

Task repetition: Opportunities for learning and development

Paul Stone
Matthew Kershaw

Introduction

A research project has recently been started by the authors with the goal of developing Japanese university students' L2 interactional competence (IC) in classroom group discussions (Stone and Kershaw, 2019). Despite concerted efforts to improve students' communicative abilities, communicative teaching methods are often lacking in Japanese schools (Nishino and Watanabe, 2008), while in English discussions in Japanese university English classes, students often give their opinions in turn and unchallenged, rather than developing a discussion together (e.g. Hauser, 2009). The lack of attention given to communicative abilities and the somewhat “monologic” (Hauser, 2009) nature of classroom discussions may help explain the problems experienced by Japanese and other East Asian students studying abroad, who find it difficult to participate in spoken activities and often remain silent in the classroom (Chen, 2003; Kim, 2006; Lee, 2009; Nakane, 2003).

With this relative lack of attention given to spoken interactional practices in mind, the authors' goal is to raise student awareness of IC in the context of classroom group discussions and introduce a method to operationalize IC in the classroom (Stone and Kershaw, 2019). The present study focuses on one particular aspect of IC: repair sequences. More specifically, the paper will use Conversation Analysis to investigate students' use of word searches as a type of forward-oriented repair (Schegloff 1979, 273; Greer 2013). The aim of this paper is to determine whether task repetition and analysis of authentic models of proficient English

speakers can improve Japanese university students' competence in performing word searches.

Interactional Competence

IC has been the focus of much research in recent years and it is widely recognised that developing IC is beneficial for second language learners to become competent speakers (Young, 2011). IC is different from the concept of communicative competence. While communicative competence is viewed as an individual trait, IC is seen as a collaborative process that cannot be “reduced to an individual participant’s competence” (Kasper and Wagner, 2014, p. 28). Rather, IC requires interactional partners building meaning together in a shared context.

Young (2011) suggests that IC can be developed by learners' analysis of interaction within particular contexts of social interaction. In the present paper, the context is university students analysing their own interactions during classroom discussions. There have been few attempts to design materials to explicitly teach L2 IC, despite it being a well-established concept (Salaberry and Kunitz, 2019, p. 2), and we hope that this project can make a meaningful contribution to the field.

Task Repetition

The project under discussion here involves learners repeating a discussion with different group members. Task repetition involves students repeating identical or similar tasks at regular intervals (Bygate and Samuda, 2005, p.43), with performance of the original task being preparation for subsequent repetitions (Ellis, 2005). While several studies have shown the positive effects of task repetition, further empirical research is required before claims of its benefits on L2 acquisition can be upheld (Ahmadian, 2012). In the current study, students notice certain features of IC in recordings of both their own discussions and those of proficient speakers. Task repetition is then utilised to help students improve these features in subsequent performances.

Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis (CA) has made a significant contribution to understandings of IC. CA is “a powerful methodology for studying social interaction and its sequential organization” (Kasper and Wagner, 2014). Language is not per se the focus of CA, and current CA research takes a multimodal approach that focuses equally on “embodied actions, participants’ mobility, spatial arrangements, and the role of the material environment” (Kasper and Wagner, 2014). But while CA is rooted in the social sciences and is an attempt to understand the social organisation of human interaction, it has made contributions to interactional linguistics through analysis of how turns-at-talk are constructed (e.g. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974). Concepts such as turn-taking and transition relevance places (TRP), which are points during a turn-at-talk where a speaker change may take place, remain foundational to CA.

CA and Learning

From a CA perspective, learning is not an internal cognitive process, but rather behaviour that can be seen in socio-interactional contexts. Like any interactional activity, learning is something people carry out together and the processes and methods involved are socially observable phenomena. Interactions may provide learners with ‘learnables’ (Eskilden, 2018), which are “whatever is interactively established as relevant and developed to become a shared pedagogical focus” (Majlesi and Broth, 2012, p. 193). As participants in an interaction discover some problem (such as an unknown word), they can choose to focus on this and in doing so make it a ‘learnable’, and CA can illuminate exactly how they do this.

