shoulder'. Thus, En4's repair initiation and Ch4's repair-accomplishment demonstrate that they have both a clear understanding of the aim of this tandem learning session as one of the aims of language tandem learning is initiating repairs through supervised error corrections (Brammerts, 2003) by the more experienced person which in this case is En4.

5.4 Maintenance of intersubjectivity through situated understanding of 'Okays'

The mutual understanding of the use of 'okay' demonstrates the participants' awareness of how the tandem language learning sessions work. These sessions require the participants to close the topics and move them forward to ensure that they both equally benefit from the session.

Prior to excerpt 5.26, En2 has finished the process of explaining the meaning of the idiom 'sweep her off her feet' to Ch2. In the excerpt below, Ch2 is taking notes of En2's explanation and En2, in turn, confirms what he is writing.

Excerpt 5.26

1 Ch2: ((0.6 seconds during which Ch2 takes notes))

2 En2: [°yes°]
3 [En2 looking at Ch2's notes]
4 Ch2: [((taking notes))] ((0.5 seconds during
5 which Ch2 takes notes)) ↑all ↓right (.) he swept (0.1)
6 her off (1.0) ↑her ↓feet
7 (0.1)
8 En2: °yeah?°
9 (0.8)
10 Ch2: which means (0.3) he:: (0.4) ↑love ↓her
11 (0.2)
12 En2: no it means he made her love him
13 Ch2: ((0.6 seconds during which Ch2 takes notes)) ↑all
14 ↓right °I see°=
15 En2:→ =↑o↓kay ·hhh is like (0.3) he was so::
16 ama↑zing that she had to fall in love with him
17 Ch2: ((0.6 seconds during which Ch2 takes notes))
18 En2: →°yeah?°=
19 Ch2: → =°↑o↓kay ↑o↓kay I see° ((4.0 seconds during
20 which Ch2 takes notes))

In line 2, En2 produces a turn by saying 'yes' as a confirmation and says this whilst looking at Ch2's notes. The confirmation by En2 could have been used here as a way of finalising the talk (Clayman, 2013a) about that specific idiom (sweep her off her feet). From line 5 to 6, Ch2 produces a turn when he says 'all right' in high and then low intonation which ends with him repeating the actual idiom. In line 7, there is inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds which is followed by En2 producing 'yeah' in line 8. En2 ends the 'yeah' in rising intonation as a request for confirmation (Lee, 2013) of whether or not Ch2 has understood the previous TCUs produced by her. In line 9, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.8 seconds which is followed by Ch2 producing a turn as a repair-initiation as he says out loud the meaning of the idiom. Subsequently, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds in line 11 and then in line 12, En2 initiates a turn to accomplish the repair. This repair is other-initiated self-repair, as En2 is accomplishing the repair that Ch2 initiated in line 10. Through that, En2 clarifies the meaning of the idiom by saying 'no it means he made her love him' as Ch2 thought it meant 'he love her' (line 10). After the repair accomplishment in line 12, Ch2 takes notes and says 'all right' in high and then low intonation which is then followed by 'I see' as a confirmation of what En2 has produced in the previous turn. In line 15, En2 produces another turn which latches with Ch2's previous turn in line 14 and starts her turn by using a sequence closure

(‘okay’) before elaborating further on the idiom. En2 then stresses the word ‘amazing’ as a way of finalising the talk about this specific idiom and thus moving the topic forward. This is followed by Ch2 taking notes in line 17 and then in line 18, En2 again requests confirmation by saying ‘yeah’, ending it in rising intonation. Following this, Ch2 provides En2 with confirmation in line 19.

In line 19, Ch2 twice produces a sequence closing third (‘okay’) as a confirmation that he has so far understood what En2 has explained to him and as a demonstration of his understanding of En2’s previous ‘okay’ in line 15 to close the topic and move it forward (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). Through En2’s and Ch2’s collaboration and understanding of the projection of ‘okay’, they display in this excerpt an understanding of this discursive practice as they have reached mutual understanding and are both ready to move to the next idiom on the list.

In excerpt 5.27, En4 is trying to explain to Ch4 what the proverb ‘to have a chip on one’s shoulder’ means.

Excerpt 5.27

1 En4: ehh to have a chip on one shoulder (1.4) is::: like
2 (1.0) er::m (1.3) to have something you’re:: bitter
3 and resentful about?
4 (0.5)
5 En4: ((0.1 of which En4 does tongue clicking)) (0.2)
6 so::: (0.6) for example as I am I am Scottish (0.3)
7 s[o::]
8 Ch4: [heh] heh
9 (0.1)
10 En4: if I had a chip on my shoulder about being
11 Scottish (0.4) I w[ould walk] around England
12 Ch4: [°↑mhm°]
13 En4: and (0.5) people you know I would(0.2)be annoyed at
14 ↓peo↑ple because they’ve been bad to Scottish people
15 (1.5)
16 Ch4:→ °↑o↓kay °
17 (0.2)
18 En4:→ does that make sense?
19 (1.3)
20 Ch4:→ am a little bit con↑fused

In excerpt 5.27, En4 starts, in line 1, explaining the meaning of the idiom ‘to have a chip on one’s shoulder’. Within En4’s turn from line 1 to 3, he stretches three words ‘is::’, ‘erm::’, and ‘you’re::’. En4 ends his turn with a rising intonation, which might have been used here as a request for confirmation (Lee, 2013) as to whether Ch4 understood what he has explained to her so far. However, Ch4 does not produce a turn and thus En4 produces another turn as he tries to explain the idiom further by providing Ch4 with an example of how it can be used. Within En4’s turn from line 5 to 7, he again produces 3 intra-turn pauses and he stresses the word ‘Scottish’. This emphasis could have been used by En4 to stress the fact that he is ‘Scottish’ and how this relates to the example he is going to provide (Sidnell, 2013). At the end of En4’s turn in line 7, he stretches the word ‘so::’ which indicates that he did not reach a TRP, however this ‘so::’ overlaps with laughter that is produced by Ch4 in line 8. This overlap in lines 7 and 8 causes En4 to stop talking, and in turn, Ch4 produces more laughter. The laughter that has been produced by Ch4 could indicate that she agreeing with what En4 has said till this point.

In line 9, there is another inter-turn pause and it is followed by En4 producing a turn. Within his turn he stresses 2 words: ‘Scottish’ and ‘England’, which again can indicate that they are both very relevant to the example he is providing and that they both refer back to the idiom he is explaining (Sidnell, 2013). In the middle of En4’s turn, Ch4 produces an acknowledgment token ‘mhm’, and in line 13, En4 continues with the example he is providing. Within his turn from line 13 to 14, he pauses twice and emphasises two words ‘people’ and ‘bad’ which could again indicate that these two words are referring back to the idiom (Sidnell, 2013) ‘to have a chip on one’s shoulder’. At line 15, there is another inter-turn pause of 1.5, and this is followed by Ch4 producing ‘okay’ as a sequence-closure (Schegloff, 2007) in line 16 and this indicates Ch4’s understanding of the projection of ‘okay’ because until this point in conversation, En4 has finished with his explanation of the English idiom. In line 17, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds, and in line 18, En4 produces another turn. He (En4) ends his turn with rising intonation as a request for confirmation (Lee, 2013) on whether C4 has understood the meaning of the idiom. This means that he treated her previous turn as a sequence-closure as he stopped his elaboration and asked Ch4 ‘does that make sense’. In line 19, there is another inter-turn pause of 1.3 seconds which is followed by Ch4 producing a turn as she describes that she feels confused about the explanation En4 has provided her with. This turn production by Ch4 in line 20 is other-initiated repair.

The two participants in excerpt 5.27 have reached ‘epistemic congruence’ as there is a clear understanding between them regarding who is the more knowledgeable (En4) in the area and who is the less knowledgeable (Ch4) (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011). From line 1 to 14, En4 is the one who is providing Ch4 with information regarding the idiom ‘to have a chip on one’s shoulder’ and when he finishes with his explanation and with the illustration, Ch4 produces a sequence closing third ‘okay’ which can indicate her understanding of the projection of ‘okay’. In line 16, En4 treats ‘okay’ as a sequence closure as he moves the topic forward in line 18 and asks Ch4 ‘does that make sense?’. This means that he stops elaborating on the idiom and checks whether Ch4 has understood it. Ch4 treats En4’s previous turn as a question as she provides him with an answer in line 20 on how she feels regarding his explanation (‘am a little bit confused’).

Prior to excerpt 5.28, En4 explained to Ch4 the meaning of the idiom ‘to have a chip on one’s shoulder’ and in the following excerpt he continues with his elaboration.

Excerpt 5.28

1 En4:➔ you’re ↑poo↓rer like you have a chip on your
2 shoulder
3 (0.5)
4 Ch4: heh
5 (0.4)
6 Ch4:➔ okay I under↑stand
7 (0.1)
8 En4:➔ I don’t know why:: or where it comes from
9 (0.7)
10 En4:➔ ·hhh so is there anything like that in Chinese?
11 Ch4: (0.7) ·hhh uh::m (0.1) ↑yeah: (.) but usually
12 Chinese proverb is (0.3) consist of four characters
13 (0.9)
14 Ch4: do you [know that?]
15 En4: [four ch]aracters
16 (0.1)

In line 1, En4 accomplishes the repair that was initiated in the previous excerpt by Ch4. Within his turn from line 1 to 2, he continues explaining the English idiom and this is followed by an inter-turn pause of 0.5 seconds in line 3. In line 4, Ch4 produces laughter and

after the laughter, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.4 seconds in line 5 which is followed by Ch4 producing a sequence closing third in line 6 by saying ‘okay I understand’. ‘Okay I understand’ is produced by Ch4 as a way of closing the sequence (Schegloff, 2007) as now she understands it, she is ready to move on to discussing a different topic (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). In line 7, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds and this is followed by En4 producing a turn in line 8 as he moves the topic forward when saying ‘I don’t know why or where it comes from’, thus treating Ch4’s previous turn as a sequence closure. In line 9, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.7 seconds which is followed by En4 producing a turn by shifting the topic from the elaboration on ‘to have a chip on one’s shoulder’ to asking Ch4 if ‘there anything like that in Chinese?’. From line 11 to 12, Ch4 then starts discussing Chinese idioms and she starts by producing a stretched pause-filler (‘uh::m’) which is followed by ‘yeah’. Here, ‘yeah’ is ‘designed to be fitted sequentially with its prior as a relevant next action’ (Drew, 2013: p. 153). Ch4 proceeds with her turn by saying ‘but’ which can indicate that the previous ‘yeah’ is considered as a weak agreement type as it is followed by a ‘but’ (Pomerantz, 1984). Ch4 then continues by explaining from line 11 to 12 how ‘the Chinese proverb consist of four characters’, this is then followed by first, an inter-turn pause of (0.9), and then a turn production by Ch4 in line 14. At the end of Ch4’s turn in line 14, she produces rising intonation which overlaps with a sequence that is produced by En4 in line 15. This overlap was produced close to a turn completion, which means that En4 produced a turn with no gap in between as he knew that Ch4’s turn was reaching a TRP (Clayman, 2013a), and his turn in line 15 is considered as a request for confirmation from Ch4 (Stivers, 2013) and as a repair-initiation.

Both Ch4 and En4 display an understanding in this excerpt of the projection of ‘okay’ as Ch4 uses it in line 6 to close the sequence in order to demonstrate her understanding of En4’s previous turns, and in turn, En4 orients to the ‘okay’ accordingly as he moves the topic forward by, first, in line 8 announcing how he does not know where the idiom comes from, and second, in line 10 when he asks Ch4 whether there is a similar idiom in Chinese.

5.5 Lack of situated understanding of ‘Okay’, ‘oh’, and assessments

‘Okay’, ‘oh’, and assessments such as ‘good’ or ‘wow’ can be used as a minimal post expansion, meaning that when they are produced, they can function as a sequence closure and thus move the topic forward (Schegloff, 2007). Knowing how to orient to them is interactionally important in the context of tandem learning as in this context knowing when to

close the sequence and move it forward is beneficial for guaranteeing that both tandem partners benefit equally from the sessions.

Prior to excerpt 5.29, En2 has explained to Ch2 the meaning of the English idiom ‘sweep them off their feet’ and she has asked Ch2 whether there is a similar idiom in Chinese. Thus, in excerpt 5.29, Ch2 starts by informing En2 of the equivalent idiom in Chinese to ‘sweep them off their feet’.

Excerpt 5.29

1 (0.3)
2 Ch2: [which means]
3 En2:→ [↑oh:::::]
4 (0.4)
5 Ch2:→ we can't (0.1) wear (0.2) just like wear a
6 hat ·hhh uh:::: (0.1) we can't wear the same
7 weather
8 (0.1)
9 En2: heh [heh]
10 Ch2: [I]can't (0.3) I can't (0.1) wear the same
11 weather (0.9) with you
12 (0.4)
13 En2:→ ↑wo:: ↓oh: [↑o↓h]
14 Ch2:→ [cause] ((0.5 seconds during which Ch2
15 is mumbling)) under this weather this kind of
16 (0.1) this weather or this CLOTHE ·hhh there is
17 (0.6)they shouldn't be (0.1) you (0.1) and me

In excerpt 5.29 line 1, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.3 seconds. This gap is broken when both participants start talking at the same time (lines 2 and 3) resulting in an overlap. Within this overlap, the Chinese student starts by saying ‘which means’ which is an extensive elaboration on the Chinese idiom, whereas within En2’s turn she says ‘oh’ while stretching it. Thus, the ‘oh’ here ‘is used to mark the receipt of the informing delivered in the preceding turn or turns’ and it could have been produced as a way of indicating that the ‘informings are possibly complete’ (Heritage, 1984: p. 301). In line 4, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.4 seconds which is followed by Ch2 elaborating more on the Chinese idiom (lines 5 to 7), thus treating En2’s ‘oh’ as an indication for him to continue with the explanation. In line 8, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds which is followed by En2 producing laughter particles in

line 9. Laughter can be produced as an invitation for the other person to laugh along with them in order to take some time out (Glenn, 2010). However, that does not occur in this excerpt and instead, Ch2 in line 10 continues elaborating on the idiom. In line 12, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.4 seconds which is followed by En2 producing a turn by saying ‘oh’ twice in line 13. Again ‘oh’ here is an indication that the information that was provided by Ch2 was received and delivered (Heritage, 1984) and as a way of closing the sequence (Schegloff, 2007). However, the second ‘oh’ that is produced by En2 in line 13, overlaps with a turn that is produced by Ch2 in line 14. This can be considered problematic as the turn that was produced by En2 indicates that she understood what Ch2 delivered and could be seen as a sequence closure (Schegloff, 2007). However, from lines 14-17, Ch2 continues explaining the idiom.

In excerpt 5.29, Ch2 is the more knowledgeable in the area and thus has more epistemic authority than En2. Ch2 does access his epistemic authority and provides and delivers the information on the Chinese idiom to En2. However, the closure sequences that were produced by En2 were not taken into account and Ch2 continues elaborating on the idiom and causing misalignment, as alignment, according to Stivers, Mondada and Steensig (2011: p. 21), is the way we cooperate our responses by facilitating the sequence; ‘accepting the presuppositions and terms of the proposed action or activity; and matching the formal design preference of the turn’.

There is some misunderstanding in terms of how the three aspects of the turn-taking system work. The three aspects are selection of next speaker, identifying TCUs, and projecting TRPs (Young, 2008). This causes problems in terms of ‘intersubjectivity’, as the projection of ‘oh’ in lines 3 and 13 by En2 and the responses in lines 5 and 14 by Ch2 are not indicating that there is a clear understanding of what ‘oh’ as a token projects in this discursive practice (Young, 2008).

In excerpt 5.30, Ch2 is continuing to explain the equivalent Chinese idiom, and although En2 has produced an assessment ‘wow’ and ‘Okay’ as sequence closure, Ch2 continues producing turns on the same topic.

Excerpt 5.30

1 En2: ·hhh heh [heh]
 2 Ch2: [()] or you die(0.1)or (0.3) I die=
 3 En2: ➔ =WOW

4 (0.2)
5 Ch2:→so this is (0.3) this is uh:: (0.8) that is (0.1)
6 uh (0.3) this version I will use (0.3) they use uh
7 like uh (1.0) in old time
8 (0.4)
9 En2:→ OK[AY]
10 Ch2:→ [but] today e::ven you say it people (0.8) VERY
11 very (0.6) understand
12 (0.2)
13 Ch2: () [() exactly it means m]eans .hhh
14 En2: heh [heh heh heh heh heh]
15 Ch2: it means (0.1) u:::hm (1.9) the no-
16 normally (0.1) the situation is (0.6) like uh:::
17 in old history someone [c]ute (0.3)
18 En2: [mhm]

In line 1, En2 produces a solo laughter. In line 2, Ch2 continues with his explanation of the Chinese idiom, and in line 3, En2 produces an assessment ‘wow’ which could have been used to close the sequence and to start a new one (Schegloff, 2007). In line 4, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds which is then followed by Ch2 as he continues with the elaboration on the equivalent Chinese idiom. In line 8, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.4 seconds which is then followed by En2 producing ‘Okay’. ‘Okay’ can be used to close the sequence (Schegloff, 2007) and as an opportunity to move the topic forward (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). However, there is an overlap in lines 9 and 10 which occurs when Ch2 produces a turn when trying to extend the previous sequence (lines 5 to 7). After the extended sequence by Ch2 from line 10 to 11 in which he continues discussing the Chinese idiom, another inter-turn pause occurs of 0.2 seconds and this is followed by Ch2 continuing to elaborate on the idiom (line 13). This is followed by multiple laughs by En2, and just after from line 15 to 17, Ch2 continues discussing the Chinese idiom, and by the end of his turn, En2 produces an acknowledgement token ‘mhm’ which overlaps with Ch2’s turn.

