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Abstract

Decades of research on L2 interactional competence has explored how L2 learners understand prior turns or signal their understanding to others through the deployment of the interactional resources available to them as they work towards the achievement of interactional goals (Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011). Several studies have investigated the relationship between proficiency and interactional practices or the development of such practices (Abe, 2019; Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012, 2018; Galaczi, 2014; Hellermann, 2007; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2016; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011; Taguchi, 2015). However, notwithstanding a few exceptions (e.g., Gonzales, 2013; González-Lloret, 2008, 2011), text-based computer-mediated communication (CMC), such as text chat, has been relatively under-explored. It is important for L2 pragmatics researchers to focus on the ability to conduct online L2 interactions and manage the medium-specific features of these interactions in a global digital age.

This study examined interactional competence in L2 task-based text-chat interactions. More specifically, this study investigated how Japanese learners of L2 English with different proficiency levels deployed interactional practices from the openings to the closings of the task talk they produced in response to three discussion tasks.

To explore task openings, I focused on the sequential placement of text-chat posts which proffered a first idea potentially leading to task accomplishment, that is, first-idea proffers (FIPs); as well as exchanges of posts prior to FIPs, namely, preliminaries. The data analysis showed that higher-level learners’ first-idea proffers tended to occur as a response to a previous soliciting move, whereas lower-level learners’ idea-proffers were less responsive. As proficiency increased, linguistic repertoires for FIPs also showed more variation, while lower-level learners predominantly relied on a narrower range of lexico-syntactic forms.

An analysis of task closings was conducted by examining two types of two-turn sequences: summons-answer sequences between one of the dyadic participants and the researcher used to confirm that the task talk was complete; and terminal exchanges between dyadic participants, namely, the last exchanges prior to a summons. The results indicate that more proficient leaners were capable of managing disrupted adjacency
between two turns, and only high-level learners could observably problematize and reformulate crossed posts during closing rituals to maintain intersubjectivity among all participants in the interaction, including the researcher.

With regard to topical talk, the analysis found that as proficiency levels increased, learners were more dependent on explicit solicitation for second ideas. When extending topics in talk, learners of different proficiency levels deployed different interactional practices in terms of their engagement with other-initiated ideas, tendency to offer disagreement, and construction of roles and identities. The analysis also focused on non-topical talk such as informing the interlocutor of the remaining time, uploading a photo, fixing a spelling error, and dealing with miscommunication.

Overall, this study, in which interactions were carried out in a text-only condition, confirmed the findings of previous studies on IC in spoken interaction, namely that the more proficient learners are, the more diverse their methods are. Analysis of across-task variations in pragmatic performance allowed for a more fine-grained picture of this tendency to emerge. This research provided several insights relevant to future IC research regarding how best to apply CA to the analysis of text-based CMC by adapting certain aspects of its analytic mentality to this medium, how best to explore task- and medium-specific resources unexplored by previous studies, how best to explore the potential of overall structural organizations such as openings and closings for the purpose of measuring L2 learners’ pragmatic competence and IC, and how best to discuss CA-findings from the perspective of L2 pragmatics instruction.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 L2 Background and significance of the study

The use of text-based computer-mediated communication (CMC) has become increasingly widespread in both real-time and off-line communications mediated by various computer-based platforms. Text-based synchronous CMC (SCMC) is used not only as an independent tool for communication but also as a supporting tool integrated within larger social networking media platforms. In other words, text-chat interaction is not only an end in itself but also a part of online platforms containing different communication modules (e.g., the messaging facility within Facebook). Whether a text-based synchronous communication tool is used as a stand-alone or as one of many facilities combined into one platform, its conversation-like nature allows users to adopt various strategies to manage medium-specific interactional features (Hung & Higgins, 2016). These medium specific features include not only simplified register or abbreviated spellings (Freiermuth, 2011), or planning or revising strategies (Kost, 2008), but also demand a response to the problem of how to deal with interactional particulars in such ‘text-only’ environments such as the lack of adjacency in turn-taking (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999). Research on such text-based CMC has explored how a competent speaker of a language interacts with others via text-based SCMC without any audio and visual clues but in an orderly manner (e.g., Epperson & Zemel, 2008; Garcia & Jacobs, 1999; Greenfield & Subrahmanyam, 2003; Markman, 2009; Meredith & Stokoe, 2014; Rintel & Pittam, 1997).

In language learning contexts, owing to recent bandwidth enhancement, improvements in system stability and advances in mobile computers including smartphones, SCMC has been implemented both in face-to-face classroom settings where learners bring their own devices and online environments (Adams, 2015). It is essential for L2 learners to engage in online text-based messaging in a pragmatically appropriate and socially acceptable manner in order to make their messages understandable and analyzable as performing an intended action to other online interactants. In other words, learners require pragmatic competence to deal with pragmatically appropriate L2 text-based communication. However, pragmatic
competence to deal with L2 SCMC has been relatively under-explored in language learning research, in spite of the potential of SCMC as a medium for language learning. The scarcity of such research may be a consequence of the lack of standardized methods to analyze SCMC in relevant disciplines, especially subfields of applied linguistics including language teaching, learning, acquisition, and testing as well as Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP). ILP has a long historical background and the evolution of research instruments and methodologies to measure L2 speakers’ pragmatic competence has been a longstanding concern in this field (Kasper, 2006). ILP has largely depended on Discourse Completion Tasks or Tests (DCTs), which are designed to assess a learner’s production and understanding of speech acts such as requests, apologies, or refusals in the form of single-turn utterances without accounting for multi-turn interactions between interlocutors. Responding to a call for a discursive approach to speech act pragmatics (Kasper, 2006) and for a conceptual respecification for L2 acquisition (Firth & Wagner, 1997), ILP has more recently started investigating L2 pragmatics through an analysis of interactional data. These studies have often been conducted based on, or with an analytic contribution from, Conversation Analysis (CA). CA was established by sociologist Harvey Sacks, who drew on Harold Garfinkel’s (1967) ethnomethodology to explore how members of a society systematically, jointly, and ongoingly achieve the orderliness of everyday life. Much of the research on L2 pragmatics or acquisition based on CA has also been called research on interactional competence (IC), where researchers investigate how an L2 learner collaboratively makes his or her own verbal and nonverbal behavior recognizable as performing a meaningful social action (such as a request, apology, or refusal) to others (Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011). However, such IC research on text-based CMC has lagged behind IC studies on face-to-face spoken interactions. The current study on IC via text-based SCMC will not only add to the existing literature on IC in language learning, but will also generate novel insights into new methodologies for examining different levels of L2 pragmatic ability in interaction.

The current research is located in the field of applied CA on talk-in-interaction, where the primary goal of the research is not to explore how social order is achieved among members of a society, but is instead to answer pre-existing research questions with a view to improving the quality of interactional skills in particular institutional settings, including educational, medical, or industrial areas. Although IC is
an interdisciplinary concern spanning different academic fields and subfields, and CA lies at its theoretical and methodological center, how CA can be applied to an analysis of something which is not a spoken conversation, or to ‘conversation-like’ talk-in-interaction, is an ongoing question. It has been suggested that adopting or adhering to some of the basic principles of CA but relaxing others may be a fruitful approach to this problem (Taguchi & Roever, 2017). Some of the basic analytic concepts that constitute the CA approach include unmotivated looking at data (i.e., researchers must not depend on pre-determined categories to understand the meanings of interactional behaviors they observe), the next-turn proof procedure (i.e., the meaning of action is only analyzable by referring to other interlocutors’ subsequent responses), or adjacency pairs (i.e., social actions are made up of two-turn sequences of a first and a second action such as a greeting and another greeting or a request and an acceptance or refusal). The use of text-based SCMC with an educational purpose as data for CA obviously generates some tension with CA’s basic analytic principles. Other concerns may include how quantitative and qualitative methods can coexist in CA-based research (Stivers, 2015). Thus, the current research plays a significant role in obtaining new insights into which aspects of the CA approach might be beneficially applicable to investigations of interactional ability in the context of non-spoken interaction.

Based on this background, the current study is aimed at examining IC in L2 dyadic task-based text-chat interactions. To that end, the study explored the relationship between participants’ interactional behaviour and their L2 proficiency levels (three levels: high, mid, and low) using a cross-sectional research design. This study has several distinctive features possibly separating it from the mainstream of L2 IC studies over and above the fact that this study focuses on text-based CMC rather than spoken conversations.

First, this study highlights the overall structural organization of the task-based interactions into three sections: openings, closings, and the talk in between those two, namely, topical talk. Both the openings and closings are sections of the entire occasion of interaction and they have their own internal structure containing various sequences of actions (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). This is of particular interest as the question of how participants in interaction create sequences of turns to structure such subsections of an interaction is a basic question of CA (Schegloff, 2007). All the task-based interactions studied have one opening and closing, which allowed the researcher to collect a large
number of interaction samples and to make comparisons across the three proficiency
groups. It is also beneficial to compare these three overall structural organizations from
a methodological perspective. Each overall section of interaction has a unique
composition of social actions and different problems interactants need to overcome to
achieve intersubjectivity. Furthermore, by examining the three overall sections, it is
possible to analyse topic transitions between the core business of accomplishing the task
and topically empty talk, where participants’ IC to manage the boundary of interactional
events (Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011; Young, 2008) or to manage topic shifting
(Jefferson, 1984; Sacks, 1992) can be explored.

Another conspicuous feature of this study is a focus on participants’ roles or
identities in addition to the linguistic and sequential features of interactional practices.
In previous studies, IC has been conceptualized as being constituted by developable and
L2 proficiency-sensitive interactional practices such as preambles, sequential
expansions, use of mitigation, or recipient design attributed to individual L2 speakers
(e.g., Al-Gahtani & Roever 2012, 2014, 2018; Galaczi, 2014; Hellermann, 2007, 2008;
Ishida, 2009; Pekarek Doehler & Berger 2016; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger,
2011; Rine & Hall 2011; Taguchi, 2015). Given that L2 IC is co-constructed by all
parties involved in an interaction (He & Young 1998), a focus on how their roles and
identities are interactionally co-constructed and how they are related to IC is likewise
important. However, in spite of a few exceptions (e.g., Kasper, 2004; Nguyen, 2012;
Okada, 2010), there has been a scarcity of research that features sequential analysis of
how participants’ roles and identities are co-constructed in interaction in the body of IC
literature. Thus, this study contributes to minimizing this particular gap in L2 IC
research.

To effectively document different interactional features in each section of the
overall structural organization (i.e., openings, closings, and topical talk in between),
with a focus on interactionally shaped roles and identities, three discussion tasks were
chosen as data elicitation instruments. This is another distinct feature of the current
study. By implementing tasks where participants could engage in free discussion instead
of role play tasks, which assign predetermined roles to participants, the researcher was
able to investigate how participants co-constructed roles and identities to make their
actions mutually recognizable in each section of the overall structure of the interaction.
This study uses time-limited discussion tasks, thus requiring participants to be oriented
to time constraints, which introduces a specific type of difficulty in closing discussions in SCMC media. This study also examines the role of the third party, that is, the researcher, who also participated in the online interactions as a moderator for the participants’ interactional performances. This type of investigation of participation frameworks for two ratified participants within a task-based discussion and an unratified participant externally monitoring the ratified participants enabled the researcher to analyze how ratified participants used the third party as a resource to make their actions recognizable to another ratified counterpart - a feature of interactional behaviour that has been rarely documented in IC research. Furthermore, adopting three consecutive tasks provides us with an opportunity to look at changes in participants’ interactional practices across tasks, even though the study design does not provide sufficient time to look at development longitudinally. Finally, the findings of the study are relevant to not only the CA and IC fields, but also have pedagogical implications for technology-based task-based language teaching (TBLT) in terms of offering fresh insights into how to best implement text-based SCMC tasks.

1.2 Organization of the thesis

This thesis divided into seven chapters. The current chapter provides a background, argues for the significance of this study and offers an outline of the thesis. The following chapter will first present a review of literature on the fields of L2 pragmatics, CA, and IC. Based on the CA literature, basic analytic principles (i.e., turn, turn-taking, sequence organization, recipient design, repair, etc.) and analytic concepts used to explore participants’ roles and identities (i.e., epistemics, membership categories, and participation frameworks) are presented in detail with excerpts from previous studies. Next, I present a review of the literature on CMC, including text-based SCMC, through reviewing classifications of CMC media, looking at the basic characteristics of SCMC and ACMC, and highlighting previous work on L2 pragmatics and IC in text-based CMC (both SCMC and ACMC). Descriptions of previous empirical studies on IC and analyses of how they applied CA to their own individual contexts are presented when appropriate. Chapter 3 will present the methodology used for the study. Owing to the fact that this is an ILP study, the research questions are provided. Then, the chapter discusses methodological considerations and highlights the
approach adopted to challenges surrounding the applicability of CA concepts and
methods to attempts to answer ILP research questions. Subsequently, detailed
information about the participants, Japanese L2 learners of English, and their individual
attributes including proficiency levels, is provided. In addition, the data collection
procedures, the elicitation instruments, and the technical affordances of the text-chat
tools, are introduced and described. In the same chapter, the method by which text-chat
interactions were transcribed into a script for analysis is presented with sample excerpts.
Chapters 4, 5, and 6 will report the findings of the analysis of task openings, task
closings, and topical talk respectively. Each chapter starts with a description of key
terms used in the analysis. The main analysis features excerpts of each overall structural
section individually (i.e., Chapter 4 contains only excerpts pertaining to task openings).
The first half of each chapter is devoted to presenting how each overall structural
section was jointly constructed by participants. The second half is dedicated to
examining proficiency differences, namely, differences in interactional practices across
proficiency levels. Whether the proficiency differences are analysed through coding and
quantification or more qualitatively is tailored to the findings in the first half, namely,
the interactional features of each of the three overall sections. In Chapter 6, I first
compare the findings from the previous three chapters (Chapters 4, 5, and 6) in terms of
differences in interactional practices across tasks. Then, I discuss the nature of IC
observed in the current study in terms of IC for task-based interactions as well as IC for
text-based SCMC. Chapter 7 summarizes the main findings, outlines the general
conclusion of the thesis and discusses the pedagogical implications of the study as well
as its limitations and possible future research directions.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, in order to better understand the historical evolution of the field of L2 pragmatics or interlanguage pragmatics (ILP), I first outline in Section 2.2 what the literature has reported to date on L2 pragmatic competence and its development. Next, Section 2.3 reviews definitional debates surrounding IC by means of a comparison with communicative competence. Section 2.4 introduces theoretical and methodological overviews of CA. Section 2.5 introduces analytic concepts used in CA studies. These are the basic building blocks (turn-taking, turn design, sequence organization, and repair) that underpin an understanding of participants’ social actions, analytic perspectives used to explore the relationships between participants (epistemics, roles, identities, and participation frameworks), and the overall structural organization (openings, closings, and topical talk in between) used to explore participants’ IC in the current study. Section 2.6 reviews the literature surrounding pragmatics for CMC.

2.2 L2 pragmatics

Pragmatics deals with the relationship between the use of language, one of the semiotic systems in our society, and its use in context (Levinson, 2001). L2 (or interlanguage) pragmatics is one of many subfields (e.g., cross-cultural pragmatics) of pragmatics and it is the study of how L2 learners understand and use a target language in a pragmatically appropriate manner (Taguchi & Roever, 2017). L2 pragmatics is rooted in various disciplinary domains and it was philosophy that contributed most to L2 pragmatics research in its early days. One of the greatest contributions is the speech act theory developed by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969, 1975). More recently, CA has emerged as a popular theoretical and methodological framework derived from sociology and anthropology. Although CA has almost as longstanding a history as speech act theory, it is only recently that it has come to be frequently employed in L2 pragmatics research. The movement towards more CA approaches has been inspired by a trend for L2 pragmatics to view speech act approaches more critically and to shift its research
focus from the use of language in single isolated utterances to more extended interactions situated in a social context (Kasper, 2006).

Austin’s (1962) speech act theory is one of the most influential theories in both L1 and L2 pragmatics. Austin took a critical stance towards logical positivism, which focuses only on the truth value of a given statement. Instead, he introduced felicity conditions that determine whether a speech act is successful or not. Austin’s assumption that “to say something is to do something” (p. 12) allows us to interpret an utterance or sentence such as Can you come here? as a speech act with the illocutionary force of a request as long as the felicity conditions are satisfied (i.e., the speaker is in a position to make that request to the listener(s) and the listener(s) has the capability to come to the designated place). Searle (1969) advanced Austin’s theory by classifying the function of illocutionary acts into several categories and later (1975) proposed indirect speech acts consisting of two or more illocutionary forces in a single utterance or sentence (e.g., statement and request). Speech acts have been the most frequently researched topic in L2 pragmatics up to today.

L2 speech acts have been investigated using discourse completion tasks (DCTs), where non-interactional data such as a sample of short utterances or sentences are examined in terms of their linguistic and pragmatic features. A pioneering study called the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP), conducted by Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989), examined speech act data elicited from 1946 participants from seven language backgrounds. For instance, Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) presents the following speech sample produced in response to a DCT item: Judith, I missed class yesterday, do you think I could borrow your notes? I promise to return them by tomorrow. They coded utterances of this type into four basic elements: alerters, which include attention-getters such as address terms with various lexical variations (e.g., Judith or darling); supportive moves, which include prefaces (e.g., are you busy? or will you do me a favor?); head acts, which are the main body of an utterance, in this case the request (e.g., do you think I could borrow your notes?); and internal modifications, which serve as optional modifiers (e.g., do you think). To further code head acts for requests, they introduced strategies and two perspectives. They propose nine types of strategies, ranging from those conveying more explicit illocutionary force (e.g., mood derivable such as leave me alone or performatives such as I am asking you to clean up the mess) to more implicative meanings (e.g., you have left the kitchen in a
right mess). Perspectives refer to whether head acts are composed in a speaker-oriented (e.g., Can I have it?), hearer-oriented (e.g., Can you do it?), inclusive (e.g., Can we start clearing now?), or impersonal (e.g., It needs to be cleaned) fashion. The coding scheme developed by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) has been partially or entirely applied to studies on different types of speech acts including requests (Biesenbach-Lucas, 2006), apologies (Hudson, Detmer, & Brown, 1995; Liu & Ren, 2016), refusals (Beebe & Cummings, 1996; Hudson et al., 1995), and suggestions (Li, 2010).

Bella (2014) pointed out two important aspects relevant to collecting language samples and measuring learners’ pragmatic competence. The first one relates to using learners’ individual differences, such as proficiency levels or study-aboard experience, to examine their development. Bella states that proficiency is a useful indicator owing to its more ready availability (compared with other indicators for development such as study-abroad experience). The second one concerns the tasks used to explore development such as role plays, verbal reports or institutional talk as well as oral and written DCTs or other non-interactive data. Bardovi-Harlig (2013) classified methods of collecting interactive data into (1) role plays or simulated tasks and (2) conversation or institutional talk. Bardovi-Harlig points out that although these two types of data are authentic in terms of turn-construction, the former (role plays and simulated tasks) have no real-life consequences. On the other hand, Okada’s (2010) research found that role play allows interactants (i.e., a role-play conductor and a learner) to construct roles and identities moment by moment during oral proficiency interview interactions. Thus, task-based interaction may not be consequential to learners, but it can elicit learners’ emergent identities observable in interaction and this viewpoint is important for L2 pragmatic competence research when dealing with interactive data.

Development of L2 pragmatics has been investigated based on analysis of L2 speech acts, most frequently requests. Ellis (1992) investigated the L2 pragmatic development of two school age children for one year and one-and-a-half years. Although the participants’ repertoire of strategies was limited, possibly because of the classroom context, a link between the development of L2 pragmatic ability and L2 proficiency was suggested (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999). Achiba (2003) examined the development of L2 requests in a child ESL learner and found that the participant increased his repertoire of request strategies. Based on Ellis (1992) and Achiba (2003),
Kasper and Rose (2002), proposed five stages of development for L2 requests. See the summary presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Pre-basic</td>
<td>Highly context dependent</td>
<td>‘Me no blue’, Sir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No syntax, no relational goals</td>
<td>‘Let’s play the game.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Formulaic</td>
<td>Reliance on unanalyzed</td>
<td>‘Let’s each breakfast.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>formulas and imperatives</td>
<td>‘Don’t look.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Unpacking</td>
<td>Formulas incorporated into</td>
<td>‘Can you pass the pencil please?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>productive language use, shift</td>
<td>‘Can you do another one for me?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to conventional indirectness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Pragmatic expansion</td>
<td>Addition of new forms to</td>
<td>‘Can I see it so I can copy it?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pragma-linguistic repertoire,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increased use of mitigation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more complex syntax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Fine-tuning</td>
<td>Fine-tuning of requestive</td>
<td>‘Is there any more white?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>force to participants, goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the later stages of their development, learners start to exhibit an expansion of pragmatic ability by, for example, combining more clausal units in an utterance or using mitigation devices. After automatizing the basic structure of requestive utterances with emergent extra components, learners start to fine-tune utterances to increase their well-fittedness to the situation in which the speech act is performed. This five-step developmental model has been confirmed by several studies on L2 pragmatics (e.g., Bella, 2012; Felix-Brasdefer, 2007).

More recently, L2 pragmatic development has been investigated in extended interactions (e.g., Abe, 2019; Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2015; Galaczi, 2014; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011). Al-Gahtani and Roever (2015), adopting both cross-sectional and longitudinal designs, investigated the development of L2 requests shown by L2 Arabic learners with different language backgrounds. Overall, regardless of their proficiency level, learners created more indirect requests in the later months of the study. As for proficiency differences, lower-level learners shifted from making direct
requests to making indirect ones, while higher-level learners decreased their use of indirect requests over time. Although this finding confirms Kasper and Rose’s (2002) model of development of L2 requests in that beginners increased their pragmatic repertoires, the tendency among advanced learners apparently contradicts it. This suggests that Kasper and Rose’s model is not universally applicable and researchers need to consider the possible effect of target language norms (i.e., in Arabic, more direct requests are preferred), a complication which has also been explored in studies on L2 Spanish requests (e.g., Bataller, 2010; Shively, 2011). Abe (2019) investigated online interaction in text-editing software where Japanese learners of L2 English discussed and co-created an English essay in response to a prompt. This study focuses on changes in the interactional practices deployed by three participants over five weeks. Using the text-chat facility, one focal participant, Tada, initially made a request for corrections for the writing he had contributed with an apology, a self-deprecat ing comment on his own writing, an account for the low quality of his writing, and what can be called the head act of his request, namely, the main request component prefaced with so please. In the second attempt, Tada’s request for correction was divided into two components using a line break, firstly a report of what he had written and secondly a request head act prefaced with so please and a sentence ending if-clause (“if you find something wrong”). Subsequently, Tada used anything instead of something in his sentence-ending if-clause and a smiley emoticon. This finding indicates that the development of L2 English requests in an online text-only environment conforms to Kasper and Rose’s (2002) model and pragmatic repertoires can include non-linguistic resources such as line breaks or emoticons. This developmental tendency to produce extended interactions also suggests that L2 pragmatic competence can be regarded as interactional competence as these studies (e.g., Abe, 2019; Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2015) dealt with participants’ competence in fine tuning their pragmatic behaviors to others through managing the local contingencies of their interactions. This indicates that we need an appropriate way of conceptualizing such competence and methodological approaches for investigating it. In the next two sections, I review theoretical debates regarding pragmatic competence to manage extended interactions, or interactional competence (IC), and CA, which is one of the most frequently implemented methodological frameworks for investigating IC.
2.3 Interactional competence (IC)

L2 pragmatic competence has been regarded as a constituent part of holistic language ability or communicative competence and it has been theorized in well-known models in the fields L2 learning, teaching, acquisition and testing (e.g., Bachman & Palmer, 1996; 2010; Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980). On the other hand, IC has also been more widely investigated in broader areas aside from those fields mentioned above, including various institutional contexts including clinical settings or the development of children’s social behaviors. Several researchers have raised concerns regarding the ambiguity of the term ‘IC’ (e.g., Hall, 2018; Hauser, 2019; Skogmyr Marian & Balaman, 2018). This section first briefly reviews the historical evolution of the concept of communicative competence (Section 2.3.1). Subsequently, previous studies attempting to define IC (or L2 IC) will be presented as a means of highlighting points of similarity and divergence between IC and communicative competence (Section 2.3.2). Section 2.3.3 presents the field of CA-SLA and its particular analytic approach to IC.

2.3.1 Communicative competence

Ability for communication in an L2 has been conceptualized under the term communicative competence, which was originally coined by Hymes (1972). The theoretical debate can be traced back to Chomsky’s (1965) distinction between linguistic competence and linguistic performance. Chomsky’s theory of generative grammar, which focuses only on linguistic ability, claimed that actual speech utterances and the psychological factors influencing individual speaker’s production should be excluded from scientific investigation of language. Taking a critical standpoint to Chomsky’s theorization regarding language and language use, Hymes treated competence as the general term to refer to human capabilities, consisting of tacit knowledge and an ability to use it. Hymes, as a sociologist as well as an anthropologist, claimed that the actual contexts in which language is used need to be taken into account, so that not only linguistically accurate use of language, but also its socially appropriate use, can be included in the broader concept of communicative competence. With regard to the socially appropriate use of language, he stated that “the concept of ‘performance’ will be important also in the light of sociological work such as that of Goffman . . . as
its concern with general interactional competence helps make precise the particular role of linguistic competence” (p. 65).

Since Hymes introduced the notion of communicative competence, several researchers have discussed and refined theoretical models that aim to map its constituent features. Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) developed a model of communicative competence consisting of grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic, and strategic competences. Grammatical competence can be defined as one’s ability to produce a sentence with an accurate form and it encompasses phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical, and semantic knowledge. Discourse competence is the ability to produce and recognize textually coherent and cohesive messages. Sociolinguistic competence refers to an understanding of the socially appropriate use of an utterance and its meaning in a particular context. Strategic competence means that a speaker can manage to avoid communication breakdown altogether, or, failing that, effectively repair it either verbally or nonverbally. Although these models do not explicate the relationship among these four competences, they served as a theoretical grounding for the integration of a social aspect into the conceptualization of language ability.

Bachman (1990) and Bachman and Palmer (1996, 2010) refined the previous models of communicative competence into their model of communicative language ability which features a clear taxonomy. Through integration of psycholinguistic perspectives into his model, Bachman (1990) proposed that communicative language ability subsumes language knowledge, strategic competence, and neurological and psychological processes. Language knowledge is divided into organizational knowledge (grammatical and textual knowledge) and pragmatic knowledge (functional and sociolinguistic knowledge). Functional knowledge refers to knowing how to use language in communicatively appropriate ways, while sociolinguistic knowledge means knowing how to select language forms suitable to a particular social context. Bachman’s model includes the psychological processes of assessing contextual factors and planning and executing a planned language form in pursuit of a particular communicative goal. These theoretical models including the most recent model provided by Bachman and Palmer (2010) are useful for L2 pragmatics research as pragmatics is a part of all these models and these models reproduce a distinction between sociopragmatics and
pragmalinguistics (Roever, 2011) that is roughly similar to that articulated by Leech (1983).

Although these theoretical models of communicative competence provide some tools to explain L2 speakers’ language ability for effective communication, they fail to generate sufficient explanatory power when it comes to exploring L2 speakers’ context-sensitive conduct to deal with dynamically changing, locally situated interactions, in spite of the fact that such conduct ought to be considered a part of Hymes’ (1972) original theorization of communicative competence. Besides, the most well-known model introduced by Canale and Swain (1980) excluded more generic abilities such as personality factors, interpersonal communication skills, an ability to deal with troubles in an impromptu fashion or adapt to different situations, and cultural tolerances, even though those are included in Hymes’s original definition of communicative competence (Sato & McNamara, 2018). As Hymes (1984) also states that “the abilities of individuals and the composite abilities of communities cannot be understood except by making ‘verbal repertoire,’ not ‘language,’ the central scientific notion” (p. 44), a more comprehensive conceptualization of language ability is required in L2-related fields and one such conceptualization that has emerged in recent years is labelled as interactional competence. However, communicative competence and the models built to define it still have a very significant influence on the construct of L2 proficiency and how it is used in both teaching and assessment practice today.

2.3.2 Interactional competence

Just as models for communicative competence were introduced by Hymes in response to Chomsky’s competence-performance distinction, interactional competence also originated from a critical review of a dominant trend in language learning and teaching. Historically, the term IC dates back to Kramsch’s (1986) criticism of ‘the proficiency movement’ or the proficiency-oriented language learning policy in foreign language education in the US. Kramsch states:

Whether it is a face-to-face interaction between two or several speakers, or the interaction between a reader and a written text, successful interaction presupposes not only a shared knowledge of the world, the reference to a common external context of communication, but also the construction of shared internal context or
“sphere of inter-subjectivity” that is built through the collaborative efforts of the interactional partners. (p. 367).

Through her orientation to the collaborative nature of face-to-face interaction and intersubjectivity between interlocutors, Kramsch criticizes the standpoint that L2 speaker’s language abilities are deficient in contrast with those of L1 speakers. However, neither a definition of IC nor an explanation of its disciplinary roots in linguistic anthropology or sociology were clearly mentioned (Hall, 2018).

Since Kramsch’s call for a shift towards IC in language learning, several researchers have sought to develop the concept from linguistic anthropological, sociological, and sociolinguistic perspectives (Hall, 1993, 1995; He & Young, 1998; Kasper, 2006; Young & Miller, 2004). One of the most influential references among these studies was Hymes’s work on communicative competence (Hymes, 1972, 1974, 1992). Hymes (1972) treats communicative competence as tacit knowledge and the ability to use language in social-interactional contexts and communicative competence is comprehensive enough to subsume non-cognitive factors such as motivation, or what Goffman (1967) considers to be competence to interact with others, such as an ability to control emotion and maintain composure and dignity or project stage confidence.

Hymes takes an approach based in the ethnography of communication with his colleague Gumperz, who claims that effective communication presupposes an agreement between speakers and hearers not only on what the words they use mean, but also on what their word selection implies given the standards shared in a society (Gumperz, 1971). Referring to these views, Hall (1995) defines IC as the competence to discursively establish and manage topics in a goal-oriented fashion in order to achieve a particular interactional practice. Although it is apparent that Kramsch (1986) is not cited in Hall (1995), it is possible to regard what Kramsch referred to as a “shared internal context or ‘sphere of inter-subjectivity’” as parallel with what Hall (1995) refers to as “expectations about what is going on and to place us in a context in which our actions are mutually intelligible” (p. 39).

Viewing ‘oral proficiency interviews (OPIs)’ as speech events whose norms govern language use, and pointing out that an OPI is a cross-cultural encounter where two parties with different L1 backgrounds create interactions, Young and He (1998) edited a book by collecting studies that took different methodological approaches such
as speech act theory, interactional sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, intercultural communication and conversation analysis. He and Young (1998), in the first chapter of the book, point out that both parties to an interaction may bring different views of communication and these views may be influenced by communicative competence perspectives (e.g., Canale & Swain, 1980). Thus, He and Young’s interdisciplinary conceptualization of IC is different from those post-Hymes models of communicative competence. IC is based in, for He and Young, what Jacoby and Ochs (1995) call co-construction. According to Jacoby and Ochs, what can be co-constructed in social interactions is “joint creation of a form, interpretation, stance, action, identity, institution, skill, ideology, emotion, or other culturally meaningful reality” (p. 171). Based on that, He and Young (1998) state that:

Individuals do not acquire a general, practice-independent communicative competence; rather they acquire a practice-specific interactional competence by participating with more experienced others in specific interactive practices. … Interactional competence is not an attribute of an individual participant, and thus we cannot say that an individual is interactionally competent; rather we talk of interactional competence as something that is jointly constructed by all participants (including an analyst if the interaction is subjected to analysis) (p. 7).

Although this definition is clear enough to highlight IC’s discursive and co-constructed nature, we can find several ambiguities in it. First, the statement that IC is not attributable to an individual seems to contradict the claim that individuals can acquire practice-specific interactional competence (Hauser, 2019). Second, it is potentially problematic to assume that participating with more experienced interactional partners in cross-cultural encounters is an important means of acquiring IC. That is because such a view could potentially perpetuate the attitude that non-native speakers’ performance can be seen as deficient compared with that of native speakers (Firth & Wagner, 1997). Third, whether a researcher who is co-present as a participant with other participants can construct IC needs to be considered (e.g., if an analyst watches video data where L1 and L2 speakers are interacting, is the analyst co-constructing IC?). Fourth, in many attempts to define IC, whether the competence pertains to second language ability or more generic competence is unclear (i.e., IC vs. L2 IC). However, despite some
conceptual ambiguities, He and Young’s model provides an analytic framework and emphasis on interdisciplinarity, which has contributed to the advancement of IC research in different fields including L2 learning, teaching, acquisition and testing, including studies on L2 pragmatic ability to manage extended interactions.

IC has been investigated in mainly spoken interactions which have several of what Hall (1995) calls interactive practices or what Young (2008) calls discursive practices. Discursive practices are recurrently observable social practices and, due to their recurrently observable nature, participants are able to use them as a resource to observably display their normative orientations, which has social and cultural significance for a society (Young, 2011). Young (2011) presents an episode from Saville-Troike’s (1989) ethnographic study on a kindergarten classroom on a Navajo Reservation. In the episode, a Navajo man visits his son’s classroom to pick him up and meets his Anglo-American teacher. Although the teacher offered a greeting following the Anglo-American norm, the father remained silent following Navajo norm. Then, the son “walked towards the man (his father), stopping to turn around and wave at the teacher on his way out and saying, “Bye-bye.” The teacher responded, “Bye-bye.” The man remained silent as he left” (Saville-Troike, 1989, p.131-132). Young analyzed the son’s behavior as displaying interactional competence, that is, the ability to recognize and respond to interactants’ expectations in a particular discursive practice. This type of episode is conducive to solving one conceptual ambiguity associated with IC, namely, the issue of whether IC is attributable to an individual or to all participants. It was the son who recognized and responded to members’ expectations in a leave-taking practice in a kindergarten (in an Anglo-American cultural setting), which is attributable to the son. However, it was the Anglo-American teacher and Navajo father who ratified the son’s behavior with a relevant response to co-construct the whole leave-taking practice. Moreover, this example invites a further fine-tuning of the definition of IC. How we deal with participants’ roles and identities in a particular discursive practice appears to be another aspect of the IC construct.

Young (2000, 2003) proposes a six-component model of IC and later (Young, 2008) divided these components into three resources: identity resources (participation frameworks), linguistic resources (register and modes of meaning), and interactional resources (speech acts, turn-taking, repair, and boundaries). Young (2008) models interactional competence as follows (p.71):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>- Participation framework: the identities of all participants in an interaction, present or not, official or unofficial, ratified or unratified, and their footing or identities in the interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic</td>
<td>- Register: the features of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar that typify a practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Modes of meaning: the ways in which participants construct interpersonal, experiential, and textual meanings in a practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>- Speech acts: the selection of acts in a practice and their sequential organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Turn-taking: how participants select the next speaker and how participants know when to end one turn and when to begin the next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Repair: the ways in which participants respond to interactional trouble in a given practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Boundaries: the opening and closing acts of a practice that serve to distinguish a given practice from adjacent talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young’s (2008, 2011) inclusion of identity resources as a part of IC is an extension of Goffman’s (1981) concept of interactive footings (Taguchi, 2015) and these subcomponents of IC have commonly been viewed as resources partially or entirely conventionalized as tacit knowledge to achieve interactionally competent performance. A recent definition of IC was proposed by Hall and Pekarek Doehler (2011) in the first chapter of the book edited by Hall, Hellermann, and Pekarek Doehler (2011). Hall and Pekarek Doehler define IC as the following:

In our interactions with others, we set goals and negotiate the procedures used to reach them. At the same time, we constitute and manage our individual identities, our social role relationships, and memberships in our social groups and communities. Central to competent engagement in our interactions is our ability to accomplish meaningful social actions, to respond to co-participants’ previous actions and to make recognizable for others what our actions are and how these
related to their own actions. IC, that is the context-specific constellations of expectations and dispositions about our social worlds that we draw on to navigate our way through our interactions with others, implies the ability to mutually coordinate our actions. (pp. 1-2)

Although Hall and Pekarek Doehler (2011) avoid defining IC with clearly termed subcomponents, their definition of IC seems to subsume three aspects: (1) knowledge of context-bound (everyday or more institutional) practices, processes by which each participant with a particular role and relationship to other participants conventionally accomplishes a goal, (2) the ability to understand and produce socially and contextually organized sequence of turns and actions, and (3) the linguistic and non-linguistic resources to successfully realize and acquire this ability (2) based on this knowledge (1). One notable feature in Hall and Pekarek Doehler’s definition is their placing of CA as a central device for the conceptualization of IC, which is partially suggested by their avoidance of the use of the term speech act, which had been used in previous definitions of IC. Moreover, Hall and Pekarek Doehler’s concern for defining IC extends to its applicability to developmental research. Although Hall and Pekarek Doehler’s definition of IC refers to IC in itself rather than ‘L2 IC’, the phrase L2 IC can be seen here and there in the volume and the distinction of these two concepts seems not to be topicalized.

IC research has been done in other areas including studies on children’s’ IC in managing child-child interactions (Stivers, Sidnell, & Bergen, 2018) or clinical interactions between a doctor or a therapist and a patient (Ferrara, 1999; Kovarsky, Duchan, & Maxwell, 1999; Rapley, 2004). Ferrara (1999) identifies several interactional practices used by a therapist to construct patients’ incompetence such as taking the stance of an expert, providing metalinguistic assessments, repeating what a patient has said or recycling patient failure. Rapley (2004) states that disability is not an outcome of diagnostic judgment but unfolds locally as a discursive practice. Due to the interdisciplinary nature of IC, each discipline or field has tended to develop and work with its own unique definition of IC.
2.3.3 CA-SLA

An academic branch that more strictly follows CA is CA-SLA. The nature of SLA has long been debated, with discussions of the role of input, output, interaction, intake, comprehension, feedback, noticing or negotiation of meaning being prominent. Various researchers have adopted theories concerning the cognitive mechanisms involved in L2 learning, which can be either implicit or explicit (Long, 2015). This field has established various social learning theories inspired by different disciplinary areas such as Vygostkyan sociocultural theory (Lantolf & Appel, 1994) and Lave and Wenger’s (1991) notion of Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Although cognitively-oriented SLA theories allow researchers to adopt experimental designs and socially-oriented SLA theories allow for thick descriptions that capture possibly overlooked social aspects of learning, these etic, theory-driven and researcher-centered analytic standpoints have been problematized by several researchers (e.g., Firth & Wagner, 1997; Kasper, 2006; Markee & Kasper, 2004). It was Firth and Wagner (1997) who first criticized the approach to analyzing L2 learning common in traditional SLA research. They claim that much of the central SLA literature comprises different types of studies with varied predetermined concepts but no critical evaluation of those concepts. They proposed changes in SLA research such as an enhanced awareness of contextual and interactional aspects of learning, an emic viewpoint and a broadening of SLA concepts such as “native-speaker”. Firth and Wagner’s contentions can be summarized as: (1) A cognitivist, mentalistic view prevents researchers from focusing on a context-sensitive, emic, discursive approach to second language acquisition; (2) Globalization means various emergent multilingual speech communities are being shaped, and non-native speakers have multiple identities at the same time; (3) SLA research has treated non-native speakers’ performance as deficient compared to that of native speakers (for a counterargument, see Gass, 1998).

Since Firth and Wagner’s (1997) call for a shift in the direction of SLA research, several researchers have investigated second language use in terms of a larger trajectory of actions under the label interactional competence (e.g., Gardner & Wagner, 2004; He, 2004; Hellermann, 2007, 2008; Hellermann & Cole, 2008; Kasper, 2004; Markee, 2004, 2008; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004). Kasper (2004) focused on repair sequences and an L2 German speaker’s L1 use in an L2 German interaction (i.e., code-switching) for learning with a native-speaker of German with a focus on
participants’ identities. Kasper claims that CA is sufficiently robust to examine the relationship between interactional features and learning through analysing extended interactions and employing longitudinal and cross-sectional data. Not only repairs and code-switching, but also various other aspects of participants’ interactional repertoires such as facial expressions, gestures, epistemics as well as other non-linguistic resources and collaboratively achieved behaviors using these resources, are observable as driving the moment by moment construction of socially distributed cognition (Markee, 2008).

In CA-SLA, some studies have suggested an answer to the question of whether IC is best understood as a generic competence or as being tied to ability in a specific L2. Kasper (2004) documented a dyadic interaction for L2 learning between a native speaker of German named Dagmar and an L2 speaker named Cindy. In the opening of their conversation, Dagmar offers questions such as how are you? or how was your weekend? in German and Cindy answers in German. When Cindy reciprocates those question-answer sequences, she used her L1 English (“how was your weekend?”) with a lower voice. Subsequently, Dagmar supplied an other-initiated repair saying in German (“wie war dein wochenende?” meaning “how was your week?”), which shows Dagmar’s orientation to the activity as an occasion for German speaking. Cindy displays an orientation to common conversational practice such as reciprocating a sequence of how are you? with I am fine, which indicates Cindy’s interactional competence as a participant in daily dyadic conversation, while the fact that Cindy had to use her L1 English to produce how are you instead of L2 German indicates her interactional incompetence to do so in her L2, namely, L2 interactional incompetence. Kasper’s view of IC suggests that interactional competence is constructed based on participants’ sequentially shaped roles and identities.

CA-SLA and IC research can be different. Markee (2008) points out three solutions to the problem of using exogenous theories or variables in IC studies. The first solution is to use CA as an analytic tool with a pre-existent theory of learning and to ignore CA’s emic, agnostic, and ethnomethodologically indifferent standpoint. The second solution is to adopt a position where researchers assume that learning is rooted in participants’ participation in structuring social interaction, their building and altering of participation frameworks and their discursive construction of identities, while at the same time leaving aside the building blocks of social order with which CA concerns itself such as turn-taking, repair, and sequence organization. In that it involves
researchers adopting theories such as socio-cultural theory or situated learning theory, the second solution is fundamentally the same as the first one. The third solution, which Markee claims is equivalent with CA-SLA, is to fully embrace CA and adopt all of its analytic principles (e.g., turn-taking etc.) and stances (e.g., unmotivated looking etc.) through reconceptualizing the cognitive process of learning. Thus, Markee defines IC as the deployment of different semiotic resources “to co-construct with their interlocutors locally enacted, progressively more accurate, fluent, and complex interactional repertoires” (p.406). In tracking the development of the IC displayed by science professors in an intensive English language program at a university in the US, Markee focused on the use of the word prerequisite for two reasons. First, that participants themselves picked up this word and centralized it to structure an interactional event, which follows the epistemological stance of CA, and second, that mastery of a lexical item is no doubt essential for a competent member of a society who is involved in co-constructing with interlocutors a larger interactional event containing the sequential deployment of this lexical item.

Taguchi and Roever (2017) provide another solution to this problem as an alternative to combining CA with exogenous theories of learning or conducting pure CA. This is to use CA as a set of analytic tools to analyze a pre-targeted L2 pragmatic phenomenon but without researcher-centered speculation about it, that is, following the next-turn proof procedure for analysis of interactional data. In other words, this standpoint prioritizes answering research questions or solving problems regarding L2 pragmatics over respecting all of CA’s epistemological commitments around exploring members’ methods to co-construct a speech event. For instance, Al-Gahtani and Roever (2012) investigated L2 (English and Arabic) learners’ requests in conversational roleplays. Their study was motivated by the necessity to investigate L2 requests in extended interaction, an area which had not been sufficiently addressed since research had often been conducted through DCT-based methods. For that purpose, roleplays designed to elicit L2 requests were used. Although this approach is not entirely faithful to the epistemology of CA, it boasts a flexibility and robustness that makes it a valuable option for investigating the nature of L2 IC with a focus on pre-targeted interactional practices.

This approach can be seen as an ‘applied’ CA, which stands in contrast with ‘pure’ CA, where an analyst is expected to entirely subscribe to CA’s epistemological
standpoints. Applied CA, motivated by pre-existing questions, problems, or agenda items within a particular institutional setting, makes use of the full range of analytic toolsets which CA provides and this is its greatest advantage when compared to other sociocultural or anthropological approaches to interactional data that may be used to investigate IC.

2.4 CA

Conversation Analysis (CA) is a sociological approach used to explore the mechanisms of social interaction and is widely used in various fields including sociology, anthropology, and linguistics. It was established by sociologist Harvey Sacks in the 1960s. Sacks was inspired by ethnomethodology, a sociological approach to describe everyday practices and their meaning from emic perspectives. Its origin is derived from Harold Garfinkel’s work on ethnomethodology, which was a critical reaction to the deductive approach of Parsonian sociology whose basic assumption is that sociologists’ views on a society are superior to the viewpoints taken by the members (Seedhouse, 2004). Garfinkel (1967) rejected the assumption that normative rules determine human conduct and intersubjective knowledge is established based on these rules. In other words, influenced by Husserlian phenomenology and its rejection of psychological reductionism (Heritage, 1984), Garfinkel’s ethnomethodology repudiates the view that the meaning of words is pre-determined prior to their actual use (Izumi, 2017). A few years later, Garfinkel and Sacks (1970) state that “the definiteness of expressions resides in their consequences; definitions can be used to assure a definite collection of ‘considerations’ without providing a boundary; the definiteness of a collection is assured by circumstantial possibilities of indefinite elaboration”. As Garfinkel opposes the idea that the meaning of a word is predetermined, Sacks, the founder of CA, is also centrally concerned with the contextual sensitivity of language use (Akman, 2000).

Through the collaboration of Sacks and his colleagues, fundamental rules of conversational organization, such as the adjacency pair, a pair of two reciprocating conversational turns produced by different speakers, were introduced (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977, Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). These papers also introduced basic toolsets for CA such as turn-constructional units.
(TCUs), the repair system, and preference organization. Sacks et al. (1974) divided an adjacency pair into the first pair part (FPP) and the second pair part (SPP). According to Schegloff (2007), before, between, and after the FPP and SPP, sequences that perform actions such as mitigation, clarification or the further extension of a topic can be produced. Due to the ethnomethodological standpoint that the definiteness of an expression is determined by its consequences and the concept of adjacency pairs, CA’s analytic system is called the next-turn proof procedure; CA researchers try to understand the meaning of participants’ social actions through the analysis of adjacent turns in a conversation (Sidnell, 2013). These apparatuses have been robust enough to be capable of identifying pervasively observed interactional features but still retain sensitivity to various local sociocultural contexts (Waring, 2018).

The primary purpose of CA is to reveal the organization of naturally-occurring talk with ‘unmotivated looking’ (Schegloff, 1996), which suggests that CA should be used to explore unknown phenomena rather than previously theorized concepts (Psathas, 1990). This epistemological standpoint is one of the challenges in applying CA to L2 pragmatics research as L2 pragmatics researchers tend to be motivated by research questions. To deal with this problem, Seedhouse (2005) claimed that applied CA studies can analyze the machinery producing social order as long as the emic nature of CA is preserved through detailed analysis, which allows researchers access to members’ perspectives rather than an analyst’s perspective. Seedhouse’s prioritization of detailed analysis conforms to the original CA perspective on the importance of transcription and its inclination to encourage researchers to pay attention to the minute details of interactions (for other potential solutions to applied CA’s epistemological problems, See Section 2.3.2).

Applied CA research has been widespread for more than three decades. ten Have (1999, 2007) distinguished ‘pure CA’, which refers to the traditional framework established by Sacks and his collaborators focusing on everyday interactions and the organization of conversation itself, from ‘applied CA’, which describes CA studies especially focusing on institutional interactions (e.g., talk in a medical institution). In their edited collection of institutional applied CA, Drew and Heritage (1992) stated that work-related talk is mixed with everyday conversation in a workplace and what makes talk in working places institutional talk is speakers’ professional identities, which often
determine linguistic forms. It is also worth noting that Drew and Heritage admitted that institutional conversation is often task-based.

In addition to the well-established field of institutional applied CA, Antaki (2011) added another category ‘interventionist applied CA’, which focuses on solving problems with institutional interactions. In a collection of applied CA studies edited by Antaki (2011), Heritage and Robinson (2011) investigated doctor-patient interactions in a medical institution. Their problem was how a patient could successfully report secondary health concerns in addition to their main concern. For the purposes of data collection, they asked doctors to use either “any” or “some” to ask if each patient had problems other than their main concern. Heritage and Robinson stated that applied CA deals with questions regarding what is a cause for a particular interactional problem and these are “evidently not ‘CA questions’ but they are all questions for which CA has provided the basic conceptual ingredients for compelling answer” (p. 16). Both Antaki’s and Heritage and Robinson’s standpoints seem to be aligned with Stivers’ (2015) claim that it is advantageous for this kind of research to be able to answer research questions that are impossible to answer with CA alone. Studies on L2 pragmatics that use CA can fall into the category of applied CA, and are often aimed at investigating a change in interactional practices or a relationship between interactional features and exogenous variables such as L2 proficiency as well as revealing the interactional nature of target social actions. The following section presents the analytic tools CA offers to investigate participants’ interactional practices.

