

# Task repetition and interactional competence: designing a rubric for use in the classroom

Paul Stone  
Matthew Kershaw

学習院大学外国語教育研究センター  
『言語・文化・社会』第17号（2019）抜刷  
2019. 3. 31

# Task repetition and interactional competence: designing a rubric for use in the classroom

Paul Stone  
Matthew Kershaw

## 1. Introduction

*Interactional competence* (IC) has gained recognition as an important aspect for learners to develop as they become competent speakers of a second language (Young 2011), and it has become a central concern for much research into second language acquisition. While IC builds on previous theories of communicative competence, there are significant differences that distinguish IC. For example, where communicative competence is seen as an individual characteristic, IC involves a shared context that is built through the collaborative efforts of interactional partners (Kramsch 1986). Young (2011) suggests that IC can be developed by learners' analysis of interaction within particular contexts of social interaction. In this paper, we introduce our initial and ongoing attempts to develop pedagogical tools to use in the classroom with the aim of improving learners' IC in the classroom. We aim specifically to address and improve Japanese university learners' L2 IC in classroom group discussions.

Despite concerted efforts by the Japanese government to improve the English communicative ability of Japanese students, Nishino and Watanabe (2008) argue that communicative teaching methods are still not prevalent in Japanese schools. For a number of reasons, it is said that many teachers still primarily practice the traditional grammar translation method, and conduct teacher-centred lessons. In addition, reading comprehension is often the focus of classes due to the prominence of reading passages in high-school and university entrance tests.

Japanese students who wish to study abroad may find that this relative lack of attention to spoken interactional practices in the classroom can contribute to a lack of readiness to participate in classroom interactions when overseas. Studies have found that international students do sometimes struggle to participate in spoken classroom activities in an L2, and that this may lead to feelings of frustration (Chen, 2003; Kim, 2006; Lee, 2009). Nakane (2003), for example, found that Japanese learners studying in Australia were comparatively silent and struggled to take turns, suggesting that this may be because of a lack of familiarity with classroom interaction patterns (p. 302). One particular classroom context that many students may need to participate in is the group discussion, and in a detailed study of Japanese university students' classroom discussions, Hauser (2009) observed that, rather than developing discussions together, the participants took it in turns to state their opinions unchallenged, so that the interaction had a fairly monologic character that did not so much resemble a discussion. Rather than there being competition for turns to talk, as is the case in everyday conversations, instead there were often long stretches of silence between turns. It may be inferred from these studies that one problem faced by students in study-abroad contexts could be their L2 IC, and that this may cause barriers to classroom participation.

With the above in mind, we aim to raise awareness of IC in the context of classroom group discussions and introduce a method to operationalize IC in the classroom. To achieve this, our aim is to develop a rubric for students to self-assess their performances in group discussions. Rubrics have been developed for use by raters to assess learners' interactional skills in spoken English tests (e.g. Youn, 2015; Ikeda, 2017). However, less research seems to have been conducted involving the use of rubrics for student self-evaluation of IC in the classroom. One attempt to use such a rubric in the classroom has been undertaken at Rice University ("Assessing interactional competence in the classroom: using a rubric", n.d.), where foreign language teachers are trained to understand and make use of IC in their classes. While the focus of the online materials is to develop teachers' abilities

to assess IC in the classroom, the rubric is also designed for use by learners, and focuses on topic expansion, clarification, and participation. This rubric was designed in part to be simple and easy to use. While we also hope to develop a rubric that students can use easily, we also hope to develop something with a little more detail than the rubric developed at Rice University. This rubric also appears to be primarily designed for use by teachers and L1 English speakers learning another language. In our project, while we aim to develop a rubric in English, the intention is for Japanese learners and teachers of English to use it. Part of the development of our rubric will involve creating statements that Japanese learners can understand and make use of during self-evaluation. Furthermore, the Rice University rubric appears to ask the student to assess their own individual performance, while we intend to ask learners to assess the group's interaction as a whole.

So, by adapting rubrics from literature largely based on testing, as well as the rubric developed at Rice University, it is our aim to create a rubric for use in Japanese university classrooms to encourage students to notice and develop their own IC in small-group discussions. Furthermore, students will watch video recordings of group discussions by various levels of English learners, in order to provide language models and to demonstrate how more advanced speakers manage interactions. By applying the rubric to these model discussions, the students will learn how to analyze videos of their own discussions and self-assess their performance with the same rubric. By repeating this task throughout the semester, this study aims to develop IC by both raising students' awareness of aspects of their interactions, and providing specific feedback and learning objects that can be incorporated into their performance.

The authors plan to carry out a study at two Japanese universities using the resources and methods described here. One purpose of this current paper is to introduce and position our study by reviewing the research that has informed it. This paper will therefore begin with a general introduction to IC, before describing research into the development of L2 IC. Further sections will then look at assessing

IC and studies that investigate the use of task-repetition. Finally, an explanation of the study to be conducted will be provided, including a presentation of the rubric in its current stage of development. By making public our rubric now, we hope to encourage other teachers and researchers to also make use of and develop it, and welcome any feedback on the use of the rubric with learners.