As interactional competence is displayed through maintaining shared understanding and paying close attention to different interactional resources such as TCUs and TRPs (Pirainen-Marsh, 2011), this excerpt was problematic in that sense as the sequence closings that were initiated by En2 were not treated as such. Interactional competence is not the knowledge that a person possesses but rather how this knowledge is co-constructed in a discursive practice

(Young, 2008), and thus the two participants did not display interactional competence in this excerpt.

In excerpt 5.31, Ch2 continues with his explanation regarding the Chinese idiom that is equivalent to the English one to ‘sweep her off her feet’ and he extends his explanation as he elaborates on the idiom’s historical background.

Excerpt 5.31

1 Ch2: [so]meone’s father [or someone]’s
2 En2: →y[eah] [o::k(hh)ay]
3 Ch2: →(0.1) yes like that ·hhh so::: (0.4) and the
4 people (0.5) ((0.4 seconds during which Ch2 is
5 mumbling) whose father was good (0.7) will say
6 (0.1) I (0.2) will never (0.5) swear I I will never
7 wear the same (0.3) weather with you
8 (0.3)
9 En2: →o(hh)kay
10 (0.4)
11 Ch2: yes=
12 En2: =·hhh
13 (0.1)
14 En2: → th(hh)at’s ↑go(hh)od
15 (0.1)

Ch2 continues with his elaboration on the Chinese idiom and its historical background. In line 1, Ch2 starts with his sequence expansion from the previous excerpt and within his turn there are two overlaps. These overlaps occur as En2 produces, first, an acknowledgement token ‘yeah’ and, second, a sequence closure ‘okay’ in line 2. The ‘okay’ that is produced by En2 in line 2 has interactional consequences as it is implying that everything is understood and that no further explanation is needed, thus it can be produced to close the sequence (Pillet-Shore, 2003). However, this does not occur in line 3, as Ch2 continues with his elaboration on the Chinese idiom. From lines 3 to 7, Ch2 elaborates more on the idiom and he produces 7 intra-turn pauses within his turn. In line 8, there is an inter-turn pause which is followed by En2 producing ‘o(hh)kay’ in line 9. The ‘okay’ that is produced by En2 in line 9 is a way of indicating again that she wants to close the topic and move things forward (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). In line 10, there is another inter-turn of 0.4 seconds, and this is followed by Ch2

producing an acknowledgement token ‘yes’ (line 11). This acknowledgement token latches with an in-breath by En2 in line 12 which is followed by another inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds in line 13. In line 14, En2 produces an assessment ‘that’s good’ and in this case, it might have been used as a minimal post-expansion and thus as a way of closing the sequence (Stivers, 2013).

In lines 2 and 9, En2 produces twice ‘okay’. En2 produces ‘okay’ in these two lines as a way of marking acceptance of Ch2’s turns. ‘Okay’ can be used as a way of closing sequences (Schegloff, 2007), however, in excerpt 5.31, this does not occur as Ch2 continues with the production of his turn in line 3. This could indicate that there is a problem in terms of identifying TCUs and TRPs within this excerpt (Young, 2008). As interactional competence is mutually co-constructed, both participants demonstrate a lack of understanding of how the turn-taking system works in this discursive practice. Moreover, as this session was dedicated to teaching the Chinese participant some English idioms, through both participants’ lack of understanding of how the turn-taking system works, they risked not benefiting equally from the session.

Excerpt 5.32 starts by En2 producing an assessment as a way of finalising the talk.

Excerpt 5.32

1 Ch2: uh[huh]
2 En2: →[that’s] a good one
3 (2.2)
4 Ch2: °that° (0.1) °I think° (0.2)°no°
5 →(0.9)
6 Ch2: ((0.2 of which Ch2 is mumbling))
7 →(0.4)
8 Ch2: ((0.9 of which Ch2 is mumbling))
9 →(2.0)
10 Ch2: °good° ((1.5 of which Ch2 is mumbling))
11 →(1.1)
12 Ch2: ((1.0 of which Ch2 is mumbling))
13 →(1.6)
14 Ch2: () (0.2) there is (0.8) there is uh (0.7)
15 when you say this (0.5)
16 En2: mhm

In excerpt 5.32, after the inter-turn pause from the previous excerpt, Ch2 produces an acknowledgement token 'uh huh' in line 1, and this indicates that Ch2 is acknowledging En2's previous turn and that the talk is still in progress (Goodwin, 1986). Ch2's acknowledgement token in line 1 overlaps with a turn that is produced by En2 when she produces assessment in line 2. Assessments can be produced to mark a completion of the story being told (in that case Ch2's) (Goodwin, 1986). However, in line 3 there is a long inter-turn pause of 2.2 seconds which is followed by Ch2 producing a turn in line 4 which is a dispreferred response, as he does not agree with En2's previous assessment as he uses the word 'no' in line 4 (Pomerantz, 1984). After Ch2's dispreferred response in line 4, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.9 seconds in line 5 which is followed by Ch2 mumbling in line 6. Mumbling can be considered as a search formula (Mazeland, 2013), which means that Ch2 can be using it in line 6 in order to hold the floor while 'thinking' of what he wants to say. Search formulae as well can be used as a way of doing self-repair (Mazeland, 2013), which is what happens in line 10 when Ch2 produces 'good' as a way of accomplishing the repair from line 4. This is followed by two episodes of Ch2 mumbling again in lines 10 and 12, and in line 13 there is another inter-turn pause which is followed by Ch2 producing a turn which is a further elaboration on the usage of the idiom, and this is followed by En2 producing an acknowledgment token in line 16 ('mhm').

According to Stivers (2008), acknowledgment tokens such as: 'mhm', 'hm', 'uh huh', and 'yeah', are produced by the recipient during storytelling as an indication that the story is still in progress and not complete. However, after En2's assessment in line 2, there are quite a few long inter-turn pauses that occurred in lines 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13, and although the pauses are not attributed to neither En2 nor Ch2, En2 does not produce any acknowledgment tokens in lines 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13, thus causing misalignment (Stivers, 2008). This could indicate that En2's previous assessment was produced as a way of indicating that the information gathered at this point is complete (Heritage, 2013). Ch2 continues producing turns that consist of him mumbling and from line 14 to 15 he starts again with the elaboration of the Chinese idiom, indicating that he still wants to continue accessing his domain of knowledge.

Although prior to excerpt 5.33, En2 tried to close the sequence and move the topic forward, Ch2 is still, in excerpt 5.33, choosing to elaborate on the same Chinese idiom.

Excerpt 5.33

1 (0.1)
2 Ch2: daggers (0.2) [right]
3 En2:→ [yeah]
4 (0.1)
5 Ch2: daggers (0.1) I remember (0.3) uh:::: he's (0.2)
6 () story (0.1) ·hhh (0.1)
7 uh::::: it's uh:: very very old one
8 En2:→ mhm
9 (0.2)
10 Ch2: uh:::: (0.8) we say it uh:: (0.1) we (0.2) we have
11 uh: (0.9) ((0.2 of which Ch2 is mumbling)) (0.3) I
12 I don't know how to say is (0.3) sometimes in
13 Chinese (0.6) uh:: (0.6) all different words (0.2)
14 come to (0.9) come together
15 (0.2)
16 En2:→ okay=
17 Ch2:→ =and they have a fixed meaning

In excerpt 5.33, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds in line 1 which is followed by Ch2 producing a turn in line 2, and by the end of his turn there is an overlap with En2's turn when she produces a confirmation token (Levinson, 2013) 'yeah' (line 3). This confirmation token indicates that she is accepting Ch2's previous turn and agreeing with it (Clayman, 2013a). After the overlap in lines 2 and 3, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.4 seconds in line 4, and this is followed by Ch2 producing a turn in line 5 as he continues with his explanation through discussing a story that is related to the Chinese idiom. Within Ch2's turn from line 5 to 7, there are 5 intra-turn pauses and 3 pause fillers (Hayashi, 2013). The stretched pause fillers ('uh::') from lines 5 to 7 could have been used to indicate that Ch2 is delaying the production of his turn (Kitzinger, 2013) while holding the floor. En2 produces an acknowledgement token in line 8 ('mhm'), and this is followed by an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds in line 9. In line 10, Ch2 produces another turn from line 10 to 14, and within his turn there are 5 intra-turn pauses that can be seen as a way of slowing the production of his turn in order to delay its progressivity (Antaki and Wilkinson, 2013). Moreover, within his turn (lines 10 to 14), Ch2 produces 3 pause fillers ('uh::') (Antaki and Wilkinson, 2013) and mumbles, which could have been produced as a way to hold the floor.

In line 1 of excerpt 5.34, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds, which is followed by some background noise. In line 2, En2 produces a 'possible pre-closing sequence' (Robinson, 2013: p. 274) when she says 'O↑KAY' in an emphasised and louder volume which might indicate that she is ready to close the topic and move it forward. Ch2 then begins a turn in line 3 which latches with En2's previous turn (line 2). He starts his turn with a stretched pause filler 'uh:.' in line 3 which can be used in this case to delay the production of his turn (Kitzinger, 2013) and to keep the floor. Ch2 produces a long turn from line 3 to 5 by continuing to elaborate on the historical background of the Chinese idioms, thus ignoring En2's sequence closure in line 2. Within his turn, he pauses 4 times and this is followed by En2 producing an in-breath and an acknowledgment token in line 6 ('right') which can indicate that En2 is accepting and agreeing with Ch2's previous turn (Clayman, 2013a). In line 7, Ch2 continues with his turn. Again he starts his turn with a stretched pause filler and pauses a great deal while emphasising the words: 'shorten' and 'in four words'. The pauses within his turn and the stretched pause fillers can again indicate that he is delaying the production of his turn. There is an overlap by the end of Ch2's turn in line 11 when En2 again produces 'okay' as a sequence closure (Schegloff, 2007). In line 13, there is a long inter-turn pause of 0.8 seconds which is followed by Ch2 producing a turn in line 14 as he starts explaining to En2 how he would write the Chinese idiom, again treating En2's previous 'okay' as an opportunity to continue with his turn production. Within Ch2's turn from line 14 to 15, he pauses twice and the end of his turn latches with En2's turn in line 16 when she produces an acknowledgment token ('uh huh'). In line 17, Ch2 starts writing for 5.7 seconds and this is followed by an inter-turn pause of 0.7 seconds in line 18. In line 19, Ch2 begins another turn as he continues to explain to En2 what he has written and the concept of the 'four characters' in relation to Chinese idioms. In the middle of Ch2's turn in line 19, En2 produces an acknowledgement token ('right') which overlaps with Ch2's turn. In line 21, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds and this is followed by En2 producing another 'okay' as a pre-closing sequence (Robinson, 2013) and as a way of moving the conversation forward (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973), however Ch2 continues again elaborating on the same topic (line 23).

In excerpt 5.34, there is a lack of alignment between Ch2 and En2 as En2's turn productions in lines 2, 12, and 22 ('okay') were produced to close the sequence (Schegloff, 2007). However, Ch2 continued producing turns and continued elaborating on the story behind the Chinese idiom in the lines following the 'okays'. This means that in this excerpt there is no 'epistemic congruence' as the 'okays' produced by En2 do not align with Ch2's later turns

(Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011). Moreover, the cause for the disalignment derives from the fact that even though En2 tried twice to close the sequence (lines 2 and 22), Ch2 continued expanding on his turn and by doing so, he indicated that he did not agree with En2's sequence closures (Schegloff, 2007). To conclude, in this excerpt En2 and Ch2 did not display a clear understanding of how the turn-taking system works as they were not able to shift their TCUs when there was a need to. As Ch2 continues elaborating on his previous turns, despite the fact that En2 produced sequence closures ('okay'), this indicates that the two participants in this excerpt were not able to jointly manage this task (Pirainen-Mrsh, 2011).

In excerpt 5.35, Ch2 is still elaborating on the Chinese idiom and the story behind it. In the beginning of the excerpt, En2 produces a laughter token and Ch2 continues elaborating on the idiom. This elaboration by Ch2 continues all throughout the excerpt.

Excerpt 5.35

1 En2: ·hhh [heh]
 2 Ch2: [and tha]t ((0.5 during which there is a
 3 background noise)) that (0.6)uh::: for worse we say
 4 it
 5 (0.4)
 6 Ch2: means (0.3) someone one had something (0.1) first
 7 ·hhh but (.)at[the end] he show (0.5) his (0.6)in
 8 En2: [↑u::h::]
 9 Ch2: a show (0.1) intention
 10 (0.3)
 11 En2:→ [O:::]↑KA:::Y
 12 Ch2:→ [at the end]
 13 (0.7)
 14 Ch2: °uh huh°
 15 (0.2)
 16 En2:→ WOW that's a good one
 17 (0.1)
 18 Ch2:→ y::es °yes°
 19 En2:→ °I like that°
 20 Ch2: ·hhh
 21 (0.7)
 22 Ch2:→and (0.2) also someone else ·hhh (0.3)

23 interesting uh: like uh::: (1.0) ·hhh (0.4)
24 it all about (0.5) very interesting (.) story

In line 1, En2 produces an in-breath which is followed by laughter, and her laughter overlaps with Ch2's turn in line 2 as he continues discussing the historical background of the idiom. Ch2 elaborates more on the story behind the Chinese idiom and he pauses for 0.6 seconds in the middle of his turn. After the intra-turn pause, Ch2 uses a stretched pause filler 'uh:.' (Hayashi, 2013) in line 3 which can indicate that he is trying to delay the production of his turn (Kitzinger, 2013) while trying to continue holding the floor. After the pause-filler, Ch2 continues with his elaboration and at the end of his turn, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.4 seconds in line 5 which is followed by Ch2 continuing with his turn production. In line 6, Ch2 continues with his elaboration, and within his turn he pauses 4 times which can indicate that he is trying to slow the production of his turn (Antaki and Wilkinson, 2013).

Within Ch2's turn in line 7, there is an overlap which is produced by En2 when she uses acknowledgment token 'uh' in line 8. In line 9, Ch2 continues with his turn and at the end of his turn there is an inter-turn pause of 0.3 seconds in line 10. This is followed by En2 producing a stretched sequence closure 'o::ka::y' in line 11. This stretched sequence closure which overlaps with Ch2's turn in line 12 could have been used by En2 as a way to close the topic (the elaboration by Ch2) and move on to the next English idiom on the worksheet. After the overlap in lines 11 and 12, there is an inter-turn pause of 0.7 seconds that occurs in line 13, followed by an acknowledgment token 'uh huh' that is produced by Ch2 in line 14. Here, the acknowledgment token 'uh huh' is produced by Ch2 to acknowledge En2's previous 'sequence closure'. There is then an inter-turn pause of 0.2 seconds in line 15, and in line 16, En2 produces an assessment 'wow that's a good one' of the story that Ch2 has provided her with, and by doing so, En2 treats the information gathered as complete (Heritage, 2013).

In line 17, there is another inter-turn pause of 0.1 seconds and it is followed by Ch2 producing confirmation tokens 'yes yes' as an agreement with En2's previous assessment. This is followed by another assessment 'I like that' by En2 in line 19 which is again used to treat the information that was provided to her by Ch2 in the previous turns as complete (Heritage, 2013). In line 20, Ch2 produces an in-breath and then, after an inter-turn pause of 0.7 seconds in line 21, Ch2 continues with his turn.

In excerpt 5.35, there is an overlap in lines 11 and 12 which can indicate that there might be a competition for the turn-space between the two participants 'at and around turn's possible

completion points' (Hayashi, 2013: p. 187). Moreover, in line 16, En2 uses assessment 'wow that's a good one' which treats the information that she has received from Ch2 as complete (Heritage, 2013) and thus by doing so she is proposing sequence closures. However, Ch2 upgrades his epistemic access by using confirmation 'yes yes' (line 18) which is then followed by another assessment by En2 (Raymond and Heritage, 2006). From line 22 to 24, Ch2 continues with his turn production which can indicate that there is a competition for the floor between them, which causes a disalignment between the two (Stivers, 2008).

5.6 Summary of analysis of interactional competence

In this chapter, I have examined the concept of interactional competence amongst 4 pairs of students (each pair consisting of 1 postgraduate Chinese student and 1 postgraduate English student) using CA. I have analysed the data by examining moments in the conversations where the students displayed interactional competence through studying the ways in which they coordinated their actions (Hall and Pekarek-Doehler, 2011) and mutually co-constructed their knowledge in the discursive practice of tandem language learning/teaching (Young, 2008).

In answering the research question 'what are the characteristics of *interactional competence* for Chinese and English postgraduate students studying in the UK in a tandem language learning context?', four themes have emerged from the data. The first theme is 'maintenance of intersubjectivity through asymmetrical orientation to knowledge' and through this theme I have shown how the participants (En1 and Ch1, En2 and Ch2, En3 and Ch3 and En4 and Ch4) had a clear agreement as to whom has an access to what in each discursive practice. I have also shown that there was an alignment and a clear asymmetrical orientation to knowledge between the participants (En1 and Ch1, En2 and Ch2, En3 and Ch3, and En4 and Ch4) as the turns were facilitated by the participants as they matched the formal design preference of the turns. The second theme that emerged is 'maintenance of intersubjectivity through repair initiations and accomplishments' and I have demonstrated that through the participants' repair initiation and accomplishments, they were able to maintain intersubjectivity. For instance, when the learner in these tandem learning sessions initiated a repair (other-initiation) he/she (Ch1 and Ch2) was able to facilitate the teacher's (En1 and En2) mediation as the teacher was able to accomplish the repair and this enhanced the process of teaching/learning. In other instances, the teacher identified a problem in his/her (En1, En2 and En4) own talk and this was manifested through his/her initiation and accomplishment of a

repair. In these cases, I have shown how the repair-initiations and accomplishments have a potential for enhancing language learning.