2.5 CA-based analytic concepts for L2 pragmatics

The previous section was dedicated to a description of CA research including applied CA studies, which purposefully relax some of CA’s analytic rules in order to answer researcher-developed research questions. L2 pragmatics tends to attempt to answer questions regarding learners’ discursive practices and CA-based analytic concepts are helpful tools for investigating L2 pragmatic behaviors. The following CA-based analytic concepts are used in the current study: Turn-taking, turn design, sequence organization, repair, epistemics, roles and identities, and overall structural organization. The section concerning overall structural organization is divided into three subsections presenting openings, closings, and topical talk. In each section, after
introducing how each analytic concept works in CA for everyday spoken data, relevant L2 studies on IC are presented with an excerpt of interactional data. It is worth noting that the transcription conventions used in these excerpts were often developed for the purpose of exploring IC in L2 interaction and sometimes do not fully comply with CA conventions.

2.5.1 Turn-taking

Turn-taking is a fundamental form of conversational organization. Basically, turn-taking refers to alternate speaker change where one participant produces an utterance and, when the utterance finishes, another participant produces another utterance. Sacks and his colleagues’ seminal work developed fundamental principles of the turn-taking apparatus (Sacks et al., 1974) and the authors stipulate the following properties of conversations (p. 700):

(1) Speaker-change recurs, or at least occurs.
(2) Overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time.
(3) Occurrences of more than one speaker at a time are common, but brief.
(4) Transitions (from one turn to a next) with no gap and no overlap are common.
   Together with transitions characterized by slight gap or slight overlap, they make up the vast majority of transitions.
(5) Turn order is not fixed, but varies.
(6) Turn size is not fixed, but varies.
(7) Length of conversation is not specified in advance.
(8) What parties say is not specified in advance.
(9) Relative distribution of turns is not specified in advance.
(10) Number of parties can vary.
(11) Talk can be continuous or discontinuous.
(12) Turn-allocation techniques are obviously used. A current speaker may select a next speaker (as when he addresses a question to another party); or parties may self-select in starting to talk.
(13) Various ‘turn-constructional units’ are employed; e.g., turns can be projectedly ‘one word long’, or they can be sentential in length.
(14) Repair mechanisms exist for dealing with turn-taking errors and violations; e.g., if two parties find themselves talking at the same time, one of them will stop prematurely, thus repairing the trouble.

Although these 14 principles describe how turn-taking organization is systematized and these principles are identified as context-free, Sacks et al. (1974) noted they are applicable to conversation, which is differentiated from other speech-exchange systems, or (to take a leaf out of Schegloff’s work in several places) talk-in-interaction, such as interviews or ceremonies. It is noteworthy that Sacks et al (1974) assume that among those different speech-exchange systems, “conversation obviously occupies a central position” (p. 701). These founding conversation analysts used mundane conversational data to argue for the existence of basic turn-constructional units (TCUs) and transition-relevant places (TRPs) in conversation and turn allocation and selection rules based on the above-listed principles. For instance, the third and fourth rules regarding overlap, can be demonstrated in the following excerpts from Sacks et al. (1974:707):

A: Well if you knew my argument why did you bother to ask.
B: [Because I’d like to defend my argument.

A TRP comes in the later part of A’s sentential TCU, when the two speakers’ utterances overlap. The overlapping part is indicated using square brackets in this excerpt. The overlapping indicates that A’s utterance projects what type of TCU it is and this example serves as a typical example where the onset of overlap occurs at a transition-relevance place (Sacks et al., 1974). It is also important to note that CA distinguishes pauses from gaps. The term pause refers to silence within a TCU, while a gap is a silence between TCUs (Hepburn & Bolden, 2017; Sacks et al., 1974). The following excerpt is from Mondada (2013: 42):

1 Tea: ehm (.) sophie,
2 (2.2) X: ((cou[ghs]))
In the excerpt, Teacher produces a micropause between her TCUs, which is indicated with a full stop in parentheses. A gap of 2.2 s can be seen between lines 1 and 2, just before Sophie starts to answer to Teacher (it is also observable that Sophie’s answer is overlapped with someone’s cough). In this way, the turn-taking machinery offers a basic organizational and analytic device for conversation, or more broadly, talk-in-interaction.

Galaczi’s studies (2014) are one example of the use of the ‘no-overlap-no-gap’ principle of the turn-taking machinery in a study designed to investigate candidates of different proficiency levels’ ability to manage turn-taking in the paired speaking section of the Cambridge ESOL test. The following is the script Galaczi custom-made for analysis. The two participants are advanced-level (C2 level in CEFR) learners (Sabine and Jelmer):

Sabine  Jelmer

1 Another picture, I was thinking about (.). **the carnival**, in uh, (0.5) South America, or something. Cause I always enjoy er, (.). looking at these pictures, and they’re so colourful, and all the people wearing hats, and [masks and uhh,]

2 yeah

3 it’s amazing, yeah.

4 Also, in China, the, the carniv- is it the carnival? (1) It’s some sort of religious thing anyway, and it’s really big, and a lot of people dress up for it. (0.5) I was thinking of **Halloween** as well.

5 yeah right!

6 yeah

7 =kids love it=

8 [It’s absolutely huge.]

9 For people in the United States, I think, (.).

10 it’s the biggest there=
This transcript indicates that it took one second from the previous turn (presumably Jelmer’s turn) to Sabine’s turn. In Sabine’s turn (turn 1), Jelmer offers hearable responses and the end of Sabine’s turn and the beginning of Jelmer’s turn overlap. On the other hand, Jelmer’s turn in turn 4 seems not to receive any response tokens. Both turns 6 and 7 and turns 7 and 8 are latched (indicated with “=” sign). Overall, Galaczi concluded that the interactional competence to manage turn-taking of the advanced learners was fully developed as they demonstrated much engagement “through rapid speaker changes and supportive overlaps and latches” (p.567). Although this transcript is strikingly different from the orthodox Jeffersonian transcription and some information of timing (e.g., the precise timing of Jelmer’s “yeah” in turn 1 in relation to Sabine’s ongoing utterance) is unclear, it is designed to satisfy the requirements of an assessment tool for L2 IC. Thus, Galaczi’s adoption of the turn-taking rules as an analytic focus in a paired speaking assessment seems not only to be successful in capturing one aspect of the candidate L2 learners’ IC, but also led to the development of a transcription convention suitable for the institutional goal of language testing.

2.5.2 Turn design

A turn in talk-in-interaction is designed to be recognized as doing a certain action by an interlocutor in a sequential context (Levinson, 2013). Drew (2013) explains that a turn:

is assembled out of components, notably turn-constructional units; speakers employ a variety of linguistic and other resources in designing these components and thereby building turns-at-talk, resources that include lexis (or words), phonetic and prosodic resources, syntactic, morphological and other grammatical forms, timing (e.g. very slightly delaying a response), laughter and aspiration, gesture and other bodily movements and positions (including eye gaze). (p.121)

Drew’s explanation can be summarized as saying that a turn-at-talk can be made up of both linguistic and non-linguistic resources. This suggests that different types of talk-in-
interaction may involve the use of different types of linguistic and non-linguistic resources to construct TCUs or turns-at-talk and make the actions they perform recognizable by others.

Turns need to be recipient designed if intended meanings are to be recognized by a particular interlocutor without causing misunderstanding (Drew, 2013). This recipient design involves displaying an orientation to some attributes of that interlocutor (Sacks et al., 1974). It refers to a wide range of phenomena including topic, entitlement, obligation or the sequential organization of actions (Sacks et al., 1974). Drew (2013) demonstrates differences of recipient design using the following three sentences:

(1) Are you thinking of coming to the meeting tonight?
(2) And are you going to the meeting tonight?
(3) Are you going tonight? (p. 146)

The first sentence is designed as an indirect enquiry with the verb phrase (are) thinking of because the interlocutor is a new member of the group, while the second and third sentences show a direct enquiry designed for an interlocutor who is a longer term member. The choice of the deictic verbs, go or come, is determined by where the speaker of these utterances and each interlocutor lives and the presence or absence of the word expressing the topic, the meeting, depends on how much the topic is shared in prior talk between interactants.

Turn design is also important for action formation. For instance, when an interactant produces a disagreement when an agreement is preferred, the disagreeing component tends to be delayed in a turn and instead, other lexical units or longer TCUs such as you know or well occur in turn initial position (Pomerantz, 1984). Focusing on the turn design of L2 French learners’ disagreements in classroom interactions, Pekarek Doehler and Pochon-Berger (2011) examine the following excerpt between two learners Francois and Pascal, who are considered to be more proficient learners in their study:

1 FRA: oui mais: nous avons: beaucoup de défence.
   yes but we have a lot of defence
2 (..)
3 nous avons pas besoin (.) des: des neufs avions.
We do not need new airplanes.

4 PAS: nous avons pas beaucoup de défence.
we do not have a lot of defense

5 (.).

6 notre défence maintenant est trop vieux.
our defense today is too old

7 (.)

8 et elle ne peut pas résister.
and it is not capable of resistance

In Pascal’s disagreement, the repetition of words or syntactic structures previously used by an interlocutor, or what conversation analysts calls format tying (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987; Sacks, 1992), is used. Pascal’s turn is constructed through adding sentential TCUs incrementally at each TRP, which is signaled by the descending tones Pascal employs. Thus, this turn is recipient designed in two senses. First, format tying is used as an operator of disagreement directed to Francois, who used the same syntactic format previously. Second, the silence produced by Francois in lines 5 and 7 displays Francois’ expectation that Pascal continues his account to support his disagreement. Thus, Pascal’s disagreeing turn is jointly constructed with Francois. As is shown in Pekarek Doehler and Pochon-Berger’s data, turn design including linguistic features like prosody and non-linguistic resources such as eye gaze (they analyzed eye gaze in other excerpts), as well as recipient design, show participants’ IC to make social actions more recognizable to interlocutors.

2.5.3 Sequence organization

A focus on the sequential placement of a turn is one of the characteristics of CA’s approach to conversation and talk-in-interaction (Stivers, 2013). Since both turn design and sequence organization are conducive to forming an action, these two concepts can be regarded as an analytic unit for within-turn and between-turn phenomena, respectively. Analytic principles for sequence organization have been offered by Schegloff (2007) and Stivers and Rossano (2010).

Schegloff (2007) proposes three type of sequence organization using the concept of an adjacency pair, which consists of a first pair part (FPP) and second pair
part (SPP). Before the FPP of a core adjacency pair (e.g., a request turn in a request-acceptance/refusal pair), other pairs of FPPs and SPPs can occur, which are called pre-expansions. Pre-expansions range from pre-invitations, pre-tellings and pre-announcements to pre-requests, depending on the action conducted in an FPP. Between the FPP and SPP of a core adjacency pair, other pairs of FPPs and SPPs, which are called insert expansions, can occur. According to Scheglof’s classification, insert expansions can be divided into post-first and pre-second types. The former is other-initiated repair, where an FPP initiates a repair sequence and the SPP completes the sequence by solving a problem (e.g., a hearing problem or a lack of understanding of the meaning of a previous utterance), while the latter serves as an inquiry for clarification to determine which action to take in an upcoming SPP (e.g., whether to accept or refuse a request) of the core adjacency pair. The other type of FPP and SPP sequence is a post-expansion, which may occur after the SPP of a core adjacency pair. Scheglof divides post-expansions into two types, minimal and non-minimal types. The former is also called a sequence closing third and one example is an assessment directed to the SPP of a core adjacency pair (e.g., Offering a positive assessment immediately after an interlocutor accepts a request), while the latter refers to more extended sequences such as an other-initiated repair sequence when there is trouble in the SPP of the core adjacency pair (e.g., reissuing a request after initially being declined).

Stivers and Rossano (2010) introduce a scalar model to explain sequence organization. The authors divide sequence-initiating actions into two types: a type of action that makes a response conditionally relevant such as a request, offer, information request, and types of actions where a response is not necessarily expected such as assessments, noticings, and announcements. In the latter case, a response may be mobilized by resources such as interrogative syntax, rising tone, eye gaze or epistemic cues. These linguistic and non-linguistic resources can enhance response-mobilizability when a first action does not have an attribute of making a response conditionally relevant. An important difference between Scheglof’s (2007) model and Stivers and Rossano’s (2010) model is that the latter emphasize that interactional resources cumulatively affect the probability of producing a responsive sequence organization. Scheglof’s model seems to be a robust tool to examine a certain type of sequence-initiating actions such as requests because of its high systematicity. Stivers and Rossano’s models are useful if a target behavior is not necessarily an action.
automatically requiring a response and when investigating how the use of multiple resources together affects the probability of eliciting a response.

Al-Gahtani and Roever’s (2012, 2013, 2014) studies investigate L2 requests in terms of sequence organization. Investigating L2 English and Arabic requests in terms of pre-expansions, Al-Gahtani and Roever (2012) presented the following excerpt showing low intermediate and upper intermediate learners’ role play interactions:

1 P: Excuse me::
2 I: yes
3 P: I (.) want bread

1 P: hi ((name))
2 I: hi ((name))
3 P: .hhh >actually< I wanna ask you something?
4 I: Su::re
5 P: → . hhh today I have too many (. ) assignments to do=
6 I: =Yeah
7 P: → ↑so I have no:: more time (.1) to do my shopp[ing
8 I: [.hh
9 P: → for today (. ) a::nd I’m running out (. ) the bread so could you (.3) buy
10 some bread for me?
11 I: su::re (. ) yeah (. ) but >you know< right now I’m wa:ting
12 this match so (. )
do you wa::nt it at the moment (. ) or:: I can buy it later on?

The first excerpt (consisting of three lines), which is performed by a low intermediate learner and an L1 English-speaking role-play conductor, shows a request being made in line 3 with no pre-expansions since lines 1 and 2 are just an exchange of greetings. On the other hand, the second excerpt (consisting of 12 lines) demonstrates that an upper intermediate learner constructs pre-expansions prior to a request act produced over lines 5, 7, and 9. After lines 1-2, a sequence of greetings, the learner offers a question saying “>actually< I wanna ask you something?” with some aspiration (“.hhh”). This question
or pre-request is ratified by the interlocutor, which constitutes a two-turn sequence of FPP and SPP. Since Al-Gahtani and Roever use sequence expansions as a tool for examining L2 requests, which are a type of action that make a response conditionally relevant (Schegloff, 2007), it is less important to focus on additional non-linguistic resources that enhance response-mobilizability.

Investigating turn design and the sequence organization of L2 Arabic requests, Roever and Al-Gahtani (2015) focused on two-type of requests: multiple requests within and across turns. They use a “three-line transcript” (Hepburn & Bolden, 2017: 144) consisting of Arabic script (the first line), an interlinear gloss (the second line), and a translation (the third line):

4  P:> laa:: (.2) as-sabaah afdal (.3) indii:: as-sabaah afdal=
   no (.2) the morning better (.3) to me the morning better
   No (.2) the morning is better (.3) To me, the morning is better

5  =liananaa fii al-masaa (.2) naxruj liba’d al-duruus fii al-xaa::rij (.2)
   because we in the evening (.3) go out for some lessons in
   because in the evening we (.3) go out to attend some lessons outside (.2)

6  wa:: (.2) nushaa::riku fii ba’d al-duruus ma’a al-mashaa::yx(.2)
   and (.2) we participate in some lessons with the sheiks (.2)
   and (.2) we participate in some lessons with Sheiks (.2)

7  > lizaalika araa:: ana fii as-sabaah afdal
   so I think that in the morning better
   so I think that it’s better in the morning

1  P:  as-salaam ’alaykum
   peace upon you
   Peace be upon you (hello)

2  A:  wa ’alaykumu as-salaam.
   and upon you peace
   Peace be upon you, too (hello)

3  P:> nuriidu ixtibaa:r (.2) fii kuli yawm
   we want exam (.2) in every day
   We want one exam (.2) on each day
4 (.3)
5 A: na’am
   yes
   Yes
6 P:> narjuuk (.1) ixtibaar wa::hid (.2) fii kul yawm
   we ask you (.1) exam one    (.2) in every day
   We ask you (.1) to make it one exam (.2) on each day

The first half of the excerpt (lines 4-7) demonstrates a learner’s multiple requests within a turn. The core component of the request can be seen in lines 4 and 7 while the other lines provide an account for the request. The second excerpt shows another learner’s multiple requests across turns. The head act of request can be seen in lines 3 and 6 across the interlocutor’s go-ahead response (Schegloff, 2007). Roever and Al-Gahtani (2015) found that same-turn multiple requests were conducive to enhancing the likelihood of acceptance, while across-turn multiple requests served as a repair to make the first request more recipient designed and thereby more polite. This study provides an insight saliently different from Schegloff’s (2007) and Stivers and Rossano’s (2010) models of sequence organization in that researchers can investigate the speech act of L2 requests not only from the perspective of the conditional relevance of responses and additional efforts to mobilize a response, but also additional efforts to enhance the elicitability of a particular type of second action such as an acceptance of a request. In addition, their transcripts suggest that three-line transcripts serve their purpose of investigating relatively underexplored the Arabic language. Note that both a literal translation (“peace be upon you”), and an equivalent expression in English (“hello”), are provided for as-salaam ’alaykum.

2.5.4 Repair

Repair is a way of addressing and solving problems in hearing, speaking, and understanding by interrupting the progressivity of an ongoing interaction to deal with these problems (Schegloff et al., 1977) and repair practices have been found in more than 13 world languages (Kitzinger, 2013). Schegloff and his colleagues classified two types of repairs based on how they are initiated: self-initiated and other-initiated types, and also based on how the repair is completed (or the problem solved): self(-completed)
repair and other(-completed) repair. Thus, types of repairs can be classified into four categories: self-initiated self repair, self-initiated other repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other repair. In terms of frequency distribution, self repair is more common than other repair (Schegloff et al., 1977).

Self-initiated self repairs start when a speaker realizes that there is a problem or a trouble source and addresses it herself, while self-initiated other repairs also begin with a speaker’s claims of a trouble source within her own speech but the trouble is solved by an interlocutor. Self repairs often require a certain operational technique such as cutting off speech or doing a word search (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986). Other-initiated self repair is the repair practice started by an interlocutor who displays an orientation to a trouble source in a first speaker’s speech and repair is completed by this first speaker, while other-initiated other repair is a repair initiated and completed by an interlocutor. Other-initiated self repair co-occurs with open-class repair initiators such as *huh* or *pardon* with a rising tone (Drew, 1997). Other than open-class repair initiators, there are various lexical choice used to initiate other-initiated repairs such as *wh*-questions, repetition of speech containing a trouble source, understanding checks, or combinations of these strategies (Sidnell, 2010).

Although self and other repairs are common in that they are used to ensure that “the interaction does not freeze in its place when trouble arises, that intersubjectivity is maintained or restored, and that the turn and sequence and activity can progress to possible completion” (Schegloff, 2007: xiv), linguistic and sequential features are different between the two types. In particular, other-initiated repairs have tended to be investigated and discussed in terms of sequence organization or what Schegloff (2007) calls insert expansions, and repair can be a vehicle for conducting other social actions such as displaying a disagreement, disalignment, challenge or rejection (Stivers, 2008). Thus, the study of repair has the potential to offer a fine-grained analysis of IC to conduct social actions.

### 2.5.5 Epistemics

One interactional phenomena that has attracted attention in fairly recent CA work is the issue of interlocutors’ knowledge or epistemics in itself (Wu, 2018). The notion of epistemics refers to “the knowledge claims that interactants assert, contest and defend in and through turns-at-talk and sequences of interaction” (Heritage, 2013: 370).
Epistemics can be a resource for an interactant to select a possible next speaker in multi-party interaction (Bolden, 2011). Thus, epistemics is also a significant aspect of recipient design (Robinson, 2013). As one of the response-mobilizing resources in Stivers and Rossano’s (2010) model, epistemics also affects sequence organization.

Heritage (2012) introduces two sub-concepts, epistemic status and epistemic stance. Epistemic status refers to positioning along a gradient from more knowledgeable (K+) to less knowledgeable (K–) in terms of particular knowledge. It refers to a more long-standing state regarding access to domain knowledge, while epistemic stance refers to expressions reflecting the interactionally-formed momentarily-changing epistemic relationship between interlocutors. Heritage present three grammatical structures reflecting different epistemic stances in English:

(1) Are you married?
(2) You’re married, aren’t you?
(3) You’re married.

A speaker of (1), an interrogative format, does not have knowledge about the recipient’s marital status, which creates a deeper epistemic tilt angle between the two interlocutors. On the other hand, a speaker of (3), a declarative format, can claim a more balanced (but still shallowly tilted toward the recipient as the recipient’s marriage is usually a matter of their first-hand experience rather than the speaker’s) epistemic gradient. Use of tag question like (2) comes somewhere in between. These different epistemic statuses or stances in the continuum of knowing to not knowing and their association with syntactic or tonal features offer analytic standpoints from which to analyze participants’ identity.

Bolden (2011) presents a sequence of actions where other-initiated repair is not directed to the person who produced a turn containing a trouble source. In that sequence, first a girl named Vivian describes Shane’s (who is Vivian’s boyfriend) recent complaint about his friend. In the next turn, Michael, a friend of the couple initiated a clarification request. This other-initiated repair is completed by Shane rather than Vivian, due to Shane’s epistemic authority to claim knowledge about the current topic. Michael’s clarification request is offered in an interrogative form and with a rising tone, which displays his epistemic stance to claim that the complaint is a
matter of first-hand experience to Shane and thereby mobilizes Shane’s response. It is important to note that Shane did not actually relate the complaint but was a protagonist in Vivian’s talk. This suggests that epistemics determines appropriateness regarding who is in the position of appropriately responding to a certain question and this is influenced by the role or identity each participant in talk-in-interaction occupies.

Epistemics is one of resources with which an interactant can show his or her stance and these include affiliation, affection, evaluation, and deontic (Iwasaki, 2015; Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012; Stivers, 2008). Analyzing story-telling practices, Stivers (2008) introduces several resources used to display a teller’s stance such as story prefaces, voice, determiners, reported speech, and epistemics. Different ways of describing an event can display different stances and thereby different action ascriptions to that event. For instance, a story detailing how someone just vandalized the teller’s car is a request in an emergency call, while it can be heard as an account for not attending an appointment in a call to a doctor’s office (Heritage, 2013). Stivers (2008) also illustrates that nodding in the mid-telling can serve as a display of affiliation to a story-teller’s stance (e.g., how a story-teller evaluates an event described in his or her story), while vocal continuers (e.g., uh huh) function just as a structural alignment (i.e., supporting the progress of the telling without interrupting). Iwasaki (2015) emphasizes that stance is a dynamic and interactional phenomena which is achieved moment by moment, or TCU by TCU.

In CA, it is important to note the differences between stance and status. Stance is dynamic, emergent, situated, intersubjective, collaborative, moment by moment, and reflected in linguistic and paralinguistic cues including grammatical forms or intonations, while status is a relatively enduring social relationship which is often shared between interactants (Hayano, 2013; Heritage, 2012) at least when it comes to epistemics.

2.5.6 Roles, identities, and participation frameworks

Linguistic and non-linguistic resources in turn design and the sequential organization of social actions often influence an interlocutor’s roles and identities and relative positioning to other interlocutors in a wider participation framework. Roles and identities are often investigated using the concept of membership categories in membership categorization analysis, which analyzes how people classify one another as
a member of a particular category (Sacks, 1972, 1992). For instance, membership categories such as ‘parent’ or ‘child’ belong to the category ‘family’. When one member (e.g., parent) is relevant to the interaction, the other (e.g., child) is automatically invoked. Each category can be associated with category-bound activities (Sacks, 1992) or predicates (Watson, 1978), which are “conventional expectations about what constitutes a category’s normal behavior, such that absences are accountable” (Stokoe, 2010, p. 63). CA tends to focus on the recurrently observable structure of actions in each analytic unit such as turn-taking, turn design, and sequence organization, while the concept of membership categories is used for examining “members’ methodical practices for describing the world, and displaying their understanding of the world and of the common-sense routine workings of society” (Fitgerald et al., 2009). For instance, Stokoe and Attenborough (2015) showed the following excerpt from online chat between two friends, Callum and Isla talking about coaching sports, to demonstrate how participants’ identities change as the interaction progresses:

```
1 Callum: you can teach me 😊
2 (2.0)
3 Isla I charge by the hour 😊
4 (35.0)
5 Callum: you sound like a prostitute there haha
6 but i wont take it like that
7 (69.0)
8 Isla haha while that wasn’t exactly the intention
9 it was the connotations lol – joke with
10 my friend here – she just said the same
11 thing to another guy – again in a different
12 context but with that sort of banter lol
```

Line 1 does not invoke any category, while Isla’s turn invokes the category of a teacher, simultaneously invoking a pair of categories, teacher and student, which provisionally categorizes Callum as a student. In line 5, Callum takes Isla’s ‘I charge by the hour’ as a category-bound feature of a prostitute, which makes Isla a prostitute and Callum a customer (although Callum downgraded the definitive force by using “sound like”). This
sequence is apparently designed as humor as both provide laughter tokens (haha in line 5 and lol line 9).

Similar analysis can be applied to conversation for language learning between L1 and L2 speakers. Kasper (2004) investigated German conversation for language learning between an L1 English speaker, Cindy, and an L1 German speaker, Dagmar. The following is one excerpt:

005 C:  eh::m
006 D:  okay:, wie geht es dir?
        how are you?
007 C:  es geht gut,
        I'm okay
008 D:  Ja? (.) warum?
        are you? (.) why?
009 C:  u::mm (.) ts uh i- "er‘ am wochenende? It was large? ( ) =
        at the weekend? it was long?
010 D  =ja:,= 
        yeah
011 C  =ja 
        yeah
012 D:  was hast du gemacht am wochenende.
        what did you do at the weekend.

Lines 5-12 show a sequence consisting of Dagmer’s question and Cindy’s answer followed by Dagmer’s acknowledgement or alignment in their conversation opening. This three-part sequence displays recurrently observed features, which demonstrate how Dagmer is oriented to her role as an interaction manager with a responsibility to initiate the three-part sequence for learning. The information-eliciting move with warum in line 8 also displays Dagmer’s orientation to the nature of conversation for learning (or Gesprächsrunden) and her role of providing a language learner with an opportunity to talk. Cindy’s orientation to the nature of conversation and her role as a learner is displayed in her response in line 9. Later on, Cindy and Dagmar continue as follows:
In the excerpt, in lines 19 and 20, Cindy answers Degmer’s question and tries to reciprocate the same question-answer sequence topicalizing Degmer’s weekend but seems to be incapable of creating the relevant question in her L2. Citing House (1982), Kasper (2004) points out that it is a common conversational practice to reciprocate phatic exchanges such as question-answer exchanges regarding interlocutors weekends in English, and common but more optional in German. Thus, it is possible to interpret Cindy’s behavior as “Cindy displays her interactional competence as a participant in ordinary conversation with a peer. However, … Cindy’s interactional competence is way ahead of her TL resources” (p. 558). In lines 19 and 20, Cindy’s identity is constructed as a conversationalist rather than a learner as evident from the fact that she uses her L1 to construct her question about Degmer’s weekend. This excerpt suggests that L2 learners can display both IC in general and L2 IC depending on how their identities are interactionally constructed.

Nguyen (2012) investigated role construction and topic management in pharmacist-patient interactions. Identifying several recurrently observable subtopics (e.g., patient’s drug experience, intake administration, side effects, etc.), Nguyen points out that roles are interactionally constructed and topics are embedded in interaction between participants with different roles. The following is an interaction where a pharmacist and patient discuss the side effects of a drug:

24 Ph: um. (.) > not much in a way of the side
25 effects, < = you might wanna take it with food,
The transcript shows that in lines 24-26, the pharmacist gives advice (“you might wanna take it with food”) based on their knowledge (“not much in a way of the side effects”), while the patient offers a minimal acknowledgement in lines 27 and 28. Likewise, in lines 29-31, the pharmacist continues giving advice (“start with a little something in your stomach”) with an account (“sometimes people do get a little stomach upset when they take that so”), whereas the patient shows only minimal listenership in line 32. In this way, role construction is observable in the interaction and topics are embedded in the sequential organization of an advice-giving sequence. An asymmetrical contribution (i.e., the pharmacist proffered most topics) to topic proffering is also observable, which clearly indicates the institutional nature of this type of interaction.

IC also is influenced by the participation framework consisting of all party’s degree or manner of participation in the interaction. Goffman (1981) presents his model of participation frameworks which consist of various participation statuses (Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 2004). Goffman (1981) distinguishes between ratified and unrattedified participants. Ratified participants, including a speaker and both addressed and unaddressed recipients, are those who are participating in the social gathering verbally and are physically co-present. On the other hand, although unrattedified participants are physically co-present, they are supposed not to be actively engaged with the interaction among ratified participants. In that sense, they are called bystanders, a group which is further categorized into overhearers, who unintentionally obtain information from the ratified participants’ interaction or eavesdroppers, who listen to the conversation on purpose. Clark and Carlson (1982) state that speakers perform speech acts directed not only to an addressed recipient but also to co-present but unaddressed participants and they call these speech acts informatives. Goffman’s notion of participation frameworks, including Clark and Carlson’s model, is widely applicable to not only face-to-face
social gatherings but also interactions in different media such as TV interviews where
participants such as interviewers and interviewees tend to be aware of the physically
absent but ratified hearers, namely, TV viewers.

Goffman (1981) also provides a classification of subordinate communication
types such as byplay, crossplay, and sideplay that occur outside the main
communication event where a speaker is talking to an addressed recipient. Byplay is an
interaction between ratified but unaddressed recipients. Crossplay is an interaction
between ratified participants and bystanders which crosses the boundaries of the
domains of ratified and unratted participants. Sideplay is an interaction between
bystanders and is often carried out at low volume. This classification is an especially
convenient analytic framework if multiple interactions with different degrees of
participation exist in an interactional event, such as the shooting of a TV show. Besides,
this framework is also useful in the analysis of online Internet-based communication,
where participants with different degrees of participation interact.

Another important notion Goffman (1981) introduces is a production format
or footing. Goffman decomposes the notion of a speaker into four production formats or
footings: animator (producer), author, principal, and figure (Haugh, 2013). An
animator or producer is a person or other entity who is in charge of utterance
production. An author is an entity who is in charge of composing the speech through
using certain expressions. A principal is an entity who is in charge of authorizing the
speech which is performed by an animator and composed by an author. A figure is an
entity who is referred or cited to in speech. Production formats and footings are useful
analytic notions when analyzing the boundaries of different interactional events or
events embedded in a larger interactional event from an IC perspective (Kasper, 2004;
Markee, 2004; Okada, 2010). However, IC research focusing on interactions
constructed by participants with different degrees of participation, such as the
interaction between ratified and unratted participants, has been under-explored in
general.

Okada (2010) investigated the IC candidates in a role play test in an oral
proficiency interview (OPI) needed to demonstrate and their understanding of projected
actions performed by an interviewer. Okada’s data, role play interactions, were
embedded in a larger social encounter, namely an OPI interview between an interviewer
and a candidate. Like Nguyen (2012)’s data detailing pharmacist-patient interactions,
there is an asymmetric contribution to topic initiation between the two participants with different roles. One of Okada’s focal points was on role play openings, which feature a transition from conversation between an interviewer and a candidate to role-play interaction between interactants with different pre-determined roles. In other words, both participants need to animate a written role-play instruction. The following is an extract from the role-play interaction, where the interviewer and a candidate played the roles of a dry cleaner and a customer respectively:

22 I: the interviewer will play the role of a  
drycleaner ask him clean your jacket.  
24 (1.7)  
25 I: "this to" you: (.) you can read it (.)  
26 "think about it"  
27 C: "yes"  
28 (9.0)  
29 I: okay?  
30 (0.2)  
31 C: "yes"  
32 (0.4)  
33 I: yes ma’am, may I help you.  
34 C: yes uh my jacket is covered with mud uh:::  
35 mm (1.9) can you clean it for me?

After the interviewer introduces the task, the opening of the role-play interaction starts in line 33. Producing a phrase such as “may I help you” using an honorific address term such as “ma’am” is a category-bound activity (Sacks, 1972) of a dry cleaner. This emergent role-play identity of a dry cleaner makes another role-play identity, a customer, relevant. In lines 34 and 35, the candidate animates the relevant role through a category-bound activity, namely, asking for their clothes to be cleaned. Here, opening up the role-play interaction is an interactional accomplishment. From the participant’s perspective, the candidate demonstrates IC to understand the shift in identities that is made apparent in the first part of the adjacency pair, and is able to make the same identity shift in the second pair part and produces an appropriate utterance to animate an
instructed role immediately after the occurrence of the first part. It is also important to note that the candidate’s competency to co-construct the opening of a role-play interaction with an interviewer relies on their ability to manage adjacency pairs in spoken conversation, which is a generic ability to manage a basic conversational norm and thereby not just an element of L2 IC or role play specific IC. As Okada (2010) shows, openings of talk-in-interaction are often a site for participants to change roles and identities. The next chapter will introduce how elements of overall structural organization, such as openings or closings, are treated in CA.

2.5.7 Overall structural organization

Overall structural organization has been actively researched in various kinds of institutional talk including examples which feature universally observable organizations of openings and closings. Both openings and closings structure boundaries between different interactional events. They can refer to either openings and closings for a social encounter or for topical talk embedded in a larger institutional social encounter (e.g., a paired speaking test embedded in a larger language assessment event). The following shows how Heritage and Maynard (2006) model the overall structure of acute primary care visits (p. 13):

(1) Opening: Doctor and patient establish an interactional relationship.
(2) Presenting complaint: The patient presents the problem/reason for the visit.
(3) Examination: The doctor conducts a verbal or physical examination or both.
(4) Diagnosis: The doctor evaluates the patient’s condition.
(5) Treatment: The doctor (in consultation with the patient) details treatment or further investigation.
(6) Closings: The consultation is terminated.

In openings in doctor-patient interactions, the structure is warranted by the doctor’s authority to offer diagnosis and treatment, and patients’ inclination for alignment or acceptance (Peräkylä, 1998; Stivers, 2005). Thus, overall structural organization is closely related to the institutional nature of an encounter and the institutional roles relevant therein. The following subsections discuss openings and closings in talk-in-
interaction in daily conversation, institutional talk including task-based interactions, and text-based CMC.

2.5.7.1 Openings to topical talk

Conversation openings have been widely investigated in CA, starting with Schegloff’s (1968) pioneering work on telephone conversation openings. Based on the analysis of all 500 cases, Schegloff found a turn-distribution rule, that being, the answerer speaks first. Schegloff presents some examples of violations of this rule. For instance, whenever a telephone conversation started with a caller hello, the caller and the answerer had a close relationship (e.g., both were family members). Schegloff also presents one particular deviant case, which was found in only one conversation out of a total of about 500, to explore the operation and limitations of the answerer-speaks-first rule and the resources it offers to structure conversation. This case starts with the police officer’s (caller) “Hello.”. This opening hello is followed by the answerer’s “American Red Cross.”, to which the caller responds saying, “Hello, this is Police Headquarters… er, Officer Stratton [etc.]”. This deviant case highlights the distribution rule for conversation openings and leads to a reanalysis of the whole dataset with a focus on summons-answer sequences. One of the interactional traits of summons-answer sequences is their non-terminality. Summons-answer sequences serve as a preamble to project the main activity, which a summoner is obliged to start. A summoner is also restricted in using further summons after a summons-answer sequence is completed. This contrasts with the nature of question-answer sequences (e.g., how are you and fine), where a questioner has a right (not an obligation) to start the main body of an activity and produce the same or a similar question again after the question-answer sequence is completed. Further, Schegloff states that summons-answer sequences:

establish and align the roles of speaker and hearer, providing a summoner with evidence of the availability or unavailability of a hearer, and a prospective hearer with notice of a prospective speaker. The sequence constitutes a coordinated entry into the activity, allowing each party occasion to demonstrate his coordination with the other, a coordination that may then be sustained by the parties demonstrating continued speakership or hearership. (p. 1093)
Schegloff (1986) calls the moment of a turn where the first topic is initiated an *anchor position*, and this can follow a range of sequences such as greetings, summons and answers, or a sequence dealing with the identification of the caller and a response to it. As a typical sequence, Schegloff (1986:115) presents the following excerpt:

0 C ((ring))
1 R Hello::,
2 C H’llo, Clara?
3 R Yah,
4 C Hi. Bernie.
5 R Hi Bernie.
6 C How’re you.
7 R I’m awright, how’re you.
8 C Okay:?
9 R Good.
10 C Laura there?

In the excerpt, the sequence of a summons (a ring of the telephone) and an answering response in lines 0 and 1 is followed by an identification sequence, which involves establishing the identities of the interlocutors and a greeting sequence over lines 2-5, and a *how-are-you* sequence over lines 6-9, prior to the initiation of the first topic. Line 10 is an anchor position, which is marked by the completion of the second part of the second *how-are-you* sequence in line 9. Schegloff also demonstrates that an anchor position can be delayed because of sequential expansions, such as topic extensions triggered by non-neutral responses to *how-are-you* such as *terrific* or *terrible*. Several CA studies have examined the sequential organization and turn format of anchor-positions (e.g., Arminen & Leinonen, 2006; Arminen & Weilenmann, 2009; Bolden, 2008; Couper-Kuhlen, 2001). For example, Bolden (2008) reported that the discourse marker “*so*” is frequently found in anchor position turns used to solicit the reason for a call using the interrogative form *so what’s up*, and Couper-Kuhlen (2001: 37) demonstrates that anchor positions tend to start with high onset such as “*uhm†I just had a comment about the:* uhm”.
Overall, openings of talk-in-interaction can be regarded as a systematic environment consisting of several preliminary two-turn sequences which project an anchor position turn that initiates the core topic of each encounter.

As discussed above, openings of talk often exhibit the institutional nature of an encounter (See the five-step overall structure of acute primary care visits presented above). Heritage and Clayman (2010) illustrate the overall structure of emergency calls based on Zimmerman’s (1984, 1992 cited in Heritage & Clayman, 2010) five basic components: (1) opening, (2) request, (3) interrogative series, (4) response, and (5) closing. With the exception of the openings and closings, the overall structural organization is similar to that seen for acute primary care visits in that the interrogative series are mainly led by one of the two interlocutors (i.e., a telephone operator in emergency calls and a doctor in doctor-patient interactions). The openings of emergency calls are much simpler than those in doctor-patient consultations. For instance, there tends not to be greetings and how are you exchanges.

The openings of task-based interactions in pedagogical settings have been found to differ from casual phone conversations. Given that task talk is embedded in a wider social encounter, one of the salient features of task openings in these settings is the lack of opening sequences prior to the anchor-position turn. Stokoe (2000) investigated task openings in group discussions among L1 English speaking college students with a focus on how they construct topicality. The discussion topics included education, psychology, and the behavioral sciences. Typically, students immediately showed an orientation to the task. In some cases, students engaged in clarifying the task requirements, mentioning absent students, or talking about previous experiences of a similar task before. The transition from pre-task talk to more task-related talk was signaled by several interactional methods such as minimal acknowledgement, pauses, or the use of a discourse marker such as okay.

Hellermann (2007, 2008) investigated task openings in L2 classroom contexts. From a developmental perspective, Hellermann (2007) reported how L2 learners acquired interactional practices for task openings through adopting a particular syntactic format to get an interlocutor involved in a task opening or producing a turn with appropriate recipient design. Hellermann (2008) identified further interactional methods used in task openings such as greetings, postural alignment, task prefatory talk and inquiries about the interlocutor’s readiness, all of which were used in opening
sequences before the launch of topical talk. Hellermann (2008) also reported that higher proficiency was associated with larger amounts of pre-task talk, which is consistent with other studies of interactional competence showing that more proficient L2 participants’ interactional practices are commonly more sequentially expanded (e.g., Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012, 2013, 2014; Galaczi, 2014; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2016; Roever & Al-Gahtani, 2015).

To sum up, openings in institutional talk can be either an opening of an encounter (e.g., emergency calls) or an opening of a separate interactional event embedded in a larger social encounter. While these studies shed some light on the organization of task openings by L2 speakers, research is still scarce, and no research exists on task openings in text-based CMC by learners of different L2 proficiency levels.

As Paulus et al.’s (2016) systematic review shows, the sequential organization of text-based CMC has been extensively investigated with some attention also having been given to openings. Previous research on openings of quasi-synchronous text-based CMC has focused on opening sequences prior to anchor positions and pointed out the similarities to spoken conversations (Antaki et al., 2006; Markman, 2009; Meredith, 2017; Negretti; 1999; Rintel et al., 2001; Rintel and Pittam, 1997). Regarding openings in text-chat interactions, Rintel and Pittam (1997) investigated openings in Internet Relay Chat, one of the oldest text-based CMC media platforms, and observed opening moves such as the announcement of newly-joined interactants, greetings, or methods for signaling a transition to the core topical talk. Rintel et al. (2001) explored openings in text-chat dyadic interactions and found that interactants created alternate $abab$ sequences starting with greeting tokens followed by question-answer or utterance-response sequences, which is similar to the findings for telephone conversations. Markman (2009) found that participants in online text-chat meetings constructed openings consisting of greetings or an inquiry about an interlocutor’s readiness and responses to this inquiry, before the topic initiating turn was provided with a particular topic-shifting marker such as a $so$-token (Bolden, 2008). Besides the use of $so$, participants tended not to initiate topical talk until the minimum necessary number of participants had sent greeting tokens.

In a pioneering study on L2 text chat openings, Negretti (1999) found openings that were similar in structure to those found in L1 interactions (Markman,
Openings in L2 text-chat interactions showed similar opening sequences (e.g., greetings, summons-answer and identification sequences) to those seen in everyday telephone conversations. However, since then, few studies have investigated L2 text-chat openings, with González-Lloret’s (2011) work being an exception. González-Lloret observed how an L2 learner in dyadic text-chat interactions with a native speaker of Spanish developed interactional practices. The data demonstrated that the L2 learner initially responded minimally to troubles-talk provided by her native-speaking partner in the conversational opening. However, at a later stage of development, the L2 participant extended a troubles-talk topic proffered by the interlocutor in more expanded sequences.

To summarise these previous studies on conversation openings, openings of institutional talk, task openings and text-chat openings, it seems that applying CA is useful since some analytic features found in openings in spoken interactions can also be found in text-chat openings. Whether in spoken interaction or text-based CMC, task openings and identity construction have been studied only rarely with Okada’s (2010) study on interactive footing in L2 role play interactions being an exception to this trend.

2.5.7.2 Topical talk to closings

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) established a long line of CA research on conversation closings in talk-in-interaction, claiming that conversation “does not simply end, but is brought to a close” (p. 289). They focused on how participants deal with the closing problem, that is, the question how a possible completion of conversation can be jointly achieved given the rules governing the turn-taking machinery (e.g., Speaker-change recurs, or at least occurs). More specifically, the question Schegloff and Sacks’s (1973) ask is:

HOW TO ORGANIZE THE SIMULTANEOUS ARRIVAL OF THE COCONVERSATIONALISTS AT A POINT WHERE ONE SPEAKER’S COMPLETION WILL NOT OCCASION ANOTHER SPEAKER’S TALK, AND THAT WILL NOT BE HEARD AS SOME SPEAKER’S SILENCE. (p.294-295; capitals in the original)

In other words, this problem refers to:
HOW TO COORDINATE THE SUSPENSION OF THE TRANSITION RELEVANCE OF POSSIBLE UTTERANCE COMPLETION, NOT HOW TO DEAL WITH ITS NONOPERATION WHILE STILL RELEVANT. (p.295; capitals in the original)

To solve this problem, Schegloff and Sacks argue, interactants use a certain type of adjacency pair whose adjacent positioning of turns is conducive to bringing attention to the understanding of some sequential implicativeness between interactants.

Schegloff and Sacks then focus on terminal exchanges, such as sequences of one interactant’s bye which is immediately responded to with another bye. Pre-closings such as well, okay, or so with downward intonation contours are a common resource to initiate a closing section (in that they are only one of several possible moves that can initiate a closing section, Schegloff and Sacks suggest they be called ‘possible’ pre-closings). The following is a closing section opened up by two interactants in Schegloff and Sacks’ (1973:318):

B: Well that’s why I said “I’m not gonna say anything, I’m not Making any comments // about anybody”
C: Hmh
C: Ehyeah
B: Yeah
C: Yeah
B: Alrighty. Well I’ll give you a call before we decide to come down. O.K.?
C: O.K.
B: Alrighty
C: O.K.
B: We’ll see you then
C: O.K.
B: Bye bye
C: Bye

51
It is important to note that some components serve a closing or pre-closing purpose, while others are doing other business such as making arrangements (e.g., B’s “I’ll give you a call before we decide to come down” and C’s response with an okay token). To properly initiate a closing section, the analyzability of a pre-closing as marking the end of a topic is important and to this end, pre-closings need to be exchanged by interactants in a conversational way (i.e., following rules for turn-taking machinery). What type of pre-closings is used depends on the nature of the topic. There are occasions where more proverbial or aphoristic expressions (i.e., things always work out for the best) are more appropriate for closing a topic than more general tokens such as well or okay. It is also important to note that okay tokens can be produced with either a rising (“O.K.?”) or declining tone (“O.K.”), which affects their sequential placement and the nature of the actions they are used to perform. That pre-closings are heavily dependent on the nature of the topic reflects what Schegloff and Sacks call monotopicality, which is one of the characteristics of the overall structural organization of conversation (except in cases where there is a particular reason for involving more than one topic, such as a student wanting to talk about two things in a meeting with an instructor). Thus, the initiation of a closing section serves as an indication that none of the interactants are going to initiate talk on a new topic.

Pre-closings have been suggested as an indicator of interactional ability in previous L2 studies on task-based interactions. Based on Schegloff and Sacks (1973), Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig (1992) investigated academic advising sessions between a native academic advisor and a non-native student with advanced-level proficiency. The authors mainly focused on two differences between session-closings and conversation closings: the absence of the reinvocation of previous talk and the presence of post-closing extensions of conversation. Session-closing practices varied from ending a conversation with multiple pre-closing sequences which featured, for example, summary statements and expressions of appreciation, to the absence of any pre-closing practices, where a student used thank you as the first pair part of a terminal exchange. One of the unique pre-closings used was explicit inquiry about the end of the session. Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig called this pre-closing “successful, if not fully native-like” (p. 103). Hellermann and Cole’s (2008) classroom-based research investigated peer-peer interactions focusing on the development over time of the interactional practices that were used by a particular learner to achieve disengagement from tasks. The authors
found that the learner used embodied pre-closings, such as offering eye contact and smiles, and linguistic practices such as appreciations were found in the later stage. Hellermann (2007) found that postural shift or engagement in writing displayed disengagement from an ongoing pair activity, which thereby functioned as an embodied practice for closing an interactional event. Rine (2009) investigated the development of the interactional practices used by an L2 teaching assistant in his dialogic lectures. Although the closings of the dialogic lectures contained pre-closing sequences, the actions in them differed significantly from pre-closings in one-to-one conversation. The teaching assistant often produced inquiries using phrases such as *any questions* or *anything else* with a rising tone as pre-closings, which were designed to identify whether the students wanted to continue the ongoing interaction although with a negative polarity biasing the question towards a “no” response (Heritage & Robinson, 2011). In response to the teaching assistant’s first pair part, students usually offered a silence, which signalled the absence of any desire to continue the interaction. *Okay*, a common pre-closing method in daily conversations, was also used in closing remarks in Rine’s data. Waring’s (2009) data from teacher-student interactions showed teachers’ achieving pre-closings by using phrases such as *everybody okay* with a rising tone in order to judge the appropriateness of moving forward to the next activity.

These studies indicate the differences in the operative organization of closings between everyday conversation and task-based talk and the uniqueness of the practices used by L2 learners to adapt themselves to the specific institutional goals associated with each L2 educational setting.

Several CA studies have investigated overall structures from openings to closings of text-based CMC (Antaki et al., 2006; Gonzales, 2013; Markman, 2009; Meredith, 2017; Negretti; 1999; Pojanapunya & Jaroenkitboworn, 2011; Rintel et al., 2001; Rintel & Pittam, 1997).