CA and Repair

When participants discover a problem, they may engage in repair to resolve it. Seedhouse (2004) describes repair as the treatment of trouble occurring in

interactions. Repair can be self-initiated (prompted by the speaker of the trouble-source), or other-initiated (prompted by another person). Furthermore, it can be divided into self-repair (the speaker corrects themselves), or other-repair (someone corrects the speaker). How breakdowns and misunderstandings occur and are repaired is important knowledge for L2 learners and teachers (Seedhouse, 2004, p.34). Repair is not only used during misunderstandings, but may also be used when the ‘wrong’ language is used. For example, in a language class the use of the L1 may be seen as inappropriate, and therefore repaired (with the L1 word being substituted for an L2 word). This is known as ‘medium repair’ (Gafaranga, 2000). Repair, and the related phenomenon of word searches, are a focus of the current study.

CA and Word-searches

Word-searches are often initiated when participants in a conversation have problems producing a linguistic item and a breakdown occurs. Word-searches often involve the speaker first indicating some trouble in continuing their turn (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, 1977, p.367), such as through pausing. This may be accompanied by a gaze away from the other participants if the word-search is solitary, or a gaze towards the recipients to indicate collaboration is possible (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1986, p.63). While repair often focuses on a previous problem in the conversation, word-searches illustrate an upcoming trouble source. For this reason, they are described as forward-oriented repair (Greer, 2013). Word-searches in the classroom often involve codeswitching, particularly translating between the L1 and L2 (Mori, 2004).

Method and data

The participants in the study were split into groups of 2-3 students and asked to discuss the question “What is the best season?” for five minutes. They recorded these discussions themselves using an audio recorder application on tablet

computers. The following week, the participants then used the tablet computers to watch a video that the researchers had recorded of four ‘expert’ speakers discussing the same question. These more proficient speakers had been recruited from an international student programme at a university in Tokyo, and included US, Malaysian, and Singaporean nationals.

The participants analyzed the language used in this video with reference to a handout that we had made in order to focus their attention on certain moments (see Appendix 1). Each moment was a word or phrase used by one of the ‘expert’ speakers, and the participants were asked to consider what action each word or phrase was used to accomplish (e.g. ‘asking for help’). In doing so, we aimed to highlight how language was used to perform certain interactional practices, and so help our participants develop their understanding of IC in English discussions.

Participants then listened back to the recordings of their own interactions, and chose up to three different practices from the ‘expert’ speakers’ video that they felt were missing from their own interactions and that they also felt comfortable in trying to perform themselves in the future. The participants were then split into small groups (different from the groups they were in for the first round of discussions) and again audio-recorded themselves discussing the same topic for five minutes, attempting to make use of the practices that they had observed the ‘expert’ speakers using.

This gave us a total of six interactions (three in the first round of recordings, and another three in the second round) of five minutes each, as well as the ‘expert’ speakers’ video, which ran for eight minutes, which we analyzed using CA. In doing our analysis, we focused in detail on the practices that the participants themselves had chosen to focus on. When asked to select the three moments from the ‘expert’ speakers’ video, six of the nine participants had chosen a moment that they had labelled ‘asking for help’. This was a moment in the video in which one of the participants (Lisa) had initiated a word-search using the phrase “what’s that called” (an analysis of this moment is presented in Excerpt 1 below). As most

of our participants had decided to focus on this moment in the ‘expert’ speakers’ video, we decided to focus on word-searches in this project. That is, our focus on word-searches arose from the data, rather than being predetermined at the start of the project.

Participants

The nine participants were enrolled on an elective English communication course at a private university in Japan that met for one 90-minute lesson per week. Eight of the participants were Japanese and one was French, and they were studying various majors (although none of the participants was an English major). As this was an elective course, the students were generally motivated, although as an open class their proficiency in English varied (from ‘beginner’ to ‘intermediate’). Pseudonyms are used throughout the paper.