## 2. An introduction to interactional competence

Chomsky (1965, 1966) famously separated cognition from behaviour when he made a distinction between *competence* and *performance*, with *competence* being the knowledge that an idealized community of speakers has about a language, and *performance* being the actual use of that language in interactions. According to Chomsky, language is a fixed property of the human mind and consists of abstract rules and principles. The rules of a language, which a speaker of a language knows implicitly, are referred to as *linguistic competence*, and this competence allows speakers to both produce and understand utterances. *Performance* itself, on the other hand, is the often faulty use of this language in real life. On this view, the study of language needs to focus on the abstract system in the brain (Gass, 1998, p. 88), as we cannot study the language system by investigating a corrupt *performance* that does not represent it accurately.

While SLA has historically been dominated by this perspective, Firth and Wagner (1997, p. 286-8) note that there has been an influential “socio-anthropological” strand to SLA research. Hymes (1964, 1972), for example, challenged Chomsky’s notion of *linguistic competence* as it did not allow for the social knowledge that individuals need in order to understand utterances and communicate appropriately. Hymes proposed a very different idea of competence with the concept of *communicative competence*, and this launched a more social view of language. Arguing that linguistic features develop from social functions, Hymes proposed focusing on the ability to use language, suggesting that there are rules of use, and that without these the rules of grammar would be useless (1972, p.

278). That is, it is not enough to possess knowledge about a language, as a speaker needs the ability to communicate in actual interactions.

Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) developed this concept and put forward four competences that together constitute communicative competence: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, strategic competence and discourse competence. So, while Chomsky's view was that competence is the knowledge of language possessed by individual speakers, communicative competence includes the more social aspects of the ways in which communication works in practice.

Following this more social perspective, English language teaching (ELT) has been dominated for a number of years by communicative approaches that see interaction as being both the goal of learning and also the means through which the goal is achieved (Bax, 2003; Richards, 2006). These approaches were first developed with the aim of improving learners' communicative competence, or their ability to communicate effectively in the target language. Rather than focussing on language as an abstract system, the communicative approaches place emphasis on the individual learner in a social context, and help us understand the knowledge and skills needed to use language in order to communicate in specific situations.

However, Young (2013, p. 17) argues that this focus on the individual should be problematized, as "abilities, actions, and activities do not belong to the individual but are 'jointly' constructed by 'all' participants". Instead of communicative competence, we should therefore be looking at interactional competence (IC). IC "cannot be reduced to an individual participant's competence" (Kasper and Wagner, 2014, p. 28), and rather than being what a person knows of language, "it is what a person *does* together with others" (Young, 2011, p. 430).

IC is a broad concept (Galaczi, 2013, p. 572) that does not just include language, but involves "the development of 'methods' for action" (Pekarek Doehler and Pochon-Berger, 2016, p. 2). That is, IC is concerned with how

interactions are managed using particular methods (Walsh, 2014), and IC researchers attempt to uncover “the fine-grained techniques that are needed to successfully engage in L2 interaction” (Pekarek Doehler and Berger, 2016, p. 1). These methods for organizing interactions include the ways in which turns are taken in conversations, problems are resolved, conversations are opened and closed, and so on (Barraja-Rohan, 2011, p. 481; Pekarek Doehler and Berger, 2016, p. 2). IC can, therefore, be seen as what people need in order to get by in interactions (Walsh, 2012, p. 2).

IC is not seen as a general ability that is applied to all contexts equally, but is instead highly context specific. Different methods are needed for different situations, as the resources needed for ordering a cup of coffee (for example) differ from those needed to take part in a conversation (Walsh, 2014, p. 4). Young (2008, p. 101) suggests that we can observe IC in particular discursive practices, which are “recurring types of face-to-face interaction that are significant for particular social and cultural groups” (Young, 2013, p. 15). Particular discursive practices have particular resources that are specific to them, and we can only acquire competence in a practice by participating in it (Young, 2013, p. 32). So, on this view, individuals do not acquire a general communicative competence, but instead develop specific IC for specific practices.

The focus on interaction, rather than language, allows us to look at all of the abilities learners have that allow them to take part in interactions, rather than on their deficiencies as speakers (Hall and Pekarek Doehler, 2011). IC studies reveal how learners develop resources which become more context-sensitive, and IC development “basically involves a growing ability to design turns and actions so as to provide for their fittedness to the local circumstantial detail of the ongoing interaction, allowing for increased ‘local efficacy’ of interactional conduct” (Pekarek Doehler and Pochon-Berger, 2016, p. 21).