Rintel and Pittam (1997) found several strategies used to close Internet Relay Chat interactions such as methods for mitigating leaving, consolidating relationships, or saying farewell. Given that some methods for closing were non-verbal (e.g., virtual hugs) or medium-specific methods (e.g., using a particular action command), familiarity with the chat system was crucial to closing Internet Relay Chat interactions. For instance, some participants did not show any problematizing stance toward abrupt closings, presumably due to their knowledge of potential internet server problems.
Based on their analysis on the text-based interactions in Second Life, an online virtual world, Pojanapunya and Jaroenkitboworn (2011) found that the closings in their data consisted of pre-closings, inserts, terminal exchanges, and post-closings with all components except terminal exchanges being optional. In their study, pre-closing methods were divided into several strategies such as informing of imminent departure, expressions of appreciation, apologies, or giving accounts for leaving. Their data analysis revealed that the majority (76.9%) of closings featured a pre-closing sequence indicating participants' tendency to avoid abrupt closings, perhaps seeing them as a face-threatening action.

In a CALL setting, Negretti (1999) investigated the overall structure of Webchat interactions between L1 English speakers and L2 learners. Negretti reported that participants used pre-closings in order not to display negative emotions such as boredom to interlocutors. Negretti's data included a message consisting of both a pre-closing move and a goodbye remark in different lines within a single chat-message unit. Based on this finding, Negretti claims that L2 learners have to not only master typical interactional methods in their L2 but also to adapt these methods to the interactional needs of a particular text-based communication medium. Gonzales's (2013) case study focused on affiliative elements such as rapport building in text-chat closings in an on-campus L2 Spanish learning system. Gonzales's data showed that one L2 speaker initially used okay for terminal exchanges (for example, okay bye) and later used more sequentially expanded closing sequences featuring, for example, expressions of solicitude or arrangements for future contact, which were conducive to maintaining rapport between interlocutors. These two studies suggest a common strategy of packing different social actions into a single written message unit and participants’ fundamental orientation to the normativity of using pre-closings to avoid conveying disaffiliation.

In order to investigate L2 learners’ online interactional competence, this study will investigate the interactional practices and linguistic repertoire deployed in task closings in text-chat interactions with a larger sample size of learners with different proficiency levels. Through an application of CA to text-based interaction, this study conducted moment-by-moment analysis to understand the meaning of actions from participants’ perspectives.

To summarize the previous studies on closings in daily conversation, institutional talk, task talk, and text chat, it also seems that employing the analytic
concepts provided by CA is beneficial. Identity construction when closing episodes of talk-in-interaction or social encounters has not yet been analyzed, either in studies on spoken interaction or studies on text-chat interactions.

2.5.7.3 Topical talk

Conversation openings serve to position the initiation point (or anchor position) of topical talk, while conversation closings work to confirm that there is no need to continue the topical talk. Both are achieved locally and collaboratively according to the normative orientation of interactants. Topics occur in between openings and closings and they are also regarded as something sequentially co-constructed by interactants rather than something to be determined by external analytic criteria. Several studies have explored how topics are initiated, shifted, and closed in a conversation (e.g., Button & Casey, 1984; Jefferson, 1993; Stokoe, 2000). As Schegloff (1990) points out, topics are difficult to identify as topic shades (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) or topic transitions are achieved in a stepwise fashion (Jefferson, 1984). Topic itself is also an ambiguous term since it is possible for topical talk to be a vehicle for some other action and a topic is interactionally formulated rather than being picked out from an unconstrained set of options. Methodologically, focusing on topic may potentially take attention away from what participants are actually doing, which is a major analytic preoccupation of CA. Thus, CA examines how topicality is achieved by interactants moment by moment in interaction (Stokoe, 2000) and various topic-related actions such as topic-eliciting (Button & Casey, 1984, 1985) and topic-proffering (Schegloff, 2007) have been investigated. Button and Casey (1984, 1985) demonstrate that topic-eliciting sequences consist of topic initial elicitors (e.g., *is there anything else?*), newsworthy event reports (e.g., *getting my hair cut tomorrow*), and topicalizing moves (e.g., *where*?). Button and Casey also present recurrently-observed methods of turn design for doing, for instance, newsworthy event reporting such as the use of preambles. Schegloff (2007) presents cases where a topic-profferer urges a recipient to extend a topic based on their experiences or opinions by, for example, offering a potentially extendable topic more than once. These studies show that when generating topics, competent speakers can construct sequential expansions through the appropriate design of topic-eliciting and topic-proffering turns.
Several pioneering CA studies presented the stepwise transition of topical talk. Sacks (1992) refers to a stepwise topic transition as connecting what was talked about by interactants to what is being talked about by the same participants, whether that is done by the same speaker or between different participants (Park, 2014). Some formulaic phrases can serve as a preface to introduce a topic in a ‘disjunctive’ way (Jefferson, 1984) such as marking with specific lexical items such as by the way or speaking of X, as well as certain actions such as assessments (Lee & Hellermann, 2014). Certain lexical items such as oh or okay as well as assessments (Schegloff, 2007) are often used for sequence-closing thirds and this practice also influences the stepwise transition of topics. Epistemics are also important resources to achieve stepwise topic transition. Robinson (2013) presents the following excerpt:

1 Mom .Jus’ a ta::d. I been nibblin’ while I was cookin’ supper.
2 Pru uh hhuh ((laughter))
3 (0.2)
4 Mom .hhh But vhuginia is very hungry.
5 (1.9)
6 Mom Very very.
7 (1.9)
8 Wes I thoughtju was dietin’.
9 (.)
10 Vir Me? No. Beth.
11 Vir Beth is the one fo[r die[t(h)in’.
12 Wes [Oh. [ehhhh!

In the excerpt, in line 8, Wesley displays his K- position (evidenced by the use of “I thought”) about Virginia’s dieting, which is epistemically downgraded in comparison to Mom’s previous assertive statements displaying her K+ position about Virginia’s appetite, to which Virginia herself has exclusive epistemic access. Virginia’s response initiates a new topic, that is, that it is her sister Beth who is dieting. These exchanges of either K+ or K- positions contribute to a stepwise topic transition. Thus, methods of creating both stepwise and disjunctive topic transitions reflect participants orientations
to semantic links between the previous and forthcoming topics (Lee & Hellermann, 2014) and also their IC to signal possible boundaries between topics.

Topics in educational talk such as classroom interactions can be guided by a participant taking the role of instructor. Due to CA’s analytic mentality of avoiding predetermined categories, including considerations over whether or not a topic is on-task or off-task (Stokoe, 2000), L2 pragmatics research on IC and topic management needs to relax CA’s basic principles in terms of the way the concept of “topic” is defined. Although the tasks that instructors bring into educational contexts pre-determine the nature of the topics that will be talked about to some extent, task-generated topics are not always true to task as workplan (Breen, 1989). Seedhouse and Supakorn (2015) point out the ambiguity of the word “topic” in language learning settings. They separate ‘topic-as-script’, which refers to a standardized topic that an instructor gives a learner or an examiner gives a language test candidate, from ‘topic-as-action’, which refers to the topical talk learners or test takers momentarily co-construct within the given topic-as-script. This separation is important when dealing with the institutional goals of language learning, teaching, and testing as well as research on L2 IC. Galaczi (2014) calls these two concepts a prompt and a topic. In her data, some prompts (e.g., Things that make living in a city enjoyable) have pre-determined topics (e.g., a park, a football stadium, a coffee bar, and a disco). This indicates that there are further sub-categories of the broader concept “topic” in institutional settings such as language testing.

2.5.8 Summary

This section has presented some of the analytic tools and notions that are frequently used in CA. Turn-taking, turn design, sequence organization and repair, alongside the overall structure of interaction and the linguistic choices participants make, are the basic building blocks of talk-in-interaction (Schegloff, 2007), while other notions such as epistemics, roles, identities and participation frameworks are concepts that support sequential analysis. This whole toolset supports and sustains the viability of applied CA studies, including studies on L2 IC that look at a wide range of interactional data types including talk in CMC.
2.6 CMC

This section presents literature related to CMC. Section 2.6.1 first introduces pragmatics in CMC and briefly describes the relevant features of classic and more recent technologies (e.g., email, blogs, wikis, voice chats, video chat, text chats, social networking, and online games). Section 2.6.2 presents literature concerning IC in text-based CMC. The first half (Section 2.6.2.1) discusses IC in ACMC and the second half (Section 2.6.2.2) presents IC in SCMC.

2.6.1 Pragmatics in CMC

CMC has become increasingly popular and widespread in recent decades. Due to the wide availability of Internet-based communication, CMC tools have also become more complex featuring various technical affordances combined into single platforms. Herring (2007) suggests 10 discursive features to classify CMC tools: synchronicity, message transmission (one-way vs. two-way), persistence of transcript, size of message buffer, channels of communication, anonymous messaging, private messaging, filtering, quoting and message format. Synchronicity is determined along a continuum from synchronous communication, where all interactants need to log in to the communication media at the same time, to asynchronous communication, where interactants do not necessarily need to be online as messages can be stored and read anytime. Skype talk is one example of synchronous communication, while email falls into the asynchronous media category. Recently, the differences between asynchronous and synchronous CMCs have been blurred (Yus, 2011). Thus, for instance, video-chat on a system like Skype involves interactions with a high degree of synchronicity, while text-chat interaction is only ‘quasi-synchronous’ (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999) if the compositional process of a message-in-progress is invisible. Herring (2007) claims that synchronicity is a robust analytic indicator for investigating interactional practices in CMC. One-way transmission refers to a system where a receiver cannot view a sender’s composing process, while the character-by-character composing process is visible in two-way transmission. Persistence of transcript indicates how long messages, whether they are spoken or written, are available to replay or reread in the system. Size of message buffer means how many characters the system allows a sender of messages to use and thereby it often refers to a word limit in text-based CMC. Channels of communication refers to what kind of CMC tools are available on a single platform. For instance, although text
chat can be a stand-alone communication channel, recently developed CMC platforms often have an internal chat facility. Other aspects includes anonymous messaging, private messaging, filtering, quoting, and message format. For instance, text-chat communication can be done without showing the participants’ real name or face and can prevent external participants from joining in with an interaction. All these aspects can affect interactional practices (Herring, 2007) and participation frameworks (Dynel, 2014) in online interaction, and therefore, online users’ pragmatics.

Synchronous and asynchronous CMC is also a teaching and learning tool for L2 pragmatics as well as a research instrument for investigating the development of pragmatic competence (Belz, 2007; Taguchi, 2011). Various synchronous technologies such as audio and video conferencing and text and video chat including Skype-based talk, audioblogs and voiced bulletin boards as well as asynchronous media such as emails or internet forums, are used for CALL. Several studies have found that text-based interaction is effective for improving oral interaction skills (e.g., Payne & Ross, 2005; Payne & Whitney, 2002). There have been several developmental studies on L2 SCMC (e.g., Sykes, 2005) and ACMC (e.g., Biesenbach-Lucas, 2005, 2007). Since Web 2.0 technologies allow highly interactive activities, collaborative virtual worlds such as Active World or Second Life (Levy, 2009) have emerged. Skyes (2009) created a virtual learning system called Croquelandia for learning Spanish, where learners interact with each other using computer-generated avatars (e.g., Sykes, 2009, 2011; Sykes, Oskoz, & Thorne, 2008). Sykes (2009, 2011) investigated pragmatic development through analyzing L2 Spanish requests using a pre and post design. These studies also reinforce the limitations of DCTs as assessment tools for L2 pragmatics (Taguchi, 2011) and the necessity of more micro-level analysis as an alternative approach to the study of the development of pragmatic competence.

2.6.2 IC in text-based CMC

This section discusses IC for text-based CMC and is divided into two sub-sections. The first of these covers IC for ACMC and the second, IC for SCMC. Section 2.6.3.1 first introduces Antaki et al.’s (2006) pioneering research on the application of CA to the study of internet forum interaction and also discusses other studies that deal with more recent media including IC research that focuses on both linguistic and semiotic resources. Section 2.6.3.2 presents SCMC which has been the subject of more
CA based research than ACMC. After introducing a pioneering study conducted by Garcia and Jacobs (1999) and what they call disrupted adjacency (a central concept in IC for text-based CMC), I review other studies which use CA or analytic concepts derived from CA to analyze the discursive features participants use in SCMC interactions.

2.6.2.1 ACMC

As mentioned above, there is no clear distinction between synchronous and asynchronous CMC media and synchroniticy of communication can be changed in respond to interactionally emergent communicative needs. Given the different interactional resources from those used in spoken conversation, CMC participants need to be able to implement these resources to create social actions that are observably meaningful to other online interactants, whether the messaging is more synchronously or asynchronously sequenced. Antaki et al. (2006) claimed that CA is a robust tool to understand how senders of messages make their online activities, such as posting documents or commenting on them, recognizable to other online readers such that a responder can be made accountable for a response in asynchronous online interactions such as internet forums. Antaki et al. also suggested that senders of messages in online forums can employ interactional resources that are not available in synchronous CMC and face-to-face spoken conversation. Here are two messages they focused on in their data from a web-based Internet forum exchange conducted in Spanish.

Message 1
Line 3  Para “ella que sabe quién es,” de Lourdes 15.37 hoy
Line 4
Line 5  Para ella, que ya sabe quién es, con todo mi amor
  
  For “she who knows who she is,” from Lourdes 15.37 today
  
  For she, who already knows who she is, with all my love

Message 2
Line 5  Vaya manera de ponernos los dientes largos, chiquilla….Poz
Line 6  ná, a aguantarse, digo!!!!
Line 7  muakis a las dos.
What a way to make us green with envy, girlie ... well,
we’re gonna have to live with it, I guess!!!!
kissy-kiss to both of you.

In Message 1, the sender of a message (to show a declaration of love) provided only their given name in the message; this indicates that it is addressed to a particular person and that only that person will understand it. In other words, by making an announcement in Line 3 in which she introduces herself as “Lourdes”, the sender protects herself from possible misunderstandings like the wrong person answering the message. Subsequently, that message was responded to by a third person, who referred to him or herself and other people as “us” and displayed “envy” in his or her message saying, “What a way to make us green with envy, girlie.” This message made the original message analyzable as a declaration of love directed to someone else (not “us”). In terms of IC, a competent user is able to exploit medium-specific linguistic and semiotic resources to ensure that their contribution to the ongoing written interaction is recognizable to the other potential readers.

Recently, participation frameworks have been investigated in online asynchronous text-based communication. Marcoccia (2004) investigated participation frameworks in newsgroups, which can be characterized by the public nature of the interactions they support as well as their asynchronicity. Marcoccia viewed the newsgroup as a combination of one-on-one and mass interactions and identified three roles: simple readers, casual senders, and a host. A host is a sender who (1) sends messages including both questions and answers to other participants’ questions, (2) initiates new topics more frequently than other users do, (3) offers affiliation to other participants, and (4) shows more expertise than other senders. Marcoccia found that the role of a host is dynamically changeable, ranging from a ratified but non-addressed participant when a message is addressed to certain other participants to the main addressee when a message is not addressed to any particular participant. Bolander (2012) conducted qualitative and quantitative analysis of 187 disagreements and 220 agreements in personal blogs. To create responsiveness, blog readers in the comments section employed more direct methods such as naming or quoting as well as less explicit methods such as the use of nouns and pronouns or format tying (Sacks, 1992). Blog readers can also signal responsiveness using the order in which comments appear.
or participation roles. For instance, a blog reader can signal that his own message is responding to a particular comment from another blog reader by posting his message immediately after the comment he is responding to. Dynel (2014) explored participation frameworks on YouTube and found that each YouTuber was expected to take a leading role in dealing with three modes of interactions: those between the YouTuber and their viewers, those between viewers, and even those between viewers and interactants within the video content such as celebrities in a TV show.

In the language learning field, Abe (2019) investigated IC in online web-based collaborative L2 writing over a five-week period. Abe examined two different modes of communication: chat-based messages and writing contributions to the shared document. The web page of a collaborative text-editing software called Quip has two separate modules: a chatroom and the document, and in the chatroom areas, not only chat messages but also writing records appear. In other words, both chat messages and writing records can be a turn or a part of a turn in an interaction. The following demonstrates changes in the interactional practices used by one participant when contributing his writing to the group.

Task 1 (conducted for the first time)
19 Tada 23:29 *Tosho, craftsman of Japanese swords, is a very rare job...*
20 Tada 23:34 I'm sorry for writing shitty paragraph. But forgive me because I'm in bad shape today. So please correct this if you like.

Task 2 (conducted after two weeks since Task 1)
13 Tada 21:53 *SONY Timer is a famous urban legend among young...*
14 Tada 21:56 I wrote about SONY Timer // So please correct it if you find something wrong

Task 3 (conducted after two weeks since Task 2)
6 C 21:50 Great! Maybe I'm gonna write about traditional.
7 Y 21:52 lets see what the others say
8 C 21:53 Oh yeah
9 Tada 22:07 It's a good idea! // I wanna write about traditional one, Shogi
The scripts feature two interactional modes, chat messages and writing records (shown in italics). In Task 1 and Task 2, the focal participant, Tada, was not involved in interaction with the other participants (members of the group he was doing the collaborative writing assignment with), instead he simply provided a comment after contributing his writing to the shared document. However, between the two tasks, the pragmatic features apparent in his comments changed. In Task 1, Tada’s chat message consisted of a self-deprecating comment, an apology, an excuse, and a request for correction, while in Task 2, his comment is clearly divided into two acts with a line break (shown with double slashes). The first is an announcement of what he wrote and the second is a request for correction. In Task 3, Tada is involved in task prefatory talk with other group members as well as making a request for corrections. The linguistic repertoire used in his correction requests also changes over time (already discussed above in section 2.2).

These studies suggest that the technological affordances associated with ACMC media, including modes of communication, strongly influence the nature of the participation framework in an interaction, especially when dealing with multi-party interactions and medium-specific semiotic resources or what Antaki et al. (2006) calls the structural resources/affordances of the medium.

2.6.2.2 SCMC

Text-chat can be characterized by a lack of audio and visual resources to conduct interactional practices and a lack of precision timing that prevents text-chat interactants from exhibiting turn-taking behaviours identical to those seen in spoken interaction. Instead, turn-taking is disrupted (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999). In oral interaction, prosodic resources signal the precise timing of a possible TRP or the almost completeness of an ongoing turn, whereas in textual chat interaction, a message-in-progress is often invisible, and by virtue of this, the interaction is quasi-synchronous (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999). Despite the fundamental differences between spoken conversation and text-based CMC in terms of the nature of turns and the turn-taking
machinery, several studies have attempted to use CA to analyze the interactional features present in both L1 (e.g., Epperson & Zemel, 2008; Garcia & Jacobs, 1999; Greenfield & Subrahmanyam, 2003; Markman, 2009; Meredith and Stokoe, 2014; Rintel & Pittam, 1997) and L2 text chat interactions (e.g., Gonzales, 2013; González-Lloret, 2008, 2011; Kitade, 2000; Negretti, 1999; Schönfeldt & Golato, 2003; Tudini, 2010, 2013).

Schönfeldt and Golato (2003) investigated interactional practices on a German Web chat program. In their data, text-chat interactants tended not to talk with all other participants but rather, to talk in a group. For that purpose, interactants tended to address chat messages to a particular recipient using their (nick)name. By employing these addressing practices, the sender of the first message and the sender of, for example, the 18th message, could construct an adjacency pair in spite of the 16 messages in between. Thus, adjacency in turn-taking is not a basic building block of these interactions but rather an interactional achievement co-constructed between first and second senders (Golato & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). The invisibility of the composing process of messages-in-progress also affects sequence organization. Although a delayed preferred response in spoken conversation is an indicator of an upcoming dispreferred response such as a disagreement or refusal, delayed responses or silences or gaps between ‘turns’ are much less meaningful in text-chat interaction as such delays can be caused by server problems (Golato & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). For another example, due to the lack of visibility of the message-composing process, self-repair involving typing, deleting, and typing a corrected message occurs only privately and what occurs before messages are actually sent is not counted as an interactional practice but instead, something unobservable happening in individual minds (González-Lloret, 2015). However, as González-Lloret (2015) states, these interactional features including a lack of audio-visual cues, precision timing and visibility of the composing process of a message-in-progress are not a deficiency of text-based interactions but can instead be considered medium-specific interactional resources. It is important to tailor-make our analytic methods or customize CA so that the analytic tools we use are suitable for analyzing interactional practices in text-based (quasi-)synchronous CMC.

development of addressivity among L2 Spanish learners in synchronous online text-chat interactions. In her data, an L2 Spanish learner used incorrect address terms, which were often corrected by her L1 Spanish peer, resulting in extended repair sequences. González-Lloret (2011) reported a change in the interactional practice of producing empathetic utterances to an interlocutor’s troubles talk. For instance, at an earlier stage, an L2 Spanish learner demonstrated minimal acknowledgement of an L1 peer’s troubles talk. At a later stage, the learner topicalized their L1 peer’s troubles talk in more extended sequences. A comparison between the scripts of an earlier stage and a later stage chat between an L1 Spanish speaker (Cid) and an L2 Spanish learner (Jacy) shows us how Jacy’s responses became better designed to extend Cid’s topic-proffering moves. In the first extract, after greeting exchanges, Cid proffers a topic related to something that has been troubling him recently. Jacy provides a minimal response with a *sorry* token to display sympathy or a concern and immediately initiates a new topic without extending the topic proffered by Cid. On the other hand, at a later stage, Jacy extended Cid’s proffered topic with a series of questions. This topic was extended into more than 50 message exchanges and closed with an appreciation move from Jacy and Cid’s virtual winking (“;”)”. In documenting this change in interactional practices, González-Lloret (2011) seems to successfully follow one of CA’s most basic principles, that is, the next-turn proof procedure. This study is important not only in that it demonstrates an application of CA to text-based CMC but also because it suggests further progress through considerations about research design including data elicitation methods.

Tudini (2015) investigates how text-chat users produce an extension of a TCU by suspending TRPs and compares this with how speakers extend their turns in oral conversation. To split a ‘turn’ into several written TCUs or chat posts is a frequently observed method used to signal the unavailability of a TRP. Syntax is an important resource to format the splitting of a turn into several posts. For instance, to answer a question asking what they studied in school, a participant sent a post prefaced with an affirmative response token *si si* and *studia* (I study) in the same post. Subsequently, the same participant sent four posts containing *il latino* (Latin), *il greco* (Greek), *la filosofia* (Philosophy), and *tutte le amterie letterarie* (all the literary subjects), respectively. This turn formatting functions to suspend transition relevance by not including within the same post the information that the affirmative response projects, or the direct object that
the transitive verb *si studia* requires. The turn-final *tutte le amterie letterarie* serves as a summarizing remark signaling a possible TRP. This suggests syntactic knowledge in an L2 is a type of interactional resource used to achieve intersubjectivity and thereby L2 grammatical competence is a part of IC.

This thesis examines three overall structural sections, namely, openings, closings, and topical talk in between in L2 task-based text-chat interactions. The literature review presented above provides grounding to support the following claims:

- A cross-sectional design rather than a longitudinal design or a case study approach should be adopted in order to investigate a variety of interactional repertoires and explore the relationship between these repertoires and different L2 proficiency levels.
- Task-based interaction has been chosen as the data elicitation method as IC in text-based CMC is a relatively new area of study in L2 pragmatics. Thus, a more comprehensive investigation that does not involve pre-targeting particular sequence-initiating actions (e.g., requests) or responsive actions (e.g., disagreements) is needed.
- To meet the two conditions raised above, focusing on overall structural organization, especially openings and closings, is ideal. Since all task-based interactions have a beginning and an ending, the researcher can examine the same number of such overall structural sections as there are participants.
- Although sequence organization has been extensively researched, identity construction has been relatively under-researched in L2 IC studies. Openings and closings are moments where participants can construct different identities to make their messages recognizable as openings or closings to other participants.
Chapter 3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the methodological approach employed in the current study. Section 3.2 will state my research questions. Then, Section 3.3 briefly summarizes methodological considerations; mainly how this study of L2 pragmatics was conducted in the tradition of CA-based research on IC. After that, methods including participants (Section 3.4), data collection procedures (Section 3.5), and instruments (Section 3.6) including tasks and technical affordances for the communication medium used in the study, are presented. Finally, Section 3.7 will present sample transcripts to discuss how participants’ task-based text-chat interactions can be used to investigate interlocutors’ orientations and understandings.

3.2 Research questions

The present study is aimed at investigating IC in L2 task-based text-chat interaction using a cross-sectional research design. More specifically, the present study explores the relationship between the interactional features of participants’ openings, closings, and topical talk in three consecutive task-based text-chat interactions and their L2 proficiency levels. For the purposes of the study, participants were divided into three groups on the basis of proficiency: high, mid, and low. This study is based on two of CA’s fundamental analytic principles, namely, not imposing preexistent categories when trying to understand participants’ behaviors, and not involving exogenous learning theories. Thus, the study was motivated by two research questions: the first involving applied CA and the second dedicated to using the CA-informed findings uncovered in the process of answering Q1 to investigate the development of IC. To achieve the aims of the study, I will investigate the following questions:

Research question 1: How do L2 learners open, close and do topical talk in their task-based text-chat interactions?
Research question 2: How do the interactional practices involved in openings, closings and topical talk differ across the three proficiency groups?

Research question 3: What task effects can be seen?

To answer research question 1 (i.e., a CA question), the data was analyzed through line-by-line analysis of the whole data set. To answer research question 2 (i.e., an IC question), the data was analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively depending on the nature of the proficiency-sensitive features found. To supplement the findings regarding RQs 1 and 2, task effects are explored by focusing on a few dyad’s performances across all three of the tasks used in the current study. When a proficiency-sensitive feature was lexico-syntactically salient enough to be coded and quantified, the number of occurrences of that feature was counted. Otherwise, the study focused on recurrently observable instances where participant’s methods were put on display including several deviant cases (Maynard & Clayman, 2003; Schegloff, 1968).

3.3 Methodological considerations

This study aims to investigate IC in L2 task-based text-chat from an L2 pragmatics perspective. In considering methodologies for achieving this aim, this study settled on using CA as an analytic toolset to investigate the basic building blocks of social interaction (i.e., the turn-taking rules, the linguistic and non-linguistic features of turn design and sequence organization) as well as analytic add-ons (i.e., considerations of epistemics, roles, identities, and participation frameworks). In accounting for not fully subscribing to CA’s epistemology, this study adopts the position of prioritizing L2 pragmatics (Taguchi & Roever, 2017), where pre-determined target language phenomena (i.e., openings, closings and topical talk in L2 task-based text-chat interactions) will be examined, which limits the extent to which the researcher is able to engage in unmotivated looking. The next-turn proof procedure, another epistemological principle of CA, was strictly followed when analyzing the data. The lack of visibility of message-in-progress in text-chat interactions sometimes affected the researcher’s level of confidence in his understanding of each participant’ message (the researcher uses modals such as may, might, or seem on those occasions). However, basically this study
examines only observable and analyzable phenomenon to which participants are or-}

dented in interaction. The transcripts were created based on the above mentioned con-

erations (See Section 3.7).

This study is also interested in the development of IC and it explores the rela-

tionship between the interactional features L2 learners’ show in their turn-taking, turn
design and the sequential organization of actions, and their general L2 proficiency.
On the other hand, this study also aimed to uncover the methods used by L2 learners’ to
construct each section of their task-based interactions in an orderly manner, something
that has never been identified in previous studies. This required a large number of
participants. Thus, this study adopts a cross-sectional research design, which is often
equated with a quasi-longitudinal design. To examine the development of IC using a
cross-sectional design, this study examines three task-based interactions per participant
dyad (using three elicitation tasks), which allowed the researcher to investigate changes
in interactional methods from Task 1 to Task 3.

In addition, this study explores task effects on learners’ performances by
giving participants three consecutive tasks whose task type (a discussion task) is the
same but whose prompts are different from one another. In previous studies, IC tended
to be examined within a single task-based interaction whether the research design was
cross-sectional or longitudinal. For instance, Galaczi’s (2008, 2014) studies are based
on the paired speaking test in the Cambridge ESOL exam, where different types of tasks
are given to each dyad of learners. In longitudinally designed IC research (e.g., Ishida,
2009; Pekarek Doeher & Berger, 2016; Taguchi, 2015), within-prompt comparisons of
interactional practices tended not to be foregrounded. However, with such research
designs, it is difficult to fully explore variations in L2 interactional repertoires at a point
in time, which could possibly lead to underrepresentation of the construct of pragmatic
performance (Roever, 2011). Thus, the current study will investigate this relatively
underexplored issue, task (prompt) effects on learners’ performances, to better capture
the fine-grained differences in learners’ interactional repertoires.

Since the researcher (the author of this thesis) is an L1 speaker of Japanese
and a L2 speaker of English, L2 Japanese university learners of English were chosen for
participants. The researcher has access to knowledge of mundane conversational
features in L1 Japanese and knowledge of typical category-bound activities for
particular social categories (e.g., university students). For the purposes of examining the
participants’ orientation to roles, identities, and participation frameworks as well as turn-taking, turn design, and sequence organization in interaction, this study adopts discussion tasks where the two participants play the role of ‘candidates’ in a language task or test, which in turn, means the researcher occupies the role of an ‘examiner’ who monitors their performances. However, since the analysis of turn-taking, turn design, and sequence organization requires a large data set, while the investigation of notions of role and identities in participation frameworks requires a more focused, case study based approach, the latter kind analysis will be conducted only selectively when appropriate.

3.4 Participants

106 Japanese learners of English, including 58 men and 48 women participated in the study. They were all university undergraduate students at four-year public and private universities in Japan at the time of the data collection. Their ages ranged from 19 to 23. Although they majored in various disciplines such as English, engineering, medical science, economics, business management and law, they were all enrolled in at least one English course as a core or elective subject (recruitment for the study took place in these classes). Although participating in the current study was not part of their assessment in these English subjects, participating in the current study was considered an extracurricular activity. Recruiting was done by the teachers of these subjects, who I asked to distribute an information sheet about the project. In recruiting participants, I contacted 53 students (half of the whole sample) and asked them to invite a classmate of a similar proficiency level to work together with them in a dyad. Consequently, as each participant recruited in the first stage and their dyadic co-participant were friends in their school they were already ‘friends’ in the mobile social networking application, LINE, a text chat platform. In other words, it was not necessary for participants in a dyad to create a new LINE account or to exchange personal details like their LINE account ID just for the purposes of participating in the study.

To divide the participants into different English language proficiency groups, official scores on the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) were used. These scores had all been obtained within three months prior to the date of data collection. Although the TOEIC test consists of only reading and listening sections, the
reading section has items measuring grammatical knowledge (see the ETS website for more information). This test has been used for the purpose of investigating L2 pragmatic ability in previous studies (e.g., Kim & Taguchi, 2015, 2016). Since not all participants were interested in studying abroad, scores on tests used for that purpose such as TOEFL ibt or IELTS were not available. On the other hand, it was obligatory for all current students in the universities involved to take TOEIC and therefore, using this test to control the participants’ proficiency levels was very convenient. The participants’ TOEIC scores ranged from 800-990 (C1-B2 in CEFR) for the high-level learners, 600-795 (B2-B1) for the mid-level learners, and 400-595 (B1-A2) for the low-level learners (see the ETS website for equivalencies between TOEIC scores and CEFR levels). In total, 34 (17 dyads) high-level, 36 (18 dyads) mid-level, and 36 (18 dyads) low-level learners participated. Hereafter, student participants are referred to as participants in a dyad or dyadic participants to differentiate them from the other participant, the researcher, in the data collection sessions.

3.5 Data collection procedures

A data collection session was scheduled for each dyad of participants who were allowed to pick their preferred date and time to work on the task-based text-chat activities. Participants were asked to set aside 1 – 1.5 hours for the session. At the beginning of each session the researcher created a chat space called ‘group LINE’ and invited the two participants to join so that the three of them could talk (text chat) to each other. The two dyadic participants were asked to ensure that they were in separate physical locations for the duration of the session so as to guarantee a ‘text-only’ condition without audiovisual cues. At the time of each data collection session, all participants were in Japan and the researcher was in Australia.

Each data collection session started with greetings, the researcher’s self-introduction, and an explanation of the session in L1 Japanese. The following is a summary of the instructions:

- The researcher will give you three discussion tasks
- The discussion needs to be done in English.
- In each task, you are required to continue your discussion for at least 10 minutes.
- In each task, you may continue your discussion for up to 20 minutes.
- When the discussion is finished, please call the researcher in Japanese.
- If the 20-minute time limit has elapsed, the researcher will let you know.
- Please tell the researcher if something happens (such as a bad signal) while you are doing the tasks.
- Please do not use a dictionary.

The following is the actual instructions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The researcher’s prepared instruction</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>こんにちは、私は阿部真と申します。埼玉県の獨協大学の元講師です。今回はご参加いただいて、ありがとうございます！</td>
<td>“Hello, my name is Makoto Abe. I am a former lecturer at Dokkyo University, Saitama. Thank you very much for your participation!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>この実験はモバイルチャットで会話テストを開発する研究プロジェクトの一部で、私が所属するメルボルン大学で私と Dr. Carsten Roever が行っています。</td>
<td>This experiment is part of a project to develop a test using mobile chat in the University of Melbourne. Me and my supervisor/co-researcher Dr. Carsten Roever are in charge of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>このチャットではお二人にディスカッションのタスクを３つ出題したいと思います。トピックをよく読んで、10 分～20 分間、英語でディスカッションしてください。</td>
<td>In this chat, I will give you three discussion tasks. Please read each topic carefully and discuss in English for 10 to 20 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>開始前に何か聞いておきたいことはありますか？</td>
<td>Do you have any questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ページ</td>
<td>内容</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>それぞれのタスクでは、最低でも10分間、チャットを続けてください。最大15分までチャットをすることができます。それを過ぎた場合は、私がお二人に声をかけます。電波が悪くなったり、何か急に中断しなければならないことが起きたら教えてください。3つ全てのタスクが終わったら15分程度時間をいただいて、アンケートにご記入いただきたいと思います。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>質問はありますか？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>そうそう、言い忘れましたが、辞書はなしです。チャットの仕方は自由ですが、5分も6分もかけてものすごい長文を書いているとチャットになりません（笑）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>では始めましょう。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the instructions, the first task was given to participants and they started discussing (text chatting) in L2 English. Between both Tasks 1 and 2 and Tasks 2 and 3, participants were allowed to ask the researcher questions. Participants were allowed to produce their messages any way they chose. For instance, the *autocomplete* function (where a typing application offers candidate words or phrases when a user is typing a message) or automatic spelling correction or voice recognition were allowed since these features are part of their conversational conventions in L1 Japanese. However, the use of an L2 dictionary (including English-English, English-Japanese, or Japanese-English dictionaries) and L2 sentences prepared or borrowed from Internet sources was not allowed due to the study’s stated purpose of investigating the participants’ IC to deal
with L2 task-based text-chat interaction. Each task-based text-chat interaction was screen-captured on the researcher’s computer, where the researcher monitored the ongoing discussions and reminded participants that they were running out of time if they approached the time limit (the screen-captured video was later used for measuring time gaps between chat posts).

3.6 Instruments

This section presents the discussion tasks used in the data collection session (Section 3.6.1) and the technical affordances of the communication tool participants and the researcher used in the current study, namely, text-based CMC in LINE (Section 3.6.2).

3.6.1 Tasks

L2 task-based text-chat interactions were elicited using three discussion tasks (See Table 1). Each task can be categorized as a decision-making task (Pica et al., 1993). One of the features of decision-making tasks is a convergent goal-orientation, which means that dyadic participants need to come to an agreement in order to accomplish the task. Thus, participants have an overall goal to reach in their interactions but their path toward task accomplishment is not predetermined. The task sequence began with the easiest task and ended with the most difficult one, based on participants’ perceptions in a pilot study, where all 12 participants indicated that Task 1 was the easiest and Task 3 was the most difficult. Table 1 shows the tasks. Tasks were also designed to differ in terms of the degree to which situational settings are provided and how close they are to learners’ real lives. Tasks 1 and 2 provide imaginary settings, while Task 3 has no such situational setting. With regard to the degree of how close each setting is to learners’ real lives, Task 1, where dyadic participants, ‘friends’, are going on a short overseas trip, is less imaginary than Task 2, where the two dyadic participants, university students, are opening a cafe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Task 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You two are students studying in the same university. You two are planning to go overseas for five days. Where do you want to go?

You two are opening a new stylish cafe. It is a small cafe having only four tables. You hired an artist to paint the white wall. What do you want to paint on the wall?

Define “success”.

Discuss and raise several ideas, but decide one answer in the end. You have 10-20 minutes to discuss. Call the examiner once your discussion is done. Let’s start!

In each data collection session, dyadic participants used their own smartphones and the social networking application LINE. LINE was selected as the text-chat communication platform for the current study because it was the most popular text-chat application in Japan at the time of data collection and all participants regularly used it. Notably, it is a feature of LINE chat that the message-in-progress is not visible to interlocutors although several text chat applications do have that function (e.g., Google Hangouts). In other words, unless a message is composed and actually ‘sent’, it does not appear in the shared chat space. Participants used various different smartphones, operating systems and typing systems. The only restrictions placed upon participants was that they were not allowed to send voice or video messages and none of them did.

3.6.2 Technical affordances

LINE allows participants to compose messages using a basic word-processing function. Figure 1 demonstrates the space for text-chat interaction between two participants. Once participants send a message by touching the ‘enter’ key in the on-screen keyboard of a smartphone, the message is displayed in a green balloon (See the figure). The interlocutors’ messages are displayed in white balloons. Both text-based emoticons (e.g., ‘:-)’) and icon-style emoticons or emoji (😊) can be used like normal characters by selecting them within the LINE system. A sticker, or larger-sized emoticon, can also be selected and sent as an independent post rather than as a letter within a post. Files such as pictures can also be uploaded and are also counted as a single post. Time stamps (the time of day) are attached to each message immediately
after it appears. If interlocutors let a message appear on their screen, the system stamps
it as ‘read’ and this can be seen by all interlocutors. In the data collection sessions, since
all interactants (the researcher and the two participants in each dyad) were logged in to
the LINE system until the session ended, the ‘read’ stamp was not an important
interactional resource to make their text-based behaviors recognizable to other
participants (in fact, there was no indication that participants were oriented to the ‘read’
stamp).

Figure 1: Screenshot of text-chat discussion in the LINE system.

3.7 Scripts and analytic methods

This section demonstrates the way data analysis proceeded in terms of how
data scripts were obtained, how line-by-line (post-by-post) analysis was conducted
based on the next-turn proof procedure and how the time gap between posts was
interpreted.

Scripts for participants’ text-chat interactions were obtained through ordering
and numbering each chat message in a temporal sequence. Each message is not called
line 1, line 2, and so on, but rather post 1, post 2, and so on. The numbering of posts
starts from the beginning of each task-based interaction. Thus, the task prompt is always
post 0 and the first message sent by either of the dyadic participants is post 1. Any other
interaction is beyond the scope of the current study. The interactions around the time
when the task is provided and when the task talk ended are demonstrated in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 1. Interactions around task opening

Res では始めましょう
“now let’s start”
Mayu はい！
“yes!”
Omo はい
“yes”
Res それでは、タスク1です。
“Now, this is Task 1”

You two are students studying in the same university. You two are planning to go overseas for five days during the semester break in March. Where do you want to go? Discuss and raise several ideas, but decide one place in the end.

You have 10-20 minutes to discuss. Call the examiner once your discussion is done.

Let’s start!

1 0:00 Omo I want to go Thailand.

Excerpt 2. Interactions around task closing

23 13:28 Omo I want to go Thailand and get my memories back!!
24 13:49 Mayu 以上です
25 13:55 Res はい！
“Yes!”
14:10 Res ありがとうございました！
“Thank you very much!”
Excerpt 1 and Excerpt 2 show a fundamental difference in participation frameworks. Excerpt 1 shows that Shun, one of dyadic participants says, “I want to go to Flance.”. This message may look like a response to the task prompt including the phrase saying, “Where do you want to go?”. However, after analyzing all data set, I found that there was no case where the researcher responded to dyadic participants’ opening posts and there was no case where the absence of the researcher’s response was accountable, namely, problematized by dyadic participants. Based on this observation, the current study does not closely examine the interaction between the task prompt (i.e., post 0) and subsequent posts. In other word, the participation framework including two dyadic participants and the researcher is also beyond the scope of the current study. On the other hand, as Excerpt 2 shows, to close the task talk, at least one dyadic participant is talking to the researcher by switching L2 English to L1 Japanese and the researcher responded. When the researcher does not respond to such closing posts, dyadic participants provide them again, which indicates that the absence of the researcher’s response is accountable. Thus, the current study examines the interaction between dyadic participants closing move and the researcher’s response to it by taking participation framework into consideration.

As is seen in Excerpt 1 and Excerpt 2, just prior to the opening of task talk between participants in a dyad, the researcher shifts the language from L1 Japanese to L2 English and immediately after the task talk is closed (in Excerpt 2, the researcher closed the task talk because the participants exceeded the time limit), the researcher shifts back from L2 English to L1 Japanese. Thus, the transition from non-task talk to task talk (task openings) and from task-talk to non-task talk (task closings) is signaled by the researcher’s code-switching between L1 Japanese and L2 English.

This study takes the standpoint that a post in text-chat interaction is akin to a turn-at-talk in spoken interactions. Multiple posts can constitute a turn and a post can be akin to a TCU in spoken interactions (Tudini, 2015). Working with the assumption that a post is equivalent to a TCU, this study considers it possible for multiple posts to constitute a turn and in these cases, posts subsequent to the first post can be called
increments’. For instance, Excerpt 3 shows how Koji’s posts 6 and 8 together constitute a turn.

**Excerpt 3 (High-level learners: Task 2)**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1:38</td>
<td>Koji</td>
<td>Do you like to paint some view?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>Koji</td>
<td>Sea,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>Rika</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1:54</td>
<td>Koji</td>
<td>or mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1:57</td>
<td>Rika</td>
<td>Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2:04</td>
<td>Rika</td>
<td>Mountains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Posts 5 and 7 constitute a sequence of two turns, where the second turn is responsive to the first since they constitute a question-answer sequence. Posts 6 and 8 seems to constitute a turn since “or mountains” seems to be grammatically fit as a continuation of “See,”. Thus, it is possible to analyze post 5, posts 6 and 8, and post 7 are turns (or TCUs). Across Rika’s affirmative answer in post 7 to Koji’s polar question in post 5, Koji produces a noun phrase with a coordinator, that is, an A or B form. In addition, there is no indication that Koji, in post 8, is oriented to Rika’s response Yes. More importantly, upon completion of Rika’s affirmative answer, Koji’s “Do you like to paint some view?” is analyzed as a yes-no question. In posts 9 and 10, Rika produces oh, which has often been referred to as a change-of-state-token in English in previous CA literature (e.g., Heritage, 1984) and reiterates Koji’s previous utterance, namely, mountains. Upon completion of posts Oh and Mountains, it is observable that Rika is oriented to Koji’s previous utterance, which also means that Rika’s Yes in post 7 and Oh in post 9 do not constitute a turn. By picking Mountains out of two choices Sea or mountains, Rika displays that her orientation has shifted to the issue of Sea or mountains rather than Do you like to paint some view?, which supports the analysis that post 7, Rika’s Yes, is directed to Do you like to paint some view? rather than Do you like to paint some view? Sea, or Sea, in itself. This analysis is also supported by the fact that there was a less than one-second time gap between posts 6 and 7. As can be seen in the analysis of this excerpt, the next-turn proof procedure can be applied to text-chat data as long as a participant produces a response to his or her interlocutor.
Based on the idea of disrupted turn-taking (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999), this study examines whether two posts are crossed instead of whether they are overlapped or latched (Sacks et al., 1974). Although there is no difference between pauses and gaps as there is in spoken conversations, the time gap between two posts is a useful reference point. In order to judge whether posts are crossed or not, not only the time gap between posts but also the length and content of a response is examined. This judgment is informed by the length of the second post, the average length of other posts, the average time gap for each dyad and the researcher’s subjective judgement as a participant in the data collection sessions. For instance, if there is a time gap of approximately one second between a first post sent by one dyadic participant and a second post sent by the other, and the second post consists of, say, more than 10 words, the researcher judges that they are crossed. However, if the second post consists of one short lexical unit, the judgement of crossed posts is more difficult. Excerpt 4 demonstrates posts 12-20 between Tora and Gari, who are mid-level learners, in Task 1.

**Excerpt 4 (Mid-level learners / Task 1)**

12 2:48 Tora I wanna go Thai
13 3:16 Gari Thailand ! I've been to there once!
14 3:17 Tora Last summer, I went Thai
15 3:32 Gari Yeah

There was a time gap of 28 s between posts 12 and 13, while there was only one second between posts 13 and 14. It is apparent that posts 12 and 13 are responsive in that these two posts refer to “Thai” and “Thailand”. However, judging from the time gap of one second between posts 13 and 14, post 14 seems to have been being composed before post 13 appeared. However, in post 15, Gari says, “Yeah”, which appears to be a response to post 14 rather than to post 12 or a combination of posts 12 and post 14. This is because post 12 has already been responded to and it seems to be unlikely that post 13 and post 15 constitute a turn (where post 15 is an increment) given that these two posts (“Thailand ! I’ve been to there once!” and “Yeah”) have no apparent format tie. Overall, both posts 12-13 and posts 14-15 are considered to be sequences consisting of an utterance and a response, which is more important than whether posts 12-14 and posts 13-15 are considered to belong to a single turn or not. In the current study, these
sequences are referred to as a ‘turn-response’ sequences in order to highlight their responsive nature.

The following excerpt is an extension of the same excerpt presented above.

Excerpt 5 (Mid-level learners / Task 1; previously appeared as Excerpt 4)

12 2:48 Tora I wanna go Thai
13 3:16 Gari Thailand ! I've been to there once!
14 3:17 Tora Last summer, I went Thai
15 3:32 Gari Yeah
16 3:52 Tora Thai was really good place
17 4:18 Tora Oh, have u been Thai!?
18 4:24 Gari Which place is your favorite?
19 4:27 Gari Yes!
20 4:35 Gari ((sending a sticker))

In post 16, Tora says, “Thai was really good place”, which is still formally linked to his previous posts, while he marks the responsiveness of post 17, which is explicitly directed to post 13 judging from the lexico-syntactic link between the two posts (i.e., the use of the word been with present perfect tense and the reference to Thailand), with a possible change-of-state token oh. Thus, posts 16 and 17 should not be considered to be a turn consisting of two posts. Gari’s response to “Oh, have u been Thai!?” can be found in post 19 (“Yes!”) instead of post 18, the immediately following post. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that posts 17 and 18 are crossed. Immediately after providing an affirmative response in post 19, Gari posts a sticker with a cartoon-like illustration of a seaweed-like creature and the word zawa zawa, a Japanese onomatopoeic expression roughly meaning buzz. Although Gari’s motive for using this sticker is unclear, it is easier to argue that posts 19 (the affirmative response “Yes”) and 20 (the sticker) constitute a unit akin to a turn since no co-participant’s message is inserted between them. It is important to note that whether a turn consists of more than one post, and whether two posts are crossed, is not always clear. What is observable is whether participants in a dyad display responsiveness in their interaction despite possible post-crossing and non-adjacency of turns. Consequently, this study focusses more on
participants’ methods for producing responsiveness despite possible unclear turn boundaries and disrupted adjacency in a turn and a response sequence.

Based on the methodological standpoints, tasks and scripts for analysis described above, the current study defines three overall structural organizations (openings, closings, and the topical talk in between), turns, turn-taking, turn design and sequence organization as follows:

**Opening:** The opening refers to the talk that stretches from when the researcher provides the task prompt in L2 English up until when the participants begin to discuss the topic at hand and includes whatever exchanges occur in between.

**Closing:** Closing refers to the talk around the point when the dyadic participants bring the task to completion by calling the researcher. Upon calling the researcher, dyadic participants switch from L2 English to L1 Japanese.

**Topical talk:** Topical talk refers to the rest of the task-based interaction or task talk except for the opening and closing.

**Turn:** A turn can consist of either one single post or multiple posts including stickers, large-size iconic emoticons, which are equivalent to a single post. A turn can be split into several posts if a sender does that in observable ways including composing the first post in a syntactically incomplete form and adding subsequent posts to complete this projected syntactic trajectory or displaying a format tying between posts.