The third theme is ‘maintenance of intersubjectivity through situated understandings of ‘Okays’’ and I have demonstrated how the participants (En2 and Ch2, En4 and Ch4) maintained intersubjectivity through their collaborations and understanding of the projection of ‘Okay’ as a sequence closing third. Through that, the participants displayed an understanding of the projection of ‘Okay’ in this discursive practice and they were able to close the topic and move it forward. The last theme that has emerged from my data is the ‘lack of situated understandings of Okay/oh and assessments’. The data showed that there was a lack of intersubjectivity between the participants (En2 and Ch2) when they displayed a lack of understanding of the projection of ‘Okay, oh, and assessments’ as sequence closing third, as in these incidences this caused misalignment between the participants.

Chapter 6. Findings: Intercultural Competence

6.1 Introduction

This set of findings will be looking at answering the second research question

- 2) What are the characteristics of *intercultural competence* for Chinese and English postgraduate students studying in the UK in a tandem learning context?

In order to answer this research question, I will be re-examining the excerpts from the chapter on the findings of interactional competence (chapter 5). I will be studying the themes that emerged from using CA to explore interactional competence and through the lens of CA and interactional competence, I will be examining claims made about intercultural competence. The two themes that will be discussed below which emerged from studying interactional competence are: intersubjectivity and asymmetrical orientation to knowledge and intersubjectivity and repair initiations and accomplishments. This chapter will offer an insight on intercultural competence that 'is deeply grounded in participants' own communicative conduct' (Bolden, 2014: p. 234). The total excerpts that are used in this chapter are 16.

6.2 Intersubjectivity and asymmetrical orientation to knowledge

In chapter 5, I have elaborated on the ways in which the participants displayed asymmetrical orientation to knowledge, and how through that they maintained intersubjectivity and as a result, achieved interactional competence. Thus below, I will examine the same excerpts and, through the lens of CA and interactional competence, show the type of cultural claims that these excerpts demonstrate.

In excerpt 6.1, En1 starts by producing an assessment in line 1: 'next one is a good one'. This refers to the next idiom he will be discussing. In line 3, Ch1 produces an acknowledgment token, and from line 5-6, En1 continues accessing his domain of knowledge by repeating the idiom. As a result, Ch1 produces an in-breath followed by a laughter, and in line 9, En1 starts his turn with a pre-expansion by asking Ch1 'you're heard this one before or not?'. In turn, Ch1 says in line 10 that she has 'never heard of that', and in line 11, En1 produces an assessment by saying it 'is a good one', and this is followed by En1 explaining the idiom in line 13-16.

Excerpt 6.1

1 En1:→ ne- next one is a good one
2 (0.2)
3 Ch1:→ ↑uh ↓huh
4 (0.3)
5 En1: erm:: (0.5) <↑don't ↓look ↑at ↓gift horse (0.2) in
6 the ↓mouth>
7 Ch1:→ .hhh hehe
8 (0.9)
9 En1: you're heard this one be↑fore or not?=
10 Ch1: =n↑o:: [never heard] of ↑that
11 En1:→ i[t's is a good one]
12 (0.3)
13 En1:→yeah >ish ↑use ish use< (0.1) ish useful
14 (0.3)yeah(0.3)↑I ↓WOULD ↑USE ↓IT erm: .hhh (0.8) SO
15 (1.0)↑YOU ↓DON'T ↑LOOK (0.1) so you don't look at
16 ↑something .hhh

In excerpt 6.1, En1 and Ch1 achieve intersubjectivity through their asymmetrical orientation to knowledge as En1 assesses whether Ch1 knows the idiom or not by using a pre-expansion, and when Ch1 answers by saying 'no', En1 continues accessing his domain of knowledge and informs Ch1 of the meaning of the English idiom. However, the asymmetrical orientation to knowledge and the agreement between the two participants regarding who has more access to the English idiom also displays 'intercultural moments' in conversation. Here, En1 treats Ch1 not as a bona fide co-member and he (En1) treats her (Ch1) as one that does not share the taken for granted knowledge (the English idiom). However, this occurs after Ch1 confirms in line 10 that she has never heard of the English idiom 'don't look a gift horse in the mouth'. As a result of Ch1's confirmation of not knowing the idiom, she positions herself in an unknowing position and attributes to herself the identity of a novice. After Ch1 confirms that she has never heard this idiom before, En1 produces an assessment of the idiom in line 11 and proceeds with the explanation of the idiom from line 13 to 16. Through that, En1 aligns himself along the expertise line (Bolden, 2014). Thus, 'intercultural moments' are manifested through En1's and Ch1's asymmetry in their expertise and their agreement as to whom is the expert and whom is the novice in this discursive practice.

In excerpt 6.2, En1 continues with an elaboration of the idiom ‘don’t look a gift horse in the mouth’. After this elaboration in lines 1 to 2, 4 to 5, 7, and 11 to 12, Ch1 produces a laughter in line 3 and acknowledgment tokens in lines 6, 9, and 13. This displays intersubjectivity as there is a clear understanding between the two participants as to whom has access to what and there is no competition for the floor, thus their turns are aligning with each other. The two identities of novice/expert, in this excerpt, are invoked and sustained by the two participants (Park, 2007) as En1 is the one who keeps producing turns as he informs Ch1 of the meaning of the English idiom ‘don’t look a gift horse in the mouth’. In turn, Ch1 is the one who produces acknowledgment tokens and thus acknowledging that En1’s turns are still in progress. The asymmetry in knowledge demonstrates cultural differences between En1 and Ch1 as En1 treats Ch1 as a novice in the area and Ch1 treats En1 as the expert who provides her with information regarding the English idiom. By ascribing to each other the identity of a novice/expert, the asymmetry in knowledge is maintained by both participants all throughout the excerpt (Hosoda, 2006; Bolden, 2014).

Excerpt 6.2

1 En1: (0.7) ah gift horse (0.9) erm::: (0.6) a (0.1) gift
2 (0.1)and a horse (0.2)
3 Ch1: .hh heheh
4 En1: (0.3) in the mouth and it (0.1) basically just
5 ↑mea:ns(0.4) don’t (0.1) be <ongrate↑ful> (0.7)
6 Ch1:→mhm
7 En1: (0.2) for <receiving a pre↑sent>
8 →(0.3)
9 Ch1:→↑uh:::
10 →(0.2)
11 En1: so:: (0.1) it ↑say::: (1.3) someone bought you a
12 birthday present (0.1)
13 Ch1:→↑uh ↓huh

In excerpt 6.3, En1 continues elaborating upon the English idiom from lines 1 to 3, 5 to 7, 10 to 11, and 13. In turn, Ch1 produces acknowledgment tokens such as ‘yeah’, ‘mhm’. This can indicate an agreement between the two participants as to whom has the primary access in this discursive practice. There is no competition for the floor between En1 and Ch1, as although there are long inter-turn pauses in lines 9 and 15, En1 is the one who proceeds with the talk as he exercises his expert identity (Park, 2007), and thus both participants show an

understanding regarding who has access to what. Moreover, in line 16, En1 produces a confirmation check ‘yeah?’, and in line 17, Ch1 produces an acknowledgment token ‘uh huh’ regarding the information En1 has provided her with so far. Both participants demonstrate intersubjectivity in this excerpt through their asymmetrical orientation to knowledge as student/teacher.

Excerpt 6.3

1 En1: (0.7)a:::nd (0.9) <you didn't seem happy to receive
 2 ↓it> or you didn't >o yit o yit o yit o yit< (0.2)
 3 you didn't say ↑thank ↓you ↑for ↓it
 4 Ch1: →yeah
 5 En1: (0.6)someone may ↑say (0.4) well (0.1) don't look
 6 (0.1) don't look (0.1) at gift (0.2)don't look at
 7 gift horse in the [mouth]
 8 Ch1: [hhh]
 9 →(0.8)
 10 En1: like you should be G↑RATEFUL (0.2) for
 11 [re]ceiving
 12 Ch1: →[°mhm°]
 13 En1: some↑thing=
 14 Ch1: → =°mhm°
 15 →(0.5)
 16 En1: yeah?
 17 Ch1: →↑uh ↓huh
 18 →(0.2)

Through this asymmetry in knowledge, in excerpt 6.3, En1 and Ch1 not only display interactional competence but also they attribute to each other the identity of a novice/expert and the identity of a student/teacher (Hosoda, 2006; Bolden, 2014). Additionally, cultural differences between the two participants are manifested in this excerpt through the asymmetry in knowledge as Ch1 keeps producing acknowledgment tokens after En1's turns which indicate that she has a clear understanding that his turns are still in progress. Additionally, En1 treats Ch1 not as a bone fide co-member (Bolden, 2014), as after informing her of the meaning of the English idiom he produces a confirmation check in line 16. Through this, En1 demonstrates that he orients to Ch1 as the one with a relatively low cultural expertise (Bolden, 2014) as he checks that she now understands the meaning of the idiom ‘don't look a gift horse

in the mouth' after his explanation and in turn Ch1 produces an acknowledgment token in line 17 which confirms her understanding.

In the following excerpt (6.4), En2 elaborates upon the English idiom 'to sweep her off her feet', and through this, she claims epistemic authority and expertise in the area. Conversely, in lines 2 and 12, Ch2 produces acknowledgment tokens, and in so doing, cedes the epistemic authority to En2. Moreover, there is no competition for the floor as while En2 produces her long turns from lines 6 to 11 and 14 to 18, Ch2 produces acknowledgment tokens which align with En2's turns as they are helping with the progressivity of En2's turns. This asymmetry in knowledge displays intersubjectivity between the two participants.

Excerpt 6.4

1 En2: that uhm:: °you know the the girl° (0.4)
 2 Ch2: →[°↑uhu ↓huh°]
 3 En2: [((drawing))] [°here's the girl°] ((0.5 seconds
 4 [((drawing))]during which En2
 5 is drawing))
 6 En2: →standing here ·hhh and the GUY comes in
 7 ((0.7 seconds during which En2 is drwaing))
 8 [and like] ((1.2 seconds of which En2 is
 9 [((drawing))] he's all amazing and ((0.2
 10 seconds of which En2 is drawing))strong ()
 11 great and HE RUNS IN
 12 Ch2: →=<°↑uhu ↓huh ↑uhu ↓huh ↑h[uh°>]
 13 En2: → [w]o:: and then like
 14 ((0.2 seconds of which En2 is drawing)) sweeps her
 15 up into his arm so he's holding her °like this°
 16 ((1.3 seconds of which En2 is drawing)) °and she's°
 17 °there° ((0.5 seconds of which En2 is drawing))
 18 () °there in his arms°

Through this asymmetry in knowledge in excerpt 6.4, En2 and Ch2 attribute to each other the identity of a novice/expert. While En2 keeps accessing her domain of knowledge and thus produces long turns, Ch2 cedes the epistemic authority to En2 by producing acknowledgment tokens and thereby acknowledging that she is the expert in the area. En2, on the other hand, treats Ch2 as a novice and as one who does not share with her the taken for granted knowledge which is the English idiom ('sweep her off her feet'). Through the identities of a

In excerpt 6.5, the asymmetry between En4 and Ch4 indicates that there is a clear understanding between them and, as a result, they maintain intersubjectivity. However, in terms of intercultural competence, what this excerpt reveals to us is that through this asymmetry in knowledge, the two participants are ascribing to each other the identity of a novice and expert and through that, the two participants are demonstrating cultural differences between them. En4 shows expertise in the area of English idioms through exercising his expert identity (Park, 2007) as an English person by producing long turns as he expands on the meaning of the English idiom ‘to have a chip on one’s shoulder’. On the other hand, by Ch4 not trying to produce TCUs after the inter-turn pauses and by producing an acknowledgment token, she is ascribing to En4 the identity of an expert and to herself the identity of a novice (Hosoda, 2006; Bolden, 2014).

In the following excerpt (6.6), the roles of En2 and Ch2 are reversed. Although this session was dedicated to teaching English idioms to the Chinese student, En2 in this excerpt has asked Ch2 whether there is a similar idiom in Chinese to ‘sweep her off her feet’. Therefore, in this excerpt En2 plays the role of the learner and Ch2 the role of the teacher. In line 1, En2 starts by producing a question as he seeks confirmation from Ch2 regarding the meaning of the Chinese idiom and Ch2, in turn, produces a confirmation token ‘uh huh’ in line 2. In line 4, Ch2 continues with his elaboration of the Chinese idiom, and in line 6, En2 produces another turn by asking about the Chinese idiom’s meaning ‘they really don’t like?’. In line 7, Ch2 produces a confirmation token ‘yes’ and in line 9, he continues elaborating on the Chinese idiom. In line 10, En2 produces an acknowledgment token ‘uh’ and in line 12 and 14, En2 repeats the meaning of the Chinese idiom. In line 15, Ch2 produces a turn which overlaps with En2’s turn in line 14. Ch2’s turn in line 15 starts with ‘I’ and then he produces a confirmation token ‘yes’ which is followed by more elaboration from him. In line 19, Ch2 continues explaining the Chinese idiom and thereafter in line 20, En2 produces an acknowledgment token ‘uh huh’.

Excerpt 6.6

- 1 En2: ➔really?
- 2 Ch2: uh huh
- 3 (0.2)
- 4 Ch2: which (0.1) means (0.4) you guess you guess it
- 5 (0.5)
- 6 En2: ➔THAT (0.5) they really don’t like?

7 Ch2: (0.7) yes
 8 (0.1)
 9 Ch2: they hate him (0.3) [too]much
 10 En2: [↑uh:::]
 11 (0.5)
 12 En2:→ you can't even live under the sa[me WEATHE]R
 13 Ch2:→ [((mumbling))]
 14 En2:→[is the]
 15 Ch2:→[I] yes we (0.1) can't (0.4) uh::: we can't
 16 (0.1) you know uh::: (0.1) wear (0.5) the same
 17 weather
 18 (0.1)
 19 Ch2: we [can't] [take it] on
 20 En2: [↑uh::] [↓uh::]

In excerpt 6.6, there is a clear asymmetry between the two participants as En2 attributes to Ch2 the identity of the expert and Ch2 attributes to En2 the identity of a novice all throughout the excerpt. This displays cultural differences between them as although this session was dedicated to teaching English, Ch2 treats En2 not as bona fide co-member as she (En2) does not share with him the taken for granted knowledge of the Chinese idiom (Bolden, 2014). This demonstrates that the two identities of a novice/expert are highly negotiable as in this excerpt, the roles of the two participants have been reversed accordingly (Park, 2007).

In the following excerpt (6.7), after En1 has finished explaining the meaning of the idiom 'to fly off the handle', Ch1 produces a turn in line 1 by asking En1 'do you use that a lot?'. In turn, En1 starts explaining from line 2 to 8 whether he uses it and explains that his mum 'uses it quite a lot'. By the end of his turn in line 8, Ch1 produces an acknowledgment token 'hmm'. By Ch1 producing a question in line 1, she is orienting to her role as a learner: she has designed her turn in line 1 as a question and ended it with high intonation to display uncertainty towards the usage of the idiom. En1, on the other hand, orients to his role as teacher as he is providing Ch1 with information regarding the usage of the idiom. Through this asymmetry in knowledge, the two participants maintain intersubjectivity.

Excerpt 6.7

1 Ch1:→ do ↑you::: (0.2) use (.) that a lot?
 2 En1: (0.6) erm:: (1.6) ↑yeah like (0.1) ↑yeah (0.19) if
 3 you said that to someone they'd defiantly know what

4 you meant (0.5) I WOULDN'T USE IT THAT OFTEN (0.1)
5 but(0.3) I've (.) I've defiantly used it before
6 (0.3)so uh (1.2) my mum uses it quite a lot (1.6)
7 erm but yeah that's (0.2)quite a well known one (.)
8 yeah °[definitely] yeah (0.5) definitely°
9 Ch1: [hmm]

Through the participants' asymmetry in knowledge, they are ascribing to each other the identity of a novice/expert. This is demonstrated through En1 not treating Ch1 as a member of his (En1) own culture. By Ch1 designing her turn as a question in line 1, in asking about the English idiom's usage, she is ascribing to herself the identity of an outsider and she is treating En1 as a representative of the English culture (Park, 2007). As a result, the asymmetrical alignment between En1 and Ch1 becomes aggravated in this excerpt. When Ch1 designs her turn as a question (line 1), through this she requests more information from En1 regarding how often he uses the English idiom 'fly off the handle'. This is then followed by a long turn by En1 in which he explains to her that he does not use it that often but that his 'mum uses it quite a lot'. This excerpt reveals some 'intercultural moments' in conversation that manifest some cultural differences between both participants. Both participants agree that they do not share the taken for granted knowledge of the English idiom 'fly off the handle', and that there are cultural differences between them (Hosoda, 2006; Park, 2007; Bolden, 2014).