Conversation analysis (CA) has played an important role in helping researchers to develop understandings of what IC looks like in practice. From a CA

perspective, social interaction is the “primordial site of human sociality” (Schegloff, 2006, p. 70), and is not seen as being chaotic and random, but rather as displaying order at all levels. CA researchers have studied naturally occurring interactions to detail the interactional structures of conversation, such as the ways in which turns are taken (Sacks et al., 1974). The social structures of interaction that CA researchers have uncovered are argued to be the common-sense knowledge of the members of a society, or in other words, their interactional competence (Hall, 2018, p. 28). These structures are observable, and can be seen in the methods that people use when maintaining order in an interaction. CA researchers are, in other words, attempting to document the universal structures that underlie, or the methods that organize, social life.

As discussed above, IC does not exist in the abstract, but in particular contexts (Hellermann, 2018, p. 51), and it is developed socially through discovery. Learners need to learn the linguistic ways in which particular social actions are accomplished by participating in a trial-and-error way in interactions with others. All of this means that teaching IC is not necessarily a straightforward endeavor. Waring (2018, 57) argues that it is not simply a matter of designing classroom activities, but requires a clear understanding of what needs to be taught; that is, what the development of IC looks like (see the next section for a more detailed discussion of this). So, while a gradient view of competence is at odds with a CA approach, in which the focus is on description rather than evaluation, Waring (2018, p. 61) argues that there is profit to be had in teaching students some of the practices common amongst expert speakers. She suggests that in order to be able to teach the things that enable successful interaction, as captured in the concept of IC, we should shift the focus away from the idea of *competence* and onto *practices* (seen as the methods of interaction that are the manifestation of IC). These practices include turn-taking practices, sequencing practices (e.g. “thank you” is not always the most appropriate response to a compliment), overall structuring practices, and the ways in which speakers address troubles in speaking, hearing, and

understanding. Although we still have a very limited understanding of what these practices actually are, Waring argues that this does not make the existing findings of research worthless, and we should be making these available to students.

Eskildsen (2018a, p. 73) proposes that L2 teaching should be concerned with making *semiotic resources* (which are conceived of as routinized patterns of language use) available for learners to notice and appropriate. And like Waring, Hall (2018, p. 25) also proposes moving away from the idea of competence, suggesting instead the concept of *interactional repertoires* to refer to the objects of L2 learning. She argues that, while the concept of IC has been important in enriching our understanding of the social nature of learning, it has been less clear how it enhances our understanding of learning objects, because IC is used to refer to both learners' competence and the linguistic and other resources that they develop.

### 3. Research into the development of L2 IC

Hall and Pekarek Doehler (2011) have written that IC consists of knowledge of social contexts, types of communicative activities, and the typical trajectories of these activities, and that it allows participants to interact with one another. Table 1, which is taken from Ikeda (2017, p. 12), provides an overview of the abilities underlying IC as outlined by Kasper (2006).

Table 1

Kasper (2006)
Recognition and production of social actions in their sequential contexts
Management of turn-taking in an organized fashion
Organization of actions including turn-taking and affective stance by utilizing several verbal, nonverbal resources
Conducting repair in conversation when problems in recognition and production are identified in interaction
Co-constructing social and discursive identities through sequence organization in interaction
Recognition and production of boundaries between activities, including management of openings and closings

However, as discussed in the previous section, these definitions do not necessarily help us understand what language learners need, and Waring (2018) has suggested that teachers need some idea of what IC actually looks like in practice in order to make use of the concept in the classroom. The above definitions and statements concerning the nature of IC do not provide us with concrete ideas as to what actually transpires in interactions, or what the objects of L2 learning should be, and we need more detail about what it actually looks like in particular contexts, as well as an understanding of the development of L2 IC in learners. A growing body of CA research is attempting to document just that.

Here, we will summarize some of the findings of this research. Research into IC development has looked at the interactional practices of more advanced learners and compared these with those of less advanced learners. For example, more advanced learners have been found to delay disagreements and use preliminary moves prior to making requests (Pekarek Doehler and Pochon-Berger, 2011; Al-Gahtani and Roever, 2012), and these practices may be seen as demonstrating greater IC. More advanced learners have also been found to use discourse markers in more varied ways, using them in different places in conversational turns more appropriately (Kim, 2009; Ishida, 2009). Meanwhile, Ishida (2011) found that a learner's responses when listening to another participant's story developed to include more contributions that were more likely to initiate new conversational sequences, rather than lead to a closing of the conversation.

Similarly, Galaczi (2013) observed that higher - level learners are more confident in developing conversations mutually with their conversational partners. Lower-level learners provide little support when others are speaking, tending to use simple receipt tokens or backchannels (such as 'yeah'), while more advanced learners provided support by engaging more with confirmations of understanding (e.g. 'exactly'). And while lower-level learners were weaker at contributing to the development of other-initiated topics and tended to start new topics more frequently, leading to shorter topical sequences, more proficient speakers were able

to engage with and develop their partner's topics over multiple turns. Galaczi (2008) also found that more advanced speakers developed topics with a higher degree of mutuality. That is, speakers developed others' topics more frequently, rather than starting their own topics, as prior speakers' utterances were taken up and expanded upon (not just repeated). There were also more acknowledgement tokens and syntactic and lexical cohesion across turns, as well as a more balanced quantity of talk amongst the participants. The interactions of lower-level learners included more topic initiations, shorter durations of topics, and less cohesion across turns.