**Turn-taking:** Adjacency is disrupted in turn-taking in text-chat interaction and is therefore unlike that which we observe in spoken interaction (Herring, 1999). To display responsiveness under the condition of disrupted adjacency caused by crossed posts, one needs to explicitly display which post a responsive post is directed to by means of deploying specific elements of turn design.

**Turn design:** Turn design is probably similar between text-chat and spoken interactions. Based on the assumption that posts can constitute a turn, interactants can use various methods to display a coherence with previous turns such as repetition, ellipsis, deictic expressions, answering format to question format (Drew, 2013), format-tying (Sacks, 1992) or particular interjections such as *oh* (Heritage, 1984) and other turn-initial components (Drew, 2013). Although a significant difference between turn design in spoken interactions and text chat is the lack of prosodic resources that can be employed, text chat offers other types of resources to display the connection between
turns. For example, a question mark can be used for similar purposes as questioning intonation in spoken interaction.

**Sequence organization:** Although turn-taking is fundamentally different, text-chat interaction can display sequence organization due to the similarity of turn design between text-chat and spoken interactions, as long as the responsiveness between two turns is sufficiently displayed. Although the ambiguity of concepts such as TCU and TRP in the text chat context blurs turn boundaries, especially when posts are crossed, a response that is designed to clearly display a connection with prior messages constructs a responsive two-turn sequence. What the current study refers to in what sequential environment FIP occurs. More specifically, when FIP is often preceded or followed by a particular action, that action and FIP constitute what the current study refers to a two-turn sequence whether such sequence is equivalent to what Schegloff (2007) refers to adjacency pairs. For instance, if the first turn is “I want to go to US” followed by the second turn “US?”, it is what Schegloff (2007) refers to the first pair part of a base adjacency pair deferred by the first part of an insertion repair sequence. However, this study refers to this type of sequence as a two-turn sequence since (1) this study is not aimed at exclusively subscribing Schegloff (2007) to study sequence organization, which is useful to certain types of actions (e.g., request, offer, etc.) and (2) a turn (e.g., “US?”) can be seemingly oriented to a sequentially initial turn (e.g., “I want to go to US”) and thereby can be construable as a response mobilized by such an initial turn (Stivers & Rossano, 2010).
Chapter 4 Task Openings

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will address the following research issues: How L2 learners open task-based text-chat interactions and how the interactional practices seen in these task openings differ across proficiency groups. This chapter consists of 10 parts including this introduction section. Section 4.2 summarizes key terms for the analysis of task openings with a sample analysis and outlines the analytic standpoint for the chapter. Sections 4.3 and 4.4 illustrate the interactional features of two focal phenomena, first-idea proffering and preliminaries. Section 4.5 demonstrates how these interactional features found in task openings are different across the three different proficiency groups. Section 4.6 examines task effects based on within-dyad comparisons of all three task performances. Section 4.7 will summarize the findings and discuss the nature of IC to construct task openings through comparing findings between this study and previous studies.

4.2 Key concepts, sample analysis, and analytic standpoint

This chapter focuses on these interactional features: first-idea proffers (FIP), FIP sequences, preliminaries, preliminary sequences, and task-accomplishment talk. These five terms are outlined below.

**First-idea proffer (FIP):** FIP refers to a post or posts proffering the first idea for accomplishing the task. Ideas refers to candidate answers for each task. Ideas for Task 1, where participants are required to decide one place they want to visit for a five-day imaginary trip ranged from more specific destinations such as America, the UK, or Australia (or more specifically, names of cities) to more general areas such as Asia, somewhere warm, or places close to Tokyo. Ideas for Task 2 included a drawing of the sea, painting the wall black, or putting a map of Tokyo on the wall of the café that participants were running in an imaginary setting. Ideas for Task 3, where participants are asked to discuss and define the word “success”, tended to be a sample definition of the word. A post or posts constituting a FIP can be called a FIP move and can be a part
of a two-turn sequence. Two-turn sequence refers to two consecutive turns, where the second turn seems to respond to the first turn (two-turn sequence does not necessarily mean adjacency pairs but include them).

**FIP sequence**: A FIP sequence refers to a two-turn sequence including FIP moves. Section 4.3 present three types of FIP sequences: proffer-proffer, proffer-response, and solicit-proffer.

**Preliminaries**: Preliminaries refers to moves or sequences appearing prior to FIP sequences. Preliminaries includes phatic exchanges such as greetings or evaluating the difficulty of the task as well as more task prefatory elements such as talk aimed at clarifying task requirements or adding extra conditions to candidate ideas for task accomplishment.

**Preliminary sequences**: When two preliminaries form a two-turn sequence such as a *hi-hi* greeting sequence or a pair of an *are-you-ready* question and an affirmative response to it, the sequence is called a preliminary sequence.

**Task-accomplishment talk**: In and after producing an FIP sequence, the talk is called task accomplishment talk. If there are no preliminaries or preliminary sequences, the task talk starts with task-accomplishment talk. This study identifies the entire task-based interaction (i.e., preliminaries and all remaining task accomplishment talk) as ‘task talk’.

Excerpt 6 shows how two participants (Rumi and Yuki) opened their talk in response to the Task 1 prompt. FIP sequences are highlighted by arrows.

**Excerpt 6 (High-level learners: Task 1)**

0 -0:23 Res Task 1

You two are students studying in the same university. You two are planning to go overseas for five days during the semester break in March. Where do you want to go? Discuss and raise several ideas, but decide one place in the end.
You have 10-20 minutes to discuss. Call the examiner once your discussion is done.

Let’s start!

1 0:00 Rumi Hi yuri～
2 0:09 Yuki Hi～
3 0:17 Rumi Did you read it all?
4 0:25 Yuki Yup!
5 0:32 Rumi ok then let's start
6 0:42 Yuki Yes,let's
7 0:58 Rumi => where do you wanna go? haha
8 1:24 Yuki => I wanna go to many place, actually
9 1:28 Yuki => Korea
10 1:32 Yuki => Thailand
11 1:39 Yuki => America
12 1:42 Yuki => Haha
13 1:56 Yuki Where do u wanna go?
14 1:57 Rumi hey Korea!!! me too
15 2:04 Yuki Oh really!??
16 2:15 Rumi yea but 5 days in Korea

Post 0 is sent by the researcher to provide a task prompt. Prior to post 0, the researcher and two participants in each dyad talked about the conditions and requirements for the tasks and the researcher asked the participants in a dyad whether they had any questions, to which participants responded negatively (See previous chapter for details about pre-task-talk interaction). Therefore, the post containing the task prompt shifts code from L1 to L2 and thereby recognizably displays the initiation of task talk. After the task prompt is provided it takes 23 s for the first ‘speaker’ to send a post. As this study is aimed at examining L2 speakers’ interactional practices for doing task openings, the time gap between the provision of a task prompt and participants’ initial post is not analyzed.

In posts 1 and 2, two students construct a greeting sequence. These two posts form an adjacency pair, where the first hi makes the second hi relevant. 9s seems to be
sufficient for one participant to write (type) *hi* after reading the first *hi*, which suggests that the two *hi* tokens form a responsive sequence. It is also noteworthy that these two posts are format tied (Goodwin, 1990; Sacks, 1992) in that not only *hi* tokens but also a symbol of prolonged sound “~” are used in both posts. After 6 s, in post 3, Rumi asks if her interlocutor has already read the prompt, which is responded to affirmatively by Yuki with an eight-second time gap. Due to the responsive nature of a question-answer sequence organization and the seemingly sufficient time gap (i.e., 8s for composing “Yup!”), these two posts also seem to be a two-turn sequence. In post 5, which occurred 7 s after the previous post, Rumi suggests moving forward, which is responded to affirmatively by Yuki after 10 s, which is seemingly enough time to respond.

These two posts (posts 5 and 6) also seem to constitute a two-turn sequence occurring just before the initiation task-accomplishment talk. Thus, these six posts (posts 1 to 6) construct preliminaries consisting of three preliminary sequences.

In post 7, Rumi asks Yuki where she wants to go, or a possible destination for the imaginary trip, that is, she solicits a candidate answer for Task 1. This question is responded to by Yuki in the following posts. Yuki’s response comes in posts 8-12, where a sentential unit with a laughter token is formatted similarly to Rumi’s previous question with expressions such *wanna go* or *haha*. Thus, these posts constitute a two-turn sequence of soliciting an idea for task accomplishment and proffering ideas for task accomplishment. Since this is the beginning of task-accomplishment talk and ideas for task-accomplishment have been produced for the first time in this task talk, Yuki’s posts in which she proffers ideas are considered a first-idea proffer or FIP. This study calls the two-turn sequence (consisting of post 7 as a first part and posts 8-12 as a second part) including the FIP an FIP sequence. The remaining parts of the excerpt seem to contain some crossed posts. In post 13, Yuki solicits Rumi’s idea for task accomplishment to reciprocate the previously shown sequence. However, post 14 does not respond to Yuki’s idea-soliciting question but instead is oriented to one of the ideas Yuki had previously proffered (post 9). Further evidence that these two posts are not a two-turn sequence but are actually crossed is the time gap of less than 1 s between them. In post 15, Yuki seems to be responding to the immediately previous post, which indicates that a response to Yuki’s idea-soliciting question has been suspended. In post 16, upon the occurrence of a response to post 15, it is manifest that Yuki’s idea-soliciting has been abandoned for the moment. Instead, Rumi and Yuki extend and
augment the idea of “Korea” in order to work towards task accomplishment. It is notable that before and after the FIP sequence, the topic is recognizably shifted from more generic talk to more goal-oriented task talk.

This study is aimed at identifying differences in interactional patterns possibly discriminating the different levels of English proficiency the participants held. This study found that FIPs are a boundary between non-task-accomplishment talk, or preliminaries, and task-accomplishment talk, and the turn design and sequence organization used in these FIPs were proficiency-sensitive pragmatic features. That is because some participants are observably oriented to these two different types of talk, preliminaries and task-accomplishment talk, in task openings. Since this study found that all interactions had at least one idea-proffering move, FIPs were found to be codable and countable. As for preliminaries, whether each task opening had preliminaries or not was countable, while whether participants made preliminary moves only or preliminary (two-turn) sequences was not entirely clear. However, whether participants created extended sequences consisting of more than one two-turn sequence was identifiable. Thus, the study counted the number of task openings containing preliminaries and extended preliminary sequences. This study also found that some of the extended preliminary sequences involved participants roles and identities in more observable ways than other cases and these cases are analyzed qualitatively. This analysis will be applied to all 159 task openings (53 dyads produced three task openings in each three task).

4.3 FIP sequences

This section is dedicated to presenting a typology for FIPs (FIP moves and FIP sequences). FIPs are divided into three types: (1) A sequence of two idea-proffering moves, (2) a sequence of an idea-proffering move and a response to it, and (3) a sequence of an idea-soliciting move and an idea-proffering move (See Table 2 for summary with an example sequence for demonstration). The excerpts demonstrated in the following subsections are cases of task openings with no preliminaries preceding the FIP.

Table 2. Patterns of FIP sequences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>proffer-proffer</th>
<th>proffer-response</th>
<th>solicit-response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: I want to visit India</td>
<td>A: I want to visit India</td>
<td>A: Where do you want to go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: I want to go to Thai</td>
<td>B: That’s nice</td>
<td>B: I want to visit India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3.1 A sequence of two idea-proffering moves (proffer-proffer type)**

The first type is a sequence of two idea-proffering moves in adjacent position with no inserts. This study found 29 cases out of 159 task openings, which accounts for 18.2% of the whole data set. This type can be divided into two subtypes. The first one is a two-turn sequence; therefore, the first and second moves for proffering ideas are regarded as the first and second part of a two-turn sequence. This type is exemplified in Excerpt 7.

**Excerpt 7 (Low-level learners / Task 1)**

0 -1:10 Res Task 1

You two are students studying in the same university. You two are planning to go overseas for five days during the semester break in March. Where do you want to go? Discuss and raise several ideas, but decide one place in the end.

You have 10-20 minutes to discuss. Call the examiner once your discussion is done.

Let’s start!

1 0:00 Shun IP=> I want to go to Flance.
2 0:30 Dai IP=> I want to go to German.
3 0:39 Shun wwhy?
4 0:54 Shun why? sorry.
5 2:02 Dai I’m interested in German culture

*Note.* “IP” indicates idea-proffering moves.
Post 1 is a FIP and post 2 is another idea-proffering move. There are two reasons to suggest that Dai finished reading the previous post and composed his idea-proffering move as a response (or a counter-proffer) to it. First, the second idea-proffering move is format-tied to the previous FIP. Second, the time gap of 30 s was sufficient to compose a 6-word sentence (although this dyad were relatively slow overall). The remaining parts of the excerpt show that the first speaker Shun responds to his interlocutor’s idea-proffering move in post 4 in a question to ask a reason, after his self-repair (post 4) for misspelling (in post 3). In post 5, Dai provides a reason why he chose “German” as an idea for task accomplishment. It is important to note that the presence of two idea-proffering moves with no response in the first two posts is not problematized by these participants, while misspelling is problematized at least by one of the participants (showing their competence to display an orientation to trouble in text-chat interaction). This is marked by a token of apology, sorry, in post 4. Thus, the ostensibly independent two idea-proffering moves in the first two posts could constitute a two-turn sequence.

The second type is a pair of two independent moves which are not responsive but crossed. See Excerpt 8 as an example.

**Excerpt 8 (Low-level learners / Task 1)**

0 -2:15 Res Task 3

Define “success”.

You have 10-20 minutes to discuss. Call the examiner once your discussion is done.

Let’s start!

1 0:00 Eiji IP=> When the result appear, it succeeds.
2 0:04 Shu IP=> make some achivement things and efort efort efort
3 0:17 Eiji yes
4 1:13 Eiji but I don't understand success in life
5 1:33 Shu hmm, getting result is important point
The first two posts provide ideas for accomplishing Task 3, where participants are asked to produce a definition of the word “success”. Judging from the relatively small time gap of 4 s which seems insufficient to compose an 8-word post, post 2 seems not to be responsive to post 1. There is no indication of format tying between the two posts. Thus, these two idea-proffering moves are highly likely to be crossed. Based on this assumption, post 2 and a response token (“yes”) in post 3 constitute a two-turn sequence. Despite the possible crossed nature of these two posts, the participants show no indication (such as apologies, laughter, or an explicit mention of post-crossing) of problematizing this in the subsequent discussion. Similar to Excerpt 7, the ‘second’ idea seems to be adopted as an idea to be further topicalized in subsequent discussion (not presented in the excerpt).

Given that there was not always observable evidence (in terms of format tying and the relationship between time gap and length of posts), it is difficult to classify all 29 cases of task openings starting with two idea-proffering moves in the first and second posts into these two types (i.e., two-turn sequence vs. two independent moves). In addition, this sequential ambiguity is based on the possibility that idea-proffering moves in the beginning of task talk could be a response to the previous post, namely, the task prompt. Note that the task prompt for Task 1 contains the expression of “Where do you want to go?” and the two idea-proffering moves in Excerpt 7 are composed in a want-to construction (The idea-proffering posts in Excerpt 8 are not that explicitly format-tied to the prompt though). More importantly, whether the second idea-proffering turn is oriented to the FIP or not, none of them were problematized by interactants by repair, apology, or laughter. Thus, these two types of FIP sequence are coded into the same category namely, proffer-proffer.

4.3.2 A sequence of FIP and a response to it (proffer-response type)

The second type is a sequence of an FIP move and a response to it. This study found 90 cases out of 159 task openings, which accounts for 56.6% of the whole data set. This type of FIP sequence is the most frequently observed. See Excerpt 9 as an example.

Excerpt 9 (Low-level learners / Task 3)
The first post (“Success is to think out past”) is a FIP and the second post (“It is nice view”) is an assessment of the idea. Judging from the sufficient time gap (35s) and coherence in terms of content of these two posts, I argue that they constitute a two-turn sequence. In other words, an idea-proffering move makes a response relevant in task openings. Jin’s positive assessment in post 2 also seems to function as a go-ahead to extend the proffered idea as a topic. In post 3, Kota provides a self-repair to change his original wording “think our past” used in post 1, into “good past”. Posts 4 and 5 seem to be Jin’s idea-proffering, which happens to be constructed as a counterargument to Kota’s idea for task accomplishment. Here, Jin recycles the same format (i.e., the I think construction) as that used in posts 3 and 4 with an antonymous adjective in a similar sentential structure containing a copula (i.e., “a good past is success” in post 3 vs. “Bad past is success” in post 5). Thus, unlike the proffer-proffer type of FIP sequence, the proffer-response type seems to provide participants with clear roles such as an idea-profferer and a responder.

A response to an FIP can take the form of asking for an account. See Excerpt 10.

**Excerpt 10 (Low-level learners / Task 1)**

1 0:00 Kota  IP=>  I want to go America
2 0:10 Jin  R=>  Why?
3 0:41 Kota  Because America is very large
4 0:44 Kota  so,
5 1:02 Kota  I can know various things
6 1:15 Kota  How about you?
7 1:35 Jin  I want to Australia
The second post elicits a reason for the previous post (an FIP), specifically, why Kota wants to go to America for their imaginary trip for Task 1. Participant roles are divided into an idea-profferer and a responder in this moment and subsequent posts produced by Kota, who seemingly holds the floor by dividing his turn into several posts (i.e., inserting a bare conjunction so with a comma to display that the previous post is not-yet completed and an upcoming provision of a TCU in the following post). From posts 6 to 10, these participants exchange roles with each other and the same sequence of proffering an idea (post 7) and asking for a reason (posts 8 and 9) is reciprocated (For the process of how a ‘second’ idea is generated, see Chapter 6). It is also noteworthy that the reciprocated sequence is constructed in a way that is format-tied to the first sequence (i.e., use of a want-to construction, stand-alone why with a single question mark, because-initial composition).

It is also important to note that the proffer-response type is sequentially similar to the proffer-proffer FIP sequence type on the assumption that, in the latter, the first idea-proffering move is abandoned. The followings are excerpts coded as proffer-proffer type in the previous subsections.

**Excerpt 11 (Low-level learners / Task 1; appeared previously as Excerpt 7)**

1 0:00 Shun (IP=>) I want to go to Flance.
2 0:30 Dai IP=> I want to go to German.
3 0:39 Shun R=> wyhy?

**Excerpt 12 (Low-level learners / Task 3; appeared previously as Excerpt 8)**

1 0:00 Eiji (IP=>) When the result appear, it succeeds.
2 0:04 Shu IP=> make some achivement things and efort efort efort
3 0:17 Eiji R=> yes
In both Excerpt 11 and Excerpt 12, if the second post is regarded as an FIP, the sequence including this and the following responsive move (i.e., the question asking for a reason with a stand-alone *why* in Excerpt 11 and an affirmative response or a go-ahead *yes* in Excerpt 12) constitutes a two-turn FIP sequence. Thus, the first type (proffer-proffer) and second type (proffer-response) may be fundamentally similar, with the difference being the presence of an extra move that is not responded to. The third type, which will be explained in the following section, is substantially different in terms of sequence organization.

### 4.3.3 A sequence of an idea-soliciting move and an FIP

The third type of FIP sequence is a sequence of an idea-soliciting move and an FIP as a response to it. This study found 40 cases out of 159 task openings, which accounts for 25.2% of the whole data set. Like the proffer-response type (and some examples within the proffer-proffer type), this type constitutes a two-turn sequence. See the following excerpts.

**Excerpt 13 (Mid-level learners / Task 1)**

1 0:00 Kei **IS=>** Which country do you want to go?
2 0:28 Yama **IP=>** I want to go America
3 0:43 Yama hou about you?
4 1:38 Kei Well, I want go America because I want to see Nakahara falls.
5 1:58 Kei Naiagara falls.

*Note.* “IS” indicates idea-solicitation.

**Excerpt 14 (Low-level learners / Task 2)**

1 0:00 Eiji **IS=>** What do you think?
2 1:02 Daigo **IP=>** I want to paint many tables.
3 1:18 Eiji Why?
4 3:58 Daigo Because, the cafe is small. // To paint many tables make it widely.

*Note.* “//” indicates use of a line break.
In Excerpt 13 there is a 28-second time gap between the first and second posts and both are formatted with a *want-to* form, which suggests that they are a two-turn sequence. Between posts 3 and 5, these two participants reciprocate the same solicit-proffer sequence with post 4 being self-repaired by Kei in post 5. The first idea soliciting post in Excerpt 13 specifically asks for a candidate answer for accomplishing Task 1 by saying “Which country do you want to go”, while the first post in Excerpt 14 uses a more general question saying, “What do you think?”. In the sense that a specific idea is proffered to respond to the solicitation move in both excerpts, there is not much difference in how these questions are interpreted by the co-participant. Thus, this study does not analyse whether idea-soliciting moves are composed as an open or more specific question as long as the question is observably understood as an idea-soliciting move making a second turn that supplies an FIP relevant.

As two idea-proffering moves may be produced with a small time gap, idea-soliciting moves can be crossed without constructing a two-turn sequence. See Excerpt 15.

**Excerpt 15 (High-level learners / Task 1)**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Haru IS=&gt;</td>
<td>Where do you want to go for a winter break?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0:01</td>
<td>Sari IS=&gt;</td>
<td>So where do you think you wanna go Hayaka?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0:05</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>Lol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0:08</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>Lol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0:14</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>Okay I'll answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both posts 1 and 2 seem to solicit ideas for task accomplishment and these two posts are format-tied (e.g., use of *where do you want*). However, given the one-second time gap between the two posts, it seems that these posts are crossed rather than forming a two-turn sequence. Crossed idea-soliciting moves are a problem, which is marked by the laughter tokens (Glenn & Holt, 2013) produced by both participants in posts 3 and 4. These laughter tokens possibly constitute a two-turn sequence judging from the similarity of the format (“Lol”) despite the relatively small time gap (since this dyad was relatively fast in exchanging chat messages). Thus, posts 1-4 show that these two participants are competent to both construct a two-turn sequence that clearly displays responsiveness and to clearly problematize a source of discursive trouble. In post 5
(saying, “Okay I’ll answer”), Sari offers to play the role of answerer, which ratifies Haru’s idea-soliciting move in post 1 as the first part of an FIP sequence and abandons her own idea-soliciting move.

On the contrary, Excerpt 16 shows that even when two moves were made by the two different participants in a dyad with no time gap, no laughter was evident.

**Excerpt 16 (High-level learners / Task 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Turn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>So any suggestions for a design on the wall?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>Oh I've always wanted to have my own cafe in the future!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:38</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>Really!? That's great!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:48</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>I think before we decide we have to think what kind of cafe or food are we going to serve?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, post 1 looks like an idea-soliciting move, while post 2 is a statement about the main theme of the task. In that the talk for accomplishing the task is suspended and non-task-accomplishing talk is initiated, this part (consisting of several posts that follow from post 2) is considered a preliminary, which will be analysed in the next section. Consequently, post 1 did not recognizably function as an idea-soliciting move. In total, this study found three cases of crossed idea-soliciting moves in the first and second posts, and two of them produced shared laughter between the dyadic participants. It is important to note that instances of two idea-soliciting moves tended to be observably problematized by dyadic participants. Hence, this study regards ‘solicit-solicit’ sequences as instances of interactional trouble rather than a type of FIP sequence.

Finally, this section summarizes the linguistic features of FIP sequences. Across the three sequence types outlined above, FIPs were often formatted as a sentence with the first person singular subject *I* and mental predicates such as *want* or *think* such as *I want to go to US* (Task 1), *I’d like to paint the map of Tokyo* (Task 2), or *I think success is a result of an effort* (Task 3). In the whole data set, *I want* and *I think* forms account for 34.0% and 23.8% of the total number of FIPs, respectively. *I-want* forms were the most frequently observed format for FIPs in Task 1, taking the form of participants expressing their wishes to travel to a particular destination, while *I think* forms were the most frequently found in Task 3, being used to produce FIPs that provided a candidate definition of the word “success”. In addition, FIPs could be
formatted as a single lexical item such as USA! (in Task 1) or Money (in Task 3). I-want, I-think, or similar constructions were formatted with phrasal or clausal elements such as In my opinion, we should draw wild animals or fishes or If we travel in Europe, I wanna go to France, which show a certain epistemic stance for an idea. Some of the I-want and I-think constructions involved the use of modals (e.g., I would like, I think we should, I would say), though the frequency of this is not high. Although this study investigated the lexical features of other actions such as idea-solicitation moves and the differences between cases of FIP moves consisting of a single post and those consisting of multiple posts, there were no salient differences that helped address the research questions and thereby served a purpose for the study. Thus, this study only focuses on the linguistic repertoire used to construct FIPs in the context of exploring proficiency differences and this analysis is presented later in this chapter.

Overall, FIPs and FIP sequences have sufficient clarity to take a quantitative approach toward examining frequency and linguistic forms given that all 159 cases are exhaustively codable. Section 4.5 will present the results of coding across the three different proficiency levels and the three tasks after Section 4.4 explores the interactional features of preliminaries.

4.4 Preliminaries

In the previous section, the three types of FIP sequences were demonstrated using excerpts of FIP sequences with no preliminaries. This section illustrates what preliminary moves and sequences are and how they are constructed prior to an FIP sequence. This study found 47 cases task openings containing preliminary moves or preliminary sequences, which accounts for 30.0% of all 159 cases.

Several task openings contained greetings. The linguistic repertoires used included hi, hello or their derivatives with additional symbols such as one indicating a prolonged sound (“~”). Only 9 (5.7%) cases with greetings were found in the data set. See the following excerpts as examples. Preliminaries are highlighted by arrows.

Excerpt 17 (Mid-level learners / Task 1)

1 0:00 Shige => Hi dude
2 0:11 Ino => hello
In Excerpt 18, in post 1, Shige offers a greeting with an in-group marker dude, to which Ino responds with a greeting only. Although these two posts are formatted differently, it is highly possible that these two posts constitute a two-turn sequence in terms of the content of each post and the seemingly sufficient time gap (11 s) between the two posts. Likewise, posts 3 and 4 constitute a two-turn sequence owing to the observable responsiveness between them. It is apparent that the first and second two-turn sequences are different in terms of the nature of the social actions they perform owing to the clear differences in the content of the second turns (i.e., posts 2 and 4). This difference serves as evidence that posts 1 and 2 qualify as preliminaries not involving task-accomplishment talk and posts 3 and 4 can be considered an FIP sequence (i.e., proffer-response type). In terms of topic transition, the shifting from preliminaries to task-accomplishment talk in this excerpt may be too abrupt to be considered “stepwise” (Sacks, 1992). This can be compared with Excerpt 19 (previously presented as Excerpt 6), where the two participants construct two more preliminary sequences after producing a greeting sequence.

Excerpt 19 (High-level learners: Task 1; appeared previously as Excerpt 6)

1 0:00 Rumi  Hi yuri ~
2 0:09 Yuki  Hi~
3 0:17 Rumi  Did you read it all ?
4 0:25 Yuki  Yup!
5 0:32 Rumi  ok then let's start
6 0:42 Yuki  Yes,let's
Excerpt 18 is a task opening for Task 2 performed by the same dyad (Shige and Ino). In post 1, Shige offers a greeting with no in-group marker this time, while Ino mentions the task prompt in the first half of the post and produces an FIP (of painting a room-like picture on the wall) in the second half, which is responded to by Shige in post 3 (his reason for using a pair of parentheses when expressing the idea is unclear though). Therefore, the first greeting move is not responded to. Although it is possible to call Excerpt 17 a preliminary sequence and Excerpt 18 a preliminary move, this study does not further examine the difference between moves and sequences for preliminaries since that does not further our project of finding proficiency-sensitive interactional features.

A more frequently observed type of preliminary was a sequence of an evaluation of the difficulty of task and a response to it combining to make a two-turn sequence. 34 cases fall into this type (21.4% of the whole data set). First, typical examples of preliminaries in which participants evaluated the difficulty of the task are illustrated as follows.

**Excerpt 20 (High-group learners: Task 2)**

1 0:00 Rika It's so difficult!
2 0:15 Koji Yes.
3 0:25 Rika Small cafe
4 0:38 Rika Only four tables
5 1:38 Koji Do you like to paint some view?

**Excerpt 21 (High-group learners: Task 2)**

1 0:00 Yui It's difficult...
2 0:38 Ami ok! // what type of painting you wanna paint?

In Excerpt 20, Rika initiates task talk with an evaluation of the difficulty of Task 2 and Koji responds to it affirmatively. In posts 3 and 4, Rika repeats (or 'reads aloud') some parts of the Task 2 prompt containing the expression, “It is a small café having only four tables.” It is not until after Koji solicits Rika’s ideas for how to paint the imaginary café wall (in post 5), which will potentially lead them to accomplishing Task 2, that they initiate task-accomplishment talk. Thus, although posts 3 and 4 are utterances regarding the task, they are still preliminaries since task-accomplishment talk, which
requires an FIP, has not started yet. To summarize, posts 1-4 constitute preliminaries, while post 5 starts task-accomplishment talk in the form of an FIP sequence (solicit-proffer). In Excerpt 21, the evaluative move in post 1 seems not to be responded to. Rather Ami’s first post directly solicits an idea for task accomplishment. Judging from the seemingly sufficient time gaps of 38s, this does not seem to be a crossed post. Thus, it seems that Ami simply did not show any orientation to the necessity of replying to Yui’s evaluative move.

The interactional practice of evaluating the difficulty of the task was accomplished by drawing on various linguistic (or semiotic) repertoires. These include not only synonyms of the adjective difficult but also symbols including the use of punctuation, letter repetition, verbalized laughter, or emoticons. See the following examples.

**Excerpt 22 (High-level learners: Task 3)**

1 0:00 Yu     This is Tough one !
2 0:03 Yu     Lol
3 1:08 Moto   Yeah // Do you have any ideas?

**Excerpt 23 (High-level learners: Task 3)**

1 0:00 Rika   Too difficult hahaha
2 0:26 Koji   Yeah, most difficult
3 1:07 Koji   What is "success" for you?

**Excerpt 24 (Mid-level learners: Task 3)**

1 0:00 Cho    Difficult ambiguous theme!
2 0:15 Rie    I think so,too.
3 0:19 Rie    ;)
4 0:25 Rie    I think
5 1:08 Rie    There are different standards of success among people.
6 1:31 Cho    For me success is what I want to do something towards what I've never experienced.

**Excerpt 25 (Mid-level learners: Task 3)**
In Excerpt 22, Yu uses the word *tough* instead of *difficult* to express the difficulty of the task. In the immediately following post, Yu adds a verbalized laughter token “Lol” (abbreviation for “laughing out loud”), which suggests that the difficulty of the task is a problem for him (Glenn & Holt, 2013). Upon Moto’s offering of an affirmative response, the problem is shared between the two interactants. In the same post, Moto initiates the FIP sequence. Excerpt 23 shows that Rika adds an intensifier *too* to *difficult* and she also uses a laughter token within the same post. Koji’s agreement upgrades the evaluative expression (Pomeranz, 1984) by using *most*. In Excerpt 24, Cho used *ambiguous* as well as *difficult* with an exclamation mark to comment on the difficulty of the task. Rie affirmatively responds to the first speaker’s task-evaluation move with a smiley emoticon (“;”) in post 3. In Excerpt 25, in post 1, Kayo makes an evaluation of the difficulty of the task with a set of three non-spaced ellipsis points, which Vandergriff (2013) analyzed as a disagreement or mitigation token in text-based CMC. In the following post, Kayo posts “ummm”. This is what Vandergriff (2013) calls a lexical surrogate, which can serve the same function (expressing mitigation) as a three-dot ellipsis in text chat.

It is noteworthy that Excerpt 24 and Excerpt 25 have an account for the evaluation of the task difficulty (“There are different standards of success among people” and “because depends on people”, respectively). In Task 3, several task openings had *depend* tokens or its synonyms. In the following excerpts, at least one of the two participants in a dyad conveys his or her belief that the definition of “success” depends on an individual’s values. Not that this does not directly answer the prompt which asks them to reach a consensus on the definition of the word.

**Excerpt 26 (Mid-level learners: Task 3)**

1 0:00  Roki  That's difficult one, i think
2 0:13  Nako  Yeah, but It's depends on the each people.
3 0:34  Roki  Yes
Excerpt 27 (Mid-level learners: Task 3: appeared previously as Excerpt 25)
1 0:00 Kayo very difficult ....
2 0:11 Kayo ummm
3 0:19 Dai It's difficult because depends on people. // So.....

Excerpt 28 (High-level learners: Task 3)
1 0:00 Risa Ohh it's a difficult task
2 0:17 Yuko Meaning of Success differs person to person i think
3 1:02 Risa Yea that's right

Excerpt 29 (High-level learners: Task 3)
1 0:00 Sari What's success for you Haru?
2 0:21 Haru I think success difers by person u know?
3 0:28 Sari I agree

In Excerpt 26, after Roki’s evaluation of the task difficulty in the first post, his partner, Nako, sends an affirmative response (“Yeah”) in the following post. In the same post, Nako also says “but it depends on the each people.” which is responded to by Roki in post 3. Thus, these three posts seem to create two two-turn sequences and the “depends” token is used to show an alignment to the interlocutor’s evaluation that Task 3 is difficult. In Excerpt 27, Kayo uses two posts to display her evaluation of the difficulty of the task using a four-dot ellipsis and a mitigating token, in post 3, Dai shows his alignment to his interlocutor’s evaluation by repeating the evaluative adjective difficult and provides an account for his alignment, which is that success “depends on people”. This example also shows a depends token being used in the second turn of a two-turn evaluative sequence around task difficulty. Although in the second post of Excerpt 28 Yuki says, “Meaning of Success differs person to person”, there is no clear evidence that this post is a response to the previous evaluative move since the second turn has neither an affirmative response token nor a repetition of the same evaluative adjective. On the other hand, Excerpt 29 shows that the second speaker is more likely to be completing a two-turn sequence due to the idea-soliciting move in the first post. Thus, “I think success difers by person u know?” may be an idea-proffering move (in fact, there were several dyads who reached an agreement on a final answer of “success
depends on persons” in Task 3). In the current study, the first two posts in Excerpt 26 and Excerpt 27 and the first post in Excerpt 28 were coded as a preliminary (two-turn) sequence and a preliminary move respectively, while Excerpt 29 was considered to be a case of a task opening initiated with an FIP (solicit-proffer) sequence without preliminaries.

There are several task openings where participants just repeated or rephrased a part of the task prompt. See the following examples.

**Excerpt 30 (High-group learners: Task 2)**

1  0:00  Rui  One drawing on the wall...
2  0:14  Rui  At cafe
3  0:15  Taro  in front of TK station
4  0:50  Rui  In it right?
5  1:07  Taro  franky i don't think Fuji, skytree and TK tower would be good
6  1:11  Taro  yea

**Excerpt 31 (High-group learners: Task 3)**

1  0:00  Kana  Success
2  0:05  Aki  It's too difficult for me😭😭
3  0:23  Kana  Money
4  0:38  Aki  oh...
5  1:15  Aki  But, It's important thing...🙈🙈
6  2:03  Kana  I think success in general is "money, career and lover"

In posts 1-3 of Excerpt 30, both the first and the second speakers repeat or rephrase a part of the Task 2 prompt which says, “It is a small café in the Tokyo Station having only four tables. You’ve hired an artist to paint the white wall”. Taro’s contribution in post 3 seems to be designed as an increment to Rui’s turn (posts 1 and 2) and functions to supply a more informative noun phrase (“cafe” “in front of TK station”). In post 4, Rui initiates a repair, identifying Taro’s understanding of the task prompt (“in front of TK station”) as a trouble source. The repair is completed in post 6 with an FIP inserted in post 5. In Excerpt 31, the word “Success” is offered as a single lexical unit, which can be seen as a repetition of a part of the Task 3 prompt saying, “Define ‘success’”. In
the second post, after 5 s, Saki offers an evaluation of the task difficulty with an emoji showing a crying face. Although whether these two posts constitute a two-turn sequence is unknown, they are preliminaries in that task-accomplishment talk has not yet started. Post 3 is an FIP, to which posts 4 and 5 respond with a possible acknowledgement with a hesitation marker (“oh...”) and a but-initial assessment of the proffered idea. Since whether or not verbalizing the word “success” constitutes a repetition of the prompt is unclear, this type of preliminary was not counted.

Another type of preliminary was that used to specify or clarify task requirements, with 12 cases falling into this type (8% of the whole data set). See Excerpt 32.

**Excerpt 32 (High-level learners: Task 1)**

```
1 0:00 Yu => I suppose we need to start with deciding the purpose of the trip.
2 0:06 Yu => First
3 1:36 Moto => Purpose… // What kind of things do you want to do?
4 2:21 Yu => Like studying or just tourism.
5 2:48 Yu => The destination depends on what we want to do.
6 3:29 Yu As for tourism, I would choose Hawai.
7 4:01 Moto That sounds good
```

The first speaker, Yu, opens the task talk with a post that suggests discussing “the purpose of the trip”. (This displays Yu’s orientation to the necessity of talking about the purpose of the trip. Thus, this talk may help participants accomplish the task. However, what the current study calls task accomplishment talk is initiated by an FIP. Thus, this section of talk is coded as a preliminary). Moto, in post 3, repeats the same word (“Purpose”) and provides his understanding of the word (“What kind of things do you want to do?”) in the form of a question, which makes the word repetition serve as a display of Moto’s alignment with Yu’s suggestion (despite the presence of a possible hesitation marker, namely, a three-dot ellipsis). In post 4, Yu answers Moto’s question. Subsequently, in post 5, he elaborates “the purpose of the trip” using Moto’s words (“want to do”) but changing the subject you into we. These responsive sequences indicate that these dyadic participants collaboratively maintain mutual understanding. In
post 6, Yu produces an FIP. On the other hand, his interlocutor Moto displays his readership in post 3 by repeating the word *purpose* from Yu’s previous utterance in the first half of the post and extends this topic by offering a clarification request in the second half (“What kind of things do you want to do?”). Thus, although responsiveness is not fully achieved, posts 1-5 can be seen as preliminaries.

Overall, although preliminaries have great variations in frequency, countability, their tendency to create two-turn sequences, and linguistic forms, they are important interactional features that need to be considered in order to address the current study’s research questions. This discussion will be presented in the next section.

4.5 Proficiency differences

To address the second research question, the relationship between interactional practices and participants’ proficiency levels needs to be explored. The analysis of task openings takes both quantitative and qualitative approaches to examine proficiency differences. Section 4.5.1 and Section 4.5.2 are dedicated to presenting quantitative tendencies regarding sequential repertoires for FIP sequences, including cases of extended preliminary sequences, and linguistic repertoires for FIPs, respectively. Section 4.5.3 provides a detailed qualitative analysis of extended preliminary sequences, where students’ roles and identities are constructed in a unique way.

4.5.1 Sequential repertoires for FIP sequences

This section presents the differences in the sequential features of task openings (where preliminaries were optional features and FIP sequences were present in all cases) across three proficiency levels (High, Mid, and Low levels). First, the frequency of the three types of FIP sequence (proffer-proffer, proffer-response, and solicit-proffer) is shown quantitatively. The following tables demonstrate the frequency of the occurrence of each type of FIP sequence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Frequency of proffer-proffer type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18 dyads)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Frequency of proffer-response type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low (18 dyads)</th>
<th>Mid (18 dyads)</th>
<th>High (17 dyads)</th>
<th>Total (53 dyads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Frequency of solicit-proffer type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low (18 dyads)</th>
<th>Mid (18 dyads)</th>
<th>High (17 dyads)</th>
<th>Total (53 dyads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that low-level learners produced the proffer-proffer type of FIP sequence the most frequently, followed by the mid-level group. High-level learners did not produce this type of sequence at all.

Table 4 shows that participants produced similar numbers of the proffer-response type of FIP sequence across the three proficiency levels. Table 5 demonstrates the frequency of the solicit-proffer type of FIP sequence, showing that high-level learners produced idea-solicitation moves before the FIP the most frequently, followed by mid-level learners and low-level learners, who produced this type the least frequently. These findings can be summarized by noting that high-level learners showed a stronger tendency to avoid proffering an idea immediately and used idea-solicitation moves in
the beginning of task-accomplishment talk. These frequency distributions seem not to be influenced by task differences.

Table 6 shows the frequency of task openings with preliminaries (including both preliminary moves and sequences).

**Table 6. Frequency of preliminaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low (18 dyads)</th>
<th>Mid (18 dyads)</th>
<th>High (17 dyads)</th>
<th>Total (53 dyads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that low-level learners constructed the fewest number of preliminaries of all three proficiency groups. What seems to discriminate the mid-level and high-level groups was the number of preliminaries appearing in Task 2. High-level learners produced a larger number of preliminaries in Task 2 than mid-level learners ($n=10$ vs. $n=4$). With regards to task difference, the table shows that Task 1 is considerably less productive for preliminaries. This finding can be explained by the fact that more evaluative moves and sequences can be produced in later tasks when it becomes possible to make comparisons between the current and previous tasks.

This study did not separate preliminary moves from preliminary sequences by counting their relative frequencies because doing so seemed not to be conducive to addressing the research questions. Instead, this study counted the number of multiple preliminary sequences (a two-turn preliminary sequence and another subsequent preliminary move or sequence(s) such as Excerpt 6 or a few of the others presented above). Table 7, which is a subset of Table 6, shows the frequency of extended preliminary sequences.

**Table 7. Frequency of extended preliminary sequences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low (18 dyads)</th>
<th>Mid (18 dyads)</th>
<th>High (17 dyads)</th>
<th>Total (53 dyads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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As is apparent in the table, high-level learners almost exclusively constructed extended preliminary sequences. There seems to be no task influence on this quantitative tendency. Section 4.5.3 will demonstrate cases of extended preliminary sequences which were much longer than a two-turn sequence plus another move or featured more than one sequence (i.e., they were longer than $aba$ or $abab$ sequences), where learners’ roles and identities are constructed in unique ways.

### 4.5.2 Linguistic repertoires for FIPs

Table 8 provides a comparison of linguistic repertoires used for FIP moves. While features of the three types of FIP sequences were analyzed on a frequency basis, this study examined the linguistic formats of FIP moves as linguistic resources available to participants at the three proficiency levels in order to understand the breadth of their linguistic repertoires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low</th>
<th>mid</th>
<th>high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. I want construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion, I wanna X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want the wall to X (Task 2 only)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I want X</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I personally want X</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my case, I like X</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmm I want X</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want X, you know</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know I really like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that low-level learners utilized less varied linguistic formats than higher-level learners. Mid-level learners boasted the same level of variety in the formats they used as high-level learners except in the case of the *I want* forms. Mid-level learners were more dependent on the *I want X* format, while high-level learners deployed more complex *I want* forms, such as using the verb *want* with an object and to-infinitive such as *I want the wall to X* or using an embedded *I want* construction in a
main clause starting with *I think* such as *I think I want*. Other lexical or phrasal components added to *I want* forms were also more varied in the high-level learners’ FIPs. Overall, this table suggests that high-level learners had the most varied linguistic repertoires for FIPs in task openings.

### 4.5.3 Roles and identities found in some extended preliminary sequences

This section further examines proficiency differences by focusing on extended preliminary sequences, which were mainly produced by high-level dyads. As was shown in Table 7, there were 14 cases with extended preliminary sequences, 13 of these being produced by high-level dyads and one by a mid-level dyad. This subsection presents 5 cases produced by high-level dyads (two from Task 1, one from Task 2 and two from Task 3) and the one case from a mid-level dyad (in Task 2). This section demonstrates how FIP sequences are difficult to find (for an analyst) owing to extended preliminary sequences. This section is also aimed at showing how different task prompts impacted the roles and identities learners could display in extended preliminary sequences.

Excerpt 33 shows two high-level learners’ (Haru and Sari) extended preliminaries and an FIP sequence. The first attempt at idea soliciting in post 1 is not taken up by the interlocutor and it takes 17 turns consisting of 21 posts lasting for about 5 m to construct a complete FIP sequence, initiated with a FIP move in post 23.

**Excerpt 33 (High-level learners: Task 2)**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Haru (IS=&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Sari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0:38</td>
<td>Haru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0:48</td>
<td>Sari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1:13</td>
<td>Haru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1:13</td>
<td>Haru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1:21</td>
<td>Sari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>Haru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>Sari</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In post 1, Haru offers an idea-soliciting move. However, Sari’s message in post 2, crosses with the first post (see that the time gap between posts 1 and 2 is less than 1s), and is not directly associated with task accomplishment but is rather a preliminary move that expresses her general feelings regarding owning a café, which is supposed to be an imaginary setting for further discussion. In post 3, after 38s, Haru responds with a possible topicalizer “Really!” (Button & Casey, 1984) and a positive assessment. In post 4, Sari suggests talking about “what kind of café or food are we going to serve?”, which serves to specify or clarify task requirements (like Excerpt 32 starting with the first speaker’s “I suppose we need to start with deciding the purpose of the trip”) and is therefore a preliminary. Thus, post 1 is still a possible first turn of an FIP sequence pending a second turn as a response. In post 5, Haru more explicitly ratifies Sari’s suggestion that it is necessary to discuss “what kind of café or food are we going to serve” before deciding on the “design” of the café. This further suspends the FIP sequence, and the preliminaries only seem to conclude with an okay token in post 22, a
possible topic-transition or sequence-closing marker (Schegloff, 2007; Stokoe, 2000). Sari provides an idea-proffering turn in post 23, which seems to be responsive to Haru’s request for clarification in post 19 (“Explain ambiance???”). This analysis is consistent with the observation that Sari admits that “Yeah that's what I meant” in post 25. It is difficult to analyze Sari’s FIP (“A café with white and greenish paints, wooden furniture and jazz music”) as oriented to Haru’s post 1 (“So any suggestions for a design on the wall?”) because of the considerable time gap and lack of format-tying. Thus, it seems to be reasonable to suggest that Haru’s post 1 has been abandoned and posts 23 and 24 constitute a proffer-response type of FIP sequence with extended preliminary sequences.

Given the task prompt for Task 2 says, “You two are opening a new stylish café”, it may be natural for participants to play the role of café owners. However, in fact, the majority of participants did not show many ‘café owner’s activities’ prior to an FIP. These “owners’ activities” include thinking about the food menus in their café as displayed in several posts such as “what kind of café or food are we going to serve?” (Sari in post 4), “I wanna do vege shake” (Haru in post 8), or “And I want to baked cakes that are good for people on a diet” (Sari in post 13). It is observable that Sari and Haru shared the same stereotyped knowledge that cafés in Japan usually serve at least a few food items. Although these café owner’s activities were mainly guided by Sari, who conveyed her wish to own a café in real life in post 2, Haru did not show any problematizing stance but displayed her full alignment. Only high-level learners showed this kind of engagement with imaginary café owner’s activities to push an FIP sequence further back into the interaction during a task opening.

The following example is a task opening constructed by a high-level dyad (Yuki and Rumi) in Task 3. Their FIP sequence can be found in posts 49 and 50.

**Excerpt 34 (High-level learners: Task 3)**

```
1 0:00 Yuki  Hi
2 0:01 Rumi  yuri !!!
3 0:04 Rumi  yo yo
4 0:12 Yuki  Hey hey
5 0:21 Rumi  I think this one is difficult
```
It's quite difficult 😨@NoArgsConstructor

ummmm

Ummmmm

success

Success

Who is successful person??

we can use verb too

ohhhh people

Yup

Trump

Yeah

Son masayoshi

Mr Son!

because of his business?

Yes

And he have much money haha

It's so difficult

haha we love money

Do we have to define success!?

Of course!

Haha

yes I guess so

Ok

Ummmmm

when do you feel success?

for me I sometimes feel it after the exam

when I did it well

People say "you did good job" or "how wonderful"

I think we can say that by ourselves too

Yup

I think so too

And also I think
Between posts 1-10, they produce a greeting sequence with a playful tone in posts 1-4, a sequence of two evaluative moves concerning the difficulty of the task in posts 5 and 6 (judging from the time gap of 2s, this seems not to be a two-turn sequence), an exchange of lexical surrogates to display mitigation in posts 7 and 8 (this is more likely to be a two-turn sequence due to the format tying), and a sequence of two stand-alone success tokens or repeats of a part of the Task 3 prompt in posts 9 and 10 (probably a two-turn sequence due to the sufficient time gap of 11s and format tying). From post 11, where Yuki asks, “Who is successful person??”, a new topic is initiated without producing an FIP. After a suggestion of a method to help carry out the discussion in post 12, which is not taken up, and an inserted clarification sequence between posts 13 and 14, Rumi directly answers Yuki’s question in post 15, and this is acknowledged by Yuki in post 16. This topic is extended through some clarification sequences, playful exchanges and an evaluation until Yuki reminds Rumi of the task prompt saying, “Do we have to define success!?” in post 24. After they confirm that between posts 24-28, Rumi says, “when do you feel success?” in post 30, which is possibly taken as an idea-solicitation move. Without waiting for Yuki’s answer, Rumi also proffers her idea over posts 31 and 32, which could be an idea-proffering move. Post 33 seems to be Yuki’s
answer to Rumi’s question, which could also be an idea-proffer. Although it is difficult
to identify the FIP sequence for this dyad, it is more important to note that extended
preliminary sequences push the occurrence of the FIP sequence further back into the
interaction.