In the following excerpt (6.8), En3 lists all the English idioms that she has explained the meaning of to Ch3 and asks whether there are any similar idioms in Chinese. This occurs from line 1 to 5 and she ends her turn in a rising intonation as a way of indicating that she is asking a question. In turn, Ch3 gazes at the handout and then in line 9, En3 produces another turn by saying 'in Chinese?' formulating her turn again as a question. In line 10, Ch3 gazes again at the handout and in line 11 she says 'eat like a bird'. In line 12, En3 repeats the idiom 'eat like a bird?' ending her turn in a rising pitch which can indicate that her turn here is formulated again as a question (Enfield, 2013). From line 13 to 14, Ch3 gazes at the handout while nodding, and in line 15, En3 produces another question as she asks Ch3 'is it the same?'. In turn, Ch3 nods from line 16 to 17 and in line 18, En3 produces another question as she asks Ch3 whether the English idiom 'eat like a bird' 'is the same meaning?' in Chinese, and again, in line 19, Ch3 nods. In line 20, En3 produces another question as she says 'anything else?' and in turn, Ch3 moves her head from side to side. These sequences of questions by En3 and the answers by Ch3 display asymmetry in knowledge between the two interactants. En3 elicits information from Ch3 as she plays the role of the teacher and Ch3

provides her with the information she is asking for and thus plays the role of a student. There is an agreement between them as to whom is the one who produces questions (En3) and whom is the one who produces answers (Ch3). This is clear in this excerpt as there is no competition for the floor but rather a mutual understanding in terms of who does what.

Excerpt 6.8

1 En3: >to buy a pig in a poke< (0.3) >grin like a
2 Cheshire cat eat like a bi::rd be in a dog house
3 play chicken< and slip of the tongue ·hhh
4 in Chi↑ne:se oop sorry break your neck yeah well
5 done ·hhh are there (0.2) is there anything
6 →similar?
7 Ch3: ((1.5 seconds during which Ch3 is gazing at the
8 handout))
9 En3: →in Chinese?
10 Ch3: ((1.2 seconds during which Ch3 is gazing at the
11 hand-out)) °eat like a bird°
12 En3: →eat like a bird?
13 Ch3: ((0.3 seconds in which Ch3 is gazing at the hand-out
14 while nodding))
15 En3: →°yeah:??° is it the same?
16 Ch3: ((0.3 seconds in which Ch3 is gazing at the hand-out
17 while nodding))
18 En3: →the same meaning?
19 Ch3: ((0.5 seconds during which Ch3 is nodding)) ·hhh
20 En3: anything else?
21 Ch3: ((5.1 seconds during which Ch3 is moving her head
22 from side to side))

This asymmetry in knowledge between En3 and Ch3 demonstrates intersubjectivity as they are displaying an understanding of their roles accordingly. What this excerpt also reveals to us in terms of intercultural competence (through the lens of CA and interactional competence) is how the two participants' identities are formulated. As mentioned above, through the clear asymmetrical orientation to knowledge, En3 and Ch3 are playing the roles of a student/teacher accordingly. Additionally, this shows that although En3 is playing the role of the teacher as she tries to elicit information from Ch3 regarding the equivalent Chinese idioms to the English ones they have discussed, through the formulation of her (En3) turns in lines 5

to 6 and also line 9, she is ascribing to Ch3 the identity of an expert and the one who is a representative of the Chinese culture (Park, 2007). By Ch3 providing En3 with the answers, she is treating En3 not as bona fide co-member (Bolden, 2014) of the Chinese culture and as someone who does not share with her the knowledge of Chinese idioms. Thus, as the two interactants ascribe to each other the identity of a novice/expert, they display cultural differences between them (Hosoda, 2006; Bolden, 2014). However, what this excerpt also demonstrates is that the two participants' identities are highly negotiable and locally occasioned (Park, 2007), as although En3 was playing the role of the teacher and Ch3 was playing the role of the student, they have both ascribed to each other the identity of a novice/expert accordingly. Through En3's elicitation techniques (the formulation of her turns as questions) from Ch3, she attributed to Ch3 the identity of an expert, and by Ch3 providing her with the information she needed, Ch3 attributed to En3 the identity of a novice.

In excerpt 6.9, En3 continues with her elicitation technique as she tries to find out whether there are similar idioms in Chinese to the English ones she and Ch3 have discussed. En3 starts in line 1 by saying 'no?' ending her turn in a rising pitch which again indicates that her turn is formulated as a question. From line 2 to 3, Ch3 moves her head from side to side, and in line 4, En3 produces a turn which again is ended in a rising pitch as she asks 'they are very different?' referring to the Chinese idioms. In line 5, Ch3 nods, and in line 6, En3 produces another turn by formulating it as a question ('yeah?') as she ends it in a rising pitch. In turn, Ch3 says 'yeah' in line 7 as a confirmation of what En3 has been asking regarding the Chinese idioms being different to the English ones. In line 9, En3 produces another turn by formulating it again as a question as she ends it again in a rising pitch, and in turn, Ch3 nods in line 10. From line 13 to 14, En3 produces another turn and she ends it again in a rising intonation formulating it as a question as she asks Ch3 'do you have anything at all that's links to animals?'. From line 15 to 16, Ch3 gazes at the handout, and in line 19, En3 initiates a repair by saying 'would you say:::' in a stretched manner as previously, Ch3 had not provided her with an answer to the question asked. In line 20, Ch3 accomplishes the repair by producing a confirmation token 'yeah' which is followed by 'a lot' in line 21. As we can see, throughout this excerpt, En3 is the one who produces questions and Ch3 is the one who provides her with answers which demonstrates that there is a clear asymmetry between them as there is no competition for the floor.

Excerpt 6.9

1 En3: no?

2 Ch3: ((0.1 seconds during which Ch3 is moving her head
3 from side to side))
4 En3: →they are very different?
5 Ch3: ((0.8 seconds during which Ch3 is nodding))
6 En3: →°yeah?° ·hhh
7 Ch3: (2.7) °yeah°
8 (0.1)
9 En3: yeah?
10 Ch3 ((0.2 seconds during which Ch3 nods while directing
11 her gaze at En3 and then redirects her gaze at the
12 hand-out))
13 En3: →·hhh (.) <do you have anything else that> >DO YOU
14 HAVE ANYTHING AT ALL< that's links to animals?
15 Ch3: ((0.4 seconds during which Ch3 is gazing at the
16 hand-out))
17 En3: ·hhh
18 (0.1)
19 En3: would you say::
20 Ch3: ((0.4 seconds during which Ch3 is nodding)) °yeah°
21 (0.1) °a lot°

Through the lens of CA and interactional competence, excerpt 6.9 demonstrates, via the asymmetrical orientation to knowledge between the two participants, how they (the two participants) attribute to each other the identity of a novice/expert. Although En3 is again playing the role of the teacher as she tries to elicit information from Ch3, through her elicitation techniques she is ascribing to Ch3 the identity of an expert. Due to her (En3) turn formulations (as questions), she is displaying that she does not share with Ch3 the taken for granted knowledge of the Chinese idioms, and thus ascribes to herself the identity of a novice in this area. On the other hand, through the formulation of Ch3's turns as she provides En3 with the information En3 is requesting regarding the Chinese idioms, she is attributing to herself the identity of an expert and to En3 the identity of a novice and not as bona fide co-member (Bolden, 2014). This excerpt also reveals to us that identity is highly negotiable as the teacher (En3) and the student (Ch3) in this expert ascribed and oriented to their identities accordingly (Park, 2007).

Using CA to examine Ch1 and En1's interactional competence in excerpt 6.14 enables us to see how the two participants interact and how, for instance, they orient to each other's identities. In this excerpt, after Ch1 explains from lines 2-14 the equivalent Chinese idiom to the English one 'don't look a gift horse in the mouth', En1 initiates and accomplishes a repair from line 17-18 as he identifies a problem in the talk in the previous turns by Ch1. As En1 identifies a problem in the talk, he is showing expertise in the domain of the English idioms, precisely the idiom 'don't look a gift horse in the mouth' (Kitzinger and Mandelbaum, 2013; Bolden, 2014). On the other hand, through the repair-initiation and accomplishment, En1 is ascribing to Ch1 the identity of a novice and NNS and to himself the identity of an expert and NS, as through the repair-initiation and accomplishment, En1 is demonstrating that Ch1 needs more clarification regarding the meaning of the English idiom 'don't look a gift horse in the mouth'. Through that, cultural and linguistic differences between En1 and Ch1 are exposed (Park, 2007; Bolden, 2014).

Hence, CA exposes for us the cultural differences between the interactants through the ways in which they ascribe to each other the identity of a novice and expert. However, different models of intercultural competence/intercultural communication competence, such as Hofstede (2001), attribute certain characteristics such as 'individualism/collectivism' and 'masculinity/femininity' to people from different cultures, and treat people from different cultures as groups rather than individuals and ignore the issue of context (Martin and Nakayama, 1999).

In the following excerpt (6.18), Ch1 asks En1 about the difference between 'idioms' and 'slungs' in lines 4 and 5. In turn, En1 initiates a repair in line 6 as he asks Ch1 to clarify what she has just said, ending his turn with a rising intonation. In line 7, Ch1 initiates another repair as she says 'and a slung?', also ending her turn with a rising intonation. In turn, En1 repeats the word 'slung' and in line 9, Ch1 produces an acknowledgment token 'yeah'. This results in En1 repairing the talk in line 10 as he says 'slang'. Ch1 repeats the word 'slang' which results in En1 producing a turn in line 13 by starting to explain the difference between idioms and slang.

Excerpt 6.18

1 En1: °[definite]ly yeah (0.5) definitely°
 2 Ch1: [mhm]
 3 (0.2)

4 Ch1: yeah may I ↑aska what's the difference of idioms
5 and a slungs?
6 En1:→ (1.2) idioms and ↑what sor[ry?]
7 Ch1:→ [and] a slung?
8 En1: (0.9) slung
9 Ch1: (0.1) ↑yeah
10 En1:→ (.) s↑la↓ng
11 (0.1)
12 Ch1:→ slang hhh=
13 En1: =[↑all ↓right] [slang is just erm]
14 Ch1: [s] [orry bad pronunciation]
15 (0.5)
16 En1: idioms (0.14) are:: just phrases (0.6) that (0.4)
17 mean something

Again from an interactional competence perspective, we are able to see in this excerpt that through the repair initiation and accomplishment, En1 and Ch1 achieve intersubjectivity. However, from an intercultural competence point of view (through the lens of CA and interactional competence), this excerpt reveals to us some linguistic/cultural differences between the two participants. As Ch1 addresses En1 with a question about the difference between idioms and slang (lines 4 to 5), she is, through that, orienting to his (En1) entitlement as an NS who might potentially provide her with the linguistic and cultural resources she is seeking. In turn, En1 aligns with the invoked NNS identity (Park, 2007) by firstly initiating repair in line 6 to seek a clarification of her request, secondly by accomplishing the repair as he identifies what she meant, and thirdly by proceeding with the explanation of the difference between idioms and slang (lines 16 to 18). Moreover, as En1 accomplishes the repair, providing Ch1 with the right pronunciation of the word 'slang' (line 10), Ch1, in turn, accepts his repair by repeating the repaired word (Hosoda, 2006) 'slung' in line 12. Through that, Ch1 attributes to En1 the identity of an expert and NS, and En1 attributes to Ch1 the identity of a novice and a NNS (Hosoda, 2006; Park, 2007; Kitzinger and Mandelbaum, 2013; Bolden, 2014).

In excerpt 6.19, En2 asks Ch2 to guess the meaning of the English idiom 'sweep them off their feet'. In line 1, Ch2 repeats the idiom which is then followed by a laughter in line 3. Ch2 then repeats the idiom again in line 5, and after a long inter-turn pause in line 6, Ch2, in line 7, says 'uhu::::' in a stretched manner which could have been used here to delay the production of his turn and to show hesitance (Kitzinger, 2013) regarding the meaning of the

idiom as he tries to guess. In line 9, Ch2 produces a turn by saying what this idiom could mean ('forgot some old thing'), after which En2 produces a turn in line 11 by saying 'no' as a repair accomplishment. In line 13, Ch2 tries to guess the meaning of the idiom again as he says 'uhm:.' in a stretched manner which again indicates hesitation (Kitzinger, 2013). Subsequently, in line 14, En2 produces a turn by starting to explain the meaning of the English idiom 'sweep them off their feet'.

Excerpt 6.19

1 Ch2: sweep (0.1) them (0.2)of (0.4) their f:: feet:
 2 (0.4)
 3 Ch2: heh heh
 4 (0.7)
 5 Ch2: °sweep them of° (0.5) °their feet°
 6 (1.1)
 7 Ch2: °uhu°:::
 8 (3.8)
 9 Ch2: →forget ↑some (0.5) ↑old ↓thing
 10 (0.5)
 11 En2: →no
 12 (0.5)
 13 Ch2: ·hhh uhm::: (0.1)
 14 En2: →if you sweep somebody (0.1) of their feet
 15 (0.4)
 16 Ch2: ↑uhu ↓huh=

From an interactional competence view point, En2 and Ch2 maintain intersubjectivity in this excerpt, as they both orient to their roles of student/teacher accordingly. By accomplishing the repair in line 11, and by deciding to proceed with the explanation of the idiom (line 14), En2 adopts the role of a teacher. Moreover, Ch2 orients to his role as a student as he downgrades his epistemic authority in the matter and upgrades En2's as he shows hesitation regarding the meaning of the idiom. What this excerpt demonstrates in terms of intercultural competence is that En2 ascribes to Ch2 the identity of a novice and Ch2 ascribes to En2 the identity of an expert. En2, for instance, attributes to Ch2 the identity of a novice by accomplishing a repair as Ch2 demonstrates a lack of competency through his hesitation towards the meaning of the English idiom 'sweep them off their feet'. Additionally, through Ch2's hesitation towards the meaning of the English idiom, he (Ch2) attributes to En2 the

identity of an expert and thus she (En2) proceeds with the explanation of the idiom (Hosoda, 2006; Kitzinger and Mandelbum, 2013; Bolden, 2014). Thus ‘intercultural moments’ are revealed in this excerpt through the participants’ display of cultural and linguistic differences (Bolden, 2014).

In excerpt 6.20, En2 proceeds with the telling as she starts explaining the meaning of the idiom ‘sweep them off their feet’ (line 3). In line 4, Ch2 repeats the meaning of the idiom and he ends his turn with a high intonation which could indicate that he is formulating his turn as a question (Enfield, 2013) that needs an answer. Ch2’s turn in line 5 is produced as other-initiated repair as he is asking for confirmation from En2. In line 7, En2 then produces a confirmation token ‘yeah’ as she accomplishes the repair. Ch2 then repeats the actual idiom from line 8-9 and in line 11, En2 produces another confirmation token ‘yeah’. Ch2 then repeats the meaning of the idiom from line 13-14 as other-initiated repair as he emphasises the last word (‘you’) in his turn. This other-initiated repair could be a request for confirmation from En2. In line 16, En2 accomplishes the repair as she produces another confirmation token ‘yes’ and she then proceeds in line 18 with further explanation regarding the meaning of the idiom.

Excerpt 6.20

1 En2: →°↑r↓ight°
2 (0.6)
3 En2: >it means you make them fall in love with you<
4 (1.4)
5 Ch2: → fall in love with you?
6 (0.2)
7 En2: →°ye[ah°]
8 Ch2: → [y] ou make (0.2) you swep (0.2) them ·hhh
9 (0.2) on (0.4) their feet
10 (0.2)
11 En2: → YEAH
12 (0.2)
13 Ch2: → means you make (0.1) them fall in
14 love(0.2) °with°(0.3) you
15 (0.2)
16 En2: → yes
17 (0.1)
18 En2: ·hhh AND THE IDEA IS (0.5)

In excerpt 6.20, En2 and Ch2 achieve intersubjectivity as they are both orienting appropriately to their roles as student/teacher. Ch2's repair-initiations (lines 5, 8 to 9, and 13 to 14), for example, were produced to seek help and confirmation from En2 regarding the meaning of the English idiom 'sweep them off their feet'. By doing so, Ch2 orients to his limited expertise in the English language/culture and he treats En2 as the language expert. En2's repair accomplishments were produced to provide Ch2 with confirmation regarding the meaning of the idiom 'sweep them off their feet' and by doing so, she orients to her status as a language expert (Hosoda, 2006). To conclude, what this demonstrates to us in terms of intercultural competence is that due to the repair-initiations by Ch2 as he seeks confirmations from En2, he is ascribing to En2 the identity of an expert, whereas through En2's repair accomplishments, she (En2) is not only showing that she is the expert in this field but she is treating Ch2 as a novice and as someone who does not share with her the taken for granted knowledge (Bolden, 2014) of the English idiom 'sweep them off their feet'. This asymmetry in knowledge reveals 'intercultural moments' in conversation as the two participants demonstrate cultural differences between them (Bolden, 2014) through their repair-initiations and accomplishments.

In the following excerpt (6.22), after En4 cedes the epistemic authority to Ch4 when he asks her whether there is a similar idiom in Chinese, Ch4 then accesses her epistemic primacy by explaining to En4 that Chinese idioms consist of four characters (lines 3 to 5, 8 to 9). However, by the end of Ch4's turn in line 9, En4 produces in line 10 a sequence-closure 'okay' (Schegloff, 2007) which overlaps with Ch4's turn. Following this, in line 14 and 16, En4 initiates a repair by asking Ch4 again whether there a similar idiom in Chinese, and in line 15, Ch4 produces acknowledgment token and a confirmation ('ah yeah') and it is followed by repairing the talk in line 17 as she says 'kind of understand it'.