Many of the above findings have come from studies on testing second-language speaking. However, other studies suggest similar results are found in group discussions within spoken English language classrooms. Like Galaczi, Doe (2016) found that higher-level students in his university speaking classes showed a higher degree of mutuality at the start of the course than lower level students. By the end of the course, both groups had increased the total number of development moves recorded, and both showed a decrease in the extension of topics they initiated themselves, and an increase in the extension of topics initiated by group members.

Regarding learning, Teng (2014) found that when lower proficiency learners were paired with higher proficiency partners for speaking tests, they produced more language, more fluently. This suggests that one way to improve the IC of lower level learners could be to have them work with, or follow models of, higher proficiency learners.

Summarizing CA studies into second language interaction, Pekarek Doehler and Pochon-Berger (2015) attempted to outline the basic components of IC in an L2. They found that IC is not simply transferred from the L1, but is recalibrated in the L2. Development is seen in the diversification of resources used to accomplish particular actions, such as taking a turn, disagreeing, initiating repair, and so on. Less proficient speakers will tend to use the same resource (a phrase, or a technique like speaking loudly) and standard grammatical patterns repeatedly, regardless of

the context. More proficient speakers, on the other hand, will use a greater variety of resources in a greater variety of sequential locations within an interaction. For example, practices for disagreeing develop to involve a ‘yes-but’ pattern, while the opening of stories include an increased repertoire of practices for gaining speakership and displaying how the upcoming story fits with the interaction so far. More proficient speakers interact in a more context-sensitive way, and design their talk for their conversational partners. This includes an ability to perform dispreferred actions, such as refusals or disagreements, appropriately, and also to project or foreshadow the trajectory of the talk so as to better fit their contributions to the ongoing interaction.

Pekarek Doehler (2018) shows how L2 grammar-for-interaction develops over time, from limited and literal uses of resources to a more diversified range of uses for organizing social interaction. In other words, changes over time “relate to the interactional purposes that L2 grammatical resources serve to fulfil - rather than to the formal correctness of these resources” (p. 18). For example, Pekarek Doehler and Pochon-Berger (2016) found that, as the IC of a learner of L2 French developed, she better fitted her story openings to the ongoing interaction. This learner had in the early stages of the study opened stories with ‘and then’ (*et puis*), which suggests continuation of the prior talk and is unusual for the opening of a story. By the end of the study, she used ‘but’ (*mais*) to open stories, which is something frequently seen in story-openings.

In summary, the above studies show that as learners’ L2 IC develops they are more able to, among other things, use their interactional resources in more diverse ways, maintain conversational topics (by both developing topics and providing support as listeners), use discourse markers appropriately, delay performing dispreferred actions, and fit their contributions to the ongoing talk.

#### 4. Assessing IC

While the present project is not necessarily concerned with assessment, but is

rather focussed on classroom teaching, we will be involved in designing a rubric for students to use in class to help raise awareness, and promote development of IC. There have been some attempts to address the concept of IC in the literature on assessment, and as these attempts have involved the development of rubrics for assessment, they are of relevance to the present project. For example, in a study concerning classroom assessment, Youn (2015) developed criteria for assessing “L2 pragmatics in interaction”, which includes aspects of IC. This involved Youn developing criteria based on a CA of the examinees’ role-play performances.

Youn (p. 201) argues that concepts from CA, such as *turn-taking* and *adjacency pairs* (pairs of utterances such as question-answer, which are fundamental to establishing intersubjectivity) are critical to the concept of pragmatic competence. The performance of a first pair-part (e.g. an invitation) creates an expectation for a second pair-part (an acceptance or refusal), and if this second pair-part is not provided, this absence is usually accounted for in some way (e.g. ‘Can I give you an answer later?’). CA researchers refer to *preferred* actions, which are usually positive actions, such as accepting an invitation. *Dispreferred* actions, such as refusals, are usually performed with delays and hesitation markers (e.g. ‘well’). Pragmatic competence involves the appropriate use of these features of interaction. As briefly discussed in the previous section, more advanced learners have been found to display higher levels of pragmatic competence (or IC) by, for example, using pre-requests (e.g. ‘Can you do me a favour?’) which are largely absent from lower-level learners’ interactions (Al-Gahtani and Roever, 2012).

Youn’s (2015) study used these CA concepts to inform the five categories used in the data-driven rating criteria. The category of *content delivery* measures the ability to deliver a turn appropriately, including the use of pre-requests. *Language use* attempts to measure the range of linguistic resources and pragmatic strategies used to convey meaning appropriately. This includes the appropriate use of modal verbs (‘might’), tenses (‘I was wondering’), and dependent clauses (‘if you are able to’) when making requests. *Sensitivity to situation* includes more social

aspects of the situation, such as acknowledging an imposition (e.g. a short due date) when making a request. *Engaging with interaction* measures the use of tokens, such as change-of-state tokens (‘oh’) and acknowledgement tokens (‘uh huh’). *Turn organization* measures the appropriate use of turns in, for example, adjacency pairs, such as the expression of gratitude after a request has been granted.