This excerpt demonstrates that these two participants produce different
stances towards the topic given by the prompt. In an evaluative sequence concerning
task difficulty, Yuki upgraded Rumi’s evaluation (posts 5 and 6). To the shared
question of “Who is successful person” Rumi and Yuki raised American and Japanese
billionaires respectively (posts 15 “Trump” and 17 “Son masayoshi”). To “when do you
feel success?” Rumi pointed out her experience saying, “for me I sometimes feel it
after the exam when I did it well” (posts 31 and 32), while Yuki’s experience was
“People say "you did good job"or"how wonderful"” (post 33). This excerpt includes
several candidates for FIP sequences, which reflected the difficulty of finding a clear
border between the preliminaries and task accomplishment talk in this conversation. It is
also important to note that participants’ real-life experiences are used to direct these
extended preliminary sequences towards task accomplishment by the participants’
construction of contrasting stances or displays of knowledge.

The next case is also an example where the border between the preliminaries
and the FIP sequence was ambiguous. Excerpt 35 starts with Yone’s proffering of a
topic regarding what she had experienced the previous day. This is not directly related
to the goal of the task and is thereby considered a preliminary.

**Excerpt 35 (High-level learners: Task 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Yone</td>
<td>Natsu, I was so sad yesterday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:26</td>
<td>Natsu</td>
<td>What happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>Natsu</td>
<td>Are you OK?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1:28 | Yone  | Well, I have already work as a hotel front desk stuff for
      |       | for months, but I still make so many mistakes |
| 1:51 | Natsu | That's not problem. |
| 2:13 | Natsu | I make many mistakes everyday. |
| 3:05 | Yone  | Oh, do you think there is a person who really does not
      |       | make mistakes? |
What is the definition of success?

Even though I started working more than one year ago.

I can totally understand you.

Nobody is perfect.

Well, that's so true.

But if we look back.

We can find many changes we make.

I wrote an essay about success in the class this semester.

Yeah.

But we couldn't, and we regret.

What did you write?

There are some kind of success.

Like money.

academic success.

or.

Well, why did you write money.

There are some vary rich people.

Yone’s opening post is analyzed as troubles-talk by her partner, Natsu, who offers a request for further information in post 2 and a display of concern in post 3. Yone’s trouble is clarified in post 4, which contains a key word “mistakes” which seems to be used as an antonym of “success”- the topic provided in the task prompt. In response to her problem, Natsu produces a sympathetic move and expresses an affiliative stance in posts 5 and 6 which serve as a continuer. In post 7, continuing the same topic regarding “mistakes” but also generalizing the agent from “I” to “a person”, Yone raises a question of “do you think there is a person who really does not make mistakes?”. Without waiting for Natsu’s answer, Yone says, “What is the definition of success”, which can be seen as an idea-soliciting move. In post 9, instead of proffering an idea in response to Yone’s solicitation, Natsu provides an increment (“Even though I started working more than one year ago”) to her original TCU in post 6 (“I make many mistakes everyday”). Thus, Yone’s idea-soliciting move is abandoned or a response is pending. In posts 12-14, although the meaning is unclear, Yone seems to provide both agreement and partial disagreement components. In post 15, Natsu relates her
experience of writing an essay on the topic of success, which is also related to the task 3 prompt. After Natsu’s posts 16 and 17 which seemingly respond to some of Yone’s previous posts (to which posts is unclear), post 18 is offered by Yone to extend the topic of Natsu’s essay. Finally, in posts 19, 20, 21, 22, and 24, Natsu creates an FIP. Yone’s response (“Well, why did you write money”) comes in post 23. Although their interactions are not recognizably responsive but are frequently crossed and are based on Natsu’s essay-writing experience, this is considered an FIP sequence. However, this case contains another example of a blurred border separating an FIP sequence from preliminaries.

This dyad also constructed roles or identities in a unique way. To push their FIP sequences back to a later point in the task talk, these two participants talked about Yone’s recent troubles in her part-time job and Natsu’s recent experience of essay-writing, that is, their real-life activities as university students. Although discussion of these real-life activities was found at all levels in the process of extending topics during topical talk in Task 3 (See Chapter 6), only high-level dyads used such discussion as preliminaries in task openings.

Likewise, only high-level dyads delayed the occurrence of an FIP sequence by constructing extended preliminary sequences in Task 1, which is the least productive task in terms of the occurrence of preliminaries according to the quantitative tendency shown above (See Table 6). In the following task opening excerpt, high-level learners Ryu and Mei also seem to construct extended preliminary sequences based on their real-life experiences. See Excerpt 36.

**Excerpt 36 (High-level learners: Task 1)**

1 0:00 Ryu    So let's start.
2 0:09 Mei    Ok
3 0:18 Ryu    Have you ever been to any other countries?
4 0:24 Mei    Yes
5 0:27 Mei    Australia
6 0:42 Mei    America, including Hawaii
7 0:58 Mei    And you??
8 1:49 Ryu    Me too. // I’ve been to Australia once for a month!
In posts 1 and 2, the initiation of talk is suggested by Ryu and this is responded to by Mei. Subsequently, Ryu asks a question about Mei’s real life overseas travel experience in post 3, which is responded to affirmatively by Mei in post 4 and extended in posts 5 and 6 with the specific names of countries and states. However, they are specific answers to Ryu’s question rather than ideas for task accomplishment and thereby they do not constitute an FIP (since whether they are listing candidate destinations for their imaginary trip or excluding wherever they have been previously from the candidate list is unknown at this moment). Upon the occurrence of Mei’s “And you??” in post 7, the question and answer sequence is reciprocated. Ryu tells Mei where he has been and his length of stay there in post 8. In post 9, Mei suggest that they “should go other countries instead of Australia”, indicating that Mei recognizes her and Ryu’s behaviors up to this point as preliminaries to the proffering of ideas for task accomplishment. After displaying an alignment to Mei’s suggestion in post 10, Ryu offers an idea-soliciting move in post 11. The time gap of 7s between posts 11 and 12 may have been too short for Mei to compose a 12-word-long sentential unit Thus, I categorized this FIP sequence into solicit-proffer due to the clarity of the meaning of the two posts (“Do you have any country you want to visit?” and “I've never been to European countries, so I want to go there”) as soliciting and proffering moves.

This excerpt also displays not only a link between the participants’ real lives and their talk but also how this preliminary discussion impacts subsequent task-accomplishment talk. By telling each other which countries they have been to, participants position themselves differentially with regard to domain knowledge and this seems to be a resource that they use to take on different roles or identities. Although several participants from the three proficiency groups talked about their real-life
experiences with staying in or traveling to foreign countries in Task 1, only high-level
learners did this in task opening preliminaries to delay the occurrence of an FIP
sequence. The following excerpt is another example of extended preliminary sequences
produced by another high-level dyad in Task 1 (previously presented in Excerpt 32).

**Excerpt 37 (High-level learners: Task 1: appeared previously as Excerpt 32)**

1. **0:00** Yu  I suppose we need to start with deciding the purpose of the
   trip.
2. **0:06** Yu  First
3. **1:36** Moto  Purpose… // What kind of things do you want to do?
4. **2:21** Yu  Like studying or just tourism.
5. **2:48** Yu  The destination depends on what we want to do.
6. **3:29** Yu  IP=> As for tourism, I would choose Hawai.
7. **4:01** Moto  R=> That sounds good

In this excerpt, the participants seem not to discuss their real lives in the preliminaries.
Only Yu seems to explicitly construct his identity as a student through raising the idea
of studying as a potential purpose for an overseas trip. On the other hand, Moto only
offers a clarification request in post 3, where he repeats a part of his interlocutor’s
previous utterance (“purpose”) with a three-dot ellipsis to display his puzzled state.

Only one mid-level dyad constructed multiple preliminary sequences. See the
following excerpt.

**Excerpt 38 (Mid-level learners: Task 2)**

1. **0:00** Shota  I think cafe should be relax space. // How about you??
2. **0:27** Kota  Yeah, I think so.
3. **0:40** Kota  But
4. **1:47** Kota  We have to consider it in terms of running this cafe.
5. **2:43** Shota  Yeah you are right. // Our cafe have just four seats.
6. **3:11** Kota  In my opinion, the paint in the cafe should have big impact
   on customers.
7. **3:36** Kota  What do you think?
In post 1, Shota opens the task talk by offering a general idea of what kind of place a café should be and solicits Kyota’s opinion. Kyota first offers an agreement and suggests that they should discuss this “in terms of running this café” in post 4, which is reminiscent of Sari’s “Oh I've always wanted to have my own café in the future!” and “I think before we decide we have to think what kind of café or food are we going to serve?” in Excerpt 33. In post 5, Shota affirmatively responds to Kyota’s suggestion displaying his alignment. In posts 6 and 7, Kyota provides an opinion that elaborates on his previous suggestion and solicits Shota’s opinion. In post 8, Shota makes a clarification request, in response to which Kyota further expands on his original suggestion in posts 10 and 12 (“For my suggestion, we should hire the artist who can paint the picture that customers can take a photo and up on SNS” and “Like Instagram”). Although several posts are possibly crossed (e.g., posts 10, 11, and 12), an FIP sequence appears in post 11 (“I think red color is the best”) and post 13 (“That's right!!!!!”).

Shota speaks as a café owner using phrases such as “Our café”, while Kyota speaks from a more neutral position without using such expressions. This differs from Haru and Sari’s case (Excerpt 33), where both participants represented themselves as café owners in the preliminary sequences in their task opening. Haru and Sari, high-level learners, talked about food menus and other elements affecting the whole atmosphere of a café in over twenty posts, whereas Kyota and Shota, mid-level learners, initiated task accomplishment talk fairly quickly, namely, specifying what they wanted to paint on the café wall, despite expressing some global views about the café in general such as “hire the artist” or “Our café have just four seats”. Thus, unlike the example of
the two high-level learners’ with their extended preliminary sequences, it is not difficult to identify an FIP sequence in Kyota and Syota’s case.

4.6 Task effects

To address the third research question (what task effects can be seen), selected dyads’ task openings from all three tasks need to be explored. As we have seen in Table 6 in Section 4.5.1, Task 3 was the most productive for preliminaries among the three tasks and Task 1 was the least productive for preliminaries. This is partially due to the productivity of evaluative exchanges concerning the difficulty of the task. This section examines other noteworthy features of preliminaries in task openings.

The first example is Rumi and Yuki’s preliminaries in task openings. This dyad consistently used greeting sequences over all the tasks in the first two sequences.

Excerpt 39 (High-level learners: Task 1; appeared previously as Excerpt 6)

1 0:00 Rumi Hi yuri ~
2 0:09 Yuki Hi～
3 0:17 Rumi Did you read it all ?
4 0:25 Yuki Yup!
5 0:32 Rumi ok then let's start
6 0:42 Yuki Yes,let's
7 0:58 Rumi where do you wanna go ? haha

Excerpt 40 (High-level learners: Task 2)

1 0:00 Rumi Yuri～
2 0:15 Yuki Hi
3 0:22 Rumi Cafeeee !!! haha
4 0:27 Yuki Haha
5 0:34 Rumi it's a stylish one
6 0:38 Yuki We'll start cafee
7 0:46 Rumi but so small
8 1:00 Yuki Only four table
9 1:01 Rumi I think we are poor haha
There seem to be differences in the types of preliminary sequences used across tasks. For instance, a confirmation that the interlocutor has read the prompt and a suggestion that they start are found in Task 1, while their phatic exchanges in Tasks 2 and 3 feature practices that were absent in the Task 1 preliminaries. Such practices included laughter tokens, a yo-hey sequence, a display of mitigation ummm and a reading aloud of the task prompt as well as an evaluative sequence concerning the difficulty of the task, where Yuki upgrades the initial evaluation with emoticons. It is notable that Rumi commenced the greeting sequence in the first post in Tasks 1 and 2, while it was Yuki that opened the task with Hi in Task 3. Thus, a comparison between the openings across the three tasks shows a diversification of the linguistic repertoire, or types of actions, being used to construct extended preliminary sequences. It is also important to note that some preliminary actions such as the confirmation that the interlocutor had read the prompt and the suggestion that they start were not used in the subsequent two tasks, while a greeting sequence was used in all tasks. This suggests the nature of the first task requiring dyadic participants to be more effortful to maintain the intersubjectivity. In
addition, the laughter sequence in Task 2 and the evaluative sequence in Task 3 suggest that they are enjoyable and difficult tasks for the participants, respectively.

In contrast, Shige and Ino (mid-level learners) produced a greeting sequence in Task 1, only one participant offered a greeting move in Task 2 and finally there were no greetings in Task 3. See the three task openings in the following excerpts.

**Excerpt 42 (Mid-level learners / Task 1; appeared previously as Excerpt 17)**

1 0:00 Shige Hi dude  
2 0:11 Ino hello  
3 0:34 Ino I want to go to Australia  
4 1:06 Shige This vacation ?

**Excerpt 43 (Mid-level learners / Task 2; appeared previously as Excerpt 18)**

1 0:00 Shige Hi  
2 1:26 Ino the cafe is very small !! // I want him to paint (another room)

**Excerpt 44 (Mid-level learners / Task 3)**

1 0:00 Ino I think success is money  
2 0:29 Shige Earn lot of money is success?

It is important to note that this dyad ceased producing a greeting sequence between Task 1 and Task 2 and ceased producing any greeting moves at all between Task 2 and Task 3. However, this can also be considered a change or diversification of interactional methods to organize the task opening. With regard to task effect, Ino and Shige showed more orientation to the necessity of producing a responsive greeting sequence when constructing their opening exchanges in the first task, while they were more oriented to the discussion topic in the third task.

The methods used to perform the action of evaluating the difficulty of the task were also seen to diversify across tasks. Rika and Koji, a high-level dyad, did not evaluate the difficulty of the task in Task 1, while they constructed evaluative sequences regarding task difficulty using different linguistic repertoires in Tasks 2 and 3.

**Excerpt 45 (High-level learners: Task 1)**
1 0:00 Rika What do you think about the topic?
2 0:35 Rika I would like to go to the Australia because there's no time lag
3 0:53 Rika We can communicate with my friends easily
4 1:00 Koji that's a good idea!

Excerpt 46 (High-level learners: Task 2)
1 0:00 Rika It's so difficult!
2 0:15 Koji Yes.
3 0:25 Rika Small cafe
4 0:38 Rika Only four tables
5 1:38 Koji Do you like to paint some view?
6 1:45 Koji Sea,
7 1:45 Rika Yes
8 1:54 Koji or mountains
9 1:57 Rika Oh
10 2:04 Rika Mountains

Excerpt 47 (High-level learners: Task 3)
1 0:00 Rika Too difficult hahaha
2 0:26 Koji Yeah, most difficult
3 1:07 Koji What is "success" for you?
4 1:12 Rika My
5 1:19 Rika Success
6 1:22 Rika Is
7 2:33 Rika I complete something like I planned
8 2:42 Rika Its success
9 2:46 Rika Kind of
10 2:58 Rika DIFFICULT😂😂😂😂
11 3:13 Koji ((providing a sticker))
12 3:29 Koji but I got your opinion.

Excerpt 45 shows that this dyad did not construct an evaluative sequence concerning the difficulty of the task in Task 1. In Excerpt 46, in Task 2, the evaluative sequence
provided in posts 1 and 2 opens the task talk and is followed by Rika’s reading-aloud of
the task prompt. An FIP is conducted in post 6 (“Sea”), which is preaced by a pre-
telling in post 5 and is incremented in post 8 (“or mountains”). In Excerpt 47, in post 1,
Rika says, “Too difficult hahaha”, which is formatted differently from her evaluative
move in Task 2, where she said, “It’s so difficult!”. In post 2, Koji responds by saying,
“Yeah, most difficult”, which is also different from his response to Rika’s evaluative
move in Task 2, where he provided one word “Yes.”. Between posts 4 and 9, Rika
provides a turn split into several posts, which can be regarded as an FIP (“Success” “Is”
“I complete something like I planned”). In post 10, Rika again makes an evaluation of
the difficulty of the task by upgrading an evaluative adjective using uppercase type.
Rika also uses an emoji featuring a face that is smiling and crying (See Figure 2). In the
following post (11), Ko sends a sticker, which is a function of the LINE text-chat
application used to portray a user’s emotion with an icon that is larger than an emoji.
The sticker that Ko uses is a man’s smiley face with the outer ends of both eyebrows
slanted downward (See Figure 3). This sticker is visually aligned with the smiley
emoticon. Note that both Rika’s second evaluation and Ko’s second response to it are
upgraded from their first renderings through the use of medium-specific semiotic
resources. This also indicates that the interactional methods they deploy have
diversified from Task 2 to Task 3, which is supported by the increase in difficulty
across the three tasks.

Figure 2. Emoticon in post 10 in Excerpt 47

Figure 3. Sticker in post 11 in Excerpt 47
4.7 Summary and discussion

This section summarizes the findings of this chapter and discusses them. Section 4.7.1 addresses the first research question: How do L2 learners open task-based text-chat interactions? Section 4.7.2 is dedicated to addressing the second question: How do interactional practices in task openings differ across different proficiency groups? Section 4.7.3 answers the third research question: What task effects can be seen?

4.7.1 How task openings are constructed

The findings can be briefly summarized by stating that the participants constructed task openings through sequences consisting of moves such as idea-proffering or idea-soliciting and subsequent moves. Although those FIP sequences were often found in a pair, they were not always found in the form of a two-turn sequence. It was not common that such two-turn FIP sequence is what CA for spoken interactions refers to adjacency pairs (Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 2007). Because of the possible crossing of posts, FIPs can appear to be ordered in a series accidentally. Preliminaries such as greetings, evaluations of the task or task prefatory talk proceeded FIP sequences in several cases. Some of these preliminaries were constructed as two-turn sequences, while others were not. Some preliminary sequences were extended across a number of turns.

Through introducing the concept of the FIP, the study assumed two points of topic-transition in task openings: (1) transition from non-task talk to task talk (i.e., the moment when the task prompt is presented); (2) transition from task talk to task-accomplishment talk (i.e., the moment when the FIP is produced). In some ways, FIPs are similar to anchor position turns, where interlocutors initiate the core business of talk after producing preliminary sequences such as greetings in daily conversations. However, an FIP is different from an anchor position turn. A good example of a point of difference between these two phenomena is task prefatory talk. When task prefatory talk (preliminaries for specifying or clarifying task requirements) is initiated, it would be safe to say that the core business (i.e., task talk) is already underway, but this happens before an FIP has occurred. This study did not find any instances of task-accomplishment talk being suspended after an FIP move. This differentiation is important in the current study as these analytic units are useful to discriminate the
participants’ interactional practices at different proficiency levels and the distinction between beginnings of task talk and task accomplishment talk is sufficiently supported by the evidence found through sequential analysis based on the next-turn proof procedure.

This study found that FIPs were more frequently initiated than solicited. About 75% of FIP sequences commenced with idea-proffering instead of idea-soliciting moves (whether preliminaries were present or not). This tendency can be explained by the participants’ normative orientation to prioritize accomplishment of the decision-making task. This normative expectation is strong enough to produce sequences of two idea-proffering moves where the second was not responsive to the first despite there being sufficient time between posts for the first to have been read, comprehended and replied to directly. In other words, the proffer-proffer type of FIP shows that participants do not orient to responsiveness as being necessary in these cases. In a sense, a pair of two idea-proffering moves may constitute a two-turn sequence since the study did not see any instances of them being problematized by participants, while pairs of two adjacent idea-solicitation moves were regarded as a problem. While not as conducive to advancing towards task accomplishment as a response, a second idea can be seen as relevant to task-accomplishment in that it can be interactionally construed as a response to the first idea in the sense of a counter-suggestion, whereas a second solicitation is more difficult to so construe and thereby deviates from the normative expectation. Moreover, both first and second ideas are construable as a response to the prompt. Thus, the proffer-proffer sequence type is open to several interpretations in the current study.

The preliminaries found in the current data may be analogous with those discussed in previous studies (not only research that looked at spoken interactions [Schegloff, 1968, 1986; Heritage & Maynard, 2006], but also studies on text-chat openings [Markman, 2009; Rintel et al., 2001; Rintel & Pittam, 1997]). However, preliminaries were not mandatory but occurred in only about 30% of the whole data set of task openings. This is also able to be explained by participants’ normative expectations around accomplishing a decision-making task, which are fundamentally different from the expectations involved in everyday talk. The direct launch of talk related to task accomplishment is not a medium-specific feature of text-chat openings but an intrinsic feature of task openings. This is supported by the findings of Stokoe
(2002) and Hellermann (2008) who reported that learners showed an orientation to the tasks they were working on. In particular, preliminaries such as the task prefatory talk found here were similar to actions identified in Hellermann’s study. Greetings were much less common as preliminaries given that task openings did not open the encounter between the participants for the day but rather, opened talk for each task and these individual tasks were embedded in a larger social encounter, namely, the data collection session (at the start of every single data collection session, the two participants and the researcher constructed an exchange of greetings).

Preliminaries in task-based text-chat interactions can be expanded to push the genesis of an FIP sequence further back into the task talk. Medium-specific temporality does not seem to hinder participants from creating such extended sequences, but in actual fact, sometimes facilitated it. As the dyad of Haru and Sari in Excerpt 33 shows, even what looks like a first part of an FIP sequence (i.e., an idea-proffering or idea-soliciting move) can be delayed or abandoned.

In such preliminaries, roles and identities are constructed in a unique way. By evaluating the difficulty of the task, the two participants can display different evaluative stances toward the task by upgrading an evaluative expression or not responding to it. Provisions of personal episodes or knowledge reflecting participants’ own real lives construct an epistemic imbalance with regard to these episodes or this knowledge, and thereby different roles and identities. Those roles include not only those of questioners and answerers but from what position each participant speaks (e.g., as a student, cafe owner, etc.). Thus, preliminaries can not only act as more extended sequences prior to an FIP sequence, but also offer various resources for participants to construct roles and identities in interaction.

4.7.2 Proficiency differences

This section discusses interactional features, sequential and linguistic repertoires and patterns of role and identity construction across the participants’ proficiency levels. Overall, the findings are consistent with several studies on L2 IC in terms of sequential and linguistic features. The findings that high-proficiency learners were more inclined to engage in more responsive or extended interactions in task openings is similar to the findings of previous studies on L2 IC (e.g., Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012, 2014, 2018; Galaczi, 2014; González-Lloret, 2011; Ishida, 2009; Pekarek
Doehler & Berger, 2016; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011), although these studies did not investigate openings exclusively. However, owing to the fact that task openings (one of the overall structural organizations of talk-in-interaction) contain different types of social actions, and because of the current study’s separation of FIPs from preliminaries, the current study revealed more fine-grained differences across the three proficiency groups.

As for FIP sequences, it is notable that high-proficiency learners never produced a sequence of two idea-proffering moves with no inserts in an adjacent position, compared with low-proficiency learners, who produced that type of FIP sequence in a third of their task openings. The fact that high-proficiency learners never produced the proffer-proffer type of FIP sequences seems to suggest their higher IC to manage sequential and linguistic repertoires. More specifically, high-proficiency learners tend to be able to construct mutually responsive two-turn FIP sequences regardless of the preceding move or whether posts are crossed or not. The evidence for this view includes the fact that only high-level learners produced crossed solicitation moves with a subsequent remedial action, namely, a two-turn sequence of laughter tokens. High-level learners’ orientation to the responsiveness of turns was also demonstrated by the fact that they tended to produce more preliminaries, which are conducive to creating solidarity and affiliation between interactants. Several high-proficiency participants produced more recipient-designed preliminary moves (e.g., “Did you read it all?” in Excerpt 6), which were responded to by their interlocutor. High-proficiency learners’ prioritizing of the construction of two-turn sequences over advancing task-relevant work indicates their orientation to maintaining social solidarity, generating intersubjectivity and displaying affiliative conduct for social actions.

High-proficiency learners were more oriented to responsiveness in communication as such and solidarity and affiliation between interlocutors, while low-proficiency learners’ tended to display their orientation to the direct initiation of task-accomplishment talk, the core business of task-based interaction. Low-proficiency learners’ relatively high dependency on the proffer-proffer type of FIP sequence to start task accomplishment talk may be explained by a lack of sequential and linguistic repertoires to construct social solidarity as well as enacted orientation to the direct initiation of task accomplishment talk. In other words, it is more painstaking for low-proficiency learners to produce questions to solicit ideas or perform preliminary
sequences. Although proffer-proffer has a sequential ambiguity regarding whether the first two posts are responsive to each other or whether they are responding to the prompt (which may be a medium-specific resource available in text-chat interaction), the strategy of taking advantage of that medium-specific resource was not associated with high proficiency. The proffer-proffer type of FIP may be an example of low-proficiency learners’ adopting an effort-minimizing strategy (Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2013). This finding is also consistent with some IC research reporting that recipient designing social actions to fit social situations is more challenging for beginner level learners than advanced level learners (Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2018; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015).

A comparison of the linguistic repertoires used for FIPs indicates that high-proficiency learners used more complex syntax and lexis than lower-proficiency learners. This finding is consistent with previous studies exploring the linguistic architecture of turn formats (e.g., Pekarek Doehler and Pochon-Berger, 2011) and the notion of the diversification of methods with increasing interactional competence (Pekarek Doehler and Pochon-Berger, 2015). The finding is also consistent with previous studies on L2 speech acts pointing out that more developed L2 learners produce more complex syntax with wider pragmalinguistic repertoires (Kasper & Rose, 2002). Complication tends to be avoided by low-proficiency learners and their limited linguistic resources provide only basic lexico-syntactic building blocks or what Pekarek Doehler and Pochon-Berger (2015: 262) call “standardized ‘pass-partout’ resources” to proffer ideas for task accomplishment. On the other hand, higher-proficiency learners’ more varied linguistic repertoires are based on their ability to conduct recipient-designed actions in a context-sensitive manner (Pekarek Doheer & Pochon-Berger, 2015). Thus, the observation that high-proficiency learners showed more diversity in *I-want* construction formats in FIPs than in *I-think* construction formats requires further investigation. It may suggest that the *I-want* construction is a development-sensitive feature (Childs, 2012) that differentiates low and medium proficiency learners from high proficiency ones.

High-proficiency learners’ IC was also observable as their emergent roles and identities constructed in preliminary sequences in task openings. It was almost exclusively high-proficiency dyads that produced extended preliminary sequences. It was possible for lower-proficiency learners to display their evaluative stances regarding
how difficult the task was, while it was only high-proficiency learners that were capable of taking on unique roles available in the settings of each task or bringing in some experiences or real-life knowledge to establish different roles and identities between partners. This indicates that extended preliminary sequences are interactional sites used not only for constructing solidarity and affiliation, but also for negotiating in what roles or identities participants will extend the topical talk along with the proffered idea. This will be developed further in Chapter 6.

4.7.3 Task effects

The data analysis also documented several task effects. Learners’ attention to an attribute of the task is observable in preliminaries in task openings, and is reflected in the distribution of these preliminaries across tasks. There is seemingly no salient interaction between proficiency difference and task effect except that high-proficiency learners created more evaluative moves or sequences in which they commented on task difficulty in preliminaries in Task 2, while their lower-proficiency counterparts expressed these evaluative stances mainly in Task 3.

Task effects can be discussed from the viewpoint of task prompts or the settings they offer. Task 1 elicited preliminaries where the two dyadic participants discussed the purpose of the trip (Excerpt 32) or countries they had never visited (Excerpt 36) to narrow down potential candidate ideas for accomplishing the task. On the other hand, displays of identities within the task (as a cafe owner) were observed in preliminaries for Task 2 (especially in Sari and Haru’s case shown in Excerpt 33). On the contrary, one participant starts task 3 with an opening message saying, “I was so sad yesterday”. This kind of talk was seen only in Task 3, which featured no imaginary situational settings in the prompt. Thus, task prompts influence what roles and identities are constructed in preliminaries.

In addition, task openings provide an interactional site for demonstrating the width of interactional repertories for a particular social action such as greetings or evaluation of the nature of the task. This width can be explored via a comparison of all three task openings performed by the same dyad. This suggests that both the topics that a task prompt presents and the differences between them create unique contingencies in learners’ opening exchanges and thereby elicit different interactional resources to
construct ad-hoc methods to increase responsiveness, affiliation and intersubjectivity and maintain the progressivity of task-based interaction.
Chapter 5 Task Closings

5.1 Introduction

The previous chapter looked at how task-based interaction is opened by L2 learner dyads and the relationship between the interactional practices found in task openings and proficiency differences. This chapter deals with task closings. Section 5.2 summarizes key terms for the analysis of task closings in order to establish an analytic standpoint. Section 5.3 presents terminal exchanges between dyadic participants to demonstrate how task closings were constructed. Section 5.4 demonstrates how these interactional features are associated with the three different proficiency levels. This section adopts a qualitative approach to analyse recurrently observable interactional features of task closings. Section 5.5 offers within-dyad comparisons to explore task effects. Section 5.6 will summarize the findings to address the two research questions.

5.2 Key concepts, sample analysis, and analytic standpoints

To analyse task closings, this analysis focuses on two interactional features: terminal exchanges and summons-answer sequences. Four terms are outlined below.

Terminal exchange: Unlike a bye-bye sequence in daily phone conversation, a terminal exchange is defined as a two-turn sequence used to terminate the task talk. A terminal exchange is constructed between the two participants who were instructed to call the researcher back into the chat only when they had completed the task. In that sense, a terminal exchange was supposed to be obligatory. However, for certain reasons, frequently because participants could not finish the discussion in the given time limit of 20 minutes (participants were made aware of this time limit in the instructions), some task-based interactions were not closed with a terminal exchange. In those cases, the researcher terminated the task talk by sending a post “Time is up!” The present study calls the former cases participant-generated task closings and the latter cases researcher-generated task closings.

Summons-answer sequence: As each task prompt says, “Call the examiner once your discussion is done” and participants were told to do this in L1 Japanese instead of L2 English in the beginning of the data collection session, participants informed the researcher that they had finished their discussion in their own words in L1
Japanese and he responded to it in Japanese. A summons-answer sequence follows a terminal exchange (generated by participants). In the sense that a terminal exchange can be a warrant to make a summons-answer sequence, a terminal exchange and a summons-answer sequence are similar to a pre-closing sequence and a terminal exchange respectively, in daily spoken conversations (Pre-closings did not emerge as an important interactional practice to address the research questions for the current study).

In the following, I will present participant-generated and researcher-generated task closings separately. The first excerpt is an example of a researcher-generated task closing. Excerpt 48 demonstrates Haru and Sari’s task talk. 47 posts are omitted from the complete transcript to focus more on the later stages which feature the task closing talk.

**Excerpt 48 (High-level learners: Task 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>So any suggestions for a design on the wall?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>((47 posts are omitted))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:46</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>Yeah birds, fruits and leaves and we can choose a quote that can be like a theme of our cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:02</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>Yeahhhhh xD im excited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:08</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>Me too!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:31</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>So just to conclude our idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:22</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>We're going to have a nature feeling style cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:34</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>Wood or dark brown floor and sealing, on the wall we would have paintings of the trees and 🍃 and vibrant color, and a not too big quote?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:01</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>Yeah that's perfect!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:24</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>And next is we have to think about the menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:50</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>Okay! I only want to sell two drinks!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:03</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>And few foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:08</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>Two kinds of drinks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:16</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>Or maximum 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:39</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>I think for drinks, tea with fresh fruits is nice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
62 16:13 Haru Cuz its near the tokyo station we wont have enough space, ohh thats good! But we need to be original not just a tea, the tea
63 16:57 Res 3 more minutes!
64 16:59 Sari For coffee we can sell other coffee that aren't usual in Japan
65 17:20 Haru Yeah i think thats a great idea!! What about food?
66 18:15 Sari Carrot cake, vegan chocolate cakes and muffins
67 18:33 Haru That sounds good!!!
68 18:52 Sari 3 types for dessert and just sandwiches and salads
69 19:05 Haru That sounds good!!!
70 19:38 Sari Yeah I'm excited to start our cafe
71 19:57 Haru Yeah! Lets have fun had make ppl happy xD
72 19:57 Res Time is up!

In Excerpt 48, in posts 52-55, the two participants, Haru and Sari, seem to agree on an idea for the design for the wall in their imaginary cafe, and this is detailed in post 54. In post 52 (“So just to conclude our idea”), Haru explicitly projects making a conclusion and Sari’s subsequent post is probably a response to this since this post (post 53-“We’re going to have a nature feeling style cafe”) is formatted in a more summative way than her previous posts (e.g., post 49). In post 54, Haru summarizes her and Sari’s ideas for accomplishing Task 2, which is recognizably responded to by Sari in post 55. However, Sari provides a new topic in post 56, “the menu”, which is extended by Haru into the topic of “drink” and “food” in posts 57 and 58. Sari extends the topic of “drink” in post 61 after an inserted sequence (posts 59 and 60). In post 62, Haru seems to supply an increment to her previous message in the first half and also to respond to Sari’s post 61 in the second half. After that, the researcher provides a time reminder in post 63. After 2s (probably crossing with the time reminder), Sari extends the topic in posts 64, 66, and 68, while Haru mainly provides assessments in posts 65, 67, and 69. Given that posts 67 and 69 were repetitions, they may possibly be closing moves in the form of assessments (Schegloff, 2007). Just prior to the researcher’s termination of talk in post 72, this dyad makes a phatic exchange in posts 70 and 71 regarding their imaginary cafe business.
Although they accomplished the task through reaching an agreement on their conclusion, a terminal exchange was not generated by participants themselves and thereby no summons-answer sequence was constructed between participants and the researcher. Therefore, this is an example of a researcher-generated task closing.

Excerpt 49 shows another example of a researcher-generated task closing. In this example, it is more obvious that the two participants did not reach an agreement within the time limit.

**Excerpt 49 (Mid-level learners: Task 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:25</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>Nature is the best design, I think!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:29</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>That's awesome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:44</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>I like sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>3 more minutes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:19</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>I know that, I love to relax at the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:23</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>So...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:36</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>We decide to paint the sea, ok?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:36</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>But, you know,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:22</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>I have only summer image for the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:41</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>I see that...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:46</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>But, winter sea is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:10</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>Like lomantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:42</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>That's adultish and It's good for our cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>Time is up!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 49 shows two participants, Nako and Roki, closing their task talk in Task 2. Before the 3 minute warning in post 36, Nako provides her idea (“Nature”) for task accomplishment, which is positively assessed in post 34 and specified into “sea” in post 35. After the time reminder, Nako displays her alignment with Roki’s more specific idea for task accomplishment (post 37), offers a stand-alone so with a three-dot hesitation marker (possibly as a means of holding the floor (post 38)), and foregrounds their decision by saying, “We decide to paint the sea, ok?”. Crossed with that post of Nako’s, Roki offers a but-initial post in post 40. This sounds like a disagreement and an account for his disagreement or skepticism follows in post 41. After Nako’s display of
understanding with a hesitation marker (“I see that…” in post 42), Roki adds further increments to his turn in posts 43-45. Finally, this talk is then terminated by the researcher in post 46.

Although it looks like both participants came close to an agreement, the data does not contain sufficient observable evidence to judge that the task was successfully accomplished through participants’ agreement due to the lack of a participant-generated task closing consisting of a terminal exchange and a summons-answer sequence.

Whether the task is accomplished or not can be unclear even though the topical talk becomes topically-empty (such as an exchange of *okay* tokens) unless there is a summons-answer sequence. See the following example.

**Excerpt 50 (Mid-level learners: Task 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:25</td>
<td>Shin</td>
<td>what do you think important word in defining success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:51</td>
<td>Kota</td>
<td>Rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:06</td>
<td>Kota</td>
<td>How about you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:52</td>
<td>Shin</td>
<td>feel achievement is most important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:44</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>3 more minutes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:28</td>
<td>Kota</td>
<td>So our definition is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:48</td>
<td>Shin</td>
<td>rewards is secondary in definition success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:52</td>
<td>Shin</td>
<td>i think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:19</td>
<td>Kota</td>
<td>when we are faced with a problems then we effort and achieve something and finally we get rewards and achievement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:28</td>
<td>Kota</td>
<td>Ok?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:45</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>Time is up!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:47</td>
<td>Shin</td>
<td>okay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher provides a time reminder in post 35 which seems to change the direction of the talk. In the following post, Kota implicitly suggest that they should decide on the final answer for Task 3, the definition of the word “success”. In posts 37 and 38, Shin seems to express his disagreement with Kota’s idea of “Rewards”, which was proffered in post 32. In the following post 39, Kota proffers a definition of success, which does not seem to be responsive to Shin’s previous posts. Immediately after
providing his definition of success, Kota says “Ok?”, which is responded to by Shin with “okay”, with the researcher’s task terminating post inserted. To whom Shin’s okay is addressed is unclear. Although it seem to be responding to Kota’s Ok? and may have been crossed by the researcher’s post 41, alternatively, it may also be a response to the researcher’s post. Thus, it is not clear whether the participants accomplished the task or not. As a result, this is also considered a researcher-generated task closing.

Next, I will present examples of participant-generated task closings. Excerpt 51 presents a full transcript of task talk from the opening to closing. Shin and Kota discuss the design of the cafe wall (Task 2).

**Excerpt 51 (Mid-level learners: Task 2)**

1 0:00 Shin  i want to draw pokemon
2 0:34 Shin  pokemon is famous around the world now
3 0:51 Kota  Pokemon? It's dangerous
4 1:23 Shin  copyrights?
5 1:23 Kota  Copyright
6 1:28 Kota  Yes
7 1:33 Shin  i see
8 1:46 Kota  Another idea
9 2:54 Kota  Cafe is important to calm down
10 4:12 Shin  sea creatures
11 4:28 Kota  Oh good idea
12 5:21 Kota  but it is different from cafes image
13 5:39 Kota  so…
14 5:56 Shin  i dont
15 6:05 Shin  think so
16 6:17 Kota  Why
17 6:51 Shin  blue color having relaxing effect
18 7:20 Shin  and sea creatures have same effect
19 7:41 Kota  Hum
20 7:46 Kota  I agree
21 8:38 Shin  what do you want to draw?
Shin and Kota discuss an idea proffered by Shin, “sea creatures”, for the design of the wall from post 10 until they construct a closing. These two participants extend this topic with partial agreements, disagreements and counterarguments to disagreements over several turns. In posts 11-13, Kota disagrees with Shin’s idea through delaying a disagreeing component (in post 12) by supplying a positive assessment (in post 11), followed by a hesitation marker (in post 13). After Shin’s disagreement in posts 14 and 15, which Kota responds to by asking for a reason (in post 16), Shin provides an account in posts 17 and 18. Kota disagrees again in posts 19-23, using the same method (a disagreement delayed by an initial agreement), while Shin solicits an idea in post 21 possibly crossed with Kota’s turn. After Shin’s counterargument in posts 24 and 25, Kota says, “Sea and blue sky are better // Creature is not necessary”. This idea is replied to with a display of understanding by Shin. In post 28, Kota requests confirmation of their agreement on the idea for task accomplishment in a so-prefaced format with a question mark and then an okay token with another question mark. This is recognizably responded to by Shin with an explicit agreement and an okay token. Due to the format tying and a seemingly sufficient time gap of 13 s, posts 28 and 29 can be seen as responsive. In the next post, Kota calls the researcher in L1 Japanese to terminate the task, which qualifies the previous two-turn sequence as a terminal exchange. The researcher responds to Shin to construct a two-turn summons-answer sequence in L1 Japanese which implicates the end of task talk. Later, the
researcher thanks both participants and asks whether it is possible to proceed to the next task and if they have any questions before moving on (not presented in the excerpt).

From the first part of the terminal exchange in post 28, to the researcher’s second part of the summons-answer sequence, all participants collaboratively display their understanding that task has been accomplished. Thus, this is an example of participant-generated task closing.

This study found 97 participant-generated task closings out of the whole data set (159 task closings), which accounts for 62.2%. Table 9 shows the frequency distribution of task closing types across the three proficiency levels and the three task types. There was no salient association between proficiency and task in terms of closings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Low (18 dyads)</th>
<th>Mid (18 dyads)</th>
<th>High (17 dyads)</th>
<th>Total (53 dyads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study separates participant-generated task closings from researcher-generated task closings because of their fundamentally different nature. In order to examine dyadic participants’ interactional practices for producing terminal exchanges and summons-answer sequences, this study focuses on the 97 cases of participant-generated task closings. First, the sequential features of terminal exchanges are explored. Next, the linguistic repertoire used for the first part of a terminal exchange is examined. Then, proficiency differences are demonstrated by qualitatively analyzing the recurrently observable sequential and linguistic patterns evident in terminal exchanges and summons-answer sequences in participant-generated task closings. When presenting proficiency differences, cases of researcher-generated task closings were also examined as supporting evidence.
5.3 Terminal exchanges

This section explores the sequential and linguistic features of terminal exchanges. As defined in the earlier section of this chapter, a terminal exchange in the current study is a two-turn sequence designed to end the task talk, which is produced in L2 English. In other words, the subsequent summons-answer sequence (constructed in L1 Japanese) between one of the participants in a dyad and the researcher qualifies the previous two-turn sequence as a terminal exchange. First, the terminal exchange and summons-answer sequence in Excerpt 51 are re-examined here.

Excerpt 52 (Mid-level learners: Task 2; appeared previously as Excerpt 51)

28 15:12 Kota  Tf => so our idea is sea and blue sky? OK?
29 15:25 Shin Ts => ok, i agree
30 16:01 Kota  S => 阿部先生終わりました。お願いします。

“Mr. Abe, we’re done. Please”

31 16:02 Res  A => はい！

“”Yes!”

Notes: Tf, Ts, S, and A indicate the first part and second part of the terminal exchange and a summons and an answer of a summons-answer sequence, respectively.

Kota confirms the idea for task accomplishment in the first half of post 28 (”so our idea is sea and blue sky?”) and provides an okay token with a question mark in the second half. This move is responded to by another okay token without a question mark in post 29 to construct a two-turn sequence. Although okay tokens are a common lexical resource to project a closing of talk-in-interaction in daily conversation and spoken interactions in language learning settings (e.g., Wong & Waring, 2010), the form okay? is strikingly different from okay as used as a pre-closing resource in mundane conversational closings, that is, the same token without a question mark. Okay tokens with interrogative markers are more often found in conversational closings in institutional settings (e.g., Hartford & Bardovi-Harlig, 1992; Hellermann & Cole, 2008; Rine, 2009; Waring, 2009).

The lexical resources used for the first part of a terminal exchange can be varied. See the following excerpts (The following excerpts in this section omit the researcher’s answering posts in the summons-answer sequences).
Excerpt 53 (Low-level learners: Task 1)

21 15:19 Ken    Tt=> We decide France! // Are you OK?
22 16:07 Yo     Ts=> OK!
23 16:25 Ken    S => 終わりました。

"we’re done."

Excerpt 54 (Low-level learners: Task 2)

18 8:05 Jiro    Tt=> Do you agree me ? OK?
19 8:25 Nako    Ts=> Ok!
20 8:33 Nako    S => 終わりました！

"We’re done!"

Excerpt 55 (Mid-level learners: Task 2)

26 12:12 Kumi   Tt=> I think
27 12:53 Kumi   Tt=> best idea is all of Kobe port!
28 13:18 Kumi   Tt=> harbor!
29 14:06 Aya    Ts=> Ok! So, let's paint the Kobe harber's painting!:)
30 14:52 Aya    S => 終わりました。

"We’re done."

Excerpt 56 (Low-level learners: Task 3)

9 16:38 Yama    Tt=> Do you agree with my idea?
10 17:04 Tomo   Maybe, for achiving something, effort is necessaly.
11 17:11 Res    3 more minutes!
12 17:50 Tomo   Ts=> Yes. I agree.
13 18:04 Yama   S => 終わりました。

"We’re done."

Excerpt 57 (Low-level learners: Task 3)

12 10:10 Nobu   Tt=> I think success has many shapes!
13 10:42 Kaho   Ts=> I agree your opinion.
In Excerpt 53, the first post is divided into two lines. The first line is used to declare that the decision-making has been completed with an exclamation mark. The second line uses okay tokens in a sentential format (“Are you OK?”). Responding to the second line, the interlocutor offers a stand-alone okay token with an exclamation mark. After 18 s, the first speaker of the terminal exchange offers the first part of the summons-answer sequence. In Excerpt 54, an agreement is explicitly solicited by the first speaker and the second speaker affirmatively responds to it and okay tokens are used in both posts. Here, it was the second speaker who produced the first part of the summons-answer sequence. In Excerpt 55, the first part of the terminal exchange is split into three posts (posts 26-28) and the second part contains more than a stand-alone okay. Aside from an okay token, this second part is formatted as a “let’s” form with a summary of their idea for task accomplishment (“Kobe harber’s painting”). After 46 s, the second speaker summons the researcher. In Excerpt 56, an agreement is explicitly mentioned in the first part of a terminal exchange in post 9 which follows a discussion of whether or not success requires effort that took place earlier in this dyad’s task talk (not presented in the excerpt). This is responded to by post 12, with an extension of the previous talk (post 10) and the researcher’s time warning post (post 11) being inserted in between. In Excerpt 57, an agreement is offered in the second part despite the absence of a solicitation move in the first part. Here, it is the first speaker that calls the researcher. Each pair of two moves in these excerpts can be seen as a two-turn sequence consisting of a move that solicits or invites an agreement and a response to this. It is important to note that in examining examples of terminal exchanges, we are both examining linguistic forms and types of action.

In the following examples, participants confirm whether their discussion is over instead of achieving an agreement.

Excerpt 58 (Low-level learners: Task 3)

20 17:07 Maza T_r => Ok! Our discussion is done.
21 17:15 Kama T_s => YES!
In Excerpt 58, the first speaker offers an okay token and a declaration that the task talk “is done”, with which the second speaker displays an alignment. Immediately, the summons is produced by the second speaker. In Excerpt 59, the first speaker uses a more implicit expression and a question mark, to which the second speaker responds affirmatively. Then, the first speaker calls the researcher. The other two excerpts show more than one two-turn sequence. In Excerpt 60, the two speakers first construct a two-
turn sequence consisting of “that’s all?” and “Maybe” in posts 25 and 26 and then, the first speaker adds a stand-alone ok with an exclamation mark and an agreement, which is what Mori and Nakamura (2008) call a third turn pursuit of full agreement. The second speaker calls the researcher, which is crossed by the first speaker’s “i agree”. In Excerpt 61, Rumi suggests calling the researcher with a mention of his name. Seemingly crossing with this post, in post 95, Yuki offers a possible joke or instance of troubles talk with a laughter token. It is in post 96 that Yuki affirmatively responds to Rumi’s suggestion. In post 97, Rumi responds to Yuki’s joke. Then, in post 98 Rumi offers the third-position agreement and calls the researcher in the next post.

To understand the sequential features of the terminal exchange, it is important to note the role of the researcher’s three minute warning posts. The researcher’s first time reminder is a resource to project an upcoming task closing. Some task closings consist of more extended sequences that stretch from the researcher’s first time-reminder to the terminal exchange. See the following example.

**Excerpt 62 (High-level learners: Task 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>15:07</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>so in conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>15:29</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>we'll visit Singapore for its weather, language, clean city and the hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>16:15</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>and also the price too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>16:19</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>agreed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>16:21</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Right!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>16:27</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Agreed👌👌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>17:01</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>3 more minutes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>17:12</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>T_f=&gt; We should call Mr Abe then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>17:24</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>Than you yuki :)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>17:27</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Thanks to conclude our discussion Rukui!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>17:38</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Sorry miss typinghaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>17:40</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>17:41</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>17:44</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Haha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Excerpt 62, Rumi suggests making a conclusion regarding an idea for task accomplishment (visiting Singapore for Task 1), to which Yuki responds affirmatively (posts 102 and 103). In posts 104-106, Rumi summarizes their ideas and solicits Yuki’s agreement, to which Yuki immediately responds affirmatively in posts 107 and 108. Note that there is a time gap of 34 s between Yuki’s response with an agree token and the researcher’s time reminder. The gap of 34 s is a relatively large gap considering that neither participant produces any long messages around here. Then, after the first time reminder, Rumi explicitly suggests that they “should call” the researcher and explicitly mentions the researcher’s name. This indicates that the researcher’s time reminder might have served as a more explicit resource for projecting an upcoming task closing than their coming to an agreement in the preceding two-turn sequence. In post 111, Rumi also offers appreciation, which is immediately reciprocated by Yuki. After several turns in which the participants talk about a typo with laughter in posts 113-117, this time Yuki explicitly suggests calling the researcher with a reference to his name, which is followed by Rumi’s posting of the first part of a summons-answer sequence.