Excerpt 6.22

1 Ch4: yes
 2 (0.7)
 3 Ch4: AND (0.6) heh mhm:: they're quite like (0.5)
 4 useful just ↑four ↑characters (0.5) to:: describe
 5 a:: long sentences
 6 (0.2)
 7 En4: [erm]
 8 Ch4: [peo]ple can under↑stand ↓it just in four

9 cha[racters]

10 En4:→ [o↑kay] it's exactly con↑densed

11 (0.2)

12 Ch4: yes

13 (1.6)

14 En4:→ but do you have an idea that similar to (0.9)

15 Ch4:→ a[h:: ↑yeah]

16 En4:→ [to that one]

17 (0.4)

18 Ch4:→ kind of understand it

19 (1.4)

As discussed in the previous chapter, through the repair initiation and accomplishment, the two participants in this excerpt achieve intersubjectivity. This excerpt shows that through En4's other-initiated repair because of the lack of competency by Ch4, he orients to his role as the teacher and thus the expert in the area, and he also ascribes to Ch4 the identity of an outsider. As En4 realises that Ch4 is not providing him with the answer to the question he has asked originally (is there any similar idiom in Chinese to the English one 'have a chip on your shoulder'), he therefore initiates a repair in line 14 as he rephrases the question and through that reveals to Ch4 that she is not a fully competent member of some domain of expertise (Kitzinger and Mandelbaum, 2013), which in this case is the English language. En4 and Ch4 display in this excerpt their asymmetry in knowledge through the repair-initiation and accomplishment and thus orient accordingly to their roles as novice/expert (Hosoda, 2006; Kitzinger and Mandelbaum, 2013; Bolden, 2014). To conclude, through the use of CA, this excerpt reveals to us the identity of the participants and the cultural differences between them (Bolden, 2014). Other models of intercultural competence/intercultural communication competence would, instead, ascribe certain identities to the participants prior to their talk (Hofstede, 2001) and would look at the notion of intercultural competence as a quality that is possessed by an individual (Bennett, 1986; Byram, 1997; Bennett, 1998) rather than as a process that is jointly constructed by all participants involved.

In the following excerpt (6.23), En4 again starts his turn in line 1 with a repair-initiation as he is paraphrasing the question that he asked Ch4 previously, regarding whether there are any similar proverbs in Chinese to the English one they have discussed. En4 continues with his repair-initiation in lines 2, 3, and 6, and just after a long inter-turn pause in line 7, Ch4 accomplishes the repair from lines 8-10 as she says 'it should have...'. In line 11, En4

produces an acknowledgment token ‘yeah’, and in lines 12 and 14 to 15, Ch4 continues with her repair accomplishment in which she says to En4 ‘think about it if I wanna useful characters...’ referring to the equivalent Chinese idiom to the English one ‘to have a chip on one’s shoulder’.

Excerpt 6.23

1 En4:➔ but uh:: is there I think (0.2) well I think the
 2 question is (0.2)is there is there like a saying or
 3 a proverb in Chinese:: (0.4) that [means] something
 4 Ch4: [↑uh::]
 5 (0.9)
 6 En4:➔ it’s like the ↑same as ↑that
 7 (1.0)
 8 Ch4:➔ it should have I just (0.1) erm (0.3)heh(0.7)
 9 e(hh)rm heh(0.5) I pro(hh)bobaly need the time
 10 to thi-(0.4)
 11 En4: yeah
 12 Ch4: t(hh) thi(hh)nk about it
 13 (0.8)
 14 Ch4:➔ if if I wanna ↑use:ful: (0.5) characters (0.5) but
 15 they’re longer(0.7) °you know °
 16 (1.0)

This excerpt demonstrates the cultural differences between the two participants, as by En4’s other-initiated repair, he is showing expertise in the area and in doing so, he is ascribing to Ch4 the identity of an outsider. En4 initiates a repair (lines 1 to 3 and 6) as he again realises that Ch4 did not provide him with the answer to the question he posed. Through that, he conveys asymmetries in linguistic and cultural expertise between him and Ch4. Therefore, in terms of intercultural competence, this excerpt can only reveal to us, through the use of CA, the cultural differences between En4 and Ch4 (Hosoda, 2006; Kitinger and Mandelbaum, 2013; Bolden, 2014).

In excerpt 6.24, there are repair-initiations and accomplishments produced by both En4 and Ch4. For instance, from line 8 to 12, Ch4 initiates and accomplishes a repair as she elaborates on the differences between proverbs and four characters. En4, in turn, produces an agreement token ‘right’ in line 14 In line 16, Ch4 continues with her repair accomplishment as she continues explaining the difference between four characters and proverbs. En4 then produces

23 En4: okay
 24 (0.6)
 25 Ch4: → but proverbs usually: is a sentence
 26 (0.5)
 27 Ch4: longer
 28 (0.1)
 29 En4: → right okay
 30 (0.1)
 31 En4: → so I think maybe more the the f- the short one
 32 is the like an ↑expression
 33 (0.5)
 34 Ch4: °yes°
 35 (1.0)

In excerpt 6.24, both participants achieve intersubjectivity as through the repair initiations and accomplishments, the two participants are demonstrating asymmetry in knowledge. This asymmetry is highly negotiable and locally occasioned as both En4 and Ch4 change their roles from expert to novice and vice versa accordingly. Both participants reclaim authoritative access when they realise there is a need for a repair despite who is the teacher and who is the learner in this excerpt. To conclude, this excerpt shows that the identity of En4 and Ch4 changes from the expert to the novice and vice versa and this demonstrates that these two identities are negotiable and not fixed (Hosoda, 2006; Park, 2007; Kitzinger and Mandelbaum, 2013; Bolden, 2014). This showcases some of the problems with some of the intercultural competence/intercultural communicative competence models, as many of them do attribute certain identities to people from different cultures such as individualism vs. collectivism (Hofstede, 2001). Byram (1997), within his intercultural communicative competence model, treats cultures as spatial entities (Matsuo, 2012) which in itself is a problem as the analysis of this excerpt highlights that every interaction is highly negotiable and locally occasioned (Park, 2007).

6.4 Summary of analysis of intercultural competence

In this chapter, I have examined the concept of intercultural competence through the lens of interactional competence. I have used CA as my main method of analysis in order to study what interactional competence tell us about the interactants' intercultural competence. I have examined the concept of intercultural competence through the lens of interactional

competence and used CA as my main method of analysis in order to study what interactional competence tell us about the interactants' intercultural competence. Two themes have been discussed in trying to answer the research question 'what are the characteristics of *intercultural competence* for Chinese and English postgraduate students studying in the UK in a tandem learning context?' The first theme is 'intersubjectivity and asymmetrical orientation to knowledge' where 'intercultural moments' in conversation were manifested in which the participants displayed mutual understandings and asymmetrical orientation to knowledge through ascribing to each other the identity of a novice/expert accordingly. For instance, when discussing 'English idioms', the Chinese participants (Ch1, Ch2, and Ch4) ascribed to the English participants (En1, En2, and En4) the identity of an expert and the English participants ascribed to the Chinese participants the identity of a novice (an outsider/not as bone fide co-member). In addition, when discussing Chinese idioms, the Chinese participants (Ch2 and Ch3) attributed to the English participants (En2 and En3) the identity of a novice and the English participants attributed to the Chinese participants the identity of an expert. This has not only displayed cultural differences between the participants but also demonstrated that the two identities of a novice/expert are highly negotiable as the participants' identities have been adapted accordingly.

The second theme that emerged is 'intersubjectivity and repair-initiations and accomplishments'. The data that have been discussed under this theme has illustrated several points. Firstly, when the teacher (En1, En2, and En4) in these tandem learning sessions initiated and accomplished a repair when identifying a problem in the talk, he/she through that ascribed to themselves the identity of an expert and the identity of novice to the student (Ch1, Ch2, and Ch4). Secondly, when the student (Ch2) initiated a repair to seek confirmation from the teacher (En2), he/she through that attributed to the teacher the identity of an expert, and when the teacher accomplished the repair, he/she attributed to themselves the identity of an expert and to the student the identity of a novice. Thirdly, that the identity of the participants (En1 and Ch1 and En4 and Ch4) changes accordingly from expert to novice which demonstrates that the two participants' identities are not fixed but adaptable and can change from one discursive practice to another.

To conclude, the analysis in this chapter demonstrates that cultural and linguistic asymmetries do not occur automatically, as the interactants make moment-by-moment decisions and, at times, various judgments about each other's competencies underline the significance of

viewing interculturality ‘as a contingent interactional accomplishment’ (Bolden, 2014: p. 223). Thus, this chapter shows:

empirically the importance of seeing interculturality not as an invariable outcome of participants’ differing cultural backgrounds but as something that gets accomplished (or not) in interaction with others, on a moment-by-moment basis. (Bolden, 2014: p. 227).

Chapter 7. Discussion

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will present my findings with reference to the literature review and I will explore how I have used CA to interpret my results. I will present the summary of the findings of interactional and intercultural competence for Chinese and English postgraduate students studying in the UK in a tandem language learning context.

This work has been motivated by 2 research questions:

- 1) What are the characteristics of *interactional competence* for Chinese and English postgraduate students studying in the UK in a tandem learning context?
- 2) What are the characteristics of *intercultural competence* for Chinese and English postgraduate students studying in the UK in a tandem learning context?

To answer these research questions, I have analysed a total of 51 excerpts. 35 excerpts were used to examine the notion of interactional competence, and out of these 35 excerpts, 16 also examined the concept of intercultural competence.

7.2 Dimension 1: A summary of the findings of the characteristics of interactional competence

Below is a summary of the main findings of the characteristics of interactional competence.

7.2.1 *Intersubjectivity, asymmetrical orientation to knowledge and alignment*

When it comes to interactional competence, how we orient to the knowledge we possess in a discursive practice is essential. The ways in which we co-construct the knowledge we possess in a discursive practice is important as through it we demonstrate whether we are interactionally competent or not (Young, 2008). Moreover, through our orientation to the knowledge we have of a discursive practice, we can display alignment or disalignment, as alignment is the way in which we coordinate our responses by facilitating the sequence (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011). In a tandem language learning context, the autonomy of learners is important as the tandem learners are responsible for their own learning and teaching (Holec, 1979, 1988; Little, 2003). In addition, both partners have to show equal

commitment in terms of devoting an equal amount of time for each language in order for both partners to benefit equally from the sessions (Little, 2003). Thus, it was vital to examine the ways in which the participants in this research orient to the knowledge they possess and whether they display alignment in the tandem learning sessions. Furthermore, I have examined the ways the participants manage, elicit and claim access to knowledge (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011), as in the tandem learning sessions, half of the time is dedicated to teaching one language and the other half is dedicated to teaching the other language and as a result, both partners in a tandem learning session play the role of teacher for half of the allocated time and the role of the learner in the other half.

My data show that asymmetrical orientation to knowledge and alignment between the participants occurred when they reached an agreement between them as to whom has more access to what. This was demonstrated in my data in different ways. First, while the English participant explained the meaning of some of the English idioms, the Chinese participant in turn used vocal continuers/acknowledgment tokens (e.g. ‘mhm’, ‘hm’, ‘uh huh’, and ‘yeah’) to indicate that he/she is treating his/her peer’s turn as still in progress (this is illustrated in excerpts 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5) as well as indicate that the English participant has the primary rights to access and assess the English idioms. Thus, the use of the acknowledgment tokens by the Chinese participant helped with the English participant’s turn progressivity (Stivers, 2008).

Second, although long inter- and intra-pauses would occur during the English participant’s explanation of the meaning of the English idioms to his/her Chinese peer, the Chinese participant would not take this opportunity to produce a turn but would allow the English participant to continue accessing his/her domain of knowledge and elaborate on the English idiom (this is illustrated in excerpts 5.3, 5.5, and 5.7). Third, the overlaps that occurred between the English and the Chinese participants did not cause a problem and were resolved as the Chinese participant dropped out when the English participant was explaining the meaning of some of the English idioms and he/she let the English participant continue elaborating on them. The English participant, on the other hand, dropped out when the Chinese participant was explaining some Chinese idioms and he/she let the Chinese participant continue with his/her explanation (this is illustrated in excerpts 5.6 and 5.10). Fourth, during the English teaching session, the English participant would, at times, pose questions to her/his peer by ending his/her turns with rising intonation (this is illustrated in excerpts 5.8, 5.9, 5.11, and 5.12). By doing so, the English participant adopted the role of the

teacher as he/she would select the student, which is the Chinese participant in this case, to answer his/her questions. This resulted in the Chinese participant adopting the role of the learner by providing answers to the questions posed.

My data agree with previous studies (Asmuß, 2011; Keevallik, 2011; Kohler and Thorne, 2011; Sahlström, 2011; Stivers, 2008) on interactional competence and asymmetrical orientation to knowledge and alignment. Although my study was conducted under the context of tandem learning, my findings do correspond with other studies conducted under other contexts. Sahlström's (2011) study on two children who are engaged in post-school activities showed similar results to mine. His findings demonstrated that the two children knew how to position themselves during the interactions as the child that was more knowledgeable in the area (i.e. knew how to count from 1 to 10) positioned herself in a knowing position and the child who was not knowledgeable in the area positioned herself in an unknowing position. The two children showed a clear understanding of how to access and cede epistemic access and this resulted in a clear asymmetrical orientation to knowledge. Therefore, the more knowledgeable the child was, the more he/she was able to teach the less knowledgeable child and this process resulted in an actual 'learning'.

During her study, Stivers (2008) also showed similar results. Her findings indicate that during storytelling, the use of acknowledgment tokens such 'mhm', 'hm', 'uh huh', and 'yeah' by the recipient were used to indicate that they understand the storytelling is still in progress and a lack of understanding of how to use acknowledgment tokens caused misalignment between the storyteller and the recipient. Asmuß (2011), Keevallik (2011), and Kohler and Thorne's (2011) studies also demonstrate that when a recipient does not produce a response when a question is posed to him/her, this can cause misalignment. In juxtaposition to this, nodding or the use of acknowledgment tokens can cause an alignment between the teller and the recipient.

To conclude, as the findings of my research on tandem learning correspond with other findings of researches in different contexts, this can broaden our understanding of the development of the concept of interactional competence with relation to alignment and asymmetrical orientation to knowledge. For instance, in the context of language learning classrooms such as EAP (English for academic purposes), EFL (English as a foreign language) and ESL (English as a second language) classes, the teachers can help raise the students' awareness of the importance of aligning their responses when interacting with

others. By illustrating (e.g. through role plays) to the language students/learners how managing and sustaining the turn-taking system effectively can lead to an alignment and how a lack of understanding of how the turn-taking system works can lead to misalignment, this can help language learners/students avoid situations in which they can be misunderstood.

7.2.2 Intersubjectivity and repair

Repair, according to Young (2008), is one of the interactional resources that is used by participants in a discursive practice. Thus when investigating interactional competence, it is essential to examine the trouble source and who initiates and accomplishes the repair (Young, 2008). When examining the ways in which interactional competence is developed, Hellermann (2011) and Van Compernelle argue that self-initiation, other-initiated repair, and repair accomplishment are all parts of learners' interactional competence as they enhance learning. In addition, one of the goals of the tandem language learning sessions is for the tandem partners to support each other equally with learning. One of the ways this can be achieved is through correcting each other when needed (Brammerts, 2003; Little, 2003) as other-correction is:

a device for dealing with those who are still learning or being taught to operate with a system which requires, for its routine operation, that they be adequate self-monitors and self-correctors as a condition of competence. (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977: p. 381).

My data demonstrate that when repair-initiations and repair-accomplishments are produced, they promote interactional competence. Moreover, the data show that there are different types of repairs and the repairs were initiated by either the teacher or the student. The repair-accomplishments were accomplished by either the teacher or the student. The data on repair can be summarised as follows: first, during a session on teaching English idioms by the English participant to the Chinese participant, the Chinese participant (the learner in this case) would take the opportunity to initiate a repair in order to clarify the meaning of the English idiom once it had been elaborated on by the English participant. The English participant (the teacher) would then accomplish the repair (this is illustrated in excerpt 5.13, 5.17, and 5.20), and through that, both participants would achieve intersubjectivity leading to the promotion of interactional competence. The learner, through their identification of a problem in the talk, was able to get more clarification from the teacher regarding the English idiom and in this case helped facilitate teacher mediation.

Second, when the English participant (the teacher) would notice a problem in the talk, he/she would initiate and accomplish a repair (this is illustrated in excerpts 5.14, 5.15, 5.16, 5.18, 5.19, and 5.24). By doing so, interactional competence would be promoted as the English participant's realisation that there was a problem in the talk helped enhance the process of 'learning' and helped achieve mutual understanding between him/her and the Chinese participant.

Third, at times, the teacher would initiate a repair when noticing a trouble in understanding (when addressing the student with a question). In doing so, the student was able to accomplish the repair (this is illustrated in excerpts 5.21, 5.22, 5.23, and 5.25) which resulted in achieving mutual understanding between himself/herself and the teacher (Hellermann, 2011; Van Compernelle, 2011).

Although previous researches on interactional competence and repair (e.g. Hellermann 2011; Van Compernelle, 2011) were conducted under a context different to the context of this research, the results of previous research and this one do demonstrate various similarities. For instance, Hellermann's (2011) study was conducted in a language classroom between language learners and the students (in pairs) in this study were instructed to perform adjacency pairs in which they were handed a list of yes/no questions and two types of answers to choose from by the teacher. The findings of this study indicated that the students played the role of the teacher and learner accordingly. For instance, the student who played the role of the teacher initiated a repair in order to help the other student compose the right answer which resulted in the other student (who played the role of the learner) accomplish a repair. This culminated in them both achieving mutual understanding as they were able to complete the task according to the instructions given by the teacher (Hellermann, 2011).