In a study of paired speaking tests incorporating CA, Galaczi (2013) also developed coding categories to investigate IC. These were *topic development moves* (e.g. initiation, extension of own topic, extension of other topic, and minimal extension), *speaker selection and turn-taking* (i.e. no-gap no-overlap, pauses, and overlaps), and *listener support* (backchanneling and confirmations of comprehension).

In a doctoral study, Ikeda (2017) developed an instrument for assessing L2 oral pragmatics in English-medium university classes. The rating rubrics developed included *social actions to achieve the communicative goal* (i.e. showing understanding of the situation with appropriate actions), *facility with language* (i.e. clear and fluent speech), *language use to deliver the intended meanings* (i.e. control of linguistic structures), *language use for mitigation* (i.e. mitigating imposition with, for example, modal verbs), *engagement in interaction* (i.e. showing understanding of a previous turn by giving feedback, clarifying, acknowledging, and asking questions), and *turn organization* (i.e. completing adjacency pairs without awkward pauses).

Sun (2014) argues that China needs to introduce more conversational styles of spoken English testing in order to encourage the teaching of conversational strategies in the classroom and hence, promote IC development. One example in the US of such teaching and assessment of IC is Rice University (<http://clicmaterials.rice.edu>), which has already been briefly introduced above. The university has a heavy focus on IC, incorporating authentic material and activities to foster co-construction of language and reach interactional goals. They also

offer a series of workshops for language instructors that focus on the nature of IC, such as practicing politeness, making requests, or closing conversations, as well as assessing IC in the classroom through the use of the rubric discussed in the introduction to this paper.

## 5. Task repetition studies

One feature of the current project is that participants will repeat the classroom activities that they perform in an attempt to promote the development of their IC. Much of the research into task repetition is from a cognitive processing perspective on L2 learning (Ahmadian et al., 2017), rather than the more social perspective adopted by CA researchers. On the cognitive view often taken in task repetition studies, learners are thought to have limited cognitive resources that prevent them from attending to all aspects of their L2 performance, and it is argued that repetition of a task can help learners attend to different aspects of their performance by freeing up attentional resources (Samuda and Bygate, 2008). Bygate (2001) suggests that, when performing a task for the first time, learners are likely to be focussed on meaning at the expense of form. When performing the same task later, however, the experience of having already performed the task, it is argued, allows the learners to attend more to the language that they use. Whether or not this is the case, research has found that task repetition does lead to improved performance (e.g. Bygate, 2001; Lynch and Malean, 2001; Garcia et al., 2018). Further, both Ahmadian et al. (2017) and Stillwell et al. (2010) have found that learners view task repetition favourably. However, Ahmadian et al. (2017) found that some learners were initially confused about the purpose of task repetition and some believed that it should be clearly explained prior to use.

Researchers adopting CA and usage-based perspectives have argued that learning is complex and emerges from repeated use in interactions (Pekarek Doehler, 2018). We therefore believe that repetition of a task or activity has the potential to facilitate learning, as it should allow for repeated exposure to L2

learning objects. For example, usage-based/CA research suggests that an encounter with a new L2 item leaves a trace in a learner's experience, and that learning involves appropriation during multiple encounters over time (Eskildsen, 2018b, p. 49). While it is impossible to perform the exact same interaction twice, as every interaction is a unique moment in space and time, it may be possible to help facilitate learning by repeating the same (or a similar) activity that will involve the use of the same (or similar) learning objects. This may particularly be the case if learners are able to view transcripts of videos of their interaction before repeating the activity, in order to raise awareness of certain aspects of their language use.

## **6. Our context and plan**

In this project, we hope to develop tools for use in the classroom that will help learners both notice and develop their IC. A central aim of our project is, therefore, to use the existing literature to develop a rubric that learners can use in order to assess their own performances in classroom activities. By performing an activity once, evaluating it using this rubric, and then repeating the same (or a very similar) activity, we hope to be able to improve learners' IC in the L2. The aim of using the rubric is therefore not primarily for assessment purposes, but to raise learners' awareness of what constitutes IC in a particular L2 context (i.e. a classroom discussion) and, by asking them to evaluate their own performances, allow them to notice how they may be able to develop their own IC by focussing their attention on specific aspects of their interactions. In feedback that will be given to the participants once they have evaluated their own performances, and in video recordings of more advanced speakers performing similar activities to those the learners perform, we also hope to be able to provide them with examples of language that they can utilize in their own performances. The repetition of the activity will afford them an opportunity to put these new resources, as well as the insights they have gained from noticing things about their own performances, into practice. In short, we hope to both raise awareness of IC and provide learning

objects that learners can incorporate into their interactional repertoires.