In Excerpt 63, the researcher’s time reminder leads to a more direct influence on the interaction (note that this is not a participant-generated closing but a researcher-generated closing).

**Excerpt 63 (Mid-level learners: Task 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:04</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>If you go there for vacation, what do you want to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:41</td>
<td>Yuzu</td>
<td>Of course, I won't go there to study! I want to go the place the drama was taken like times square!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:01</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>Oh I see your idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:08</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>Sounds good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Yuzu</td>
<td>Thanks! We should choose one place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this excerpt (from Task 1), before the time reminder in post 22, these two participants talked about what they wanted to do on their imaginary trip. In post 20, Yuzu argues for the necessity of deciding on one idea. In post 21, Hana responds to this by suggesting that they should come up with more ideas in the form of *yes-but* construction. In other words, Hana projects a stance that disaligns with Yuzu’s stated intention of moving into a task closing phase. 30 s after the researcher’s time reminder, Hana posted, “But time is limited”, which serves as an account for Hana’s disagreement (“Let’s choose one place”). Although this dyad could not close their task talk as they ran out of time, it is apparent that Hana used the researcher’s time reminder as a resource to project an upcoming task closing. Thus, it is not only participant constructed interactional practices but also the researcher’s time reminder that can function as resources to either explicitly or implicitly signal that task closing is upcoming.

5.4 Proficiency differences

The previous sections presented the sequential and linguistic/actional features of a terminal exchange including discussion of the role of the researcher’s time reminder. This section first reports a comparison of the linguistic patterns used by members of the different proficiency groups for the first part of a terminal exchange.
Later, the proficiency differences are explored based on several excerpts for each proficiency group.

Starting with linguistic features, Table 10 provides a comparison of linguistic repertoires formats for the first part of a terminal exchange. Due to the difficulty of quantifying the types of linguistic repertoires, this study examined the forms of terminal exchanges from the perspective of the linguistic resources available to participants at the three proficiency levels in order to investigate the breadth of their linguistic repertoire. This section focuses only on participant-generated task closings.

Table 10. Comparison of linguistic/action repertoires for the first part of a terminal exchange across the three proficiency groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low</th>
<th>mid</th>
<th>high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. okay or alright tokens only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okay (including ok, OK)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okayyyy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okay phew</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okay then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alright then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. appreciation tokens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you (including thanks)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you + address term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. soliciting an agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okay? (including ok?, OK?)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okay + confirmation (e.g., OK, so Taiwan it is then!)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confirmation + okay? (e.g., Our idea is animal wall, ok?)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it ok? (Is this ok?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do you agree?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you disagree?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you agreed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you decide my idea?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you also choose X?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it right?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So success is X?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So + the agreed idea</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We reached the best idea</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our idea/conclusion is X?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are you good with that?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you also choose X?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. confirming whether the talk is over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>So, that’s it??</th>
<th>√</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anyway X, that’s it</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is decided</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we are done</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished!</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished?</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish...?</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can we finish?</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do we say when we’re done?</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’ve reached conclusion</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss is over?</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We reached the best idea</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So it’s final decision?</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That’s all</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That’s all?</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We decide X right?</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. suggesting calling the researcher

| call sensei/Mr. Abe | √ |
| shall we call Mr. Abe? | √ |
| we should call sensei | √ |

6. clarifying that there is nothing more to talk about

<p>| Do you have more ideas?(Do you have any idea?) | √ |
| OK Any idea?? | √ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any comments??</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any idea. I don’t have.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What another idea do you have?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have an any ideas?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other questions?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table classifies the linguistic formats of the first part of a terminal exchange into six types: (1) okay and alright tokens only (e.g., okay); (2) appreciation tokens (e.g., thank you); (3) soliciting an agreement (e.g., okay?, Do you agree?, etc.); (4) confirming whether the talk is over (e.g., that’s all?); (5) suggesting calling the researcher (e.g., shall we call Mr. Abe?); (6) clarifying that there is nothing more to talk about (e.g., Any comments??). Since this coding was conducted by examining not only the first part of a terminal exchange but also the second part (that is, the response), the categorization is not conducted in an entirely researcher-centric fashion.

Although okay and alright tokens were used across all groups, high-level learners showed more variation in the way they employed these tokens such as the use of letter-repetition (e.g., okayyy) or an interjection (e.g., phew) as well as the use of alright. In addition, it was only the high-level group that explicitly mentioned the researcher by name or by an address term meaning a teacher (sensei) in Japanese when suggesting calling the researcher. On the other hand, the practice of clarifying that there was nothing more to discuss appeared only among mid-level and low-level learners. In the categories such as appreciation, soliciting an agreement and confirming whether the talk is over, the linguistic repertoires did not discriminate proficiency differences. Based on this basic outline of the distribution of linguistic resources, the next section will more closely illustrate the differences in task closings across the three proficiency groups.

### 5.4.1 Low level learners’ task closings

Low-level learners’ task closings were achieved with terminal exchanges performing a variety of actions (i.e., a variety of linguistic repertoires for the first part of a terminal exchange were evident). However, transitions from topical talk to non-topical task closings were abrupt rather than stepwise (Sacks, 1992).
See the following excerpts. Both Excerpt 64 and Excerpt 65 demonstrate how two parties reached an agreement in the terminal exchange in a sequence consisting of a first move designed to solicit agreement and a format tied affirmative response to it (Sacks, 1992).

**Excerpt 64 (Low-level learners: Task 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6:28</td>
<td>Jiro</td>
<td>Painted world map suit with white wall very much!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7:37</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>Yes! I want to see that world map!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8:05</td>
<td>Jiro</td>
<td>Do you agree me? OK?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8:25</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>Ok!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8:33</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>終わりました！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We’ve finished!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8:34</td>
<td>Res A</td>
<td>はい!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Yes!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Excerpt 64 (Task 2), before the terminal exchange, Nako shows a stance of agreeing with Jiro’s idea of painting a “world map” on the wall of the café. Posts 16 and 17 are format tied with a repetition of *world map* and an exclamation mark. Subsequently, in post 18, Jiro offers the first part of a terminal exchange in the form of a solicitation of agreement using an *agree* token with a question mark and an *okay* token with a question mark. Nako responds to this with an *okay* token with an exclamation mark.

**Excerpt 65 (Low-level learners: Task 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13:29</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>There is success in personal heart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14:22</td>
<td>Yo</td>
<td>I think so too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14:26</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>What we Define Success is wrong behave !!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14:51</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>This is my idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15:07</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Do you agree with it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15:26</td>
<td>Yo</td>
<td>I agree with you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15:36</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>終わりました</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We’ve finished”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15:37</td>
<td>Res A</td>
<td>はい!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Yes!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Excerpt 64 (Task 2), before the terminal exchange, Nako shows a stance of agreeing with Jiro’s idea of painting a “world map” on the wall of the café. Posts 16 and 17 are format tied with a repetition of *world map* and an exclamation mark. Subsequently, in post 18, Jiro offers the first part of a terminal exchange in the form of a solicitation of agreement using an *agree* token with a question mark and an *okay* token with a question mark. Nako responds to this with an *okay* token with an exclamation mark.
mark. It was Nako, the provider of the second part of the terminal exchange, who
produced the first part of the subsequent summons-answer sequence. Excerpt 65 also
shows participants reaching alignment regarding the definition of the word success. In
suggesting an idea for task accomplishment, Ken first presents the idea in post 12 with
an account in post 14. Although Ken’s idea is unclear (to me at least), Ken moves the
talk towards closing by offering the first part of a terminal exchange. Ken’s first part is
responded to by Yo’s second, which is format tied to the previous post. It is Ken, the
provider of the first part of the terminal exchange, who offers the first part of the
summons-answer sequence. However, there was no strong tendency regarding who
provided the first part of a terminal exchange or a summons-answer sequence. More
importantly, this closing sequence, from the agreement on the idea for task
accomplishment through to the terminal exchange and summons-answer sequence,
consists of only core components without any expansions.

The following Excerpt 66 shows a three-turn sequence for achieving
agreement on the idea for task accomplishment.

**Excerpt 66 (Low-level learners: Task 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 7:52</td>
<td>Hide</td>
<td>They can relax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 9:30</td>
<td>Kan</td>
<td>They may stay for a long time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 9:51</td>
<td>Hide T</td>
<td>Our choice is to paint one brown color. Is it ok?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 10:06</td>
<td>Kan T</td>
<td>Ok!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 11:14</td>
<td>Hide T</td>
<td>ok, this task finish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 11:55</td>
<td>Kan S</td>
<td>あべさん終わりました</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Mr. Abe, We’ve finished”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Res A</td>
<td>はい!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Yes!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post 12 packages a confirmation of the idea for task accomplishment along with a
solicitation for agreement on the idea into one post which serves as the first part of a
terminal exchange. This post is responded to with another okay token with exclamation
marks and is followed by a third okay token in third position and the specific statement:
“this task finish”. After 41 s, the provider of the second part of the terminal exchange
calls the researcher. Despite the third okay token and relatively long time gap between
the third part of the terminal exchange and the summons, this task closing also contains only minimum procedures and the stepwiseness of transition is limited.

Excerpt 67 is an example of a linguistic repertoire showed only by low-level and mid-level dyads, that is, confirming that there is nothing more to talk about.

**Excerpt 67 (Low-level learners: Task 3)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In post 8, Daigo states that “It contain to make good relationship”, which could be seen as an idea for task accomplishment. After Eiji displays his understanding in post 9, Daigo posts, “Do you have any idea?”. Eiji then produces two aligning replies, a negative answer “No” in post 11 and an explicit agreement in post 12. This exchange in posts 10-12 serves as a display of their understanding that an agreement had been achieved between posts 8 and 9.

Low-level learners’ researcher-generated task closings were typically due to there being insufficient time to conduct closing procedures. The evidence for that analysis is an absence of shared orientation to the necessity of task closure and the presence of crossing with the researcher’s terminal “Time is up!” posts. See the following three examples.

**Excerpt 68 (Low-level learners: Task 1)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>15:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16:56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25 16:58  Eri  I get back. 😳If I go to London. // How long would you like to do?
26 18:15  Mana  I want to go for around one year if I can do it!
27 19:23  Res  Time is up!
28 19:25  Eri  If I do, too, I would like 1 year. ༼ つprésent

Excerpt 69 (Low-level learners: Task 1)

7 13:04  Mori  Because I learn language of Italy now.
8 14:18  Mori  I want to speak there.
9 15:06  Keen  You learn Italy now! // Do you speak Italy well?
10 16:35  Res  3 more minutes!
11 16:37  Mori  No. I learn more.
12 17:53  Keen  You can do it!
13 18:28  Mori  Thank you!
14 19:16  Mori  Do you learn German language now?
15 19:36  Res  Time is up!
16 19:44  Keen  No.

In Excerpt 68, Eri had previously uploaded an image of the animated Japanese detective character “Conan”. This character is associated with the Sherlock Holmes’s detective stories which take place in London, a candidate idea for task accomplishment in Task 1. In post 23, the researcher offers a time reminder of “3 more minutes!”. Although posts 22 and 24 construct a two-turn sequence of Eri’s announcement of what she uploaded and Mana’s affiliative response to it, there is no indication that they are preparing to close the task. Eri possibly attempts a topic shift with “I get back”, which is crossed with Mana’s previous post (judging from the time gap of 2s between posts 24 and 25). However, Mana’s response to it is not conducive to moving into task closure in terms of time (it takes 1 m and 17 s) or the meaning of the post (“I want to go for around one year if I can do it!” does not directly help them make a final decision about where they want to go). In post 27, the researcher terminates the talk, and the post in which he does so is crossed by Eri’s response to Mana’s previous post. It might be safe to say that this dyad did not show a normative orientation to the necessity of closing the task talk themselves within the time limit, at least in this particular task. In Excerpt 69, the two
participants had earlier talked about Mori’s idea of visiting Italy. Before the researcher’s time reminder in post 10, Keen questions Mori about his command of the Italian language and Mori answers negatively in post 11, which, together with the second half of post 9, constitutes a two-turn sequence. In posts 12 and 13, these two participants construct phatic exchanges of encouraging comments and appreciation for them. Although this phatic exchange may be seen to make the current talk less topical, Mori then initiates more topical talk. In post 14, Mori ask Keen whether or not he is studying German (Keen’s had earlier suggested Germany as a potential destination for the trip), which is responded to by Keen in post 16 after the researcher’s termination of their task talk in post 15. Note that Keen still responds to Mori even though 8 s have elapsed since the termination of the task. As these excerpts show, low-level dyads tended to fail to secure enough time to close the task although there was theoretically plenty of time to get their closings done if both participants had been aware of the necessity of closing the task talk by themselves.

Some researcher-generated task closings showed only one post between the time reminder post and the final task termination post. See the following excerpts.

**Excerpt 70 (Low-level learners: Task 2)**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11:14</td>
<td>Keen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11:54</td>
<td>Mori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>Mori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15:57</td>
<td>Res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17:01</td>
<td>Keen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18:58</td>
<td>Res</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excerpt 71 (Low-level learners: Task 3)**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12:04</td>
<td>Yuta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13:31</td>
<td>Asa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14:03</td>
<td>Yuta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>14:59</td>
<td>Asa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>15:14</td>
<td>Asa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16:24</td>
<td>Asa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Excerpt 70, prior to post 5, the dyad had talked about “Mickey Mouse” as a candidate idea for task accomplishment (a design for the wall of the cafe) and from post 7, the topic of talk shifts to “Winnie the Pooh”. After the researcher’s time reminder in post 8, Keen extends this topic in a single post with an agreeing tone although the intended meaning is slightly unclear (“I think too. I tried to write about pooh now!”), while Mori remains silent. This is the last post in this chat and after about 2 m, the researcher terminates the task. In Excerpt 71 over posts 21-23, Asa agrees with Yuta’s idea by first summarizing the points made in previous posts and Yuta then points out another way to define success in post 24 and expresses his appreciation for Asa’s agreement in post 25. After 3 s, the researcher offers a time reminder. Between that post and the last post that terminates the task, there is only one post (post 27) produced by Asa saying, “Exactly!” . The time gaps between the researcher’s time reminder and post 27 and between that post and the researcher’s closing remark were 1 m and 37 s and 1 m and 24 s, respectively. Long time gaps in the space between the two researcher provided time reminders such as these only occurred in the low-level dyads’ conversations.

To summarize, low-level learners’ task closings were more abrupt and less stepwise since they were comprised of only the core components necessary to create participant-generated task closings. Low-level dyads’ researcher-generated task closings indicated that either one or both participants in a dyad tended to lack awareness of the necessity of creating task closing rituals by themselves, or in other cases, they tended to fail to complete the necessary task closing procedures in time.

5.4.2 Mid-level learners’ task closings

Talk around mid-level learners’ task closings showed less explicit marking of agreement and in some cases more stepwise transition from task-related talk to non-task-related talk, namely, the task closings themselves. Although linguistic repertoires for the first part of a terminal exchange were as varied as low-level and high-level
learners, mid-level learners used some unique linguistic forms for the first part of a summons-answer sequence. First let us look at the following excerpt.

**Excerpt 72 (Mid-level learners: Task 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:54</td>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>and NY, right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:07</td>
<td>Fuyu</td>
<td>But too far..?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:14</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>3 more minutes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:50</td>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>No far, as I reaseached, using car for 37h... 😑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:04</td>
<td>Fuyu</td>
<td>37h?!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:24</td>
<td>Fuyu</td>
<td>No way!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:35</td>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>But to use plane, i think it can be short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:49</td>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>shorter than using car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:02</td>
<td>Fuyu</td>
<td>Nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:06</td>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>we have five days!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:14</td>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>We can go!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:23</td>
<td>Fuyu</td>
<td>Yeahhh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:29</td>
<td>Fuyu</td>
<td>T† That's all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:44</td>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>T§ Yes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:53</td>
<td>Fuyu</td>
<td>S 終わりました。笑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We’ve finished. lol”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:54</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>A はい!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Yes!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Excerpt 72, this dyad, Miki and Fuyu, had earlier talked about traveling around America. In that sense, an agreement on their idea for task accomplishment could be said to have already been made. However, both before and after the time reminder (post 49), these two participants continued to talk about traveling in the US. In post 55 Fuyu provides a stand-alone nice. In posts 56 and 57, Miki provides concluding remarks regarding how feasible their travel plan is and a strong suggestion with exclamation marks, which is again acknowledged by Fuyu. Fuyu’s acknowledgement is somewhat minimal but echoes Miki’s use of exclamation marks. It is observable that the sequence constructed in posts 56-58 just prior to the terminal exchange in posts 59 and 60 is less
topical than the previous talk about how to travel in the US and thereby serves as a preamble. Without using explicit agreement tokens, which was common between low-level learners, this dyad confirm that the talk is over with a two-turn sequence of That's all? and Yes!. It is also noteworthy that Fuyu uses a laughter token (“笑”), which is roughly equivalent with “lol” in English (Choe, 2018). This type of affective semiotic device such as virtual laughter was not used in low-level learners’ summons to call the researcher in L1 Japanese.

Several rare cases in terms of how a summons-answer was sequentially organized were found in mid-level learners’ task closings. The following two cases are examples of this. These cases are strikingly different from the most frequently seen structure consisting of a two-turn terminal exchange sequence followed by an adjacent summons-answer sequence.

Excerpt 73 (Mid-level learners: Task 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Ano</th>
<th>Sato</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:56</td>
<td>I think sky picture is best!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:13</td>
<td>I agree!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:01</td>
<td>It's comfortable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:16</td>
<td>Relaxing and enlarging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:53</td>
<td>We reached best idea!</td>
<td>Tf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:03</td>
<td>“We've finished!”</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:07</td>
<td>It will be nice cafe</td>
<td>Ts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:13</td>
<td>“We finish”</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:14</td>
<td>“Yes!”</td>
<td>Res A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 74 (Mid-level learners: Task 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Nako</th>
<th>Roki</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:29</td>
<td>That's very very nice!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:38</td>
<td>I mean Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:02</td>
<td>Yeah of course. I've been there 5times, but don't be bored!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:52</td>
<td>Ok. That's it. Let's go there!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Excerpt 73, an agreement is constructed in a two-turn sequence between posts 17 and 18. After another sequence of positive assessments on the agreed idea for task accomplishment (painting the “sky” on the wall of the cafe) in posts 19 and 20, Ano declaratively states that they have ‘reached best idea’. After 10 s, Ano offers a summons for the researcher in post 22, which is not immediately responded to by the researcher. After 4 s, Sato provides a response to post 21 to make a two-turn sequence. After 6 s, Sato also provides a summons. Then, after 1 s, the researcher provides an answer to make a two-turn summons-answer sequence. In Excerpt 74, an agreement on the idea for accomplishing the task (visiting Vietnam for their imaginary trip in Task 1) was achieved by post 72 without the use of agree tokens. In post 73, Nako offers the first part of the terminal exchange although it seems to be crossed with the researcher’s time reminder. However, this crossing gives Roki no trouble in responding to Nako’s first part of the terminal exchange. Another crossing occurs in subsequent turns when both Nako and Roki provided a summons with a time gap of 1 second. Until the researcher provides the second part, namely, an answer, these two participants do not show any indication of problematizing this crossing. Neither does the researcher display a problematizing stance (although his answer seemed to be recognizably delayed). Thus, the two crossed summonses were not a problem for any of the three parties here. As these excerpts show, some mid-level learners showed a more flexible orientation to the norm regarding how many participants in a dyad should provide the first part of a summons-answer sequence.

Mid-level learners’ researcher-generated task closings tended to display more of an orientation to the necessity of moving into task closing within the time limit than
was the case with low-level learners. See Excerpt 75, which is a reproduction of Excerpt 63.

**Excerpt 75 (Mid-level learners: Task 1; appeared previously as Excerpt 63)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Interactor</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15:42</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>Yes but we have only two ideas so do you have any idea?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>15:46</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>3 more minutes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16:16</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>But time is limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>Let's choose one place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>After I heard your idea,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>17:53</td>
<td>Yuzu</td>
<td>I think America is good because you can see the beautiful nature there, too!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>18:27</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>I want to go America for seeing the places which are used for taking that daramas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>18:29</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>18:45</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>Time is up!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>18:47</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>I agree with you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hana displays an orientation to the time reminder saying, “But time is limited” in post 23 and suggests that they should decide upon an idea for task accomplishment in post 24. Hana and Yuzu share the same stance regarding where they want to go (i.e., visiting “America”) until post 30, where Hana explicitly declares his agreeing stance in a post possibly crossed with the researcher’s closing remark, *Time is up*!. Their problem was either that they could not finish their stepwise transition to task closing within 3 minutes or they were not aware that they were supposed to close the task themselves.

In mid-level learners’ researcher-generated task closings, some interactants kept talking even after the researcher’ closing remark (as distinct from sending another post crossing with it).

**Excerpt 76 (Mid-level learners: Task 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Interactor</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>16:53</td>
<td>Yuuto</td>
<td>Success is happiness, enough money, love, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>16:53</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>3 more minutes!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16:59 Yuuto ... 
17:37 Take I think people who are happy is most success life 
17:49 Take If don't have money 
18:04 Take They can be happy 
18:19 Yuuto I think happiness is the most important factor 
18:20 Take So I think success is 
18:26 Take To be happy 
18:32 Yuuto Right 
18:44 Yuuto 👉👉 
18:45 Take The same idea!? 
18:54 Yuuto I agree 
19:14 Take To seek happiness is to be successful 
19:38 Yuuto ((sending a sticker)) 
19:51 Res Time is up! 
20:06 Take Good timing 
20:12 Take ((sending a sticker))

Excerpt 77 (Mid-level learners: Task 1)
48 17:07 Moko Really? // Fireworks is also seen in the U.K. 
49 17:15 Res 3 more minutes! 
50 17:29 Moko Around famous fridge 
51 17:32 Moko Ok 
52 17:42 Rie Good idea! 
53 18:13 Rie So our plan should include to watch the fireworks. 
54 18:28 Moko Then let's think tha plan except fireworks 
55 18:32 Moko Yes! 
56 18:44 Rie I want to go shopping! 
57 18:50 Moko Holliday dinner in the pub 
58 18:57 Rie Good! 
59 18:59 Moko I thought too 
60 19:20 Rie And eat fish and chips. Lol
In Excerpt 76, Yuuto and Take do not show any explicit orientation to the forthcoming task closing upon the time reminder being produced in post 69. Take suggests his idea for task accomplishment with an account over posts 71- 76 with Yuuto’s post inserted in post 74 displaying his idea for task accomplishment by narrowing his previous idea from posts 68 and 70 (“Success is happiness, enough money, love, and …”) down to a more focused idea (“happiness”), which is crossed with the other posts produced by Take. In post 77 and 78, Yuuto responds to Take’s idea affirmatively and subsequently these two interactants create an agreement sequence in posts 79 and 80. In post 81, Take confirms that they have agreed on the idea of “To seek happiness is to be successful”, which is responded to by Yuuto with a sticker (a picture of a bird-like character with a hat saying “Like!” with his or her right hand showing a thumbs-up gesture). After that, in post 83, the researcher’s closing remark is posted. In response to this, Take says, “Good timing”, while his use of sticker is aligned with Yuuto’s use of a sticker (Posts 82 and 85 are aligned with each other in the sense that both are stickers, while post 85 shows a picture of a character, Little My from the cartoon series Moomin, looking up to the sky. Only in the sense that the two characters are both wearing slightly smiley facial expressions can they be said to be visually aligned with each other). More importantly, Take’s last verbal message (post 84), “Good timing”, seems to be a positive assessment for their talk or how their talk is ended. On the other hand, in Excerpt 77, the two participants kept talking without displaying that the task had been accomplished. After the first time reminder produced in post 49, the two interactants produce several tokens such as an okay token in post 51 or a so-prefaced utterance in post 53, which could possibly function as pre-closings or topic-transitions. This is probably because they had already decided where to visit for their imaginary trip earlier in the conversation. Up
until the researcher’s declaration of task closure in post 65, they discuss what they want
to do during the trip. Across the researcher’s closing remark in post 65 and following it,
neither Rie nor Moko stop talking but instead create a question-answer sequence to
continue the same topic (Rie’s post 66 may be crossed with the previously posted
closing remark). These two excerpts show mid-level learners’ flexible understanding
about whom they can talk to during L2 task talk, as well as about whether to stop
talking in their L2 once the researcher’s closing remark has been issued.

Overall, mid-level learners’ task closings were more stepwise in moving from
negotiating ideas to achieving an agreement on a final idea for task accomplishment. To
achieve this they deployed closing rituals consisting of a terminal exchange and a
summons-answer sequence which served to bring their talk to completion. Although,
like the low-level dyads, the mid-level dyads also showed limited awareness of the
necessity of creating task closing rituals by themselves as well as possible failures of
time management, mid-level learners showed a few indications of a more flexible
understanding of the instructions given in each task prompt and participation
frameworks consisting of the three participants (the two dyadic participants and the
researcher) having different roles.

5.4.3 High-level learners’ task closings

Adding to the stepwise nature of transition into task closing, high-level
dyads’ task closings showed more extended sequences and sequential expansion. High-
level learners also displayed a flexible understanding of participation frameworks and
the roles of the three participants in the text-chat environment. Some of their methods
were unique and were only found among high-level learners.

To begin with, only high-level learners explicitly mentioned the researcher to
signal an imminent task closing. See Excerpt 78.

Excerpt 78 (High-level learners: Task 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>9:40</td>
<td>Taku</td>
<td>Then let's go with the brick painting!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>10:40</td>
<td>Taku</td>
<td>It is ok?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>11:21</td>
<td>Rin</td>
<td>Paint the wall with picture of brick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>11:25</td>
<td>Rin</td>
<td>Right?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In post 47, Taku suggests they come to a final decision on an idea for accomplishing the task (i.e., selecting “the brick painting” for the wall of the cafe). However, Rin remains silent for at least 1 minute after this post, which could possibly display her disalignment with his suggestion. In post 48, Taku solicits an agreement with an okay token with a question mark. In response to his post, after 41 s, Rin offers a clarification request regarding the content of Taku’s previous turn. Rin’s turn is a first part of an insert expansion for clarification, or repair sequence, requiring a second part (Schegloff, 2007), and is immediately replied to with an affirmative response, yeah, by Taku in post 51. In the next post, Taku posts “Are you good with that?”, which can be analyzable as a second issue of “let’s go with the brick painting! Is it ok?”, the first part of a sequence designed to establish agreement on a final idea for task accomplishment. This time, Rin immediately responds affirmatively to Taku’s second try. Post 54, Taku’s okay, is a sequence closing third, which displays his understanding that an agreement has been reached. In post 55, Taku asks a question regarding what to “say” in order to close the task, to which Rin offers an answer in an imperative form with an exclamation mark. Note that Rin mentions the researcher (“him”) in the terminal exchange. Although there are several long time gaps between turns, these closing sequences are more extended than lower-level learners’ closing sequences. The last two turn-sequence in posts 55 and 56 is particularly unique in that the two participants display their completely opposite epistemic statuses regarding knowledge (Heritage, 2012) about what to do to close the task talk. Thus, their terminal exchange of “Now what do we say when we're done?” and “Call him!!” may be a strategy to enhance response-mobilizability through a display of relative epistemic statuses (Stivers & Rossano, 2010).
The following excerpts show high-level learners’ (both excerpts feature the same dyad) task closings. As with Excerpt 78, Taku and Rin’s task closing, here Rumi and Yuki explicitly mention the researcher (by name in their case). Sequences are also responsive despite the partial disruption of the adjacency of turns (Note that Excerpt 80 is a partial reproduction of Excerpt 62).

**Excerpt 79 (High-level learners: Task 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:07</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>so in conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:29</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>we'll visit Singapore for its weather, language, clean city and the hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>and also the price too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:19</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>agreed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:21</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Right!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:27</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Agree 😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:01</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>3 more minutes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:12</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>T_f We should call Mr. Abe then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:24</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>Than you yuki :)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:27</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Thanks to conclude our discussion Rukui!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:38</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Sorry miss typinghaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:40</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:41</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:44</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>Haha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:47</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>haha ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:02</td>
<td>Yuki</td>
<td>T_s Let's call mr.abe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:11</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>あべさん、トピック１ディスカッションを終わります！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Mr. Abe, we are going to finish our discussion for Topic 1!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:13</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>はい！</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | “Yes!”

**Excerpt 80 (High-level learners: Task 3; appeared previously as Excerpt 62)**
Excerpt 79 shows extended responsive sequences prior to a summons-answer sequence. In post 102, Rumi projects the main component of her conclusion, which is responded to by Yuki’s go-ahead. Rumi’s conclusion is provided, which is the expected idea for task accomplishment (visiting Singapore) with several accounts expressed over posts 104 and 105. In the same turn, in post 106, Rumi solicits an agreement with a stand-alone “agree” in perfect aspect (agreed) with a question mark. In posts 107 and 108, Yuki provides two responses to posts 105 and 106, respectively. These responses create two disrupted but perfectly responsive two-turn sequences designed to achieve an agreement on the final idea for task accomplishment. Both participants remain silent for 34 s until the researcher offers the time reminder in post 109. Then, after 11 s, Rumi suggests calling the researcher in post 110 and offers her appreciation with a smile emoji in post 111. In response to Rumi’s appreciation (but not to “We should call Mr Abe then”), Yuki responds with her own expression of appreciation and an account. In post 113, Yuki provides an apology for misspelling Rumi’s name in her immediately previous post (“Rukui”). Yuki’s apology generates Rumi’s other-initiation of repair with an open-class repair initiator what (Drew, 1997). Yuki then offers a clarification by repeating the correct spelling of Rumi’s name in post 115 with a laughter token in post 116, which is reciprocated by Rumi with an okay token. Then, in post 118, Yuki posts “Let’s call mr.abe”, which is format tied to post 110 “We should call Mr. Abe then”. Thus, these two posts can be seen as a terminal exchange with several sequences inserted in between. Excerpt 80 is a similar case in that a terminal exchange and another two-turn sequence (a humorous exchange) are constructed in parallel in a perfectly responsive way. As these excerpts show, only high-level learners were able to achieve
high levels of responsiveness in spite of the disruption of turn adjacency, even in extended sequences aimed towards performing task closings. To do this they deployed various linguistic repertoires including mentioning the researcher.

Aside from explicitly mentioning the researcher, several high-level dyads’ task closings actually affected the researcher’s interactional practices when trouble occurred in either a terminal exchange or a summons-answer sequence. The next two excerpts show crossed terminal exchanges. First, let us examine a crossed terminal exchange shown between Ami and Yui.

**Excerpt 81 (High-level learners: Task 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:21</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>Vienna!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:29</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>Yes! Opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:43</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>What is Vienna?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:29</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>I think Vienna is the name of a place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:38</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>Ok!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:48</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>3 more minutes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:52</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>Wien!(German)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:09</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>Weeeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:25</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>Ok!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:57</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>I think Austria is nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:04</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>Ok!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:14</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>Let's go to Austria!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:49</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>終わりです！“we’re done!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:57</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>はい！“okay!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>because it is very peaceful and people are friendly!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:04</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>え！“what?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:17</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>ごめん、終わりにした笑“sorry, I’ve made it done. lol”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In their earlier talk, Ami and Yui talk about their wishes to visit Austria. In post 43 Ami proffers her idea of visiting Vienna as a final answer to the task 1 prompt. Just prior to the researcher’s time reminder, Yui and Ami construct a question-answer sequence about what Vienna is. After the time reminder, Yui provides the German word for Vienna (“Wien”), displaying her understanding of Ami’s claim of insufficient knowledge of the English word for the capital city of Austria (In fact, the Japanese translation of Vienna is phonetically closer to the German Wien). Yui’s Wien! is responded to by Ami with Weeenee with repeated letters, a possible joke, in post 50. Yui provides a non-topical okay token with five exclamation marks, while Ami provides an assessment of the idea for task accomplishment. Subsequently, Yui provides her second okay token with one exclamation mark and after 10 second, posts “Let’s go to Austria!”. 35 s later, without waiting for a turn from Ami, Yui calls the researcher to close the task talk and the researcher responds to this in post 55. However, after 3 s, Ami posts a clausal unit (“because it is very peaceful and people are friendly!”) which is apparently designed as an increment to her previous post (“I think Austria is nice”). To display her confusion about what is going on, Ami then deploys an open-class repair initiator in post 58 (the Japanese word “え” which is phonetically pronounced as [e] and functions as an expressive interjection to display a surprise; see Den et al., 2012). Note that Ami’s repair initiator is written in L1 Japanese, which displays her understanding that task talk has been already closed. In post 59, Yui apologizes to Ami for her unilateral termination of talk with a laughter token (“笑”) and Ami enacts completion of the task talk by reciprocating the same laughter token in line 60. It is also notable that the researcher uses the same laughter token with different words in post 61, which displays the researcher’s understanding that the task closing generated by Ami and Yui was problematic and thereby a source of humour (Glenn & Holt, 2013). Overall, it is difficult to identify a terminal exchange here given that a terminal exchange is identifiable only when a summons-answer sequence is completed by one of the dyadic participants and the researcher with no trouble. It is interesting to think about the
possibility of treating posts 59 and 60 exchanged in L1 Japanese as a terminal exchange for this particular task talk.

Excerpt 82 shows another troubled task closing. In this excerpt, the two participants display a concern directed to the researcher rather than each other.

**Excerpt 82 (High-level learners: Task 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>Let's conclude the idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>The painting integrating the monotone and modern art is decorate the cafe in Tokyo, the near-future city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Mei</td>
<td>Pictures of integrating modern arts and monotone to make the space mysterious and stylish!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Mei</td>
<td>Oh, thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>at the almost same time!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Mei</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Mei</td>
<td>S Mr. Abe // We've done!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>haha // so why don't we finish the discussion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Mei</td>
<td>Oh, sorry! // I was a little bit fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>A は...い!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“ye...s!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mei</td>
<td>大丈夫そうですか”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“do you think we (you) are all right?!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>(S) 一応終了しました！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“at least we’re done!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>(A) はい、ありがとうございました！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“yes, thank you!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In post 64, Ryu suggests that they produce a conclusion possibly projecting a closing of their task talk. Their concluding posts seem to be crossed in posts 65 and 66, which are followed by mutual thanking in posts 67 and 68. Posts 69 and 70 serve as evidence for the crossed nature of their conclusions. Although, in post 71, Mei offers the first move of a summons-answer sequence (using L2 English for whatever reason), Ryu’s suggestion that they close the conversation appears one second later in post 72. It
seems that Ryu’s crossed post stops the researcher from immediately answering Mei’s summons. Subsequently, Mei offers an apology and an account for the crossed terminal exchange. After 20 s elapse, the researcher offers an answer to complete the summons-answer sequence, a slightly modified version using a three-dot ellipsis possibly indicating his hesitation (Vandergriff, 2013). In posts 75 and 76, each participant offers L1 utterances, which are directed to the researcher judging from their use of grammatically polite forms such as -desu (in post 75) and -masu (in post 76) instead of casual forms. Judging from the words they select, both Mei and Ryu seem to display concern with their task closing, which indicates that they probably regard the researcher’s use of punctuation as indexing some kind of problematizing stance. In short, all parties are oriented to Mei and Ryu’s crossed terminal exchange. Overall, it seems that this dyad also constructs a crossed terminal exchange and a second summons-answer sequence.

High-level learners deployed a wider range of linguistic, actional and sequential features in their talk than the other two lower-level groups with one exception. That is, they never clarified that there was nothing more to talk about (see Excerpt 67 and for other linguistic resources, see Table 10). It was only high-level dyads ($n=2$; Rumi and Yuki, and one other dyad) that produced a failed terminal exchange with other two-turn sequence(s) inserted.

It was only high-level dyads ($n=4$) that mentioned the name of the researcher or a pronoun referring to him prior to a summons-answer sequence. In their task closings, the researcher was in more ratified position in their participation frameworks. In addition, only high-level dyads ($n=3$; Ami and Yui, Ryu and Mei, and one other dyad) altered the temporal and linguistic/actional features of the researcher’s answer, which was usually offered in the form of “はい！ (Yes!)”, by constructing a second summons-answer sequence. In these task closings, the researcher participated as a ratified participant in the project of jointly postponing the task terminating ritual.

High-level learners’ researcher-generated task closings tended to display that the talk was finished just prior to the second time reminder. See the following excerpts.

**Excerpt 83 (High-level learners: Task 1)**

69 17:01 Res 3 more minute!
Taro: Guam is much closer.
Rui: That's lovely.
Taro: We're out of time.
Rui: Hey.
Taro: Almost there.
Rui: What.
Taro: But as you say.
Taro: Maybe Singapore would be great.
Rui: How come.
Taro: It's like melting pot yea?
Rui: Absolutely.
Taro: Malaysian, Indian, Chinese cultures // with probably some British.
Rui: Good place to feel like your just a tiny piece of the world.
Taro: Yep.
Taro: So Singapore then?
Rui: Ok.
Taro: Alright then.
Res: Time is up!

In Excerpt 83, this dyad had earlier proffered a number of ideas for task accomplishment, namely, destinations for a trip for Task 1. In post 69, the first time reminder is provided. After the extension of prior talk over posts 70 and 71, Taro displays his orientation to the task closing by explicitly saying that they are “out of time” in post 72. In post 74, Rui responds to this by suggesting that they are about to finish the discussion by saying, “Almost there” (and there seems to be another sequence between posts 73 and 75). Between posts 76 and 83, these two interactants talk about Singapore as an idea for task accomplishment and the reasons why they think that way. In post 84, Taro produces a so-prefaced move to solicit an agreement and Rui offers a stand-alone Ok. Taro then provides a third-position alright token and after 2 s this is followed by the researcher’s second time reminder.

In Excerpt 84, which is a partial reproduction of Excerpt 48, Sari and Haru also display their orientation to the forthcoming task closing in an example of a
researcher-generated task closing. Their method is to shift the topic from the cafe menu to how they are looking forward to opening ‘their’ cafe in the last two posts right before the researcher concludes the task.

Excerpt 84 (High-level learners: Task 2; appeared previously as Excerpt 48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:57</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>3 more minutes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:59</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>For coffee we can sell other coffee that aren't usual in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:20</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>Yeah i think thats a great idea!! What about food?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:15</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>Carrot cake, vegan chocolate cakes and muffins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:33</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>That sounds good!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:52</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>3 types for dessert and just sandwiches and salads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:05</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>That sounds good!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:38</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>Yeah I'm excited to start our cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:57</td>
<td>Haru</td>
<td>Yeah! Lets have fun had make ppl happy xD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:57</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>Time is up!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, high-level dyads’ task closings were more sequentially expanded with various linguistic resources being exploited to create responsiveness, even when the adjacency of two-turn sequences was disrupted because of crossed posts. Only high-level learners were able to manage this disrupted adjacency of two-turn sequences, even in terminal exchanges (like Rumi and Yuki’s task closing shown in Excerpt 80). A flexible understanding of the participation framework in operation was more frequently seen in high-level learners task closings than was the case for mid-level learners (low-level learners never showed such flexibility). High-level learners used the researcher as a linguistic resource to successfully deploy closing rituals. Explicit mention of the researcher, whether using a pronoun or his name, was used as a linguistic resource to signal an upcoming task closing. Their awareness of whether and when they could talk to the researcher was unique enough to affect the researcher’s interactional practices.

5.5 Task effects

With a view to exploring task effects, this section features within-dyad comparisons of task closings. As Table 9 in Section 5.2 shows, there were no salient
task differences in terms of the frequency of participant-generated task closings. This section examines other task effects seen across all three task closings from the same dyad.

The following three task closings were constructed by Risa and Yuko, high-level participants.

**Excerpt 85 (High-level learners: Task 1)**

56 14:06  Risa  I also wanna try Korean BBQ
57 14:08  Risa  There
58 14:12  Yuko  Sure
59 14:32  Yuko  It much cheaper
60 14:43  Yuko  Than in Japan
61 15:11  Risa  icrosoft good good
62 15:28  Risa  So let's visit Korea!
63 15:30  Risa  Okay?
64 15:38  Yuko  Okay～～～
65 16:08  Yuko  終わりました！

"we have finished!"

**Excerpt 86 (High-level learners: Task 2)**

40 10:50  Risa  It's gonna be cute
41 10:51  Yuko  Yep
42 11:02  Yuko  Black plants on the white wall
43 11:16  Yuko  Lets go with it
44 11:22  Risa  Okayyy
45 11:25  Risa  Goodddd
46 11:56  Yuko  I hope she express our ideas with painting ;)
47 12:35  Risa  I hope so too. I'll let you know when I get "okay" from her^^
48 12:43  Yuko  Thanks
49 12:54  Yuko  終わりました！

"we have finished!"

**Excerpt 87 (High-level learners: Task 3)**
Although in Tasks 1 and 2 Risa and Yuko constructed participant-generated task closings, the linguistic repertoire used for the terminal exchanges is different. In Task 1, their terminal exchange was formatted as an okay?-okay sequence, while in Task 2 they constructed a sequence of longer utterances using I-hope forms with Yuko’s appreciation in the third position (post 48). Note that they entered into task closings before the researcher provided the first time reminder in these two tasks. Another notable difference is that the discussion in Task 1 lasted longer than the one in Task 2. In Task 3, the first time reminder, “3 more minutes”, was given for the first time for this dyad. In post 44, provided 2 m after the first time reminder, Risa displays her insufficient knowledge (Sert, 2013) with a laughter token in the subsequent post (45). In post 46, oriented to Risa’s apparent difficulty in coming to a conclusion, Yoko summarizes their idea for task accomplishment. After 43 s, the researcher concludes the task and after another 15 s, Yuko says, “Okay です！” (meaning “Okay!”) in a mixture of L2 English and L1 Japanese, which displays to the researcher her understanding that the task talk is over. These three excerpts indicate that creating participant-generated task closings in two consecutive tasks does not guarantee the occurrence of the same phenomena in the third attempt given the different task prompts. Observably, Task 3 was difficult for Risa, who claimed insufficient knowledge for the first time across the three conversations. However, it is also observable that this dyad used recognizably different linguistic resources/actions to maintain solidarity between themselves, and intersubjectivity among all the participants including the researcher, even after the task had been closed by the researcher. Thus, the three different tasks provide dyadic participants with opportunities to demonstrate not only two types of task closings (i.e.,
participant- and researcher-generated task closings) but also varied interactional repertoires for achieving participant-generated task closings.

Excerpt 88 was previously presented as an example of a crossed task closing which was caused by a misunderstanding between the two participants, Yui and Ami.

Excerpt 88 (High-level learners: Task 1; appeared previously as Excerpt 81)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:25</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>Ok!!!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:57</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>I think Austria is nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:04</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>Ok!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:14</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>Let's go to Austria!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:49</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>終わりです！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“we've done!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:57</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>はい！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“okay!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>because it is very peaceful and people are friendly!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:04</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>え！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“what?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:17</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>ごめん、終わりにした笑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“sorry, I've made it done. lol”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:17</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>おわり！(笑)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“finished! (lol)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:31</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>了解です (笑)。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I understand (lol)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:51</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>終わりです！</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“we're done!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 89 (High-level learners: Task 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:57</td>
<td>Yui</td>
<td>What is Vegan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:19</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>3 more minutes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:09</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>but if we paint Peru's landscape, we have to serve Peru's food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>// I think my spelling of vegan is wrong. // vegan is only vegetables!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
51 17:32 Yui Ok!
52 17:33 Ami vegan is people who eat only vegetables
53 17:47 Yui Vegetarian!
54 18:03 Ami yes!!!!!!!!
55 18:39 Yui I think Peru cooking is good.
56 19:14 Yui Ami?
57 19:20 Res Time is up!
58 19:27 Ami ok, so the concept is Peru!!
59 19:31 Ami おわり！
“finished!”

Excerpt 90 (High-level learners: Task 3)

41 16:33 Yui I think making these preparation and becoming the own goal is success.
42 16:58 Yui Becoming your future image
43 17:05 Ami oh! that's right!!
44 17:13 Res 3 more minutes!
45 17:24 Yui Ok?
46 17:50 Ami ok! // I want to know your goal!XP
47 18:03 Yui My goal?
48 18:31 Ami yes!
49 18:35 Yui My goal is to be a project manager!
50 19:30 Yui But it may change!
51 19:35 Yui Hahaha
52 19:50 Ami oh! // to become that it needs a lot of time! // like 5 years??
53 20:06 Ami more?
54 20:13 Res Time is up!
55 20:16 Yui I think 7-8 years

In Task 1, they made attempts to repair the misunderstanding caused by crossing of the posts that performed the closing ritual as presented already (See Chapter 5). In Task 2, after the time reminder “Three more minutes!”, the two participants talk about “Peru’s landscape”, which was their idea for task accomplishment. In the subsequent several
posts, they talk about “vegan”, which is an extension of a topic they had previously discussed (not in the excerpt). In post 55, Yui says, “I think Peru cooking is good.”, which is followed by 35 s of silence before she calls her partner’s name in post 56. This is strikingly different from what Yui did to project a closing to Ami in Task 1, where she offered okay tokens with exclamation marks. In post 57, after 6 s, the researcher closes the task. After 7 s, Ami offers a response to post 55 to construct a two-turn sequence. This response is offered in English, which displays Ami’s understanding that task talk is not yet finished. 4 s later, Ami says, “おわり！” (“end!”). This task-closing method can be explained by the fact that Ami and Yui’s crossed task-closing rituals were not sanctioned by the researcher at the end of task 1. In fact, on the contrary, the researcher offered a laughter token (“笑”) in L1 Japanese to display alignment with the dyadic participants’ interactional practices. This dyad did not create a participant-generated task closing in the following task. In Task 3, an okay?-okay sequence is constructed over posts 45 and 46 immediately after the researcher’s time reminder. In the same post 46, Ami offers a possible topic extension saying, “I want to know your goal!” with a playful emoticon (“XP”). Yui’s repetition (“My goal?”) displays her insufficient understanding of how the topic of her goal is related to the ongoing talk. This topic was extended until post 55 even after the researcher had concluded the task in post 54 without any orientation to closing the task being displayed (except for the okay?-okay sequence from earlier). These three excerpts demonstrate not only variations between participant- and researcher-generated task closings but also variations in the interactional repertoire participants drew upon for researcher-generated task closings (Tasks 2 and 3).

Some dyads consistently produced participant-generated task closings across all three tasks. See the following three task closings constructed by a low-level dyad, Ken and Yo.

**Excerpt 91 (low-level learners: Task 1)**

17 13:55 Ken Louvre museum and Eiffel tower are in France!
18 14:17 Ken p
19 14:31 Yo I want to go
20 14:43 Yo I want to go there, too.
Excerpt 92 (low-level learners: Task 2)

8 7:29 Yo I think the sun matches the
9 7:42 Yo fruits.
10 8:45 Ken Okayama is called Sunny Country. So it must be match!
11 9:17 Yo I think so to!
12 9:46 Ken The cafe's atmosphere will be bright and colorful!
13 11:26 Yo It's nice idea!
14 11:50 Ken "we have finished"

Excerpt 93 (low-level learners: Task 3)

12 13:29 Ken There is success in personal heart.
13 14:22 Yo I think so too.
14 14:26 Ken What we Define Success is wrong behave!!!
15 14:51 Ken This is my idea.
16 15:07 Ken Do you agree with it?
17 15:26 Yo I agree with you.
18 15:36 Ken "we have finished"

These three closings are similar in that the participants enter into closings before the researcher’s time reminder. Although this dyad did not use the same method to initiate their closing rituals across the three tasks, it is noteworthy that it was always Ken that offered the first part of the summons-answer sequence. The linguistic format for the summonses was also the same except for the use of a Japanese full stop in Task 1 only. Ken consistently offered his summons immediately after Yo had made a post. However, the linguistic repertoires/actions for the terminal exchange were different in each task. In Tasks 1 and 3, a sequence of soliciting and providing an agreement on the idea for
task accomplishment was constructed, while a summons was offered without such a sequence in Task 2. This dyad’s three performances suggest that a widening of the variety of methods participants used to close their conversations can be seen throughout the three task interactions regardless of proficiency level and whether closings were participant or researcher generated.