Another study by Van Compernelle (2011) in which he examined interactional competence in relation to repair in an LPI (language proficiency interview) context has revealed that the teacher (the interviewer) when identifying a trouble in understanding would initiate a repair in order to help the student produce the right answer. In so doing, the teacher demonstrated interactional competence. On the other hand, when the student displayed an understanding that the teacher has initiated a repair in order to pursue the right answer from him/her, the student therefore demonstrated interactional competence (Van Compernelle, 2011).

To conclude, although more research is needed in order to examine the development of interactional competence in relation to repair-initiations and accomplishments, the agreements between previous research and this one might enhance our understanding of how we, as language teachers, can help language learners achieve interactional competence. This can be achieved in different ways. First, through paired work (combining weak and strong students) where the students are asked to perform adjacency pairs in which they are provided with a list of questions and few answers to choose from. Here, the language teacher can guide the language students into understanding the importance of repair initiations and accomplishments and their relationship to language learning and the promotion of interactional competence. Second, by the language teacher helping language learners understand how playing the role of a student/teacher during, as an example, paired work in a language classroom can enhance their interactional competence. This can result in the language learners being more aware of how they orient to their role and to the other student's role during an interaction.

7.2.3 Management of the turn-taking system

By demonstrating an understanding of how the turn-taking system works (knowing when to start and end a turn and when to select the next speaker) in a discursive practice, the participants can display interactional competence. My data demonstrate that during the English teaching sessions, the participants displayed interactional competence by showing a clear understanding as to whom has access to what and who has more epistemic authority to start and end a turn. Thus, through the participants' collaboration, they created a mutual understanding of how the tandem learning sessions work. This agrees with a previous study conducted by Piirainen-Marsh (2011). In her study, Piirainen-Marsh (2011) investigated interactional competence amongst two 13 year old boys while playing video games. Her findings indicate that the two boys displayed interactional competence by demonstrating how to manage and sustain and shift their TCUs. This process indicated that they had a clear understanding of the turn-taking system and how it works in this specific context.

As interactional competence is the way in which we mutually co-construct the knowledge we possess, I will thus be summarising below how 'Okay', 'oh', and assessments were oriented to by the participants.

‘Okay’, ‘oh’, and assessments were used by the participants differently. According to various scholars (e.g. Schegloff and Sacks, 1973; Mondada, 2006; Schegloff, 2007), ‘okay’, ‘oh’, and assessments have certain functions, one of which is to close the sequence and to move the topic forward. However, the excerpts reflect that some participants did use them as minimal post-expansions and other participants used them as non-minimal post-expansions. In the data, as illustrated in excerpts 5.26, 5.27, and 5.28, when the participants produced and treated ‘okay’ as a minimal post-expansion (Schegloff, 2007), they displayed intersubjectivity as they demonstrated an understanding of the turn-taking system (Young, 2008) in this discursive practice. On the other hand, when the participants produced and treated ‘okay’, ‘oh’, and assessments as non-minimal post-expansion (illustrated in excerpts 5.29, 5.30, 5.31, 5.32, 5.33, 5.34, and 5.35), this demonstrated that there was a lack of intersubjectivity between them as it showed that they do not have a shared knowledge of this discursive practice (Young, 2008). One of the aims of these tandem learning sessions is to have an equal commitment by both tandem partners in terms of devoting the same amount of time for each language so both partners would equally benefit from the sessions (Little, 2003). Thus the importance of managing the topics well and knowing when to start and when to end a topic is essential in the tandem learning sessions.

To conclude, the agreement between the findings of previous studies and this one indicate the importance of the management of the turn taking system during an interaction. This can mean that raising the awareness of the students in any language classroom about how to start and end a turn and how to select the next speaker might be beneficial for the success of any interaction. This can be demonstrated to the students by, for instance, making them listen to some audio/video recordings of two or more people talking, and noting down how speakers started/ended their turns, how the next speaker was selected, and whether the interaction was successful or not due to the management/lack of management of the turn-taking system .

7.3 Dimension 2: A summary of the findings of the characteristics of intercultural competence

Below is a summary of the main findings of the characteristics of *Intercultural Competence*.

7.3.1 Intersubjectivity, asymmetry and identity

In this section I will show how, through one of the characteristics of interactional competence which is ‘maintenance of intersubjectivity through asymmetrical orientation to knowledge’, cultural differences between the participants were manifested. Through these cultural differences, the participants ascribed to each other the two identities of a novice and an expert.

In chapter 5, I analysed how the participants maintained intersubjectivity through asymmetrical orientation to knowledge. I have shown that by the participants orienting to their roles of teacher/learner, they demonstrated that they have driven the epistemic seesaw accordingly (Heritage, 2012b) and this displayed an understanding between the interactants. This indicated that the interactants were not competing for the floor but were rather adapting to their roles appropriately.

In terms of intercultural competence, I have shown in chapter 6 how through asymmetrical orientation to knowledge and intersubjectivity, the participants ascribed to each other the identity of a novice/expert and how the participants’ identity is highly negotiable and locally occasioned (Hosoda, 2006; Park, 2007; Bolden, 2014). Through the asymmetrical orientation to knowledge, the participants demonstrated cultural and linguistic differences between them and by ascribing to each other the identity of a novice/expert, they were able to demonstrate an understanding of their roles in this discursive practice (this is illustrated in excerpts 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8, and 6.9).

Through the analysis of the excerpts in this thesis, I was able to show how asymmetries in knowledge between the participants do not occur automatically in interactions between NS (Ens) and NNS (Chs) as the participants made moment-by-moment decisions (Bolden, 2014) about who knows what, who is informing whom, and who is the less knowledgeable one in the area. Through these decisions, the participants were able to maintain asymmetry in knowledge by attributing to each other the identities of novice or expert (Hosoda, 2006; Bolden, 2014). This asymmetry in knowledge displayed understanding between the participants as they showed a clear understanding of their roles as a student/teacher and a NS/NNS. In addition, through the asymmetry in knowledge, the participants showed a clear understanding of how and when to access their domain of knowledge.

What my data also show is that the roles of the two participants, regardless of which session they were having, were reversed accordingly (this is illustrated in excerpts 6.6, 6.8, and 6.9). This means that when, during the English session, the English participant wanted to learn about the Chinese idioms, the English participant played the role of the student and the Chinese participant played the role of the teacher. When this occurred, the Chinese participant through his/her demonstration of his/her expertise in the area attributed to himself/herself the identity of an expert and the English participant through his/her lack of expertise in the area (e.g. through eliciting information from the Chinese participant by formulating his/her turns as questions) attributed to himself the identity of a novice. This demonstrated that the two identities were invoked and developed in relation to the other (Hosoda, 2006; Park, 2007; Bolden, 2014).

The cultural differences between the participants were manifested through the maintenance of the asymmetry in knowledge and demonstrated through the participants not treating each other as bona-fide co-members of their community and not as ones that share with them the taken for granted knowledge (Bolden, 2014). An example of this is where English participants informed the Chinese participants of the English idioms that they have never heard of and when the Chinese participants informed the English participants of similar Chinese idioms to the English ones that they have not heard of either (this is illustrated in excerpts 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.14, 6.19 and 6.20).

To conclude, my data does agree with previous research (e.g. Hosoda, 2006; Park, 2007; Kitinger and Mandelbaum, 2013; Bolden, 2014). For instance, in excerpts 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, and 6.5, the English participants produced long turns as they explained the meaning of the English idioms, and, through that, exercised their expert identities (Park, 2007). In the same excerpts, the Chinese participants produced acknowledgement tokens and, through that, ascribed to the English participants the identity of an expert as they were the ones who provided them with information on the English idioms. In addition, in excerpts 6.6, 6.7, 6.8, and 6.9, the English participants formulated their turns as questions to be answered in order to elicit information from the Chinese participants on the equivalent Chinese idioms, and through that they ascribed to their Chinese colleagues the identity of an expert. In turn, the Chinese participants in these four excerpts (6.6, 6.7, 6.8, and 6.9) produced long turns as they ascribed to themselves the identity of an expert and to the English participants the identity of a novice (Hosoda, 2006; Bolden, 2014). This can indicate that the identities of both the

English and the Chinese participants is highly negotiable as they both played the roles of the teacher/student accordingly (Park, 2007).

Contrary to the models of intercultural competence/intercultural communication competence (e.g. Bennett, 1986; Byram, 1997; Bennett, 1998; Hofstede, 2001) which try to fit people into boxes, my research offers a micro-analytical approach through the use of CA. Through the lens of interactional competence, I was able to reveal the cultural differences between the participants and how the participants oriented to these differences through the attribution to each other the two identities of a novice/expert. These results could help students in a multi-cultural classrooms such as pre-sessional courses (held at UK universities for international students prior to their undergraduate/postgraduate degrees) understand the importance of how one orients to his/her identity and how the identity of their colleague/s can affect the development of an interaction. The teacher, in this cases, could help enhance this process by helping the students understand how, during cultural-related discussions, on some occasions students might play the role of an expert and on others they might play the role of a novice. Through the students' understanding of this process, they might be able to learn more about their colleagues' cultural backgrounds by, for instance, using more acknowledgment tokens when playing the role of a novice or by producing confirmation checks when playing the role of an expert.

7.3.2 Intersubjectivity, repair and identity

In this section, I will elaborate on how through one of the characteristics of interactional competence, 'intersubjectivity through repair-initiations and repair-accomplishments', identity issues emerged which displayed cultural differences between the participants.

In chapter 5, I have argued that the participants were able to maintain intersubjectivity through repair-initiation and accomplishment. I have shown that, first, by the learner initiating repair, he/she displayed an understanding of his/her role as a learner as he/she was able to identify a problem in the talk which resulted in the teacher resolving this problem by accomplishing the repair. Second, by the teacher initiating and accomplishing a repair, he/she has shown an understanding of their role as a teacher and the responsibility of assuring that the student's talk is being repaired when needed. In these cases, the repair-initiations and accomplishments achieved intersubjectivity as the participants displayed an understanding of their domains and when to access them.

In terms of intercultural competence, as discussed in detail in chapter 6, through the repair-initiations and accomplishments, the participants ascribed to each other the identity of a novice/expert. For instance, when the students (novices) initiated repairs (illustrated in excerpts 6.19 and 6.20), they have done so to seek clarification from the teachers (experts), and when the teachers initiated and accomplished a repair (illustrated in excerpts 6.14, 6.18, and 6.24), it was done in order to reach an understanding between themselves and the students. Through the repair-initiations and accomplishments, the participants showed cultural and linguistic differences between them as they were able to orient to their roles accordingly through the attribution to each other of the identity of a novice and an expert (Hosoda, 2006; Kitzinger and Mandelbaum, 2013; Bolden, 2014). This has also shown that both identities are highly negotiable and locally occasioned (Park, 2007).

Through the identification of problems in the talk, the Chinese and the English participants displayed expertise in their area (the Chinese participant demonstrated expertise within the area of Chinese idioms and the English participant demonstrated expertise within the area of English idioms). In addition, both participants exposed cultural differences between them as they ascribed to each other the identity of an outsider (not as bona-fide) and the identity of an expert. Moreover, the data revealed that, regardless of what session the participants were having, the two participants changed their roles of a student/teacher accordingly, and they initiated and accomplished repairs according to their expertise in the area. This means that both identities were not fixed but were in a state of constant change (Hosoda, 2006; Park, 2007; Kitzinger and Mandelbaum, 2013; Bolden, 2014).

To conclude, excerpts 6.14, 6.18, 6.22, 6.23, and 6.24 demonstrate that by the English participants identifying problems in the talk and by carrying out the repair, they are not only showing expertise in the domain of the English idioms but also treating the Chinese participants as novices in the area. Thus, by identifying potential problems in understanding and by carrying out the repair, the English participants are pursuing their own expertise in the area and attributing to the Chinese participants the identity of a novice. Moreover, in excerpts 6.19 and 6.20, the Chinese participant identifies a problem in the talk and, as a result, attributes to himself the identity of a novice and to the English participant the identity of an expert as she proceeds by carrying out the repair. Through this, cultural differences between the English and the Chinese participants are displayed (Hosoda, 2006; Park, 2007; Kitzinger and Mandelbaum, 2013; Bolden, 2014).

Therefore, instead of relying on these models of intercultural competence/intercultural communicative competence (e.g. Bennett, 1986; Byram, 1997; Bennett, 1998; Hofstede, 2001) which are based on generalisations and pre-determinations of how people should behave when interacting with members of other societies, my research aimed to examine the participants' interactions by using CA, as CA's main focus is on the sequential development of an interaction and on the observation of what happens and what happens next. By using CA and through the lens of interactional competence, I was able to show how the participants attributed to each other different identities (novice/expert) which ultimately demonstrated cultural differences between the participants. The results of this study can help students in a multi-cultural classroom understand the importance of repair-initiations and accomplishments. As a result, students would be able to, for instance, understand (through the help of the teacher) that attributing to their colleague/s the identity of an expert by initiating a repair can help them get more clarification on the discussed cultural related topic. Finally, understanding how and when we attribute different identities to ourselves and to others can help prevent misunderstandings between people from different cultural backgrounds.

7.4 On the methodology and context

This thesis examines the two concepts of *interactional* and *intercultural competence* in a tandem language learning context. As discussed in the methodology and literature review chapters, there is very little research that examines the notion of intercultural competence using CA as its method for investigation. Various scholars (e.g. Hofstede, 1979; 1980; Bennett, 1986; Hofstede, 1991; Byram, 1997; Bennett, 1998; Hofstede, 2001) have developed different models of intercultural competence/intercultural communication competence. However, these models tend to be very descriptive and are very generalisable which means that they try to fit people into boxes and pre-determine how people are supposed to feel or behave. Therefore, in this thesis, through the use of CA and through the lens of interactional competence, I was able to demonstrate how the participants in a tandem learning context attributed to each other different identities (novice/expert) and how this attribution demonstrated cultural differences between them (Bolden, 2014).

Many scholars (e.g. Hellermann, 2011; Kohler and Thorne, 2011; Piirainen-Marsh, 2011; Sahlström, 2011; Van Compernelle, 2011) have investigated the concept of interactional competence and its development using CA. Kohler and Thorne (2001), for instance, have linked interactional competence to the achievement of mutual alignment, whereas Van

Compernelle (2011) and Hellermann (2011) have linked it to the concept of ‘learning’ which, according to their findings, can be achieved through repair-initiations and repair-accomplishments. Therefore, I have used CA in this thesis as my main theoretical framework for analysing the data in order to study how the participants in a tandem language learning context orient to what they should do and say in certain situations (Drew, 2005), uncover the sequential pattern of interaction in a tandem language learning context, and ‘underpin the production of those sequences’ (Wooffitt, 2005: p. 79).

Within the context of tandem language learning, one can both enhance learning (Brammerts, 2003; Lewis, 2003) and promote intercultural competence (Lewis, 2003; Stickler and Lewis, 2003), hence the choice of that context was the most appropriate for this research.

7.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have summarised my findings and related them to the literature review and to the research questions. I have also argued the choice of the context which is tandem language learning, and the usage of CA as the main method for analysis. Thus, this chapter has brought an insight into understanding of the characteristics of interactional and intercultural in a tandem language learning context between English and Chinese postgraduate students studying at a UK university.

The choice of using CA has enabled me specifically to critique the different models of intercultural competence/intercultural communication competence, as instead of trying to impose different characteristics and behaviours on people from different cultures, CA allowed me instead to examine interactions that embody and display moment-to-moment the products of their own as the interpretation and analysis of both the utterances and actions are the understandings of the participants:

and their robustness and inescapable relevance is ensured by having subsequent moments in the trajectory of the interaction grounded in those very understandings, and built on them. (Schegloff, 1997: p. 184).

Chapter 8. Conclusion

8.1 Introduction

In this thesis, I have examined the characteristics of interactional competence intercultural competence through the lens of interactional competence using CA as my main method for analysis. The choice of using CA was to enable me to study the organisation and the order of social action, as well as the ways in which this order is produced by the participants and oriented to them (Seedhouse, 2004b) in a tandem learning context. Thus, my aims were, firstly, to uncover the organisation and the order of the interactions between the tandem language partners in order to identify the characteristics of interactional competence, and secondly, to unravel through the lens of interactional competence and CA the cultural differences between the participants and the ways in which they orient to them.

For this study, I have used a total of 51 excerpts. 35 excerpts were analysed to examine the characteristics of interactional competence and from them, 16 were analysed from a CA and interactional competence perspective to study the characteristics of intercultural competence. The choice of not using all excerpts to examine the characteristics of intercultural competence derives from the fact that only in these 16 excerpts were cultural differences between the participants exposed.

Moreover, this study was conducted under the context of tandem language learning, and the choice of that context derives from the fact that through tandem language learning, various scholars (e.g. Brammerts, 2003; Brammerts and Calvert, 2003; Lewis, 2003; Stickler and Lewis, 2003; Walker and Lewis, 2003; Woodin, 2003) claim that the participants can develop both their interactional and intercultural competence in this type of session. Interactional competence can be promoted, according to Hellermann (2011) and Van Compernelle (2011), through repair-initiations and repair-accomplishments. Tandem partners are encouraged to use error corrections in order to support each other in their learning (Brammerts, 2003; Lewis, 2003) and thus through repair initiations and accomplishments, the tandem partners can display interactional competence.

Additionally, tandem language learning is linked to the development of intercultural competence (Lewis, 2003; Stickler and Lewis, 2003) and thus the choice of that context was

the most appropriate for this thesis as I wanted to examine the characteristics of both interactional and intercultural competence.