## 7. The rubric

In Table 2 we present, in its current form, the rubric that we have developed. The rubric was informed by our review of the existing literature, but was adapted for the most part from two studies. Primarily, we have adapted the work of Ikeda's doctoral study (2017), which developed a rubric for raters to evaluate learner performances. Ikeda's study was particularly appropriate for our project since, as well as developing a rubric that could be used to assess elements of IC, he was working in a university setting, as are we. This rubric was thorough and made use of the existing literature on IC, but since it was designed for use by raters we did not believe that it would be appropriate to use as a pedagogic tool in the classroom, as it would be difficult for learners to make sense of and use.

We have also made use of Galaczi's (2008) framework concerning topic development in collaborative talk to inform our rubric. Again, as presented in Galaczi's paper, the concepts would most likely be difficult for learners to grasp. The main aim of the current phase of this project has therefore been to develop a rubric based on research into IC development that students will be able to understand and use in the classroom. Consequently, we have tried to keep our rubric as simple as possible, taking the ideas in Ikeda (2017) and Galaczi (2008) and rewording them in such a way that they will be more accessible to learners. At present, we have written the rubric in the form of questions and multiple-choice answers that learners can select from (rather than using descriptors, as Ikeda did). As learners consider their performances in classroom activities, they can work their way through the list of questions. While the rubric will require some introduction in class, including an introduction to the basic concepts underlying IC, it is our hope that students will be able to use it to evaluate their own classroom interactions with minimal help from the teacher.

The questions are organized under headings that correspond to Galaczi's study

(heading 1) and the different criteria used by Ikeda (headings 2 - 4). However, we have omitted three of the criteria used by Ikeda, as we believe that these criteria are already covered sufficiently by the questions that we have developed. It is important to note that, while we call this a self-evaluation, we are asking the learners not to focus on their own performance, but to assess the group's performance as a whole.

**Table 2**

1. Topic Development

<b>Who starts topics?</b>
Usually the same group member introduces all topics A variety of group members introduce topics
<b>Are topics developed or not?</b>
Yes, each topic is usually developed. No, topics are not really developed.
<b>Who develops topics?</b>
Usually, one person develops topics more than other people Two or three group members tend to develop topics, while the other(s) are silent Everyone in the group develops topics equally
<b>Do speakers respond to previous comments?</b> (E.g. by agreeing, disagreeing, supporting, challenging, adding information, giving feedback, asking questions, etc.)
No, they don't often comment on what previous speakers said. Yes, they sometimes respond to something a previous speaker said. Yes, they often respond to something a previous speaker said.

**What did the members of your group do when listening to each other?**

Not much. They were mostly quiet.

They sometimes responded with head nods and little sounds like ‘un’.

They often responded with head nods, little sounds, and they also agreed, disagreed and showed emotion with words and short phrases like “yes”, “that’s right”, and “really?”

2. Cooperating and being social

**Did the members of your group cooperate with each other to have a successful discussion?**

(E.g. Helping when someone didn’t understand or couldn’t think of a word, or asking others for help)

Mostly

Sometimes

Rarely

**Was the language used appropriate for a university classroom discussion**

(E.g. not too formal/informal, not too direct/polite, spoken with appropriate speed and intonation, etc.)

Mostly

Sometimes

Rarely

### 3. Taking turns to speak

<b>The conversation is natural and smooth, without awkward pauses</b>
Mostly
Sometimes
Rarely
<b>The members of the group responded to each other appropriately</b> (E.g. group members gave answers when asked a question, or said ‘thank you’ when they were given help)
Mostly
Sometimes
Rarely
<b>If a speaker cannot give an appropriate response</b> (e.g. they cannot answer a question they are asked), <b>they give a reason</b> (e.g. ‘I’m sorry, that’s a difficult question, can you give me a moment to think?’).
Mostly
Sometimes
Rarely

### 4. Saying things clearly

<b>The members of the group use language in a clear way to make it easy for the other group members to understand</b>
Mostly
Sometimes
Rarely

## 8. What next?

The next stages of the project will involve trialling the rubric in class to see how learners respond to it. As well as the rubric itself, we also aim to develop other pedagogic tools that will complement the use of the rubric. For example, we aim to make video recordings of speakers of various L2 levels that learners can watch in class and evaluate using the rubric. Doing this will help learners understand how to use the rubric, and also draw their attention to important aspects of IC, prior to evaluating their own performances.

As discussed in the literature review, we would also like to provide learners with learning objects, or actual examples of language use, that they may be able to incorporate into their own repertoires. As well as raising awareness of what IC is, making video recordings of advanced level and expert speakers may provide learners with concrete examples of what advanced IC in the L2 looks like. The practices that learners observe in the videos can be discussed in class and potentially utilized by the learners in their own interactions. Thus, the videos will potentially serve three functions in familiarizing learners with the rubric, raising awareness of IC, and providing examples of actual language use.