Analysis

Here we present our analysis of the word-searches in our data. In the first round of participant interactions there was only one attempt at a word-search (presented in Excerpt 2), while in the second round there were four attempts to initiate word-searches. Due to space limitations, we focus on just two of these four attempts in Excerpts 3 and 4. The transcripts follow CA conventions (see Appendix 2). As the recording of the ‘expert’ speakers included video as well as audio data, we were able to transcribe some of the bodily actions they performed. These are shown in the transcripts on the lines below the audio transcription, with the onset of actions marked with symbols (e.g. ◆ and +) to indicate where they were performed in relation to the spoken language. Where necessary, English translations of Japanese are also provided on the lines below the spoken data.

The 'expert' speakers' word-search

The first excerpt presents the word-search that was initiated in the video of the 'expert' speakers.

Excerpt 1

01 L: I think in +spring you also get what's that +called.
gazing at S+gazes at desk -->+gazes up
02 um (0.5) +with the pollen and [er
+waves hand, gazes at J
03 J: [loh +yeah with spring.
| nods
L: [+gazes at S
04 L: SO THAT'S A PROBLEM. (.) so (.) autumn is just defau-
by default the best season ((laughs))
05 S: [◆wait what's the problem?]
◆gazes at J
06 J: [lo::kay] |pollen. (.)+allergy.
| nods |gazes at S
L: +waves hand-->
07 S: o:◆h.
◆gazes at L
08 L: allergies and.+
----->+
09 S: pollen.

In line 1, Lisa is gazing at Sara as she attempts to give a reason for not liking spring. However, during the turn she encounters a vocabulary problem, demonstrating that she has a problem finding the next item in her turn with the phrase “what’s that called”, gazing up towards her co-participants on the word “called”. The use of Wh-questions such as this is a common way for a speaker to invite other participants to help in a word-search (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1986, p. 63), while a gaze towards recipients may also indicate that co-participation is relevant (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1986, p. 56-7; Hayashi, 2003, p. 118-9). Lisa has

put her complaints about spring to one side, and has initiated a search for the next item in her turn, making co-participation in this search possibly relevant.

Lisa then quickly says “um” before pausing - actions that further indicate that she is having trouble, and that are also common during the self-initiation of word-searches (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks 1977, 367). However, Lisa’s “um” does not only indicate that she is having trouble. Positioned here it also helps to prevent a change of speaker. Lisa’s previous actions have suggested that co-participation in the word-search is relevant. Furthermore, her question in line 1 is a grammatically complete utterance that is performed with turn-final intonation, making the end of this line a TRP that could lead to speaker change. However, by quickly saying “um” as soon as she finishes her question, she suggests that she may continue, and the other participants remain silent. Although she has made public that she is searching for the next item, she has not yet given a clear indication of what that item might be. By preventing speaker change and continuing her turn, she is able to provide further information in order to help the other members of the group understand what she is searching for.

In line 2, as she says “with the pollen”, she waves her hand back and forth in front of her mouth, which may be an action designed to highlight the movement of pollen towards her mouth and nose, and gazes towards Jane. These actions attempt to make clearer what item she is searching for, while inviting Jane’s co-participation in the search. In response, Jane indicates that she understands Lisa by nodding and saying “oh yeah”. However, she does not attempt to provide the missing item. By showing that she understands she allows the discussion to proceed without the need for providing the item that Lisa is searching for. As soon as Jane has indicated that she understands, Lisa treats the word-search sequence as complete by turning back to face Sara and continuing her turn by stating loudly that this is a problem (we can assume that this refers to problems connected to pollen in spring). Lisa had been gazing at Sara as she spoke prior to encountering her problem in line 1, and now that the sequence dealing with the problem has been

completed, she gazes back at Sara as she resumes that prior talk.

However, while Jane has demonstrated understanding, Sara has not, and in line 5 Sara initiates other-repair to clarify what the problem is. She does so while gazing at Jane, and also in overlap with Jane's "okay", which demonstrates understanding of Lisa's turn. In line 6, Jane offers repair by shifting her gaze to Sara and saying "pollen" before pausing slightly. "Pollen" alone does not explain what the problem is, or what the searched-for item was, and Jane then adds "allergy" at the same time as Lisa again waves her hand in front of her face. "Pollen allergy" makes the previously searched-for item even clearer, and Sara receipts this in line 7. Lisa then says "allergies and" before Sara says "pollen" in line 9, demonstrating understanding of the problem. The participants have now collaboratively produced a solution to the word-search originally initiated by Lisa in line 1.