The collection that I have chosen in this thesis was on ‘idiom meaning exchange’ which means that the English student’s job was to teach the Chinese participant some English idioms related to animals and body parts and afterward to exchange information regarding a similar idiom in Chinese (Brammerts and Kleppin, 2003). The choice of that specific collection for my thesis derived from the fact that ‘idioms’ are culturally specific and have cultural related meanings.

My data confirms what other researchers (Hellermann, 2011; Piirainen-Marsh, 2011; Sahlström, 2011; Van Compernelle, 2011) have identified as the characteristics of interactional competence. However, although various scholars (Bennett, 1986; Byram, 1997; Bennett, 1998; Hofstede, 2001) have built different models of intercultural competence/intercultural communication competence, it is still not clear what this concept means and what it takes to be interculturally competent. In addition, as argued in chapter 3, most of these models are very descriptive. Therefore, instead of relying on these different models, I have used CA as my main method for analysis and investigated intercultural competence through the lens of interactional competence. Below I will summarise the main findings of my study.

The characteristics of interactional competence in these 35 excerpts of tandem language learning between English and Chinese postgraduate students studying in the UK are as follows:

- **Epistemic primacy congruence and alignment:** Epistemic primacy congruence means that the participants agree on who has more access to what in a discursive practice (Stivers, Mondada and Steensig, 2011), and thus reach mutual alignment (Stivers, 2008). My data (this occurred between En1 and Ch1, En2 and Ch2, En3 and Ch3, and En4 and Ch4) indicated that when the participants agreed on who has greater rights to cede and claim epistemic authority and respected each other’s territories (Heritage and Raymond, 2005), they reached epistemic primacy congruence. Through that, participants demonstrated that they did not have to compete for the floor (Stivers, 2008) but rather accepted their allocated roles and drove the K+/K- epistemic seesaw

accordingly (Heritage, 2012b). Thus, through their collaboration, the participants displayed aligning activity (Asmuß, 2011; Keevallik, 2011).

- **Repair-initiation and repair-accomplishment:** Through repair-initiations and repair-accomplishments, interactional competence can be promoted (Hellermann, 2011; Van Compernelle, 2011). In addition, learning can be enhanced through identifying opportunities for corrections in a tandem learning context (Brammerts, 2003; Lewis, 2003), and hence the findings support this notion. The repair accomplishments, and thus the corrections, which occurred between En1 and Ch1, En2 and Ch2, and En4 and Ch4 indicate that they occurred in order to promote learning and thus interactional competence. The repair-initiations and repair-accomplishments indicated that the participants were able to identify the requirements of this discursive practice and how to use the interactional resources in this discursive practice appropriately (Young, 2008). As this discursive practice requires participants to enhance learning through identifying opportunities for corrections, through the repair-initiations and accomplishments participants were able to mutually co-construct the knowledge they possess of this discursive practice and thus to promote interactional competence (Young, 2008).
- **Okay and assessments as minimal post-expansion:** Although the function of okay and assessments is to close the sequence and move the topic forward (e.g. Schegloff and Sacks, 1973; Schegloff, 2007), they did have two different functions in the data, the first as minimal post-expansion and the second as non-minimal post-expansion. When they were produced and oriented to by the participants as minimal post-expansion, the participants (occurring between En2 and Ch2 as well as En4 and Ch4) showed that they understood the requirements of this discursive practice and demonstrated a dedication to teaching and learning. In a tandem learning context, both partners have to display an understanding of the fact that they have to achieve the goal of mutual commitment toward equal devotion to each language (Little, 2003).

The characteristics of intercultural competence in the 16 excerpts are as follows:

- **Intersubjectivity, asymmetrical orientation to knowledge and identity:** The maintenance of intersubjectivity through asymmetrical orientation to knowledge

demonstrated the ways in which the participants oriented to the two identities of a novice/expert. The participants (this occurred between En1 and Ch1, En2 and Ch2, En3 and Ch3, and En4 and Ch4) ascribed to each other the identity of a novice/expert through their demonstration of how to drive the epistemic K-/K+ seesaw accordingly (Heritage 2012b). In not competing for the floor, they displayed their understanding of their roles of a teacher/learner and what these roles entail. Thus, the agreement between the participants on who has access to what demonstrated cultural differences between them.

- **Intersubjectivity, repair and identity:** The maintenance of intersubjectivity through repair-initiations and repair-accomplishments exposed the ways in which the participants (this occurred between En1 and Ch1, En2 and Ch2, and En4 and Ch4) ascribed to each other different identities and demonstrated the cultural differences between them. First, the English participants ascribed to themselves the identity of an expert through their repair-initiations and accomplishments, as through that they have shown expertise in the area by trying to repair their tandem partners' talk and by doing so, they have ascribed to their Chinese tandem partners the identity of a novice. Second, the repair-initiations by the Chinese tandem learners indicated in my data that they were performed so that the Chinese participants can ask for clarification from their English tandem partners. By doing so, the Chinese participants attributed to their English partners the identity of an expert/teacher and ascribed to themselves the identity of a novice/student. Through the English participants' repair accomplishments, they have treated their Chinese partners not as bona fide co-members and as ones who do not share with them the taken for granted knowledge. Third, some of the repair-initiations by the English participants were performed as a result of a lack of competency by their Chinese tandem partners, and by doing so, the English participants ascribed to themselves the identity of an expert/teacher.

8.2 Pedagogical implications

Based on the findings of the characteristics of both interactional and intercultural competence, we can use this knowledge in several ways. First, through our understanding of how interactional competence in a tandem learning context is achieved, we can therefore raise the awareness of tandem learners in order to help them enhance their interactional competence by encouraging them to initiate and accomplish repairs when needed as well as understand the

importance of ceding and accessing epistemic authority when it comes to promoting interactional competence. This is due to the fact that both partners need to make sure they understand their roles as teachers/learners so they both benefit equally from the sessions (Little, 2003).

Second, when it comes to promoting intercultural communication/competence in a tandem learning context, it is essential for the tandem partners to understand how identities are constructed and what can cause this construction. According to my study, this is via repair-initiations, repair-accomplishments and asymmetrical orientation to knowledge. Through the tandem learners' understanding of how repair and asymmetrical orientation to knowledge can cause them to ascribe to each other the identity of a novice/expert, they would thus be able to have a better understanding not only of their roles as student/teacher but enhance the process of learning.

8.3 Limitations of the study

This study has its originality and has several contributions to knowledge. However, it also has its limitations and shortcomings. This study's limitation is through its use of CA to analyse the data as CA relies on the analysis of single cases which can be problematic as this means that these cases can never yield generalisable results (Markee, 2007). However, it is fair to say that this study has not been conducted in order to generalise the data towards all different types of tandem language learning but instead to understand how interactional competence and intercultural competence are achieved in that context and in other similar contexts.

8.4 Contribution to knowledge

This study has various contributions to knowledge. First, this study is amongst the very few studies conducted with English and Chinese postgraduate students within a tandem language learning context. Second, although there are various studies that have been done to examine the concept of interactional competence and the ways in which it is developed, there are not any studies that I am aware of which were conducted to examine the notion of interactional competence and its characteristics in a tandem learning context between English and Chinese students. As this study has used CA to examine the characteristics of interactional competence, the findings do confirm those of other studies on interactional competence, which are that repair-initiations and repair-accomplishments do help develop interactional competence (e.g. Jefferson, 1974; Hellermann, 2011; Van Compernelle, 2011) and that error

corrections do help promote the notion of ‘learning’ in a tandem language learning context (e.g. Brammerts, 2003; Lewis, 2003). Third, there are multiple models of intercultural competence/intercultural communicative competence that have been developed by various scholars and these models have been used in various studies. However, as discussed in chapter 3, these models contain some flaws. Hence, instead of trying to apply these models in my research, I have instead used CA and interactional competence to examine the characteristics of intercultural competence. By doing so, I was able to identify moments in interactions in which the participants ascribe to each other the identity of a novice/expert which demonstrated cultural differences between them. Therefore, when it comes to intercultural competence, the contribution to knowledge is that I did not try to fit the different models of intercultural competence/intercultural communication competence into my data but instead I have used CA and interactional competence to examine the notion of intercultural competence.

8.5 Recommendations for future studies

This study is amongst the very few studies to examine the concepts of interactional and intercultural competence in tandem language learning. Therefore, I would highly recommend conducting more studies to investigate these two notions in a tandem learning context in order to have a greater understanding of how to promote them, so that tandem learners could greatly benefit from developing their interactional and intercultural competence.

In addition, it would also be recommended to have comparative studies that investigate the two notions of interactional and intercultural competence carried out in both a tandem learning context and in an EFL/ESL classroom, as it would give us a better understanding of how these two notions work in different contexts.

The education sector, and specifically second/foreign language teachers, would greatly benefit from more studies on interactional and intercultural competence, as having a greater understanding on how these two notions are developed and how they can have an effect on each other can help educationalists not only in the classroom, but also in developing materials for foreign/second language teaching/learning.

Finally, I would recommend this study to be replicated in other contexts such as in: EAP, ESAP and ESL/EFL classrooms, examining variables such as nationalities, in order to have a greater and in depth understanding of the results presented in this study.

Appendices

Appendix A: CA Transcription Conventions

- [A single left bracket indicates the point of overlap
-] A single right bracket indicates the point at which an utterance or utterance-part terminates vis-à-vis another.
- = Equal signs, one at the end of one line and one at the beginning of a next, indicate no ‘gap’ between the two lines. This is often called latching.
- (0.0) Numbers in parentheses indicate elapsed time in silence by tenth of seconds, so is (7.1) a pause of 7 seconds and one-tenth of a second.
- (.) A dot in parentheses indicates a tiny ‘gap’ within or between utterances.
- word Underscoring indicates some form of stress, via pitch and/or amplitude; an alternative method is to print the stressed part in *italics*.
- :: Colons indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound. Multiple colons indicate a more prolonged sound.
- ? A question mark indicates a rising intonation.
- ↑↓ Arrows indicate mark shifts into higher or lower pitch in the utterance-part immediately following the arrow.
- WORD Upper case indicates especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk.
- ° Utterances or utterance-parts bracketed by degree signs are relatively quieter than the surrounding talk.
- < > Right/left carets bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicate speeding up.
- hhh A dot-prefixed row of hs indicates an inbreath. Without the dot, the hs indicates an outbreath.
- w(h)ord A parenthesized h, or a row of hs within a word, indicates breathiness, as in laughter, crying, etc.
- () Empty parent indicate the transcriber’s inability to hear what was said. The length of the parenthesized space indicates the length of the untranscribed talk. In the speaker designation column, the empty parentheses indicate inability to identify a speaker.
- (word) Parenthesized words are especially dubious hearings or speaker identifications.
- (()) Double parentheses contain transcriber’s descriptions rather than, or in addition to, transcriptions.

(Adapted from Tan Have, 2007)

Appendix B: Availability schedule

Name:

Date:

	10-12	12-2	2-4	4-6
Monday				
Tuesday				
Wednesday				
Thursday				
Friday				

Appendix C: Chinese language syllabus

Ideas for the Chinese to help his/her English partner with his/her Chinese language skills

In the very first meeting with your partner, try to find out as much information as you can by asking him/her questions about his/her life. Try to dedicate 10 minutes of the first meeting on getting to know your partner (you can prepare some questions in advance). However, try not to be the only one who asks questions about your partner's life, but allow your partner to do that as well.

Topic	Vocabulary	Useful Phrases	Procedure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The different types of tones. First words and sentences. 	First words: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ni hao (hello) Zaijian (goodbye) Xiexie (thank you) Duibuqi (sorry) Nan (gents) Nu (ladies) Cesuo (toilet) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zai nar.....? (where is.....?) Cesuo zai nar (where is the toilet) Fandian zai nar? (Where's the restaurant?) 	Practice with your partner the different types of tones (high level, rising, falling and then rising, falling). Ask your English partner whether there are words in the English language that need to be pronounced in a high or rising pitch, for instance. Then practice with your partner the first words and sentences by trying to ask your partner to repeat after you (after practicing try to say something in Chinese to see whether your partner would guess what it is. After, discuss with your partner why you think these words and sentences are introduced first in the book for learning Chinese and if you both think there is a reason behind it.

Welcome!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qing (please) • Jin (to enter) • Zuo (to sit) • He (to drink) • Cha (tea) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qing jin (please come in) • Qing zuo (please sit down) • Qing he cha (please have a cup of tea) 	<p>Read the words and the sentences and practice saying them with your partner few times.</p> <p>Then discuss with your partner what is behind each word/sentence, what it can express, what it implies on a cultural or political level.</p>
Live to eat!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mifan (Rice) • Miantiao (noodles) • Rou (meat) • Ji (chicken) • Yu (fish) • Dianxin (dim sum) • Jiaozi (dumplings) • Shucai (vegetables) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wo chi su (I'm vegetarian) 	<p>Read the words and the sentences and practice saying them with your partner few times.</p> <p>Then discuss with your partner why you think these specific words are introduced under the topic 'live to eat', and what is the reason for calling it 'live to eat'.</p>
At the market and how to haggle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sizhipin (silk) • Jinianpin (souvenirs) • Yu (jade) • Gongyipin (crafts) • Xiezi (shoes) • Yifu (clothes) • Taoci yishu (ceramics) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wo qu shichang mai (I'm going to the market to buy) • Duoshao qian (how much is it?) • Tai gui le (it's too expensive) 	<p>Read the words and the sentences and practice saying them with your partner few times.</p> <p>Then discuss with your partner what is behind each word/sentence, what it can express, what it implies on a cultural or political level.</p>
Chinese names	<p>Popular girls' names:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ying (talented, wise) • Xiu (elegant, beautiful) • Yu (jade) • Hua (brilliant) • Zhen (precious) 		<p>Read with your partner each name and ask him/her to repeat it after you. Then discuss with your partner the meaning behind each name, and the importance of it, and the fact that Chinese people never call</p>

	<p>Popular boys' names:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wen (culture, writing) • Ming (bright) • Guo (nation) • Hua (brilliant) • De (virtue) 		<p>their children after anyone else. Then, ask your partner about popular English names.</p>
A day in the country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women (we) • Shangwu (morning) • Xiaxu (afternoon) • Pa (to climb) • Shan (mountain) • Haibian (seaside) • Zuo chuan (take a boat) • Qi ma (ride a horse) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shangwu women pa shan (this morning we are climbing a mountain) • Shangwu women qi ma (this morning we are going horse riding) • Xiawu women qu haibian (this afternoon we are going to the seaside) • Xiawu women zuo chuan (this afternoon we are taking a boat) 	<p>Read the words and the sentences and practice saying them with your partner few times. Then discuss with your partner what is behind each word/sentence, what it can express, what it implies on a cultural or political level.</p>

Notes:

- When you introduce new words to your partner, you can start by translating the words and explaining in which context they are used (e.g. when you are at the market in China, when you are in a restaurant etc....) and give examples.
- Try when introducing a new word to your English partner, to put this word in a sentence so your partner; would get used to hearing Chinese; and would know how to use the word.
- After introducing new words, try to ask your partner whether these words are used in a similar context (situation) in English.

(adapted from Carruthers, 2007)

Appendix D: English language syllabus

Ideas for the English native speakers to help his/her Chinese partner with his/her English language skills

In the very first meeting with your partner, try to find out as much information as you can by asking him/her questions about his/her life. Try to dedicate 10 minutes of the first meeting on getting to know your partner (you can prepare some questions in advance). However, try not to be the only one who asks questions about your partner's life, but allow your partner to do that as well.

Topic	Vocabulary	Useful Phrases	Procedure
<p>Sharing Personal Information - Talk about a memorable holiday or an experience you fondly remember</p>			<p>Let your Chinese partner tell you in English about the best holiday or an experience he/she fondly remembers. Ask him/her to Describe the journey, the area, the people, and the mood, anything he/she considers to be important.</p> <p>Ask your partner questions about the experience or the holiday he/she is sharing with you.</p>
<p>Exchanging Information - learning new words and learning how certain words can be associated with specific cultures and how some words sometimes cannot be literally translated</p>	<p>Red herring, Guy Fawkes' Night, Chocoholic, bag lady, hen night, negative equity, EastEnders, to Jaywalk, vaccination, nimby, joy rider.</p>		<p>Read the words with your partner and then explain them to your Chinese partner by discussing what is behind each word, what it can express, what it implies on a cultural or political level, and what experiences you and your partner associate with it. Please try to translate them, as that is not the point of this activity.</p>

<p>Holding and discussing points of view- ‘What is art’- Deciding you’re your partner whether certain types of activities are examples of art or not.</p>			<p>Discuss with your partner whether certain types of activities are examples of art or not and please try to give reasons if yes or no (you can first tell each other whether you think this activity is a form of art or not and then you can explain to each other why you think so). Below attached a table with examples that you can use for this activity.</p>
<p>Being creative together- story telling</p>	<p>Needle, fishing rod, umbrella, bowler hat, binoculars, lift, fairy godmother, dwarf, giant, ice, railway station, to fall in love, to dream about, to hunt, to be successful, deep sea diving</p>		<p>Read the story ‘crocodile tears’ which is attached below (both partners together, then the Chinese tries to finish the story by using the some of the words in the vocabulary list.</p>
<p>Talking about language and communication- expressions or proverbs that are connected with animals or parts of the body</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To buy a pig in a poke • To have a chip on one’s shoulder • Don’t look a gift horse in the mouth • Grin like a Cheshire cat • Eat like a bird • To be in the dog house • To play chicken • To be a fly on the wall • Piggyback • Head over heels 	<p>Explain to your Chinese partner the meaning of each proverb, and after discussing the meaning of each proverb try to ask him/her if there is any proverb in Chinese that is similar in meaning to the English one (please try not to translate the proverbs because that is not the point behind this activity).</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to your elbows • Slip of the tongue • Knee-jerk • White-knuckle ride • Break your neck • Twisting somebody around your little finger • Many hands make light work 	
<p>Talking about language and communication-idioms that are connected to feelings and emotions</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fly off the handle • Go ballistic • I'm fed up to the back teeth with it • Look daggers at her • Get hot under the collar • Put his nose out of joint • Jump down my throat • Lose your bearings • Can't make head or tail of it • Get the hang of it • Full of beans • Fit as a fiddle • Dead on your feet • Under the weather • Thrilled to bits • In high spirits 	<p>Explain to your Chinese partner the meaning of each idiom, and after discussing the meaning of each idiom try to ask him/her if there is any idiom in Chinese that is similar in meaning to the English one (please try not to translate the idioms because that is not the point behind this activity).</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Only have eyes for him• Sweep them off their feet	
--	--	--	--

(adapted from Lewis and Walker, 2003)

Appendix E: Informed Consent



School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences

Research title: An investigation into the relationship between Interactional and Intercultural Competence.