Another way to provide language input will be by using teacher feedback. Once learners have recorded and evaluated their interactions, we will (as teachers) also watch/listen to the recordings and provide specific feedback to learners, including comments upon things that they could have done (e.g. specific interactional practices and language that may be used to accomplish these). Upon performing the interactions for a second time, learners may be able to make use of the learning objects that we provide them with.

We also aim to experiment with the technical aspects of the project. We believe that giving the learners a transcript of their interactions, or asking them to watch a video/listen to a recording of their own performances, may allow them to pay attention more closely to what they actually do in the interactions, and to

make plans for improvement (or change) in subsequent performances. Therefore, we would like to investigate the relative merits of using video or audio recording technology to capture students' interactions, as well as the use of software-generated written transcripts. In investigating the use of transcripts, we need to consider how those transcripts are made and how accurate they are. Recent software advances have made available apps that can record and automatically transcribe spoken English interactions, albeit with some inaccuracies. We would like to investigate how these computer-generated transcripts may help to facilitate this project, while also looking at how learners respond differently to evaluating their performances as captured in written transcripts of what was said, compared with using audio-visual recordings or working from memory.

## **9. Summary and conclusion**

In this paper, we have introduced the motivations and aims of our project, summarized some of the existing research into IC, and introduced the first draft of our rubric. To recap, the aim of this project is to create pedagogic tools that help raise awareness of, and develop, learners' L2 IC in small-group classroom discussions. By asking learners to perform a discussion once, evaluate this performance with the help of the rubric that we are trialling, and subsequently perform a similar discussion, we hope to give learners opportunities to improve their IC. Language input will be provided in video recordings of more advanced learners performing similar discussions, as well as through feedback provided by teachers. This paper is our initial attempt to communicate this project to a wider audience. The rubric is as yet untested, and we hope that over the next few months our classroom trials will allow us to refine it. However, we hope that any interested teachers reading this may make use of the rubric in its current form in their own classes, adapting and developing it as they see fit. We welcome any correspondence regarding the rubric and attempts to use it.

## References

- Ahmadian, M. J., Mansouri, S. A., & Ghominejad, S. (2017). Language learners' and teachers' perceptions of task repetition. *ELT Journal*, 71(4), 467-477.
- Al-Gahtani, S., & Roever, C. (2012). Proficiency and sequential organization of L2 requests. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(1), 42-65.
- “Assessing interactional competence in the classroom: using a rubric.” (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://clicmaterials.rice.edu/assessing-interactional-competence-in-the-classroom/>
- Barraja-Rohan, A-M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research* 15(4), 479-507.
- Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT. *ELT Journal* 57(3), 278-287.
- Bygate, M. (2001). Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language in M. Bygate, P. Skehan, and M. Swain (Eds.). *Researching pedagogic tasks: second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 23-48). Harlow: Longman.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (Eds.), *Language and Communication*, 2-27. London: Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Chen, T. (2003). Reticence in Class and On-line: Two ESL Students' Experiences with Communicative Language Teaching. *System*, 31, 259-281.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MASS, MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1966). *Topics in the Theory of Generative Grammar*. The Hague, Mouton.
- Doe, T. (2016). The development of interactional competence in group discussions.

*Journal of Policy Studies*, 51, 9-14.

- Eskildsen, S. (2018a). Building a semiotic repertoire for social action: interactional competence as biographical discovery. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 68-76.
- Eskildsen, S. (2018b). 'We're learning a lot of new words': encountering new L2 vocabulary outside of class. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102(Supplement 2018), 46-63.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285-299.
- Galaczi, E. D. (2008). Peer-peer interaction in a speaking test: the case of the first certificate in English examination. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 5(2), 89-119.
- Galaczi, E. D. (2013). Interactional competence across proficiency levels: how do learners manage interaction in paired speaking tests? *Applied Linguistics*, 35(5), 553-574.
- García Mayo, M. P., A. Imaz, & A. Azkarai. (2018). Task repetition effects on CAF in EFL child task-based oral interaction. In M. J. Ahmadian & M. P. García Mayo (Eds.). *Recent perspectives on task-based language teaching and learning* (p. 11-28). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Gass, S. (1998). Apples and oranges: or, why apples are not oranges and don't need to be. A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, 82(1), 83-90.
- Hall, J. K. (2018). From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires: reconceptualising the objects of L2 learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 25-39.
- Hall, J. K., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). L2 interactional competence and development'. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 1-15). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Hauser, E. (2009). Turn-taking and primary speakership during a student discussion. In H. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 216-244). Hawaii: University of Hawaii.
- Hellermann, J. (2018). Language as competencing: considering language learning as enactment. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 40-56.
- Hymes, D. (1964). Introduction: toward ethnographies of communication. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6, 2), 1-34.
- Hymes, D. (1972) On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ikeda, N. 2017. Measuring L2 oral pragmatic abilities for use in social contexts: development and validation of an assessment instrument for L2 pragmatics performance in university settings.” Unpublished doctoral diss. The University of Melbourne.
- Ishida, M. (2009). Development of interactional competence: Changes in the use of *ne* in L2 Japanese during study abroad. In H. T. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk- in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 351-385). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai ‘i.
- Ishida, M. (2011). Engaging in another person’s telling as a recipient in L2 Japanese: development of interactional competence during one-year study abroad. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 Learning as social practice: Conversation- analytic perspectives* (pp. 45-85). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai ‘i.
- Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review*, 19, 83-99.
- Kasper, G. & Wagner, J. (2014). Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 34, 1-42.
- Kim, S. (2006). Academic oral communication needs of East Asian international graduate students in non-science and non-engineering fields. *English for*