Previous studies have found that speakers in conversations, especially those involving L1 speakers, may sometimes pursue topical talk at the expense of resolving interactional problems, and that this may lead to learning opportunities being missed (e.g. Kasper and Kim, 2007). In Excerpt 1, once Jane has demonstrated understanding of what Lisa is trying to say, Lisa continues the talk, although the searched-for item has not been provided. This may be seen as a missed learning opportunity, as Lisa has identified a possible gap in her knowledge and attempted to act upon it, but has not found a suitable term. Sara, however, does not understand and does not allow the interaction to proceed before she has achieved understanding. This leads to Jane providing the term "pollen allergy". However, we cannot be sure if Lisa did not know, or had simply momentarily forgotten, the words "pollen" and "allergy".

With regards to the practice of initiating a word-search, we can see that Lisa used the phrase "what's that called", which is one of the phrases the researchers subsequently wrote on the worksheet we gave to our participants, and which five of them highlighted as something they would like to try using in their own interactions. We can also see that Lisa prevented speaker change (using the non-

lexical token “um”) and also attempted to clarify what the searched-for item was (through the use of gesture and spoken English). Ultimately, the participants were successful in achieving understanding and the interaction could continue.

The learners' word-search prior to watching the video

Excerpt 2 is taken from our participants' first round of discussions, and was therefore recorded before they had seen the video of the expert speakers. This excerpt features the only word-search that occurred in 15 minutes of talk during this round, and interestingly is also concerned with the problem of pollen in spring.

Excerpt 2

- 01 Y: on sprin:ng there is a lot of flower's (1.0) *kona*.
powder
- 02 M: a:[:h.
- 03 Y: [*nani*]
what
- 04 R: *kafun*.
pollen
- 05 Y: flowe:r
- 06 M: hay fever.
- 07 (1.0)
- 08 Y: *nan dakke?*
what is it
- 09 R: flower::: (0.5) allergy.
- 10 T: okay I'm going to stop you there.

In line 1, Yuki is giving a reason for not liking spring. After she says “flower's” she pauses, indicating some trouble in continuing her turn. Following this pause she says the Japanese word *kona*, which may be translated into English as powder. We

can now see that her problem was in locating a suitable English word to use here. In line 2, Maki receipts this turn with *ah*, which is a non-lexical news receipt token (Heritage, 1984) that demonstrates understanding of Yuki's turn.

Although understanding has been achieved, Yuki has used Japanese, which in the context of this discussion is problematic as the students have been asked to speak in English. In line 3, in overlap with Maki's stretched *ah*, Yuki says "*nani*", which may be used as a self-addressed question that precedes a solitary word-search (Hayashi, 2003, p. 115). Here it initiates a word-search for a suitable substitute for "*kona*".

In a bilingual word-search, the use of another language allows a speaker to make public what the item is prior to it being found (Greer, 2013), and in Excerpt 2 repair is initiated on an already-produced Japanese word ("*kona*"). This means that the searched-for item has been made public and other participants can potentially help search for it. So, while Hayashi (2003) finds that "*nani*" may be used in solitary word-searches, the other participants join in the search here.

Word-searches in interactions involving language learners and bilingual speakers have been found to involve codeswitching (e.g. Mori, 2004; Greer, 2013; Sasuga and Greer, 2014; Eskildsen, 2018; Stone, 2019), and here the participants use both Japanese and English. Rina's "*kafun*" (pollen) in line 4 demonstrates understanding of what the searched-for item is, in that this is essentially what Yuki's "flower's *kona*" refers to. Rina has provided the correct Japanese term in response to Yuki's creative bilingual phrase, but has not provided the English word that they are searching for.