Researcher's name: Angela Sabbah

Researcher's email: angela.sabbah@ncl.ac.uk

Supervisor: Steve Walsh

Time:

Date:

	Age	Female or Male	Nationality	Your native language	Course/Year/Undergraduate or postgraduate student
Participant					

	Do you speak any other language/s beside your native language? If so, can you name it/them?	How well can you speak this/these language/s? (use a scale of 1-10, 1 as not well and 10 as very well)
Participant		

Informed consent

Dear Participant,

The intention of this study is to investigate the relationship between interactional and intercultural competence.

Name of participant:

Age of participant:

University:

I give consent to participate, be video and audio recorded, and use of my personal data in this research.

Date:

Signature:

Appendix F: Goal setting chart

What do I want to be able to do? (e.g. learn new vocabularies/extend my vocabularies, improve my grammar...)	By when?	What means am I going to use? (e.g. tandem partner, books, revising...)	How often?	Where?	Day and time?

References

- Alterman, R. (2007). Representation, interaction, and intersubjectivity. *Cognitive Science*, 31(5): 815-841.
- Antaki, C. (1998). Identity Ascription in their Time and Place: 'Fagin' and 'The Terminally Dim'. In Antaki, C. and Widdicombe, S. (eds.), *Identities In Talk*, Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 71-86.
- Antaki, C. and Wilkinson, R. (2013). Conversation analysis and the study of atypical populations. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 513-532.
- Aronsson, K. (1998). Identity-in-Interaction and Social Choreography. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 31(1): 75-89.
- Asmuß, B. (2011). Proposing shared knowledge as a means of pursuing agreement. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada and J. Steensig (eds.), *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*. The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 29, pp. 207-234.
- Beach, W. A. (1993). Transitional regularities for "casual" "okay" usages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19(4): 325-352.
- Bennett, M. J. (1979). Overcoming the Golden Rule: Sympathy and Empathy. In D. Nimmo (ed.), *Communication yearbook 3*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage, pp. 407-422.
- Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10(2): 179-196.
- Bennett, M. J. (1998). *Basic concepts of intercultural communication: selected readings*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bogen, D. (1992). The organization of talk. *Qualitative Sociology*, 15: 273-296.
- Bolden, G. B. (2014). Negotiating Understanding in "Intercultural Moments" in Immigrant Family Interactions. *Communication Monographs*, 81(2): 208-238.

- Brammerts, H. (2003). Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem. In T. Lewis and L. Walker (eds.), *Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem*. Sheffield: Academy Electronic Publications Limited, pp. 27-36.
- Brammerts, H. and Calvert, M. (2003). Learning by Communication in Tandem. In T. Lewis and L. Walker (eds.), *Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem*. Sheffield: Academy Electronic Publications Limited, pp. 45-59.
- Brammerts, H. and Kleppin, K. (2003). Supporting Face-to-Face Tandem Learning. In T. Lewis and L. Walker (eds.), *Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem*. Sheffield: Academy Electronic Publications Limited, pp. 157-168.
- Broome, B. J. (1991). Building Shared Meaning: Implications of a Relational Approach to Empathy for Teaching Intercultural Communication. *Communication Education*, 40(3): 235-249.
- Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(10): 1439-1465.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Clayman, S. E. (2013a). Turn-constructive units and the transition-relevance place. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 167-181.
- Clayman, S. E. (2013b). Conversation analysis in the news interview. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 604-626.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2009). Synthesizing Conceptualizations of Intercultural Competence. In Deardorff, D. K. (ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence*. Thousand Oak, California: SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 264-269.
- DeTurk, S. (2001). Intercultural Empathy: Myth, Competency, or Possibility for Alliance Building? *Communication Education*, 50(4): 374-384.

- Drew, P. (2005). Conversation analysis. In Fitch, Kristine L and Sanders, Robert E. (eds.), *Handbook of Language and social Interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 71-102.
- Drew, P. (2013). Turn design. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 150-166.
- Enfield, N. J. (2013). Reference in conversation. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 433-454.
- Friedman, V. and Berthoin Antal, A. (2005). Negotiating Reality. A Theory of Action Approach to Intercultural Competence. *Management Learning*, 36(1): 69-86.
- Glenn, P. (2010). Interviewer laughs: Shared laughter and asymmetries in employment interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(6): 1485-1498.
- Goodwin, C. (1986). Between and within: Alternative Sequential Treatments of Continuers and Assessments. *Human Studies*, 9(2-3): 205-217.
- Goodwin, M. H. and Goodwin, C. (1986). Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*, 62(1/2): 51-75.
- Goodwin, C. and Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19: 283-307.
- Greenwood, E. (2007). *Easy Peasy Chinese*, Kindersley Dorling Limited.
- Gudykunst, W. B. and Nishida, T. (1994). *Bridging Japanese/North American Differences (Communicating Effectively in Multicultural Contexts)*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Guo, Y. (2010). The concept and development of intercultural competence. In Y. Tsai and S. Houghton (eds.) *Becoming Intercultural: Inside and Outside the Classroom*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 23-47.
- Hall, J. K. and Pekarek-Doehler, S. (2011). L2 Interactional Competence and Development. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann and S. Pekarek-Doehler (eds.), *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Britain: Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data, pp. 1-15.

- Hayano, K. (2013). Question design in conversation. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 395-414.
- Hayashi, M. (2013). Turn allocation and turn sharing. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 182-200.
- Hellermann, J. (2011). Members' Methods, Members' Competencies: Looking for Evidence of Language Learning in Longitudinal Investigations of Other-Initiated Repair. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann and S. P. Doehler (eds.), *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Britain: Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data, pp. 147-172.
- Helm, F. (2009). Language and culture in an online context: what can learner diaries tell us about intercultural competence? *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 9(2): 91-104.
- Hepburn, A. and Bolden, G. B. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation analysis*, Wiley Blackwell, pp. 57-76.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 299-345.
- Heritage, J. (2011). Territories of knowledge, territories of experience: empathic moments in interaction. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada and J. Steensig (eds.), *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 29, pp. 159-183.
- Heritage, J. (2012a). Epistemics in action: action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on language and social interaction*, 45(1): 1-29.
- Heritage, J. (2012b). The epistemic engine: sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on language and social interaction*, 45(1): 30-52.
- Heritage, J. (2013). Epistemics in conversation. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 357-379.

- Heritage, J. and Atkinson, J. M. (1984). Introduction. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-15.
- Heritage, J. and Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1): 15-38.
- Hofstede, G. (1979). Value Systems in Forty Countries: Interpretation, Validation and Consequences for Theory. In L. H. Eckensberger, W. J. Lonner, and Y. H. Poortinga (eds.), *Cross-Cultural contributions to Psychology*. Lisse, Neth: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Cultures Consequences*. Thousand Oak, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Holec, H. (1979). *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (Republished 1981, Oxford: Pergamon).
- Holec, H. (ed.). (1988). *Autonomy and Self-Directed Learning: Present Fields of Application/ Autonomie et Apprentissage Autodirigé: Terrains D'application Actuels (Council of Europe. Project no. 12)*. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Co-Operation/ Conseil de la Coopération Culturelle.
- Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and Relevance of Differential Language Expertise in Second Language Conversations. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(1): 25-50.
- Houghton, S. (2010). Savoir se transformer: knowing how to become. In Tsai, Y. and Houghton, S. (eds.), *Becoming Intercultural: Inside and Outside the Classroom*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 194-228.
- Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*, Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, 3(2): 181-199.

- Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view? *IRAL – International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(1): 11-36.
- Keevallik, L. (2011). The terms of not knowing. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada and J. Steensig (eds.), *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*. The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 29, pp. 184-206.
- Kirk, J. and Miller, M. L., (1986). *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research*, London: Sage Publications.
- Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 235-257.
- Kitzinger, C. and Mandelbaum, J. (2013). Word Selection and Social Identities in Talk-in-Interaction. *Communication Monographs*, 80(2): 176-198.
- Kohler, F. S. and Throne, S. L. (2011). The Social Life of Self-Directed Talk: A Sequential Phenomenon. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann and S. Pekarek-Doehler (eds.), *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Britain: Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data, pp. 66-92.
- Kötter, M. (2003). Negotiation of meaning and codeswitching in online tandems. *Language Learning and Technology*, 7(2): 145-172.
- Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(4): 366-372.
- Lee, S. H. (2013). Response design in conversation. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 398-413.
- Levinson, S. C. (2013). Action formation and ascription. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 121-149.
- Lewis, T. (2003). The Case for Tandem Learning. In T. Lewis and L. Walker (eds.), *Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem*. Sheffield: Academy Electronic Press, pp. 13-25.
- Lewis, T., Walker, L. (eds.). (2003). *Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem*. Sheffield: Academy Electronic Press

- Liddicoat, A. J. (2011). *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Little, D. (2003). Tandem Language Learning and Learner Autonomy. In T. Lewis and L. Walker (eds.), *Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem*. Sheffield: Academy Electronic Publications Limited, pp. 37-44.
- Macfadyen, L. P. (2011). Perils of Parsimony. The Problematic Paradigm of ‘National Culture’. *Information, Communication and Society*, 14(2): 280-293.
- Mandelbaum, J. (2013). Storytelling in conversation. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 473-489.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation Analysis*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- Markee, N. (2007). Conversation Analysis: Issues and Problems. In Cummins, J. and Davison, Ch. (eds.), *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Springer International Handbooks of Education, volume 15, pp. 1017-1032.
- Martin, J. N. and Nakayama, T. K. (1999). Thinking Dialectically about Culture and Communication. *Communication Theory*, 9(1): 1-25.
- Martin, J. N. and Nakayama, T. K. (2015). Reconsidering Intercultural (communication) competence in the workplace: a dialectical approach. *Language and Intercultural communication*, 15(1): 13-28.
- Matsuo, C. (2012). A Critique of Michael Byram’s Intercultural Communication Competence Model from the Perspective of Model Type and Conceptualization of Culture. *Fukuoka University Review of Literature and Humanities*, 44(2): 347-380.
- Mazeland, H. (2013). Grammar in conversation. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 456-472.
- Mchoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, 7(2): 183-213.
- McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede’s Model of National Cultural Differences and their Consequences: A Triumph of Faith – A Failure of Analysis. *Human Relations*, 55(1): 89-118.

- Mondada, L. (2006). Participants' online analysis and multimodal practices: projecting the end of the turn and the closing of the sequence. *Discourse Studies*, 8(1): 117-129.
- Nevile, M. and Rendle-Short, J. (2009). A Conversation Analysis View of Communication as Jointly Accomplished Social Interaction: An Unsuccessful Proposal for a Social Visit. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 29(1): 75-89.
- Otto, E. (2003). Language Learning Strategies in Tandem: How to Learn Efficiently. In T. Lewis and L. Walker (eds.), *Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem*. Sheffield: Academy Electronic Publications Limited, pp. 79-91.
- Park, J.-E. (2007). Co-Construction of Nonnative Speaker Identity in Cross-cultural Interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(3): 339-360.
- Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2011). Enacting Interactional Competence in Gaming Activities: Coproducing Talk with Virtual Others. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann and S. P. Doehler (eds.), *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Britain: Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data, pp. 19-44.
- Pillet-Shore, D. (2003). Doing "okay": on the multiple metrics of an assessment. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 36(3): 285-319.
- Plug, L., Sharrack, B. and Reuber, M. (2009). Conversation Analysis Can Help to Distinguish Between Epilepsy and Non-Epileptic Seizure Disorders: A Case Comparison. *Seizure*, 18, pp. 43-50.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Pursuing a response. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 152-163.
- Potter, J. and Edwards, D. (2013). Conversation analysis and psychology. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 678-703.
- Pusch, M. D. (2009). The Interculturally Competent Global Leader (66-84). In Deardorff, D. K. (ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 66-84.
- Raymond, G. and Heritage, J. (2006). The epistemics of social relations: owning grandchildren, *Language in Society*, 35(5): 677-705.

- Robinson, J. D. (2013). Overall structural organisation. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 258-278.
- Sacks H., Schegloff, Emanuel A. and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation, *Language*, 50(4), Part 1: 696-735.
- Sahlström, F. (2011). Learning as Social Action. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann and S. P. Doehler (eds.), *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Britain: Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data, pp. 45-65.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: the last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(5): 1295-1345.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose Text? Whose Context? *Discourse Society*, 8(2): 165-187.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Reflections on studying prosody in talk-in-interaction. *Language and Speech*, 41(3-4): 235-263.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When 'Others' Initiate Repair. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(2): 205-243.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction* (Vol. 1). The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. and Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up Closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4): 289-327.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. and Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50(4): 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. (1977). The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language*, 53(2): 361-382.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004a). Conversation Analysis Methodology. *Language Learning*, 54(S1): 1-54.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004b). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Seedhouse, P. (2007). Conversation Analysis as Research Methodology. In K. Richards and P. Seedhouse (eds.), *Applying Conversation Analysis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd, pp. 251-266.

- Sidnell, J. (2013). Basic conversation analytic methods. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 97-119.
- Signorini, P. Wiesemes, R. and Murphy, R. (2009). Developing Alternative Frameworks for Exploring Intercultural Learning: A Critique of Hofstede's Cultural Difference Model. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14(3): 253-264.
- Spencer-Oatey, H., and Kotthoff, H. (2007). Introduction. In K. Knapp and G. Antos (Series Eds.) and H. Kotthoff and H. Spencer-Oatey (Vol. Eds.), *Handbooks of applied linguistics: Vol. 7. Handbook of intercultural communication* (1-6). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Spitzberg, B. H. and Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing Intercultural Competence. In Dearsdorff, D. K. (ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence*. Thousand Oak, California: SAGE Publications, Inc, pp. 2-52.
- Straffon, D. A. (2003). Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of high school students attending an international school. In R. M. Paige (Guest ed.). Special issue on the Intercultural Development. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(4): 487–501.
- Stickler, U. and Lewis, T. (2003). Tandem Learning and Intercultural Competence. In T. Lewis and L. Walker (eds.), *Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem*. Sheffield: Academy Electronic Publications Limited, pp. 93-104.
- Stivers, T. (2008). Stance, Alignment, and Affiliation During Storytelling: When Nodding Is a Token of Affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41(1): 31-57.
- Stivers, T. (2013). Sequence organisation. In Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Chichester; West Sussex, Blackwell publishing Ltd. pp. 201-217.
- Stivers, T., Mondada, L. and Steensig, J. (2011). Knowledge, morality and affiliation in social interaction. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada and J. Steensig (eds.), *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*. The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 29, pp. 3-24.
- Tarplee, C. (2010). Next turn and intersubjectivity in children's language acquisition. In Gardner, H. and Forrester, M. (eds.), *Analysing interactions in childhood: insights from conversation analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 3-22.

- Ten Have, P. (1990). Methodological Issues in Conversation Analysis. *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 27, pp. 23-51.
- Ten Have, P. (2006). Conversation Analysis versus Other Approaches to Discourse. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. [Online]. Volume 7, Number 2. Available at: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/100/209> . [Accessed: 2nd October 2016].
- Ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing Conversation analysis*, SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Van Compernelle, R. A. (2011). Responding to Questions and L2 Learner Interactional Competence during Language Proficiency Interviews: A Microanalytic Study with Pedagogical Implications. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann and S. P. Doehler (eds.), *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Britain: Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data, pp. 117-144.
- Walker, L. (2003). The Role of Tandem Learner Diary in Supporting and Developing Learner Autonomy. In T. Lewis and L. Walker (eds.), *Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem*. Sheffield: Academy Electronic Publications Limited, pp. 131-143.
- Walker, L. and Lewis, T. (2003). Tandem Learning at the University of Sheffield. In T. Lewis and L. Walker (eds.), *Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem*. Sheffield: Academy Electronic Publications Limited, pp. 7-11.
- Winter, G. (2000). A comparative discussion of the notion of ‘validity’ in qualitative and quantitative research. *The Qualitative Report*. [Online]. Volume 4, Numbers 3 and 4. Available from: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR4-3/winter.html> . [Accessed: 24th January 2015].
- Woodin, J. (2003). Encouraging Intercultural Competence in Tandem Learning. In T. Lewis and L. Walker (eds.), *Autonomous Language Learning in Tandem*. Sheffield: Academy Electronic Publications Limited, pp. 71-78.
- Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis. A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Yin, Robert K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Los Angeles, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Young , R. F. (2008). *Language and Interaction: an advanced resource book*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.