5.6 Summary and discussion

This section provides a summary and discussion of the current chapter with a view to answering the three research questions: 1. How do L2 learners close task-based text-chat interactions? (Section 5.6.1) 2. How do the interactional practices used in task closings differ at different proficiency levels? (Section 5.6.2). What task effects can be seen? (Section 5.6.3)

5.6.1 How task closings are constructed

Due to the nature of the tasks used, this study necessitates the classification of task closing rituals into two types of sequence: a terminal exchange, which is a sequence used to achieve an agreement on a final idea for task accomplishment in order to end the L2 discussion; and a summons-answer sequence, which is an L1 sequence for closing task talk.

The current study found participants using various resources to project an upcoming task closing. One interactional resource that was recurrently observed among all proficiency groups was the use of okay tokens with question marks. This resource is analogous to teachers’ utterances used before moving on to the next activity (Waring, 2009) or their inquiries asking whether there is anything more students wish to talk about (Rine, 2009) in teacher-class interactions. It is strikingly different from pre-closing moves in daily conversation closings, where okay is issued without interrogative markers such as an uprising tone (Wong & Waring, 2010). Given that a move with an okay? token makes an acceptance or a decline relevant, the preferred response is an affirmative reply such as okay without a question mark or any other affirmative or affiliative responses such as yes tokens. It is important to note that such okay responses are only linguistically akin to a second okay in pre-closing sequences in mundane conversation. An okay token as a response to okay? functions quite differently to a
second *okay* issued after a first *okay* in that the latter does not involve preference organization. An exchange of two *okay* tokens or other similar linguistic or semiotic cues constitutes a warrant that there is no more to talk about between all parties (Sidnell, 2010). On the other hand, the task closing with *okay?* in the current study was an interactional method used to simultaneously perform at least two actions: achieving core task-related business (i.e., agreeing on a final answer to the question in the prompt) and projecting the end of task talk. However, generic pre-closings consisting of *okay-okay* exchanges, as Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig (1992) identified in academic advising sessions between an instructor and a student, were also observed in the current data. That indicates that task talk in the current study was conversation-like in nature in its closing section.

The participants in the study appeared to face two problems with creating participant-generated task closings. One of these problems was a lack of orientation to the necessity of doing a participant-generated task closing. This is supported by the statistical fact that participant-generated task closings accounted for only 62.2% of all closings. In other words, almost all participants displayed their orientation to the necessity of agreeing on a final idea for task accomplishment, while less participants displayed their orientation to the necessity of participant-generated task closings. It was observable that some dyads deployed topically empty talk at the very end of the task talk, that is, just before the researcher terminated their interaction with the *Time is up!* remark, but did not call the researcher. This issue may be related the fact that the instruction that participants in a dyad should call the researcher was presented only in the beginning of the data collection sessions and was not emphasised.

Another problem in constructing participant-generated task closings was management of the time limit. Only a few participants displayed their orientation to the remaining time (See Chapter 6). In many cases, the participants did not treat their researcher-generated task closings as a problem given that the researcher himself offered his appreciation to them after his closing remark of *Time is up!* In other words, there was no sanction when participants’ talk resulted in a researcher-generated task closing. This also possibly influenced the participants’ apparent normative understanding that constructing participant-generated task closings was not of paramount importance. Although the time limit clearly created the possibility of participants failing to construct participant-generated task closings, it was also utilized
as a resource to project an upcoming termination of the talk. One good example is the researcher’s time reminder of *Three more minutes!* Utilizing locally available resources to move into conversation-closing is a universally seen interactional phenomenon as Sidnell (2010) showed in an example from daily dyadic conversational data where a dog’s barking provided one of parties with an opportunity to convey the necessity of ending their talk. Thus, the time limit produced a locally available resource to project closing rituals, and thereby allowed participants to show a generic competence to construct talk-in-interaction in an orderly manner.

From the perspective of participation frameworks, an individual dyadic participant being capable of constructing a participant-generated task closing is evidence of his or her ability to deal with two other participants with two different participation statuses: the other dyadic participant with ratified participant status and the researcher, who was an unratified participant in task talk. Although the researcher was definitely an unratified ‘speaker’ or unaddressed side participant, it was his presence in the wider participation framework that enabled the two ratified dyadic participants to exploit certain interactional resources such as specifically suggesting calling the researcher by mentioning his name without explicitly mentioning the purpose of doing so. This is also universally seen, not just in the current study’s task talk, but also in multi-party conversation as Clark and Carlson (1982) found in a study on triadic conversation. Clark and Carlson found that speaker A can use a question form “what about you?” to speaker C only after speaker A has already asked the same question with a more specific non-elliptic form such as “Did you like the museum?” directly to speaker B in front of speaker C. Thus, dyadic participants in the current study were required to deal with participants with different participatory roles simultaneously. In some task closings where one dyadic participant called the researcher in L1 Japanese but the other continued with the discussion in L2 English, the researcher remained silent for a while. This is indicative that the researcher’s involvement and engagement in task closings could be constrained by the dyadic participants’ interactional practices.

### 5.6.2 Proficiency difference

The findings are consistent with previous studies on the development of L2 IC (e.g., Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012, 2014, 2018; Galaczi, 2014; Hellermann, 2007, 2008; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011) in that the participants showed fine-
grained differences across levels. The current study also found fundamental similarities across levels. As for how dyadic participants constructed task closings before the researcher’s closing remark terminated the talk, there were no salient differences across levels. That also indicates that there was no salient difference between levels in the intensity of their normative orientation to the task instructions, specifically, the necessity of producing participant-generated closings.

The linguistic repertoire displayed, or types of action performed, in the first part of a terminal exchange showed some differences across the three proficiency levels. Only lower-proficiency learners confirmed that there was nothing more to talk about. Unlike an okay?-okay sequence consisting of a solicitation of agreement and an affirmative response, a linguistic format such as do you have any idea? makes negative forms the preferred response. This linguistic method of projecting a task closure was only found among lower-level participants. On the other hand, one of the high-level learners’ methods for commencing the terminal exchange, the action of suggesting calling the researcher, was not used at all by mid- or low-level learners.

Sequential analysis of the two structures for task closing (terminal exchanges and summons-answer sequences) revealed finer differences across proficiency levels. Several mid-proficiency learners showed behaviours that low-proficiency learners never demonstrated such as inserting phatic moves or exchanges with laughter tokens into their task closings. Also, some mid-level pairs showed a more stepwise transition from task-related talk to closing than the low-level pairs, which confirms previous studies reporting that sequences get more extended and linguistically varied with increasing proficiency or interactional ability (e.g., Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012, 2014, 2018; Galaczi, 2014; González-Lloret, 2011; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2016; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011).

Both mid-level and high-level groups showed more sequential expansions, while management of the participation framework was a distinguishing marker between these two proficiency groups. To be sure, a few mid-level learners showed unique methods to call the researcher in their summonses such as using a laughter token (See Excerpt 72) or commenting on the researcher’s closing remark itself (See Excerpt 76). Also, there were several cases where both dyadic participants provided a summons. Thus, indications of an orientation to closing the talk as being a collaborative effort...
shared among all three participants in the whole interactional event (not just within the task talk), was apparent in mid-level and high-level learners’ data.

However, only high-proficiency learners explicitly mentioned the researcher when closing task talk, including in their first moves in terminal exchanges, and that shifted the researcher’s participation status from an unratified participant to a ratified one (Goffman, 1981). Based on Clark and Carlson’s (1982) model, high-proficiency learners could use the researcher, that is, a physically co-present unaddressed recipient, to signal an upcoming task closing. For instance, what Rin did by saying “Call him!!” to Taku’s question, “Now what do we say when we’re done?” is elliptical. The use of the third person pronoun him is possible only if a co-present third party is oriented to as a participant. Thus, this finding suggests that only high-proficiency learners could modify the participation framework by introducing an emergent ratified participant who was originally positioned outside the task talk. In addition, only high-level learners could use linguistic forms based on an unaddressed but co-present participant in order to project an upcoming task closing. This finding also indicates that task closings are an interactional site where L2 learners’ identities shift from being a participant in a discussion task within a language learning context to being a participant in a data collection session as a more equal member of a social community. In that sense, this chapter suggests that high-level learners more observably showed their identities as members taking part in the data collection event.

Medium-specific features of synchronous text-chat interaction seem to have an influence on participants’ task closing performance. Only high-proficiency learners were able to occasionally break the adjacency of a terminal exchange by inserting a sequence before providing a second-pair part to close the talk or successfully manage situations in which adjacency was disrupted owing to a lack of visual and audio cues. This disruption of adjacency and its repair have been shown with higher-proficiency learners in some previous studies (e.g., Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012, 2018), and indicates a prioritization of social solidarity over transactional task talk, possibly enabled by greater processing capacity. Lower-proficiency learners are inclined to prioritize efficiency and task completion, likely owing to their language processing system being placed under heavy pressure by the demands of real-time conversation via text-based CMC. Higher-proficiency learners have the processing capacity to deal with not only explicit performative verbs such as agree tokens, but also more implicit
linguistic repertoires or actions that suspend the immediacy of adjacency pairs or repair troubles caused by disruptions in the adjacency of turn-taking, and are able to make use of all available resources, including all parties in the interaction, in doing so.

5.6.3 Task effects

Although there was no salient difference in the frequency distribution of the two types of task closings (i.e., participant- vs. researcher-generated) across tasks, there seems to be a task effect in closing rituals (i.e., terminal exchanges and summons-answer sequences). As is suggested in the excerpts presented above, an agreement needs to be achieved prior to entering task closing. However, there were no notable differences in how such agreement was reached across tasks just as there were only a few differences in the linguistic variety used to construct the first part of a terminal exchange across proficiency levels. This indicates that task prompts and the possible topics they trigger (See the following chapter for more detail) do not strongly affect the way in which the interactional practices used to do task closings vary.

Task effects can be considered only by looking at variations in interactional repertoires produced by a single dyad of learners. The three consecutive tasks allowed each dyad to show at most three different methods for achieving closings regardless of proficiency. The previous section reported that Ami and Yui (Excerpt 81) and Mei and Ryu (Excerpt 82) collaboratively reformulated crossed posts around their summons-answer sequence with the researcher in Task 1 and Task 2, respectively. It is noteworthy that Mei and Ryu constructed crossed posts in their closing rituals in task 2 even after they had successfully avoided this pitfall in their previous task (i.e., Task 1). This suggests that Task 2, the second task in the data collection session as a whole, still offered a first-time experience for Mei and Ryu and required them to deal with local contingencies peculiar to that task.
Chapter 6 Topical talk

6.1 Introduction

This chapter illustrates what happens after task talk is opened and before it is closed and how this is constructed between two participants in a dyad. In short, this chapter deals with how topical talk for task-based interactions is organized. This chapter focuses on three aspects of topical talk: (1) how ‘second ideas’ are generated, (2) how topics are extended based on a proffered idea, and (3) how non-topical talk is embedded. Section 6.2 presents key concepts and analytic standpoints. Sections 6.3 to 6.5 describe these three aspects raised above. Section 6.6 provides a comparison of topic extensions across the three tasks within a single dyad to explore possible task effects. Section 6.7 will summarize the findings and discuss the research questions.

6.2 Key concepts and analytic standpoint

The followings are key concepts requiring clarification for this chapter.

Second-idea: an idea (for task accomplishment such as “the US” for Task 1, “sea” for Task 2, and “achieving something with an effort” for Task 3) which is proffered after the first idea is proffered. In examples of the proffer-proffer type of task openings, the second idea is proffered immediately after the first idea whether they are crossed or not. In other types of task opening, the second idea is either delayed until after a single or multiple sequences have taken place, or never occurs at all. If a participant proffers multiple ideas for possibly accomplishing the task (e.g., “I wanna go Thai, Singapore, and Malaysia”) within a single turn, they are considered to be one idea.

Second-idea solicitor: recurrently observed, explicit linguistic resources used to solicit second ideas such as “how about you?”.

Topic extension: “Topic” is an ambiguous concept in the CA literature. In this study, and in light of our purpose of examining task-based learner-learner interactions, topic is defined as a part of any talk on an idea proffered by a participant towards the goal of accomplishing the task.
**Topical talk**: Topical talk is defined as all talk in the entire task-based interaction from the FIP in the task opening to the first move of a terminal exchange in the task closing. In other words, preliminaries in task openings and terminal exchanges and summons-answer sequences in task closings are less topical or topically empty. Unlike task openings and closings, no codable features emerged from the CA analysis except for the use of second-idea solicitors (See Section 6.3). Proficiency differences with regards to the genesis of second-ideas (Section 6.3) and topic extensions on proffered ideas (Section 6.4), are discussed in separate sections. As for non-topical talk (Section 6.5), proficiency differences are only partially mentioned. Sample analyses will be presented in each section as necessary.

### 6.3 Proffering second ideas

This section illustrates how second ideas are proffered after an FIP sequence is achieved. Due to the task instruction saying, “Discuss and raise several ideas, but decide on one answer in the end”, interactants tended to provide more than one idea for task accomplishment. In other words, after a first idea was proffered (FIP), second ideas tended to be produced by an interlocutor. The most frequently used expression to solicit second ideas was *How about you?*. The following excerpt supports a sample analysis.

**Excerpt 94 (Mid-level learners / Task 2)**

```
1 0:00 Miki I want a artist to pain the sky on the wall
2 0:14 Miki or the univese
3 0:48 Fuyu Sky is great!
4 0:54 Miki how about you?
5 1:15 Fuyu It will be nice place
6 1:34 Fuyu Wings
7 2:06 Fuyu Do you know Wall painting art in korea?
8 2:25 Miki I think customers can enjoy seeing the wall.
9 2:34 Miki I think I know
10 3:03 Fuyu There is a lot of cute painting.
11 3:28 Fuyu Tourist enjoy taking picture with cute paintings
12 3:43 Miki Yes!!! do you have any other painting ideas?
```
Excerpt 94 shows how a second idea is generated by two mid-level learners’ Miki and Fuyu out of the task opening. In posts 1 and 2, the first idea is proffered and this is responded to by Fuyu in post 3. In post 4, Miki solicits Fuyu’s idea with a second-idea solicitor *how about you*?. In post 5, Fuyu posts, “It will be nice place”, which could be an increment to her previous post 3 (“Sky is great!”) since it is apparently not responding to post 4 (“how about you?”). In post 6, Fuyu says, “Wings”, which is formally disconnected to her previous post (post 5). Thus, post 6 is not an incremental unit designed as a continuation of the previous post. Rather, in a new turn, Fuyu proffers her idea (painting “Wings” on the wall of the cafe), which is the second idea for this dyad, and is a response to Fuyu’s second idea solicitor. In post 7, Fuyu says, “Do you know Wall painting art in korea?”, which shows that her idea of painting “Wings” is not merely an addition to Miki’s idea of painting “sky”, but a new idea for task accomplishment. Here, it is also observable that Fuyu is oriented to Miki’s *how about you*? as a solicitor of a different idea, namely, a ‘second’ idea. In post 8, Miki maintains alignment with the ongoing discussion and in post 9, she affirmatively responds to Fuyu’s question from post 7 in a known-answer question format (Balaman & Sert, 2017; Mehan, 1979). Fuyu further extends her topic of “Wall painting art in korea” in posts 10 and 11. In post 12, maintaining the topical alignment, Miki solicits more ideas for task accomplishment.

The following table demonstrates the frequency of the occurrence of second-idea solicitors, which were mostly offered in the form of *how about you* with a question mark or in the same format as first-idea solicitors (e.g., *where do you want to go?*, *what do you want to draw?*, or *what is success?*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11. Total number of second-idea solicitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 shows that high-level learners produced far less second-idea solicitors than lower-level dyads. In addition, the table also shows that Task 1 is the most productive task in terms of occurrences of second-idea solicitors, which is followed by Task 2 and Task 3 produced by far the lowest. Although there were some linguistic variations in the way second idea solicitors were formatted, the differences were not salient across proficiency levels. The following subsections will present how participants in each of the three proficiency groups generated second ideas through an analysis of several excerpts.

### 6.3.1 Low-level learners

Low-level learners’ second-idea proffers tended to be produced in a reciprocal structure, where, for instance, the first speaker solicited an idea, then the second speaker offered an idea, and then the second speaker solicited an idea, which was followed by the first speaker’s offering an idea. Low-level learners also tended to show only limited extension of a first topic before generating a second idea. The following excerpts show low-level learners’ second-idea proffering found in three different tasks.

**Excerpt 95 (Low-level learners / Task 1)**

1. 0:00 Gon Where do you want to go?
2. 0:25 Eita I want to go to Australia.
3. 0:46 Gon Why?
4. 2:16 Eita Because south hemisphere is hot in December.
5. 2:50 Eita And I like koala.
6. 3:40 Eita I want to watch wild koala.
7. 3:53 Eita How about you?
8. 4:05 Gon I want to go America.

**Excerpt 96 (Low-level learners / Task 2)**

1. 0:00 Atsu I want to paint the desine of wood on the wall.
2. 1:49 Goro Why do you want to paint that?
3. 5:31 Atsu Because I think the wall painted that makes cafe's mood relax.
4. 8:32 Goro I think it is a good idea!
Excerpt 97 (Low-level learners / Task 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Kaho</td>
<td>If I can become happy, it is success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:17</td>
<td>Nobu</td>
<td>Umm, it's a difficult theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:13</td>
<td>Nobu</td>
<td>I think success is different from person to person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>Kaho</td>
<td>I think so too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:54</td>
<td>Nobu</td>
<td>Some people think getting much money is success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:57</td>
<td>Nobu</td>
<td>The other people think getting fame is success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Excerpt 95, the task opening starts with a sequence of idea-soliciting and idea-proffering moves (FIP). The first idea is responded to in post 3 with a stand-alone *why* with a question mark. A response is provided in the following posts in the form of a *because*-prefaced composition in post 4 with increments in posts 5 and 6. Upon completion of post 7 (“How about you”), the sequence of idea-soliciting and idea-proffering is reciprocated through the participants’ swapping of solicitor and profferer roles. In Excerpt 96, the first idea is proffered in post 1 and in the second post Goro asks Atsu why he has suggested painting the wall with “the desine of wood”. Using a *because*-prefaced format, Atsu provides an account, which is responded to by Goro with a positive assessment. In post 5, Atsu provides a second-idea solicitor in the form of a *please*-prefaced imperative form (“Please tell me your opinion to this theme.”). In the next post, Goro proffers his idea, the second idea for this dyad, which Atsu responds to with a *why*-prefaced question. This type of reciprocal structure where participants took turns playing soliciting and proffering roles was common in Tasks 1 and 2. In Task 3, low-level learners tended to produce proffer-proffer type (See Chapter 4) openings starting with an FIP. In Excerpt 97, the first idea and second idea are proffered in sequence with an evaluation of the difficulty of the task inserted in post 2. The second idea is responded to by Kaho’s agreement and Nobu extends his self-proffered idea in the subsequent posts 5 and 6.

Overall, low-level learners showed a limited variety of methods for generating second ideas and a limited ability to extend the first topic before one of them
proffered a second idea. Low-level dyads were more dependent on second-idea solicitors to shape a reciprocal structure of actions in Tasks 1 and 2, and they were more inclined to produce proffer-proffer openings in Task 3.

6.3.2 Mid-level learners

Mid-level learners extended topics more although they still used second-idea solicitors just as frequently as low-level learners in Tasks 1 and 2 (See the table above). The difference between this group and the low-level learners was that the mid-level learners more often generated second ideas through disagreements. Disagreements were more often observed in Tasks 2 and 3. Here are some examples.

Excerpt 98 (Mid-level learners / Task 2)

1  0:00  Dai    I think We don't need to paint on the white wall.
2  0:08  Dai    Just white.
3  0:14  Dai    Because,
4  0:45  Dai    White wall makes our feel comfortable.
5  0:55  Kayo   Do you mean white wall is the best?
6  1:32  Dai    Yes, I think. // Also, we don't need hire the painter.
7  1:53  Kayo   I agree that.
8  1:55  Kayo   But
9  2:38  Kayo   In Tokyo, the gap between other cafe is important.
10 2:57  Dai    For example?
11 3:30  Kayo   white wall and stylish cafe are famous in Tokyo.
12 3:38  Kayo   my experience!
13 3:45  Kayo   So
14 4:21  Dai    You mean, there are a lot of cafes which has white wall and stylish in Tokyo?
15 4:33  Kayo   yes
16 5:35  Dai    It's right.
17 6:28  Kayo   I think making the mark (like sturbucks) becomes the gap!

In Excerpt 98, an FIP is constructed by Dai over four posts (posts 1-4) and includes an account for his suggestion. There follows an inserted sequence of a clarification request
and a response to it in posts 5 and 6, where Dai further supports his idea of leaving the wall blank with “we don’t need hire the painter”. In posts 7-9, Kayo provides her disagreement with an initial agreement, a stand-alone *but*, and an account for her disagreement (“In Tokyo, the gap between other cafe is important”). However, this is not an idea for task accomplishment, a candidate design for the cafe wall. In post 10, Dai solicits reasons for Kayo’s preceding disagreement. Kayo’s explanation is provided in posts 11-13. Dai makes a clarification request in post 14 and his candidate understanding is confirmed in post 15. In post 17, Kayo proffers her idea for task accomplishment, that is, the second idea for this dyad (“making the mark (like starbucks”)”). This way of generating a second idea through oppositional talk is strikingly different from low-level learners’ practices.

See the following excerpt for an example of Task 3.

**Excerpt 99 (Mid-level learners / Task 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Ino</td>
<td>I think success is money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:29</td>
<td>Shige</td>
<td>Earn lot of money is success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Ino</td>
<td>yes // money express success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:04</td>
<td>Shige</td>
<td>I think so too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:35</td>
<td>Ino</td>
<td>I try more harder, // the money is more increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:46</td>
<td>Shige</td>
<td>But only earning money is success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>Ino</td>
<td>what do you mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:47</td>
<td>Shige</td>
<td>Can you say &quot;you are success!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:02</td>
<td>Shige</td>
<td>To A baby who Natural born rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>Ino</td>
<td>l see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:38</td>
<td>Ino</td>
<td>but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:48</td>
<td>Ino</td>
<td>the baby get success // when he was born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:27</td>
<td>Ino</td>
<td>then // what is your success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:01</td>
<td>Shige</td>
<td>I think success is get love from someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:19</td>
<td>Ino</td>
<td>for example...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Shige</td>
<td>Ummm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first post of Excerpt 99, an FIP is constructed. In posts 2 and 3, a clarification-response sequence occurs. In post 4, Shige agrees with Ino’s idea of “money” as a
definition of the word “success”. In post 5, Ino adds his account for his idea. After 11s, Shige’s disagreement is provided, which makes his agreement in post 4 interpretable as a delaying device designed to precede an explicit disagreement marker. In post 7, Ino offers a repair move and Shige reformulates his previous post 6 ("But only earning money is success?") in posts 8 and 9 (‘Can you say "you are success!" To A baby who Natural born rich”), which is responded to with a display of understanding by Ino in post 10. In posts 10-13, Ino provides a counterargument prefaced with a display of understanding (post 10) and but (post 11). In post 13, a second-idea solicitor (“what is your success”) is offered. This is responded to by Shige in post 14 and discussion of this second idea is further extended in subsequent posts. This excerpt is another example of oppositional talk being used to generate a second idea in Task 3. It may be worthwhile to note that only mid-level learners and high-level learners used second idea solicitors in Task 3.

Overall, mid-level learners extended topics more, including the use of oppositional talk to generate second ideas, which was different to low-level learners. This led to the production of extended sequences prior to the genesis of second idea proffering. On the other hand, linguistically speaking, mid-level learners were just as dependent on second-idea solicitors as low-level learners.

6.3.3 High-level learners

As Table 11 shows, high-level learners tended not to produce second-idea solicitors regardless of task type. Although several dyads showed features that were similar to mid-level learners’ methods of proffering a second idea, some unique features only produced by high-level learners can be found. High-level dyads were also less oriented to reciprocal structures in generating second ideas, which was one of the features typical of low-level dyads. For instance, in Tasks 1 and 2, high-level learners tended to produce more than one idea in a short time. See the following excerpts.

Excerpt 100 (High-level learners / Task 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Taku</td>
<td>Rin, which country do you want to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0:13</td>
<td>Rin</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0:15</td>
<td>Taku</td>
<td>It's 5 days!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Excerpt 100, the first two posts constitute a solicit-proffer sequence. In post 3, Taku says, “It's 5 days!” a disagreement by providing an account (i.e., it is not realistic to visit the US for “5 days”) instead of using but or other initials to delay a disagreement component. In posts 4-8, Rin offers several ideas. “Spain” in post 4 is possibly crossed with Taku’s previous utterance. By offering “China” in post 5, followed by a self-repair initiator “No” in post 6 and offering “Thai” or “Thailand” in subsequent posts, Rin displays an alignment with Taku’s It’s 5 days!. Thus, posts 2 and 4-8 can be seen as Rin’s FIP turn split into several posts, although multiple candidate ideas are provided with an orientation to Taku’s suggested disagreement. Taku’s ideas are proffered in post 9, where he lists several names of countries within one post. This is formally tied to Rin’s previous turn in that both participants proffer more than one idea for
accomplishing the task. In the subsequent post, Taku asks why Rin suggested “China”, while Rin does not ask the reason for any of Taku’s ideas in their subsequent talk (not presented in the excerpt). In Excerpt 101, two high-level learners talk about what to paint on the wall of their cafe. In posts 1 and 2, Nao provides the first idea (drawing “mt. fuji”). In post 2, Nao mentions “sento”, a Japanese public bath house, where one of the walls traditionally features a drawing of Mt. Fuji, the highest mountain in Japan. In post 3, Kei offers a disagreement with an account (i.e., painting the walls like a public bath house is not appropriate for a cafe). In post 4, Kei offers the second idea for this task. After Kei’s self-critical comment (post 5) and Nao’s agreement with it (post 6), Kei projects an upcoming idea-proffering (post 7), which is crossed by Nao’s increment to his previous objection (post 8). In post 9, Nao offers a go-ahead to Kei. In post 10, Kei proffers another idea. As is shown in these two excerpts presented above, high-level learners tended not to use idea-solicitors such as how about you with question marks. These two excerpts also show that high-level learners did not display any orientation to taking on solicitor and profferer roles or to a reciprocal one-interactant-one-idea structure in generating second ideas.

In Task 3, high-level learners tended not to produce second or subsequent ideas to accomplish the task. Rather, they tended to discuss the first idea from multiple perspectives over extended sequences. See the following excerpt for an example.

**Excerpt 102 (High-level learners / Task 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>Thats a difficult topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:02</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>wow super difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:15</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>Give me a second...haha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:56</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>when you felt you're succeeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:43</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>simple but deep 😏😏</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:59</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>I know 😂😂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:33</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>I never felt like &quot;oh its my success&quot; or anything like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>how about like when you passed your entrance exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:08</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>or you god jobs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I couldn't pass the university I wanted to go the most, so even tho after passing Dokkyo university I didn't feel like I did it.

then you think you never succeeded in your life?

No...it's hard to explain, but there is no moment I feel like I'm succeeded, but after going through the path I realize that was a important choice for me or that was a necessary process for me!

so you don't feel so but you think that was your success now?

Those are the things which made me grow a lot!

So I can say it's a success?

Maybe~?

Yes!

How about u?

When do u feel I've succeeded?

i don't feel like "yes this is my success!" but

when i done with something after all hard work i think that's my success

In Excerpt 102, Mika proffers an idea that success is “when you felt you’re succeeded” with her self-assessment of the idea (“simple but deep” with an emoticon of a slightly lopsided smiley face). In post 6, Hana, displays an understanding of Mika’s self-assessment with a smiley and crying face, which also displays Hana’s orientation to Mika’s post 4 as an FIP. In subsequent posts, they extend this topic in relation to their personal experiences of feeling successful. In post 7, Hana claims a lack of such experience. From posts 8 to 17, Mika asks questions and Hana responds to them. Mika inquires after Hana’s experience of passing a university entrance exam or job hunting (posts 8 and 9), whether Hana has ever enjoyed success in her life (posts 11 and 12) and whether Hana has actually experienced success despite her claims to not have felt successful (posts 13 and 14-17). Hana’s answers are not necessarily clear as she admits that “it’s hard to explain” in post 12 and she answers her own question (in posts 15 and 16). However, it is important to note that even when Hana solicits Mika’s opinion
saying, “How about u?” in post 18, the current topic is still that *success is when someone feels success*. In other words, this *how about you* token is not used to generate a second idea but to extend the current discussion of the first idea.

As we see exemplified in the excerpts presented above, high-level learners’ showed more varied methods (not only linguistically) and much less orientation to reciprocal exchanges of solicitor-profferer roles and reliance on explicit linguistic markers to solicit second ideas.

### 6.4 Extending a topic on proffered ideas

This section examines how participants’ extended discussion of proffered ideas (first, second, and subsequent ideas). For this investigation, due to the difficulty of quantifying particular sequential and linguistic patterns, I present several selected excerpts representing the recurrently observed features of topic extension trajectories for each proficiency group.

#### 6.4.1 Low-level learners

Low-level learners’ topic extensions were found to be characterized by their frequent elaboration of self-proffered ideas rather than other-proffered ideas. A typical low-level topic extension can be seen in the following Excerpt 103), which shows the whole task from opening to closing (posts 1-8 are a reproduction of Excerpt 95). Across posts 1-6, Eita provides the first idea in post 2 and then extends his own topic in posts 4-6.

**Excerpt 103 (Low-level learners / Task 1; appeared previously as Excerpt 95)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Gon</td>
<td>Where do you want to go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0:25</td>
<td>Eita</td>
<td>I want to go to Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0:46</td>
<td>Gon</td>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2:16</td>
<td>Eita</td>
<td>Because south hemisphere is hot in December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2:50</td>
<td>Eita</td>
<td>And I like koala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3:40</td>
<td>Eita</td>
<td>I want to watch wild koala.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3:53</td>
<td>Eita</td>
<td>How about you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4:05</td>
<td>Gon</td>
<td>I want to go America.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After a second idea-solicitor is provided in post 7, Gon’s idea, visiting “America”, is proffered and this topic is extended into subtopics such as “various persons” in post 10, “various english intonation” in post 11, “times square” in post 13 and how “famous” it is in post 15. Throughout this sequence of posts, Eita offers only a display of understanding in post 12, a clarification request in post 14, and a claim of insufficient knowledge in post 16. In other words, the topic of visiting America is extended only by the idea-profferer himself.

Low-level learners less frequently talked about themselves, their own experiences or personal knowledge related to the current talk. The following shows the entirety of the task talk produced by a low-level dyad in Task 3. The two participants, Sota and Kyo, did not discuss any of their own or others (e.g., famous persons’) experiences or specific knowledge about success, which is the topic of Task 3.

**Excerpt 104 (Low-level learners / Task 3)**

1. 0:00 Sota Having my home is success. // How about you?
2. 0:29 Kyo I think define success is to achieve the purpose
3. 1:58 Sota The purpose is different from people. Is it right?
4. 2:12 Kyo It is success in life
Although their ideas, candidate definitions for the word “success”, are clearly proffered (e.g., “Having my home is success” in post 1, “success is to achieve the purpose” in post 2, or “success is having a lot of money” in post 14), these ideas are not supported by their experiences or knowledge, no concrete examples are given and there are no instances where supporting information is solicited.

Overall, low-level learners tended to extend the ideas they had proffered themselves. Compared to higher-level dyads, low-level dyads used less supporting information to enhance the persuasiveness of their claims that a proffered idea was a suitable answer to the task prompt.
**6.4.2 Mid-level learners**

Participants at the mid-level were found to extend other-proffered ideas more than participants at the low-level. More specifically, they were able to work more collaboratively to specify or augment ideas for task accomplishment. A typical excerpt can be seen in the following.

**Excerpt 105 (Mid-level learners / Task 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>I wanna go hot or warm place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>Be warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>Kidding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>So, I recommend you to visit beach resort at the south East Asian country!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>Sightseeing is boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>You can stay calm, enjoy the good meals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>That's great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>And you can go there with shot time!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>Where is it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>You know I only visited Vietnam, Hoian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>I've never been there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>((uploading a picture of beach in Vietnam))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nako</td>
<td>Very nice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Roki</td>
<td>How far does it take?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Excerpt 105, after together producing 35 posts discussing where they want to visit and proffering several ideas, Roki proffers the idea of a “hot or warm place” which allows Nako to bring up an example of such a place (“beach resort at the south East Asian country”) in post 40. Roki does not respond to this post to extend the topic (instead he puts “Sightseeing is boring” in post 41). After post 42 in which Nako adds further information, Roki offers a positive assessment. After one more exchange in which Nako provides information and Roki makes a follow-up inquiry in posts 44 and 45, Nako proffers a possible idea for task accomplishment in post 46 (visiting
“Vietnam, Hoian”). Roki then further extends this topic, treating it as a possible candidate destination in subsequent posts. This excerpt shows how both participants extended an interlocutor proffered idea through questioning and providing information.

In a previous sub-section (Section 6.2.2), mid-level learners produced more disagreements in the process of generating a second idea. Likewise, when extending a proffered idea, mid-level learners showed more disagreements, as well as more engagement with other-proffered ideas, than low-level learners.

**Excerpt 106 (Mid-level learners / Task 2)**

1 0:00 Hana I want to paint the wall all green!
2 0:03 Yuzu I think it should be simple.
3 0:33 Hana I see // I love the simple
4 0:36 Hana Too
5 0:40 Yuzu Green!? That's an interesting idea!! Why do you think so??
6 1:10 Hana Usually I choose the simple
7 1:52 Hana But at this time I wanna try unusual things
8 2:05 Yuzu Nice!!
9 2:58 Hana I think many people are attracted by all green wall
10 4:16 Hana I have heard about Green is good for our eyes
11 4:43 Yuzu But I think green is bright for the cafe.
12 5:03 Yuzu So how about dark green??
13 5:28 Hana Yeah it's nice idea 🤚

Excerpt 106 starts with a proffer-proffer sequence. The first idea is painting the wall “all green” and the second idea is that the wall design “should be simple”. The second idea, although it may be too general to really constitute an idea for task accomplishment, is responded to affirmatively by Hana in posts 3 and 4, while the first idea is extended with a reason-soliciting move as well as an affirmative response by Yuzu in post 5. In posts 6 and 7, Hana seems to offer a suggestion by designing her turn with an initial display of understanding of an other-proffered idea (post 6) and then a but preface (in the first half of post 7) and finally a suggestion of an opposing idea (“unusual things”). This suggestion receives an affirmative response with a stand-alone nice with double exclamation marks, which seems to show Yuzu’s full alignment. In
posts 9 and 10, Hana extends the topic of her idea for task accomplishment, that is, painting the wall “all green” and provides reasons in the same posts. In posts 11 and 12, in response to Hana’s idea of painting the wall all green, Yuzu provides a but-prefaced disagreement and proffers the compromise idea of painting it “dark green” with the reason that “green is bright for the cafe”. Hana then responds affirmatively with a yes token and an emoji.

Overall, mid-level learners’ topic extensions were more interactionally collaborative in the process of discussing the idea proffered. They more frequently engaged with other-proffered ideas by specifying, augmenting and disagreeing with them. In addition, mid-level learners included more general knowledge in their talk than low-level learners. This was conducive to extending topics (e.g., “You know I only visited Vietnam, Hoian” in Excerpt 105 and “I have heard about Green is good for our eyes” in Excerpt 106).

6.4.3 High-level learners

High-level learners showed as much engagement with other-proffered ideas and ability to collaboratively extend them as mid-level learners. However, high-level learners produced asymmetrical contributions to the topic-extending process more frequently than lower-level learners. More specifically, high-level learners’ topic extensions more often involved knowledge known by a speaker him or herself than lower-level learners. See the following excerpt for an example of asymmetrical topic extension.

**Excerpt 107 (High-level learners / Task 2)**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4:50</td>
<td>Yuko</td>
<td>I feel reluctant to go inside of black cafe though</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5:35</td>
<td>Risa</td>
<td>Oh really then white is okay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5:49</td>
<td>Risa</td>
<td>What we have to decide is painting on the wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6:05</td>
<td>Risa</td>
<td>I have a friend who can paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6:13</td>
<td>Yuko</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7:01</td>
<td>Risa</td>
<td>Nani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7:03</td>
<td>Risa</td>
<td>Mami</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7:19</td>
<td>Risa</td>
<td>She’s my friend at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
She's sooo good at drawing
Is she good at painting nature things?
Cuz I want nature taste on the wall
Yea she's good
I can ask her
Please
Okayyy I will do that later
so what color for plants?
I have no idea what to paint
Planta should be green..?lol

Up to post 17 in Excerpt 107, this dyad had been discussing several ideas for task accomplishment such as making the wall “stay write” or painting it “all black” (not included in the excerpt). In post 18, Risa changed the topic to her friend named “Mami”, who she says is “good at drawing”. This topic shift seems to be responded to with an alignment by Yuko’s information request, “Who” (post 19) and a subsequent information-soliciting move, “Is she good at painting nature things?” (post 24), which is accompanied by an account, “Cuz I want nature taste on the wall” (post 25). The concerns raised by Yuko are answered by Risa in posts 26 and 27. After Yuko’s subsequent stand-alone please, Risa shifts the topic back to the prior topic, which is more directly related to task accomplishment, with an okay token with a letter repetition. It is noteworthy that okay is a typical sequence-closing device (Schegloff, 2007) and Risa continues her turn with a so-prefaced question, which is a typical form used for topic initiation (Bolden, 2008). It is important to note that these high-level learners do not play the same roles during the talk regarding “Mami”. That is partially because this topic belongs completely to Risa’s first-hand experience and Yuko has no access to the epistemic domain (Heritage, 2013). It is because of this recipient-tilted epistemic asymmetry (Stivers & Rossano, 2010) that Yuko takes on the role of a questioner. As seen in this excerpt, high-level learners’ topics were extended through participants taking up different roles (i.e., solicitor or profferer) in providing particular personal knowledge or experience.
Here is another example of a high-level learners’ topic extension where there is an observable epistemic asymmetry. Eiko and Rumi were engaged in talk about their ideal jobs and how to get such jobs.

Excerpt 108 (High-level learners / Task 3)

19 4:05 Eiko what kind of job do you want?
20 4:54 Rumi Hmm but it seems like it's difficult to have this kind of job in Japan
21 5:28 Eiko Yes
22 5:46 Eiko but there are a lot of start-ups
23 5:57 Rumi Like?
24 6:01 Eiko that look for bilingual people
25 6:04 Eiko buzzfeed
26 6:07 Eiko airbnb
27 6:11 Eiko uber
28 6:12 Eiko foreign companies looking to sell in Japan
29 6:27 Rumi Oh there's quite a lot, but i heard that it's really difficult to get in but if you think you can, i think it's not impossible
30 6:58 Eiko Yes, but all you really need is experience
31 7:29 Eiko so maybe interning would give you a better chance of getting in
32 8:11 Rumi Ohh right!
33 8:27 Rumi I have to do an internship of only i have more time
34 8:35 Eiko you can
35 9:02 Eiko even if you start late, at least you have something to write on your resume
36 9:24 Rumi Yeah i think i can but maybe a little bit later..i have 3 jobs right now and i'm taking 28 units so I'm pretty busy right now
37 11:13 Eiko Maybe during february

Up to post 19, this dyad had been talking about the definition of the word “success” through raising some ideas such as “being rich but being happy and contended” or “to
have a stable job” (not presented in the excerpt). From around post 19, the topic is shifted to what job these participants want to do. In post 20, Rumi used the phrase “seems like”, which may display a lack of access to knowledge concerning “job in Japan”, while Eiko does not use such phrasing in posts 21 and 22, where she says, “but there are a lot of start-ups” more assertively. This epistemic asymmetry seems to lead Rumi to take on the role of a questioner in the subsequent post and Eiko adopts the role of an answerer, relating her knowledge in a turn that is split into several posts, possibly in order to keep the floor (Tudini, 2015). These roles seem to be maintained by Rumi’s use of a change-of-state token oh and expressions that display uncertainty such as “i heard” or “I think” in post 29 and Eiko’s assertive expressions such as “all you really need is” in post 30. From post 31, they talk about Rumi’s future internship experience. It is notable that Eiko uses maybe in posts 31 and 37, while Rumi seems to be more assertive in saying “I have to do an internship of only i have more time” (“of” seems to be a typo for “if”) in post 33 and “I’m pretty busy right now” in post 36. Here she appears to abandon her previous role of questioner. On the other hand, Eiko maintains her role of information provider (including her tendency to compose long turns split into several posts) except when it comes to the epistemic domain of how busy Rumi is. This excerpt demonstrates not only these participants’ tendency to adopt different solicitor and profferer roles, but also their linguistic repertoire to display their epistemic statuses.

Overall, high-level learners extended talk about proffered ideas by taking on different roles such as questioner and answerer, which enabled them to display different epistemic K+ / K- gradients and invoke these in their utterances (Heritage, 2012). Therefore, high-level learners tended to extend proffered ideas through demonstrating their personal knowledge or experiences, which was rarely seen in low-level learners.

6.5 Other non-topical talk

Between task openings and closings, participants mainly produced topical talk. Some preliminaries in openings such as greetings, confirming that a partner had read the prompt, or evaluating how difficult the task was, as well as some closing rituals such as soliciting agreement on ideas for task accomplishment, clarifying the appropriate method to end the talk, or calling the researcher in L1 Japanese, are non-
topical. In addition, participants occasionally suspended the topical talk to create non-topical talk in order to perform various actions such as (1) informing the interlocutor of the remaining time, (2) uploading a photo, (3) fixing a spelling error, and (4) dealing with miscommunication. This section will present examples of such non-topical talk. Owing to the limited number of such examples, this section is restricted to the qualitative examination of the interactional features of these cases, carried out with a view to identifying salient differences across proficiency levels.

6.5.1 Informing the interlocutor of the remaining time

This study found three cases where a participant informed their partner of the remaining time (two high-level and one low-level learners). The following excerpts show how each dyad did this in all three cases. In two cases (Excerpt 109 and Excerpt 110), high-level learners mentioned the remaining time explicitly, saying, “5 more minutes to go” and “7 more minutes”, while a mid-level learner says “But time is limited” (Excerpt 111) to remind his partner of the time limit.

Excerpt 109 (High-level learners: Task 2)

52 13:12 Taro like Monalisa holding a mug?
53 13:21 Rui That's what I meant
54 13:49 Taro but doesn't we have to pay for copyright?
55 14:10 Rui They're dead so... Idk
56 14:16 Taro hmm
57 14:32 Rui 5 more minutes to go
58 14:33 Taro wanna risk that? lol
59 14:39 Taro got it
60 15:13 Rui No

Excerpt 110 (High-level learners: Task 3)

38 12:07 Rika My success is this
39 12:37 Koji okay
40 12:40 Koji let me think
41 12:43 Rika Ok
42 13:16  Rika  7 more minutes
43 13:44  Koji  complete something you planned
44 13:53  Koji  I think this is
45 14:04  Koji  the definition of complete.
46 14:13  Koji  The point is,
47 14:19  Koji  your feeling.
48 14:23  Koji  I think.
49 14:34  Rika  Yeah
50 14:54  Koji  So,
51 15:09  Koji  the point is,
52 15:25  Koji  How you feel when you complete the thing.
53 15:31  Rika  I see
54 15:38  Rika  I agree with your idea
55 16:16  Koji  Okay.

Excerpt 111 (Mid-level learner: Task 1; appeared previously as Excerpt 63 and Excerpt 75)

20 15:00  Yuzu  Thanks! We should choose one place.
21 15:42  Hana  Yes but we have only two ideas so do you have any idea?
22 15:46  Res  3 more minutes!
23 16:16  Hana  But time is limited
24 16:45  Hana  Let's choose one place
25 17:30  Hana  After I heard your idea,

Both Excerpt 109 and Excerpt 110 feature a reminder of the remaining time from one of dyadic participants instead of the researcher. In Excerpt 109, the two interactants had earlier been talking about whether drawing “Monalisa” on the wall of the cafe would mean they had to pay “for copyright”. In posts 55 and 56, they display their insufficient knowledge of the relevant copyright law and a lexical surrogate or mitigating token *hmm*. In post 57, Rui explicitly mentions the remaining time saying, “5 more minutes to go”, which is acknowledged by Taro in post 59. Within this sequence, another sequence of “wanna risk that?lol” (post 58) and “No” (post 60) is inserted. In Excerpt 110, in post 40, Koji makes a request saying, “let me think”, which is ratified
by Rika in an immediately following post. After 33 s, Rika says “7 more minutes” to remind her interlocutor of the remaining time (post 42). Although this move is not responded to, Koji proffers his idea, which is split into several posts (across posts 43-52) seemingly as a means of holding the floor, with an affirmative response from Risa inserted in post 49. In posts 53 and 54, Rika displays her understanding and offers an explicit agreement with Koji’s idea for task accomplishment. In both Excerpt 109 and Excerpt 110, high-level learners utilize these time reminders to display an orientation to the limited time available for the task. This is reminiscent of Hana’s post “time is limited” to display an orientation to a forthcoming task closing right after the researcher’s first time reminder (See Excerpt 111).

6.5.2 Uploading a photo

There were several tasks where participants uploaded photos. Some participants explicitly announced that action. See the following excerpts created by low-level learners to explain what the mascot character of Okayama prefecture in Japan looks like (Excerpt 112) and to describe a view of Kyoto city in Japan (Excerpt 113). Participants in both excerpts made an explicit announcement concerning their uploading of a photo(s).

**Excerpt 112 (Low-level learners: Task 2)**

7 8:27 Kosu Sorry, I don't know Momotaro. // What is it?
8 8:40 Kosu Momotaro
9 8:50 Kosu Momotti
10 9:35 Ryoya It is near Okayama YURUCARA
11 10:33 Kosu Do you have some pictures?
12 11:06 Ryoya OK!
13 11:44 Ryoya ((uploading a photo))
14 12:07 Ryoya This picture is 'momotti'!
15 13:20 Kosu Oh, it is like Momotaro. What is it?

Note. “YURUCARA” is a Japanese word ¥uru-chara. It refers to a mascot character that each prefecture of Japan has.

**Excerpt 113 (Low-level learners: Task 2)**
In Excerpt 112, this dyad had earlier talked about the mascot character named “Momotti”, which was proffered as an idea for task accomplishment in Task 2 by Ryoya. After Ryoya explains what it is in post 10, Kosu requests “some pictures”. After affirmatively responding in post 12 and uploading the photo of “Momotti” in post 13, Ryoya explains his behavior by making an announcement concerning the photo he has just posted. In Excerpt 113, Eri makes an announcement that she is planning to post a photo. In this excerpt, the dyad had talked about an idea of painting the café wall a green color, which was extended into the topic of green tea in Kyoto. That led to post 9, where Mana proffers the idea of painting “the wall of this cafe like Kyoto”. After affirmatively responding to the idea in post 10, Eri makes an announcement that she will upload a photo in post 12, saying, “Look at” with emoticons. Mana subsequently makes two posts, first displaying a noticing in post 17 and then making a positive assessment in post 18. These two examples of behaviors around the uploading of photos were common in that the announcements were made explicitly regardless of whether they came immediately before or after the actual posts containing the photos.

In contrast to the low-level learners’ explicit photo-uploading announcements, the following excerpts show that high-level learners uploaded photos more implicitly.