In line 5, Yuki then recycles the word "flower" from line 1, stretching the word slightly and not using turn-final intonation, indicating that the turn is not complete. This helps to further specify what the problem is. That is, she is searching for a word to follow "flower" to provide a suitable English-medium substitute for the Japanese word *kona*. Maki then says "hay fever" in line 6, but the response to this is silence. "Hay fever", while being an appropriate term to use in this discussion, is

not treated as a suitable substitute for *kafun*. Further, Yuki has just indicated that she is searching for a missing word in a two-word phrase that begins with the word “flower”, and “hay fever” is not treated as the missing item here.

Following the short silence, Yuki says “*nan dakke*”, which may be translated as something like “what was it?” This is a question used for recollection (Hayashi, 2003, p. 113), in which the turn-final particle *kke* indexes uncertainty in this recollection (Hayashi, 2012). This suggests that the searched-for item is known to Yuki, but that she has forgotten it. This word-search sequence may therefore be seen as an act of remembering a forgotten term, rather than learning a new one.

While *nan dakke* can be a self-addressed question (Hayashi, 2003), the other learners’ continued participation in the word-search indicates that this is still treated as a collaborative process. In line 9, Rina repeats “flower” and then pauses, as Yuki had done in line 5. This shows that she is attempting to find a word to follow “flower”, and she then suggests “allergy” as this missing word. This phrase (“flower allergy”) could possibly be seen as another way of saying “hay fever”, and so builds on ‘Maki’s turn in line 6. However, before any response is made to this suggestion, in line 10 the teacher brings the activity to a close and the word-search is abandoned.

We can see in this excerpt how Yuki has trouble completing her turn in English, and so uses a Japanese word. However, in this context the use of Japanese is problematic and she initiates a word-search to find a suitable English substitute. This may be seen as an example of what Gafaranga (2000) refers to as *medium repair*. Understanding has been achieved, so what is being repaired is the use of the medium of Japanese, rather than a lack of understanding. The sequence subsequently involves a number of short turns in which Japanese is used to specify what item is being sought (*kona, kafun*) and initiate repair (*nani, nan dakke*). The searched-for item is not found, and nor does this sequence display great interactional competence in English. However, the use of Japanese does allow the participants to understand what is being sought for and to participate in the search

for an English alternative. Once understanding was achieved, they could have proceeded with the interaction, as Lisa attempts to do in Excerpt 1. However, they display their understanding of their current roles as language learners engaged in an English-speaking activity, as they put the discussion on hold so they can focus on finding a suitable English term.

The learners' word-searches after watching the video

Excerpt 3 is taken from the second round of interactions between our participants, and so was recorded after they had analyzed the video of the more proficient speakers. The participants here are Yuki and Rina, who both featured in Excerpt 2.

Excerpt 3

01 Y: do you like sea animals?
02 R: yes.
03 Y: o:h that's nice.=
04 R: =so I (.) like (1.0) to go to (2.0) what's that
called?
05 Y: m[:m.
06 R: [mm. ((laughs))
07 (1.0)
08 R: ocean's animals.
09 (1.5)
10 R: ocean animal's zoo. [((laughs))
11 Y: [((laughs)) ocean's animals?
12 R: ↑aquarium.
13 Y: ah. aquarium.

Yuki is a member of the university's diving club and, in line 1, asks Rina if she likes sea animals. Yuki positively evaluates Rina's response in line 3 (thus

completing a classic Initiation-Response-Feedback sequence). Rina begins to expand upon her response in line 4, but apparently runs into trouble, as she pauses three times before saying “what’s that called?” with try-marked intonation (Sacks and Schegloff, 1979). This is the exact phrase Lisa used in Excerpt 1.

Lisa and Yuki allowed others to participate in their word-searches by immediately making clear what it was they were searching for (by extending their turns or using an equivalent Japanese word). However, Rina does not initially attempt to make clear what she is searching for here, and in line 5, instead of aligning to the word-search initiation by providing repair, Yuki says “mm”. “Mm” is often used as a continuer (Schegloff, 1982) to allow the current speaker to keep speaking. However, Rina has apparently discontinued her turn to focus on the word-search, and instead of continuing she repeats Yuki’s “mm” and laughs, which shows that she treats something about the situation as being laughable. There is then a one-second silence.