- Specific Purposes*, 25(4), 479–489.
- Kim, Y. (2009). The Korean discourse markers –nuntey and kuntey in native–nonnative conversation: An acquisitional perspective. In H. T. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), 151 *Talk-in-Interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 317–350). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai‘i.
- Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(4), 366–372.
- Lee, G. (2009). Speaking up: six Korean students’ oral participation in class discussions in US graduate seminars. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28(3), 142–156.
- Lynch, T. & J. Maclean. (2001). “A case of exercising”: effects of immediate task repetition on learners’ performance. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, and M. Swain (Eds.). *Researching pedagogic tasks: second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 141–162). Harlow: Longman.
- Nakane, I. (2003). Silence in Japanese-Australian classroom interaction: Perceptions and performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Sydney, Sydney.
- Nishino, T. & Watanabe, M. (2008). Communication-oriented policies versus classroom realities in Japan. *Tesol Quarterly*, 42(1), 133–138.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Elaborations on L2 interactional competence: the development of L2 grammar-for-interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 3–24.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2011). Developing ‘methods’ for interaction: A cross-sequential study of disagreement sequences in French L2. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 206–243). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence

- organization, repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno, & S. Eskildsen (Eds.) *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning*. (pp. 233-267). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2016). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: a longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics* 2016, 1-25.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. New York: Cambridge.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Samuda, V. & M. Bygate. (2008). *Tasks in Second Language Learning*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schegloff, E. A. 2006. 'Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted'. In N.J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.) *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition and Interaction* (pp. 70-96). Oxford: Berg.
- Stillwell, C., Curabba, B., Alexander, K., Kidd, A., Kim, E., Stone, P., & Wyle, C. (2010). Students transcribing tasks: noticing fluency, accuracy, and complexity. *ELT Journal*, 64(4), 445-455.
- Teng, H-C. (2014). Interlocutor proficiency in paired speaking tests. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (Eds.) *JALT2013 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 708-715). Tokyo: JALT.
- Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL* 6(1), 1-14.
- Walsh, S. (2014). Developing classroom interactional competence. *Language Issues* 25(1), 4-8.
- Waring, H. Z. (2018). Teaching L2 interactional competence: problems and possibilities. *Classroom Discourse*, 9(1), 57-67.
- Youn, S. J. (2015). Validity argument for assessing L2 pragmatics in interaction

Task repetition and interactional competence: designing a rubric for use in the classroom (Paul Stone and Matthew Kershaw)

using mixed methods. *Language Testing*, 32(2), 199-225.

Young, R. F. (2008). *Language and interaction: An advanced resource book*. London/New York: Routledge.

Young, R. F. (2011). Interactional competence in language learning, teaching, and testing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 426-443). London & New York: Routledge.

Young, R. F. (2013). Learning to talk the talk and walk the walk: Interactional competence in academic spoken English. *Iberica* 25, 15-38.

## 相互行為能力と繰返しタスク

ストーン・ポール  
カーショール・マシュー

この論文では、日本人英語学習者の英語の相互行為能力 (Interactional Competence, IC) の向上を目的にした、現在進行しているプロジェクトについて報告する。プロジェクトは日本にある二つの大学で行なわれ、特に日本の大学においてよく用いられる形態である小グループ討論に参加する能力を焦点に展開される。プロジェクトの中核として、教授法としてのツールや方法論の開発を置く。主に研究者によってデザインされたルーブリックを使用し、生徒が彼らの相互行為を評価したり、英語能力の上位者をピアとして自分自身を評価したりできるようにしていく。この評価とプロセスによって、生徒自身が英語での小グループ議論や討論における英語での IC を理解し、ひいては活用していきけるようにする。生徒は評価後に、もう一度同じ議論をする機会を持つことにより、自分の評価から、また効果的なピアから学んだ実用的な英語を実際に使用する機会を得、実践することでより実用的な英語の習得が期待できる。

この論文では IC のコンセプトについて説明するとともに本研究の理論的根拠の大枠について述べる。

そして IC と第二言語学習の向上との関係、またどのように IC が評価されるかについて議論する。本プロジェクトにおいて繰返しタスクは一つの中心的な見地であるため、そちらについても過去の研究について触れたのち、現在のファーストドラフトであるルーブリックについて、また今後の研究について記載する。この論文では、幅広い対象に向けて本プロジェクトについて紹介し、教師や研究者が本研究内容を実践で利用したり、アイデアについて発展させていくことを目的とする。