**Excerpt 114 (High-level learners: Task 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:29</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>no idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:36</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>let me google it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>Ok thanks you, google girl!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>it depends on the place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>((uploading a photo))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>Ok, so it's like almost same as Japan, right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>yah not so cold tokyo except milano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excerpt 115 (High-level learners: Task 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Nao</td>
<td>alright so NK for one day and SK for four days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kei</td>
<td>Gangnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Kei</td>
<td>like Harajuku in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Nao</td>
<td>yea that's nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Kei</td>
<td>((uploading a photo))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Nao</td>
<td>but lets do as many things as possible in NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Nao</td>
<td>alright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Kei</td>
<td>salute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Nao</td>
<td>alright</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Excerpt 114, in earlier talk this dyad had talked about whether Italy is cold in February (not in the excerpt). Posts 25 and 26 constitute a two-turn sequence of “let me google it” and “Ok” (this may also be some kind of non-topical talk). However, Mika posts her photo with no explicit announcements either prior to, or immediately after, uploading the picture. In response to either post 27 (“it depends on the place”) or post 28, a photo of Italy in winter, Hana displays her understanding saying, “Ok, so it's like almost same as Japan, right?” in post 29. In Excerpt 115, in earlier talk, this dyad had talked about visiting South and North Korea and Kei had uploaded a photo of a North Korean political leader and made an immediately subsequent comment saying, “salute”, which was a possible joke. In this excerpt, Kei uploads a photo of a South Korean celebrity who looks like the North Korean political leader he had earlier posted a photo of and says, “salute” for the fourth time, which is again a possible joke. Since to explain a joke in advance may be a potential spoiler, there is no preamble here to the uploading of the photo, but rather a humourous remark made after the post. It is also noteworthy that Nao uses only a stand-alone alright to respond to Kei’s joke, which suggest that Nao treats Kei’s salute as topically empty and thereby a joke. These two excerpts
suggest that these high-level learners produced photo-uploading turns as recognizable actions.

6.5.3 Fixing a spelling error

This study found that mid-level learners fixed a spelling error the most frequently (12 cases), there were 3 cases where low-level learners fixed a spelling error while high-level learners did not do this at all. Here are some examples of mid-level learners’ corrections.

Excerpt 116 (Mid-level learners: Task 1)
8 3:51 Dai Yes, I was stay at NewYorkers guest house.
9 4:04 Dai *i stayed

Excerpt 117 (Mid-level learners: Task 2)
37 19:31 Mai I want to be happy for children. to my nature art.
38 19:46 Mai I want to be happy for children to my nature art.
39 20:09 Mai I missed

Excerpt 118 (Mid-level learners: Task 2)
3 0:14 Take Tito
4 0:19 Take Yuto

Excerpt 119 (Mid-level learners: Task 2)
20 11:29 Kyota There is no sought!!
21 11:45 Kyota Sorry doubt!

Excerpt 120 (Mid-level learners: Task 3)
23 14:16 Yama Any ▶ And
24 14:23 Yama sorry

Excerpt 121 (Mid-level learners: Task 3)
20 16:00 Miko It sounds nice a nice word.
Excerpt 122 (Mid-level learners: Task 1)
71 15:01 Yuuto The best point of Thai is cheapness
72 15:12 Yuuto We are students
73 15:19 Take Yes
74 15:37 Take We don't have enough money to visit EU
75 15:48 Yuuto So i hope more chapter trip
76 16:11 Yuuto sorry typo

As these excerpts show, the methods used to fix a spelling error were varied and included the use of an asterisk (Excerpt 116), reformulation of the utterance (Excerpt 117 and Excerpt 118), use of apology and reformulation (Excerpt 119 and Excerpt 120), apology only (Excerpt 121), and apology and an account for it (Excerpt 122; judging from post 71, chapter was a misspelling of cheaper). These excerpts show that participants who fix misspellings display their orientation to the problematicity of the misspelled utterances. On the other hand, although high-level learners did commit what are evidently typos, they did not fix them, which marks an orientation to treating their misspellings as non-problematic. See the following excerpts including the misspelled words “reaseached” in Excerpt 123 and “franky” in Excerpt 124.

Excerpt 123 (High-level learners: Task 1; appeared previously as Excerpt 72)
50 17:50 Miki No far, as I reaseached, using car for 37h... seekers
51 18:04 Fuyu 37h?!?
52 18:24 Fuyu No way!!

Excerpt 124 (High-level learners: Task 2; appeared previously as Excerpt 30)
4 0:50 Rui In it right?
5 1:07 Taro franky i don't think Fuji, skyytree and TK tower would be good
6 1:11 Taro yea
7 1:34 Rui Yeah it doesn't have to be bout japan
6.5.4 Dealing with miscommunication

Miscommunication can be dealt with by several methods. I present several excerpts which are observable as being examples where a possible trouble causing miscommunication is dealt with by the participants themselves. See the following excerpts.

Excerpt 125 (High-level learners: Task 2; appeared previously as Excerpt 33)

16 2:56 Sari Is it okay if we'll have an ambiance like full of nature?
17 3:04 Sari Yeah!!! Definitely
18 3:14 Sari Food on the go but healthy
19 3:23 Haru Explain ambiance????
20 3:25 Haru Plz
21 3:44 Sari This is what I imagine..
22 3:52 Haru Okayyy

In this excerpt, in posts 19 and 20, Haru says, “Explain ambiance????” and “Plz”, respectively. In post 21, Sari says, “This is what I imagine..”. This indicates that Haru’s posts were not analyzed as a clarification request by Sari. In response to this answer, Haru offers “Okayyy”, which is reminiscent of what Firth (1996) calls let it pass, which can be used when hearers have problems in understanding what a speaker has said. Thus, this excerpt shows Haru dealt with this possible miscommunication by not pursuing an answer to her clarification request.

Some participants claim a possible miscommunication through explicitly pointing out its source. See the following excerpt.

Excerpt 126 (Mid-level learners: Task 1)

10 3:15 Shige But I want to go
11 3:29 Shige Bali this vacation!
12 3:51 Ino oh...
13 4:13 Shige What's the matter?
14 5:17 Ino but there are few people
15 5:35 Shige In the island?
In Excerpt 126, in posts 10 and 11, Shige proffers his idea of visiting “Bali”. Ino’s response to it is one word oh, with a three-dot ellipsis in post 12, and this leads Shige to issue a clarification request in post 13. In response to this repair initiation, Ino says, “but there are few people”, which serves as a disagreement with the idea Shige had earlier proffered. Subsequently, Shige again provides a repair initiation in post 15. After about a one-minute time gap, Ino says “your English skill is not enough to talk”. In his following turn, Shige points out that what Ino is talking about is not related to the task they are supposed to be working on (“This isn't the case we have to talk now” prefaced with a stand-alone Wait). Ino does not respond to this move. Instead, after 39 s, Ino gets back to the topic of “Australia”, which is an idea he had proffered in their earlier talk (not presented in the excerpt). Thus, in this excerpt, Shige explicitly displays his understanding that there exists some kind of trouble in communication between the two, while Ino responds to it by changing the topic.

In the following excerpt, a high-level learner also explicitly mentions the possibility that he might have caused a misunderstanding with an apology, which is responded to with a phatic move. See the following excerpt.

**Excerpt 127 (High-level learners: Task 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mei</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5:35</td>
<td>How about monotone arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5:39</td>
<td>Ryu I agree with the modern art!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>5:56</td>
<td>Mei Monotone ones??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>6:01</td>
<td>Ryu Yes! // Combining the monotone arts and the modern arts is much better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>6:09</td>
<td>Ryu Yes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>6:16</td>
<td>Ryu I missed...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>6:26</td>
<td>Mei It's one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Excerpt 127, this dyad had earlier talked about several ideas such as “modern arts”, which were proffered by Mei as ideas for approaches to painting the wall of the cafe (not presented in the excerpt). In post 30, Mei proffers the idea of monotone arts for the first time. In the following post, Ryu offers agreement but, in the course of formulating this agreement, mentions modern art instead of monotone arts which causes Mei to initiate a repair in post 32. In 33, Ryu responds affirmatively to Mei’s suggestion in post 30, which suggests that post 31 was crossed with post 30, and then extends the idea by suggesting that “Combining the monotone arts and the modern arts is much better”. In the following post, Ryu says, “Yes!”, which seems to be a response to Mei’s repair initiation in post 32. In his subsequent post, Ryu displays possible trouble through the post “I missed…”. Subsequently, Mei sends two posts “It’s one” and an okay token, which is taken by Ryu to mean that they should choose “only one painting”, that is, only one idea is permitted by the task instructions. Mei asks a reason for that in the following two posts. At this moment, Ryu offers an apology for making Mei “misunderstood”
with a hesitation token (“…”) and makes a request saying, “Please forget it”. This is accepted by Mei who produces an okay token and a consoling comment (“Dont be so worried--”). In post 46, Ryu provides a reformulation of post 33 (“I think a painting integrating the monotone and the modern art is good!”), which is ratified by Mei with a stand-alone Thanks. In his next post, Ryu uploads a picture as an example of monotone modern art. Subsequent discussion then progresses without apparent trouble. This example suggests that these participants solved the problem of miscommunication by explicitly announcing the existence of a misunderstanding and projecting an offer of a reformulation of a previous utterance.

On the other hand, in the following excerpt, no explicit display of an orientation to miscommunication is observable.

Excerpt 128 (Mid-level learners: Task 1)

9 6:11 Chie Bonsai beach was good plebes.
10 6:40 Chie In Sydney
11 7:19 Chie Do you know it?
12 7:21 Maru Really? // I think I want to go that!! // Bay the way, I want to go Canada! // Because I will go abroad!
13 7:39 Maru I didn't know that:(
14 8:44 Maru Are there some Japanese bonsai?
15 11:44 Chie That's good // bonsai? // bonsai is like a Tree?
16 12:41 Maru yep! Maybe I think so!
17 13:19 Maru What kind of tree do they have?
18 14:25 Chie I don't have tree
19 14:44 Maru Long trees...small trees??
20 15:28 Maru Hmm. It means Australia.
21 15:51 Chie But my house have cactus
22 16:47 Maru Cactus?? What is saying in Japanese??
23 17:12 Maru I don't know it:(
24 17:29 Chie Cactus is saboteurs
25 18:01 Res 3 more minutes!
26 18:02 Maru Oh!! I see!
In this case, a miscommunication seems to be caused by a misspelling of Bondi Beach as “Bonsai Beach” in post 9 (this dyad had been talking about the idea of visiting Australia for their trip). In post 14, Maru extends this topic by asking about “Japanese bonsai” (bonsai is a Japanese art form involving growing miniature trees in pots) in what appears to be a clarification request. In post 15, Chie also provides what looks like a clarification request with some repetition. After this exchange of possible repair initiations, upon Maru’s completion of this repair with an answer of, “yep! Maybe I think so!”, the topic of “trees” is extended by these two participants. In posts 17-21, this topic produces responsive but unclear sequences. Consistent with the topic of trees, in post 21, Chie mentions “cactus”, which is responded to by Maru with a display of insufficient knowledge and an information request in posts 22 and 23. In post 24, Chie provides information to complete a repair sequence (“saboteurs” is probably a misspelling of “saboten”, which means cactus in Japanese). In posts 25 and 26, the first time reminder and Maru’s display of understanding occur with a gap of 1s. Until the second time reminder, neither of participants in this dyad display any orientation to closing the task.

6.6 Task effects

As Excerpt 11 in section 6.3 shows, Task 1 is the most productive for second-idea solicitors, while Task 3 is the least productive. To explore other task effects, one dyad’s methods for topic extension across the three tasks is examined in this section.
Non-topical talk was not examined in terms of task effects because of the limited number of examples.

I will present Risa and Yuko’s methods for extending topics during topical talk across the three tasks. In Task 2 shown in Excerpt 130 (previously shown), Risa introduces her personal knowledge about her friend Mami, which creates an epistemic incongruence and leads to the allocation of different conversational roles to Risa (speaker) and Yuko (listener). On the other hand, Yuko was in the K+ position in extending the topic in Task 1. In Task 3, the epistemic positioning between the two was more dynamically conducted.

Excerpt 129 (High-level learners: Task 1)

18  5:14  Risa  Why? I've never been to Korea so I wanna visit Seoul first
19  5:58  Yuko  Most of my friends visited Busan or Jeju island said "you should go to rural area in Korea"
20  6:17  Yuko  But it is good to visit Seoul first
21  6:34  Yuko  And we can meet our Korean friends there :)
22  6:56  Yuko  Lets go to Seoul then!
23  7:39  Risa  ohh really how about going both Seoul and busan or jeju
24  8:09  Risa  Yea we can meet our friends
25  8:19  Yuko  We'll be rushing for 5days
26  8:25  Risa  But i don't know where my friend lives in
27  8:26  Risa  Hahahaha
28  8:30  Yuko  And it will cost more for moving lol
29  8:52  Risa  How can we get from seoul to busan
30  8:58  Yuko  Mostly Seoul, I think. // If they are university students now
31  9:04  Risa  By train?
32  9:09  Risa  Oh
33  9:16  Yuko  Yes train
34  9:21  Risa  How long?
35  9:39  Yuko  Dont know~~~~
36  9:58  Risa  Oh okay
37 10:01  Risa  So this time
Let's go to Seoul

We should stay in Seoul for the 5 days

I wanna take you to Sam chung dong where we can see how Korean old houses look like

And there is a restaurant i wanna go

Yea wait how many times have you ever been to Korea?

Just once

Guide me around there

What restaurant

But i remember where i visited

Excerpt 130 (High-level learners: Task 2; appeared previously as Excerpt 107)

I have a friend who can paint

Who

Nani

Mami

She's my friend at school

She's sooo good at drawing

Is she good at painting nature things?

Cuz I want nature taste on the wall

Yea she's good

I can ask her

Please

Okayyy I will do that later

Excerpt 131 (High-level learners: Task 3)

I felt I had success when I could play basketball as a starting member in the last competition

It was when i was a junior high schooler

I practiced hard everyday

Oh I know you played basketball in junior high

Keeping to work hard brought me a success
I have heard of it before
You told me before
I remember
What about you
When did you feel succeeded or actually had a success??
umm
I got accepted to university last month.
That's my success i think
And you know what
I can can go to university with less fee!
Because I got the best score
Oh thats good news and seems ur success
On the examination!! Isn't it great
Yea
Yea I'm so happy with it I'm proud of myself hahh
I can call it a big success
Yea and u should keep up with studying lol
yea I know right
I have to keep trying hard
I think I got to the key point // Success is when you feel satisfied and accomplished something by ur effort
You got the point I think the same way

In Task 1 (Excerpt 129), Risa claims the K- position about “Korea” in post 18. Although Yuko did not explicitly display her K+ position by mentioning her experience of having been to Korea, she observably took on the role of information provider or responder. Post 19 suggests that Yuko’s relative epistemic supremacy is supported by the fact that her friends are familiar with Korea. In post 40, Yuko says, “I wanna take you to Sam chung dong where we can see how Korean old houses look like” and “And there is a restaurant i wanna go”, which also supports Yuko’s K+ position. In post 46, Yuko’s experience of visiting Korea is more explicitly displayed. In Task 3 (Excerpt 131), although Yuko relates her personal experience in posts 5-7, Risa claims her access to that knowledge in post 8 (“Oh I know you played basketball in junior high”). In posts
10-12, Risa again claims the K+ position. After Yuko’s second idea solicitor in posts 13 and 14, Risa tells her own story in posts 16-20. This is responded to by Yuko with *Oh*, which often serves as a change-of-state-token in English (Heritage, 1984), and “that’s good news”, which displays her K- position. In the subsequent posts 22-28, Risa gives more information and Yuko provides responses or alignment with Risa’s telling. In posts 29, Yuko says, “I think I got the key point” and proffers an idea for task accomplishment, which is responded to affirmatively with a similar lexico-syntactic form (“You got the point”). Thus, this dyad not only constructed epistemic congruency and adopted more stable roles in the process of extending a topic (Tasks 1 and 2) but were also able to manage stretches of talk in which the conversational roles they occupied changed more dynamically as their epistemic stances changed on a turn by turn basis. It is also noteworthy that Tasks 1 and 2 included more oppositional talk than Task 3. These three excerpts indicate that the topics featured in the different task prompts can trigger epistemic imbalances between the dyadic participants and that can lead to variations in the topic-extending methods they deploy.

6.7 Summary and discussion

In this chapter, I focused on three aspects of the topical talk that occurred between openings and closings: genesis of second ideas, topic extensions for proffered ideas, and non-topical talk. This section provides a summary and discussion of the current chapter with a view to answering the two research questions: 1. How do L2 learners organize three practices, generating second ideas, extending proffered ideas, and doing non-topical talk, during topical talk? (Section 6.6.1); 2. How do interactional practices in these three activities differ between different proficiency levels (Section 6.6.2).

6.7.1 How topical talk is constructed

Given the nature of the tasks, proffering second ideas was not absolutely compulsory. In other words, participants were allowed to proffer only one idea and discuss it for 10-20 minutes. However, the current study revealed several participants’ orientation to a reciprocal kind of interactional practice when generating second ideas. Some first-idea profferers used second idea solicitors in recognizable ways. Some dyads
also reciprocated the same sequence of solicit-proffer turns. In other words, these participants swapped roles as questioner and answerer in the process of generating second ideas. These reciprocal question-answer sequences can be seen in several institutional settings such as AA meetings, where question-answer sequences are reciprocated to create solidarity among participants (Arminen, 2004). Thus, reciprocity in solicit-proffer sequences across the genesis of second ideas can be seen as evidence for participants’ orientation to the institutional nature of the task and the necessity of creating solidarity. On the other hand, other students produced second ideas before finishing talking about the first idea. Several dyads offered multiple ideas without waiting for responses from their partners, which suggests that they are less oriented to the institutional nature of the current discussion tasks and thereby more oriented to their conversational nature.

Once ideas are proffered, both an idea profferer or a responder can extend them. A proffered idea can be extended through various actions such as agreement, disagreement, counterargument, offering supporting information and contributing knowledge or personal experience in order to persuade an interlocutor using a variety of explicit and implicit linguistic and semiotic repertoires. These are social actions and as such, all interactants need the competence to produce them in ways that make them recognizable and meaningful to other interlocutors. However, more fundamentally, the more of these actions that are performed in talk, the more engagement with both self- and other-proffered ideas becomes evident. On the other hand, engaging in topic extension only for self-proffered ideas suggests a lack of competence to perform a wide variety of these social actions in talk-in-interaction.

Discussing topics requires knowledge, which can create epistemic differences between interactants. For instance, when one is extending a topic by relating their own personal experience (whether the topic is based on a self- or other-proffered idea), the two dyadic participants are divided into knowing and not-knowing positions, which affects role divisions between questioner and answerer or teller and responder. In this sense, the reciprocal solicit-proffer sequences used to generate second ideas can be considered more symmetrical. Thus, both the genesis of second ideas and topic extensions, or topical talk in general, offers a site where interactants can construct different roles, and accompanying actions based on these roles, to maintain the progressivity of topical talk.
Although topically empty talk was produced in some task talk, that tended not to be topically extended. In many cases, non-topical talk was conducted in the form of a move without a response or a two-turn sequence after which participants immediately got back to topical talk. Conducting non-topical talk explicitly, such as by offering an apology with sorry tokens, making an announcement of a photo upload, or stating explicitly that the on-going communication is troubled for some reason, makes the interactant’s understanding of the talk’s non-topicality observable. On the other hands, the absence of such non-topical talk displays the interactants’ understanding that there is no trouble in terms of intersubjectivity among all participants (probably including the researcher). Thus, the use of non-topical talk, the degree of explicitness, and the linguistic choices they make, all construct interactants’ competence to make the meaning of their actions recognizable.

Finally, the tasks themselves had some influence on the interactional practices observed during task talk. A variety of social actions occurred in all tasks. For instance, participants were able to disagree about why proffered destinations might or might not be attractive in Task 1, whether suggested designs were suitable for the wall of a café in Task 2, and how success could be best defined in Task 3. All tasks provided participants with the opportunity to draw on personal episodes or supply detailed information and thereby to create uneven epistemic gradients. However, the semantic attributes of each possible idea for task accomplishment differ from task to task. That is clearly reflected in the fact that second idea solicitors such as how about you? were produced much less frequently in Task 3. This is probably because of the difference between the semantic nature of a potential candidate idea between Task 3 (a definition of a word) and Tasks 1 and 2 (a city or country and a design on a café wall). Thus, task differences should be considered when discussing IC to construct both topical and non-topical talk.

### 6.7.2 Proficiency differences

Second idea solicitors such as how about you? were the only quantifiable linguistic items that could be used to examine proficiency differences in the organization of the talk between openings to closings. The finding that high-level dyads rarely used explicit linguistic methods to generate second ideas indicates their orientation to the generic conversational nature of the task talk rather than its institutional nature. On the other hand, lower-proficiency dyads employed second idea
solicitors, which shows that they were more oriented to the necessity of reciprocating question-answer sequences. This is reminiscent of Galaczi’s (2014) finding that less proficient learners produced less overlapping and latching and their interactions looked like walkie-talkie communication, a form of communication where the medium can transmit only one message at a time. For lower-level learners, as either an interactant in text-based CMC or an L2 learner in a task-based interaction (or as both), it is more challenging to deal with time lags and use appropriate target language forms to generate more than one idea in a short space of time due to their limited processing capacity.

The finding that higher-level learners tended to extend other-proffered ideas as well as self-proffered ideas is consistent with Galaczi’s (2014) finding in a paired speaking assessment context. However, the difference between high-level and mid-level dyads topic extensions was that high-level learners more often took on observably different roles in extending the topic, especially when only one of the dyadic participants had access to a particular knowledge domain. In terms of roles and identities, the tendency for high-level learners to produce asymmetric contributions to topic extensions, with clearly divided questioner and answerer or teller and responder roles, is indicative of their ability to manage identities. More specifically, when Yuko and Risa talked about Risa’s friend Mami, who is good at drawing and thereby a suitable candidate to paint the wall of ‘their’ cafe (See Excerpt 107), or when Eiko and Rumi talked about job opportunities and a future internship in a foreign company (See Excerpt 108), their identities are observably constructed as their true, real-life selves. Although it is due to their higher proficiency and higher processing capacity in the target language that high-level learners were more able than their lower-level counterparts to draw upon their personal knowledge and real-life identities when extending a topic, this difference is also consistent with the claim that higher-level learners were more oriented to the conversational, rather than the institutional nature, of the topical talk.

Because of the limited number of cases, proficiency differences in creating non-topical talk were not found as recurrently observable features. A typical feature of high-proficiency learners’ talk was their ability to adjust the explicitness of the methods they used to structure non-topical talk. High-level learners did not make any explicit spelling corrections, while one high-level dyad (Mei and Ryu in Excerpt 127) produced an explicit sequence of an apology for a miscommunication and an empathetic response.
to it. On the other hand, lower-level learners produced more explicit non-topical repairing moves for misspellings, while some miscommunication occurred without a shared orientation to it between dyadic participants (Chie and Maru in See Excerpt 128). Although proficiency differences in non-topical talk were partially similar to those evident in other non-topical parts in the overall structure of the task talk (and I will discuss the comparison of interactional practices between the different phases within the overall interactional event in the following chapter), the findings in this chapter regarding non-topical talk may indicate that higher-proficiency learners, to a greater degree than lower-proficiency learners, tend to produce non-topical talk using particular methods designed for the purpose of maintaining intersubjectivity between participants.

6.7.3 Task effects

Overall, topical talk, including generating second ideas and extending topics triggered by proffered ideas, showed substantial task effects, while non-topical talk tended not to be marked by such notable task effects.

The finding that in terms of the frequency of second-idea solicitors, Task 1 was the most productive and Task 3 was the least, suggests a possible task effect on how participants treated ideas for task accomplishment. In Task 1, typical candidate ideas can be stated quite briefly (the name of a country or a city would often suffice), while deciding upon the definition of a word, the goal for Task 3, is more abstract and candidate ideas are difficult to compose plainly. The nature of the topics triggered by each task also seems to affect how natural it is to use how about you? or other similar expressions to solicit further ideas for task accomplishment after a first idea has been provided.

Prompt differences seem to affect the topic-extending process, where roles and identities are often constructed alongside discussion of the topic triggered by the task prompt. Since Task 3 has no situated setting and simply involves talking about the definition of a word, interactants can draw from their personal perspectives based on their own real-life experiences to extend topics relating to the task. However, Tasks 1 and 2 ask learners to play the role of an imaginary tourist and cafe owner, respectively. That provides learners with identities within the situated setting presented in the task even though the content of their talk is not completely guided by the prompt. Task differences in terms of the presence or absence of a situated setting (Tasks 1 and 2 vs.
Task 3) and the relative distance between the task setting and reality (Task 1 vs. Task 2), seem to play an important role in highlighting proficiency differences in IC and the fine-grained discrimination of these differences.
Chapter 7 Discussion and conclusion

7.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings in the previous three chapters from several perspectives. Section 7.2 provides will discuss the contribution of the current study’s findings to L2 pragmatics research. Section 7.3 is devoted to discussing implications for the construct of IC based on the findings of the current study and literature review. Section 7.4 and Section 7.5 will discuss the pedagogical implications and future directions, respectively. Section 7.6 will conclude the current study.

7.2 Contributions to L2 pragmatics

The current study contributes to the history of the advancement of developmental models of L2 pragmatic competence, the search for better methodologies for measuring it, the exploration of overall structural organizations of task-based interactions as analytic units comprising different types of speech acts, and the consideration of the influences of roles, identities and participation frameworks when examining L2 learners’ pragmatics. This study confirms Kasper and Rose’s (2002) model of the developmental pathway of L2 pragmatics when it comes to individual learners. This indicates that the proficiency control for the current study was valid and able to discriminate developmental differences in L2 pragmatic ability.

The low-proficiency learners tended to exhibit less linguistic and sequential repertoires in their attempts to manage each section of the overall structure of task talk, which shows that they were at a pre-basic stage with some indications of an ability to handle formulaic expressions. When both proffering the first idea for task accomplishment in opening task talk, low-proficiency learners depended on I-want formula. Likewise, when exchanging questioning and answering roles, they tended to use how-about-you? formula. The linguistic variations for telling the researcher once their discussion is done to close the task talk were also limited. This study did not capture how low-level learners attempted to make a pragmatics choice depending on social contexts, how they managed sequentially extended interactions, and how their turns are fine-turned to be designed to specific recipient.
On the other hand, the high-proficiency learners demonstrated a wider variety of interactional repertoires including several rare methods found only in the data they produced. It were only high-level learners who contingently unpack what otherwise could be formalized into common interactional repertoires in collaboration with the researcher who monitoring their talk. It were only they who increase turns and sequences of turns through talking about their real-life experiences, which required sequential expansions and fine-turned actions to the other participant in a dyad, whether they are constructing preliminaries to providing the first idea for task accomplishment or extending a topic. These methods can be roughly categorized into the more frequent use of preambles, more extended interactions and more evidence of recipient design, which accords with the pragmatic expansion and fine-tuning stages in Kasper and Rose’s model of L2 pragmatic development.

However, this study suggests that developmental trajectories can be different at an individual level. For instance, in this section, Rumi and Yuki increased the number of interactional practices they used for doing preliminaries in task openings across the three tasks, while Ino and Shige ceased to create greeting sequences in their task openings. One explanation is that the former dyad were high-level learners and the latter were mid-level learners. Rumi and Yuki’s interaction contained a variety of seemingly playful behaviors and instances of humour, while Ino and Shige never showed such elements. Given that each learner and each dyad of learners had their own style and goal-orientation when proceeding with task talk via text chat, it is difficult to only call an increase of interactional repertoires for greetings in task openings evidence of the development of L2 pragmatics but to call a decrease something different. Thus, this study suggests that the process of ceasing a particular interactional practice should be counted as evidence of L2 pragmatic development and a diversification of methods.

Through employing task-based interaction, the current study has provided insight into the use of elicited interaction (Taguchi & Roever, 2017) as data to investigate L2 interactional ability. The current study’s decision-making tasks were controlled enough to examine pre-determined L2 pragmatic behaviors or speech acts such as first-idea proffers (FIPs) since the task prompts instructed participants to decide on one idea for task accomplishment. The necessity of FIPs allowed participants to be oriented to second and further candidate ideas for accomplishing the task. This aspect was less controlled because it was not essential to proffer multiple ideas in order to
complete the task successfully. Likewise, because of the task instructions, the speech act of calling the researcher was pre-determined. However, how paired learners projected and moved into the closing of their task talk, and even whether or not the speech act was successfully achieved, were not controlled. This indicates that the tasks showed a similarity to natural conversation as interactional data for the investigation of L2 learners’ pragmatics.

By focusing on the overall structural organization of task talk, the current study was able to examine all 159 task interactions with the same analytic target. Focusing on a certain section of the overall structure of talk is fundamentally different from pre-targeting speech acts such as disagreements since the former is universal, while the latter is more contingent upon local contexts. That enabled the study to use a speech act approach and CA in combination. Agreements were analyzed as one of many resources used for projecting an upcoming task closing. Disagreements were noted as an observable feature apparent in participants’ topic extensions. In other words, agreements and disagreements were not foregrounded as social actions as such but considered as single functions that combined with other actions. The occurrence of agreements between dyadic participants was reasonably expected but not controlled in designing the task. Thus, pre-targeting openings and closings, the two polar points of the overall structural organization of talk-in-interaction, has been found to have great potential as a methodology for conducting L2 pragmatics research aimed at both investigating previously theorized concepts and also at exploring unknown phenomena in interaction.

This study also highlights the benefits of focusing on and comparing all three overall structural sections as each of them serves as a different pragmatic investigation tool. Task openings seem to lend themselves to examining quantitative tendencies in learners’ pragmatics abilities since openings cannot be ‘failed’ and feature mostly linguistic, sequential, and temporal variations. Given that some sequential variations are codable and countable, the researcher can focus on quantitative tendencies according to his or her own research interest. On the other hand, task closings were able to be classified into more fundamentally different types based on whether or not participants could construct the whole closing ritual by themselves. In other words, to look at task closings as a device for investigating learners’ pragmatic abilities, we may need to examine a larger trajectory of actions towards the actual final utterance. The nature of a
task affects the nature of task closings and task openings in different ways although both sections can provide unique opportunities to elicit participants’ additional efforts (such as phatic exchanges, evaluative moves, prefatory talk and repairing talk) to maintain intersubjectivity among all online interactants. Topical talk showed more variety between dyads and was thereby less controlled as an analytic device for L2 pragmatics except when codable linguistic forms or actions were able to be identified. Topical talk seems to be similar to task closings in that it is generally more suited to qualitative analysis and quantification of interactional practices can only be partially achieved. On the other hand, it provides just as much data for investigating learners’ roles and identities as preliminaries in task openings. Thus, each overall structural organization has its own utility as an analytic tool for L2 pragmatics.

This study also provided some insights into how learners’ roles and identities within a given participation framework are formed in the different overall structural sections. In task openings and topical talk, participants assumed roles such as questioner-answerer or teller-responder based on epistemic imbalances or their real-life, task external identities. In that sense, both task openings and topical talk provided more opportunities for participants to make relevant the knowledge they held as members of a society, which is independent of the context or situations assigned by the task. In task openings and closings, it was more important to consider the participation framework of task talk, as task talk is embedded in a wider social encounter, where there are participants with different degrees of participation or different participation statues. This study’s investigation of roles, identities and participation frameworks was conducive to discriminating advanced-level learners’ behaviors in each overall structural section from those displayed by lower-level learners. That is presumably because some of the advanced learners in the current study were able to display specific identities as members of a society who were not only learning L2 English as university students but also had various external activities in their daily lives. In that sense, this study argues that advanced learners’ pragmatic ability to handle roles, identities and participation frameworks in interaction is a significant aspect of their L2 pragmatic ability.

Finally, the current study’s focus on task effects contributed to a relatively underexamined methodological perspective, namely, variations in learners’ performance across tasks of the same type but with different prompts. Since the tasks had differences in degree of difficulty and situational setting allowing for the construction of learners’
roles and identities, the current study documented a more detailed snapshot for each dyad’s L2 pragmatic performances and captured more fine-grained proficiency differences than would have been the case had the design featured only a single task. Furthermore, this study suggests a potential interaction effect between proficiency and task (prompt) differences. This effect was observed in the examination of topical talk, where both proficiency and task prompt strongly affect the frequency of second-idea solicitors. Thus, it is important to explore variations in learners’ pragmatic competence by implementing several tasks with different prompts in order to avoid underrepresenting the construct of IC.

7.3 Implications for the construct of IC

The current study has implications for the debate over the definition of IC. The construct of an ability to communicate was defined by Hymes (1972, 1974) as a collection of multiple components such as interpersonal communication skills and the ability to manage trouble according to different situations involving various cultural factors. In reconsideration of the single-turn-based methodological orientation in the area of L2 pragmatics and calls for a specification of SLA concepts, methodologies that have the capacity to analyze sequence organizations of interactive data such as CA have been being used more and more. This has been accompanied by the development and revision of models of the construct of the ability to communicate with others, or IC. Young’s (2008, 2011) model, classifying IC into linguistic, sequential, and identity resources, has been suitable for the investigation of particular pragmalinguistic forms and speech acts (Taguchi, 2015). On the other hand, Hall and Pekarek Doehler’s (2011) model defined IC as the interactional methods participants use to systematically organize social order in each episode of institutional talk-in-interaction and is centrally based on CA.

The current research took a neutral position by adopting both CA and speech-act-oriented analytic standpoints. This analytic mentality allows researchers to both code and quantify tendencies in the observable interactional methods used by participants when necessary, as well as to qualitatively analyze interactive data including rare cases. This research was conducted based on the assumption that overall structural organizations are a basic building block of human-to-human interaction and
pre-targeting them does not go against CA’s mentality. The study identified linguistically codable ‘first’ turns in a two-turn sequence, such as sequences for generating first ideas in task openings or the first part of a terminal exchange in task closings, and those were targeted as speech acts for analysis. The researcher did not engage in motivated looking to code and quantify participants’ interactional repertoire. Rather, codability emerged through unmotivated looking at each section of the overall structure of task talk and the feasibility of coding was different in each section of the overall structure.

Once target interactional practices or speech acts were determined and further analyzed in terms of the relationship between such interactional features and participants’ proficiency levels, the major findings of the current study were consistent with the findings of previous L2 studies in that more competent L2 learners tended to produce preambles, extended sequences and more recipient design (e.g., Al-Gahtani & Roever 2012, 2014, 2018; Balaman & Sert, 2017; Galaczi, 2014; Gonzales, 2013; González-Lloret, 2008, 2011; Hellermann, 2007, 2008, 2011; Hellermann & Cole, 2008; Ishida, 2009; Pekarek Doehler & Berger 2016; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2011). The findings also confirmed Kasper and Rose’s (2002) model of the developmental trajectory of L2 pragmatics, which has to date mainly been investigated in speech-act-based studies. As Hall and Pekarek Doehler (2011) point out, IC is a complex constellation of knowledge and abilities to deploy available linguistic and semiotic resources in interaction, whether spoken or non-spoken, to make participants own interactional moves more analyzable as having a certain meaning when speaking/writing and to understand what an interlocutor is doing when listening/reading. IC also involves speech acts whose meaning is pre-determined, such as did you have some/any other problem? (Heritage and Robinson, 2011) in doctor-patient consultations or can I borrow your car? in role plays for language learning between a roleplay conductor and a learner (Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012) and, in the current research, where do you wanna go?, what do you wanna paint?, or what is success?, because of institutional expectations.

How identities are constructed in interaction is a very important aspect of L2 learners’ IC. Kasper (2004) highlighted the way in which an L2 learner’s identity was interactionally constructed as a language learner, while her identity was also constructed as a general conversationalist when she produced an interactional practice in her L1
because her L2 linguistic knowledge was not sufficient to perform that practice in her L2. In the current study, some high-proficiency learners jointly reformulated crossed closing rituals using L1 Japanese to maintain intersubjectivity among all participants including the researcher (Excerpt 81 and Excerpt 82). These methods, a low proficiency learner’s code-switching to reciprocate a *how are you* sequence in Kasper’s (2004) data (although I am only assuming that her proficiency was low based on the fact she could not say *how are you* in her L2) and the high-proficiency learners’ code-switching to L1 to reformulate task closing rituals, suggest that IC is not only an issue of L2 proficiency but also an issue of roles and identities in a particular cultural or institutional setting. In other words, language learners can display their identity as a conversationalist in their daily lives anytime regardless of proficiency levels but proficiency affects how and where they are able to display it (in this study, it was only high-level learners who employed code-switching of the type described above). The decision-making tasks adopted in the current study, although the participants’ task-based interactions were elicited for research purposes, led to socially consequential interactions in that sense (Huth, 2010). This has an important implication for the debate over the definition of IC. ‘L2 IC’ may be a more suitable term when the research is embedded in a context where all participants are oriented to a common goal of constructing all interactional practices in a particular L2. Examples of such contexts include language learning settings with a learning objective of enhancing IC using L2 only (Abe, 2019) or language testing practices with clear assessment criteria (Galaczi, 2014; Youn, 2015), where failure to display L2 IC has certain stakes. Otherwise, where language learner’s identities are interactionally shaped either as a learner or as a member of a society, the standalone term ‘IC’ may be more suitable. To investigate this latter IC, not only CA-based analytic concepts centred around the building blocks of talk-in-interaction, but also analytic add-ons such as a theory of participation frameworks (Clark & Carlson, 1982; Goffman, 1981), can be used.

This study provides some insights into the wider area of applied CA including IC research and especially the narrower field of CA for text-based CMC in terms of temporality and multi-modality.

Temporality is an important resource for interactants in online text-chat interactions. The observation that the present data included non-responsive sequences shows that interactants need to use extra effort to make their utterances recognizable as
responses directed to prior utterances or stretches of talk. Such efforts include offering laughter, apologies or any other tokens that problematize crossed messages. The observable problematizing of crossed messages is one indication of interactants’ orientation to the turn-taking machinery and the adjacent pairs. Participants adopting problematizing stances towards crossed messages also allows us to see the interactional norms to which they are oriented. Task openings with two crossed idea-soliciting moves and task closings with crossed messages involving one participant’s summons and the other participant’s continuation of task (topical) talk break the norm of the adjacency pair. The use of adjacency pairs is observably regarded as a normative behavior to begin and end the task-based text-chat interactions and the ability to manage medium-specific temporality is essential to maintain progressivity of task talk in a SCMC environment.

The current study also observed several multi-modal interactional resources. This study is based on Stivers and Rossano’s (2010) approach as well as Schegloff’s (2007) conceptualization of the sequence organization of turns and responses. There were various possible response-mobilizing cues in dyadic participants’ utterances. For instance, one participant uploaded a photo and another participant offered a change-of-state token and an assessment in response (Excerpt 113 and Excerpt 127). On the other hand, the data showed that one participant displayed her evaluation of the difficulty of the task, and thereby her troubled situation, with a smiling and crying emoticon and the other showed his agreeing stance by sending a sticker, a large-sized emoticon, displaying a similar facial expression. In these examples, various semiotic resources that are only available in text-based CMC were used.

This research showed that a competent user of an online communication medium can maintain intersubjectivity or display affiliative stances by managing medium-specific temporality and exploiting available multi-modal online resources even though they have no access to the same audiovisual resources that are available in face-to-face spoken interactions. In that sense, this study’s custom-made transcription and analytic procedures optimized for the sequential analysis of crossed messages and response-mobilizing resources is a new development in the field of CA for text-based CMC.

In summary, the current study revealed the following as a definition of IC in L2 task-based text-chat interaction. IC for text-based SCMC is:
(1) access to linguistic repertoires to compose single turns in a way that is recipient
designed and to sequential repertoires to construct different two-turn sequences,
preambles and insert expansions
(2) ability to manage medium-specific synchronicity, semiotic resources and
participation frameworks
(3) resources to construct roles and identities, including the ability to relate personal
knowledge, and make one’s own stance and epistemic positioning manifest

7.4 Pedagogical implications

There are several pedagogical implications of the current study. First, this
study suggests a potential benefit of explicit instruction for L2 pragmatics in text-based
SCMC. The finding that low-proficiency learners were more inclined to open up task
talk with proffer-proffer sequences, while highly proficient learners tended to produce
preliminaries or at least questions (i.e., solicit-proffer sequence) to construct two-turn
sequences, suggests the importance of the knowledge that preliminaries or adjacency
pairs are basic aspects of (L2) IC. Another finding was that more learners observably
displayed their orientation to the problematic nature of crossed posts in task openings
and task closings. This suggests the importance of collaboratively achieving adjacency
with responsiveness between messages in the beginning and end sections of the overall
structural organization of task talk. Explicit instruction concerning adjacency pairs to
signal the boundaries of the overall structural organization of talk with typically used
linguistic devices (e.g., the first-idea solicitor what do you think? for opening moves or
pre-closings, okay for closing moves) will hopefully strengthen the foundation of
students’ pragmalinguistic competence to manage online text-based communication.

Second, this study highlights the importance of task design in facilitating
learners’ development of IC to manage locally emergent contingencies. Some
participants collaboratively attempted to create their own methods to maintain
intersubjectivity among all interactants (including the researcher) when unforeseen
circumstances occurred. Those dyads successfully avoided any repetition of the same
trouble in subsequent tasks. This sort of learning opportunity arises only when learners
are faced with a decision-making task with a time limit. Thus, not only the content of a
decision-making task, but also the time limit for completing the task-based talk, are
central components for task design. In such non-standardized learner-centered language learning, learners’ identity construction is an important resource to construct IC with interlocutors. Thus, relatively extended time ranges may be preferable to allow more opportunities for participants to do more identity construction through ACMC. Tasks whose outcomes are not strictly determined may also be beneficial in providing greater opportunities for learners to develop generic IC.

Given that there may be interactants who can only demonstrate their synchronous interactive capability through text-based CMC because of difficulty in managing face-to-face communications, and that IC in the written mode is an important skill in some professions (e.g., marketers, librarians, or mental health professionals), both explicit teaching of L2 pragmatics and incidental, student-centered learning in text-based CMC settings are important in language learning. In designing tasks to teach target pragmalinguistic forms (e.g., speech acts for requesting), it may be important to consider a trade-off between task difficulty and attention to language forms (Skehan, 1998) or to take advantage of task complexity to encourage more accurate and complex language performance (Robinson, 2001). By designing more goal-specific tasks, such as information gap tasks, where learners are more oriented to task outcomes it is possible to elicit more goal-oriented IC (e.g., Balaman & Sert, 2017). It is probably most important for teachers to decide the purpose of the task, or in other words, to decide what aspect of IC is to be developed. For that purpose, needs analyses or the adoption of game-based tasks in technology-enhanced TBLT are important (González-Lloret & Ortega, 2014; Sykes, 2014).

Finally, the current tasks may be a uniquely practical way of assessing L2 pragmatic ability to manage interaction. The chat-based tasks may be a less practical way to assess L2 pragmatic ability to manage multi-turn sequences than written scripts consisting of multi-turn conversational sequences (e.g., Roever, Fraser, & Elder, 2014). However, this method may be a more practical option to obtain natural interactions without using any audio or video instruments, which requires consistent and stable access to the Internet and is thereby more costly. The records of interactive performance via text-chat discussion can be more easily collected given that global social networking services tend to have large servers and written scripts tend to involve smaller file sizes. These features peculiar to text-based SCMC media (i.e., persistence of messages, relative ease of access to records of messages, and possibly lower cost and possibility of
troubles) could provide an alternative to enhance the practicality of assessment for L2 interaction.

7.5 Limitations and future directions

The tasks used in the study had limited task authenticity. González-Lloret and Ortega (2014) point out five key components that define a task in computer-mediated task-based language teaching (TBLT): primary focus on meaning, goal orientation, learner-centeredness, holism, and reflective learning. The current tasks meet the focus-on-meaning criteria and were sufficiently goal-oriented. However, they were not designed to meet learners’ needs and wants, which can be best analyzed through conducting a proper needs analysis. For instance, in Task 2, participants needed to think about the design of the wall of a cafe which may have been quite removed from their real-life experiences and future language activities, even if their processes of initiating, extending, and finishing topical talk via the LINE system were daily routinized activities for them. There was, therefore, a lack of connection between real life language use and the language needed to complete the tasks. In addition, there were no opportunities for learners to reflect knowledge co-constructed with other online interactants. These considerations should be taken into account when designing L2 text-based SCMC tasks for the purpose of teaching pragmatic knowledge and IC. Also, this study did not involve real-world consequences (such as would have been the case if performances on the tasks were assessed and this contributed to their final class grades), which has been show to impact talk (Ewald, 2012, Stokoe, 2013).

In addition, this study involved a relatively small number of dyads at each proficiency level, who spoke the same L1 (although participants had varying degrees of overseas experience), and came from a similar sociocultural, and socio-economic background. Individual differences such as study-abroad experiences, familiarity with and experience using text-based SCMC, or even their smartphone functions (i.e., operating system, etc.) should be taken into account. These individual differences may affect learners’ resources to design turns and sequence organization, as well as their processing capacity to deal with turn-taking. Technical affordances in learners’ own communication devices (such as smartphones) are interesting factors possibly fostering or prohibiting certain interactional practices in text-only conditions, although what
functions they use may not be known to their interlocutors (e.g., whether an interactant uses a voice recognition system or not is unknown to their interlocutors). This study used only one text-chat application (LINE), where a message-in-progress is not signaled with a three-dot image or what Meredith (2017:43) calls a “writing icon” in the chat window. Although there is no guarantee that the writing icon would appear in exactly the same way on each interactant’s smartphone screen (i.e., that it would be a common interactional resources to all interactants), it would be interesting to compare different communication platforms with the same text-based SCMC nature.

Research using various communication media allowing different levels of synchronicity, multi-modal resources and featuring different communication modules (i.e., video and text chat) needs to be conducted to further explore medium-specific IC. What the current study, as well as some previous studies on text-based CMC, suggests is that the constraints present in text-only environments (which are absent in face-to-face spoken conversation) are used by participants as resources (e.g., González-Lloret, 2015; Antaki et al., 2006). Given that asynchronous media allows users to talk to each other synchronously as well as asynchronously, how the sequentiality of messages and participants’ roles are interactionally constructed is an important question for IC research. For instance, Balaman (2016), investigating multi-modal IC in online interactions including voice chat, cursor movements, and images on a webpage or a video, suggests that the coordination of various on-screen resources involving a task interface featuring multiple windows is becoming a required competence to deal with computer-mediated educational settings. Investigating both online text-editing and text-chatting activities in one window, Abe (2019) explored how text-chatting serves as a clue to make social actions in text-editing more recognizable as well as acting as a communication tool that participants use to advance their online group work. These IC studies suggest the complex nature of the temporal and semiotic resources that are used to demonstrate IC in each CMC medium. Future studies will preferably explore not only text-only interactions (e.g., email exchanges, internet forum discussions, etc.) but also the interaction between text-only interaction and spoken interaction containing audiovisual cues (e.g., interactions of comments on YouTube or similar video streaming sites, online synchronous multi-party games, etc.) to further explore the nature of text-based or written IC. In parallel with that, learning behaviors in emergent new media
need to be closely documented with updated definitions of IC and tailor-made conversation analytic tools.

7.6 Concluding remarks

In the current study, I have attempted to examine how L2 learners construct IC in dyadic L2 task-based text-chat interaction. While the CA investigation of the current data provided evidence of different ways of constructing IC, there are still aspects of the interactional practices deployed during task talk that remain unexplored. This research provided insights into IC research methodology, specifically regarding how to apply CA to the analysis of text-based CMC without compromising CA’s analytic mentality, how to explore task- and medium-specific resources previous studies have never found, how to explore the potential of overall structural organizations such as openings and closings for the purpose of measuring L2 learners’ pragmatic competence and IC, and how to discuss CA findings from the perspective of L2 pragmatics instruction. These contributions were only possible through referring to both historically evolving methodological instruments in the field of ILP and notions from the long-standing debate around IC and its theoretical devices as well as the analytic principles of CA, which is sufficiently robust to analyze how L2 learners construct online text-based interaction in response to a decision-making task. Through letting codable and quantifiable linguistic and sequential features emerge through unmotivated looking at openings, closings, and the topical talk in between in the overall structural organization of task-based text-chat interaction, and qualitatively analyzing the roles and identities that learners constructed, this study not only found common ground with previous CA research investigating mundane conversation and IC research examining spoken interactions, but also explored previously under-researched aspects of IC. It would be interesting to further explore what methods L2 learners use to make their social actions more recognizable, analyzable and accountable to all interactional partners with different participation statuses in text-only or other online communications. At the conclusion of this thesis, I would like to highlight two things regarding IC research. First, IC research is aimed at obtaining an interdisciplinary understanding of interactional phenomena so that professionals from different fields can discuss the same topic. Second, when it comes to IC research in language learning
areas, it is important to note that a learner’s identity is not always constructed as a learner but can be constructed as any real-life category relevant to the ongoing interaction even when he or she is engaging in task-based interaction. Based on these principles, more IC research in different fields will hopefully be conducted through active definitional debate and the development of tailor-made methods to investigate human-to-human interactions involving different modalities and resources and will take full advantage of the robustness of CA, as well as its analytic add-ons, as a toolset for sequential analysis and the exploration of interactants’ identity construction.
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