It is only now that Rina attempts to clarify what the searched-for item is, by saying “ocean’s animals”. However, Yuki does not respond to this, and after another silence Rina provides more information by saying “ocean animal’s zoo”. However, Yuki still does not participate in the word-search, and both participants laugh in lines 10 and 11, again demonstrating that something in the interaction is laughable. It may be that it is the lack of success of the interaction that is treated as laughable here. While Rina has initiated a word-search, Yuki has not displayed any evidence to suggest that she understands this to be the case.

In line 11, Yuki initiates repair herself, by repeating “ocean’s animals” with try-marked intonation, indicating that this is problematic for her. The problem does not appear to be that she does not know these words (she has already used a very similar expression herself in line 1), but rather it is their use in the preceding turn that is problematic. In line 12, Rina provides Yuki with repair by saying “aquarium” with slightly higher-pitched intonation. This offers repair to Yuki, but is also the item that Rina has been searching for since line 4, suggesting that the item was

possibly available to her all along. Yuki receipts this with *ah*, indicating that she now understands. This response, as well as her repetition of the word “aquarium”, demonstrates that this word is known to her.

If Rina knew what this item was, why did she then attempt to initiate a word-search to find it. And if Yuki also knew the searched-for word, why did she not participate in the word-search by providing this word? The phrase “what’s that called?” is precisely the phrase used by Lisa in Excerpt 1, and Rina is following instructions by performing a practice that she has seen in the video in her own interaction. However, she has initiated a word-search for what seems to be an already-known item. In other words, in order to follow instructions, she has used language from the expert speaker’s video to initiate a search for an item that she could possibly have produced without a search. This may help us to understand the laughter in this excerpt. It is possibly a response to the artificiality of the situation.

Video data would give us a clearer idea of what is actually happening here, especially as embodied actions, such as gaze and posture, are important resources in determining whether a word-search is a solitary or multi-party endeavor. However, we can see in the audio data that Rina is apparently prompting Yuki with clues as to what she is searching for (lines 8 and 10). However, after initiating the word-search with the phrase “what’s that called?”, Rina did not immediately attempt to make clear what she was searching for. In Excerpt 1, Lisa had prevented speaker change and provided extra information that helped the other participants to understand what she was trying to say, while the use of Japanese in Excerpt 2 made the searched-for item public. This allowed the other participants to achieve understanding and participate in the search. This does not, however, happen here. Yuki does not provide any evidence that she understands what Rina’s trouble is, and it is only after Rina herself provides her with repair in line 12 that she demonstrates understanding.

We might then decide that this attempt to copy the word-search practice seen in the expert speakers’ video is unsuccessful. Perhaps the lack of success of this

sequence may be attributed to its artificiality. Rina has chosen to seek repair on an already-known item. That is, she is seeking repair on an item that she most likely does not *need* to seek repair for. This suggests that merely highlighting the use of particular practices may not be enough, and a more fine-tuned analysis of how the practice works may be necessary to ensure its successful use by our learners. However, we may see some success here, as Rina has at least used a phrase (“what’s that called?”) that was previously absent from the learners’ interactions. In Excerpt 2, we saw how the participants made use of Japanese word-search initiators, whereas here Rina does at least use English.

Excerpt 4 shows a word-search from a different group of learners performing their second interaction.

Excerpt 4

01 A: and do you like another event in winter.

02 C: I like *oshougatsu*.

New Year

03 A: *oshougatsu* mm. New Year.

New Year

04 C: because: (.) I can me:et (.) ah. what is it called
(.) that (.) ah (.) in Japanese *shinseki*?
relatives

05 A: ((nyuu))

06 (1.0)

07 C: mm?

08 (1.0)

09 A: ah. acquaintances?

Chikako has been talking about her favourite events in winter, and in line 1 Arisa asks her if there is another event that she likes. In line 2, Chikako uses Japanese

in her response, which Arisa receives with repetition in line 3, before providing an English equivalent (as in Excerpt 2, this may be seen as *medium-repair*, demonstrating that the proper language of the interaction is English).

In line 4, Chikako begins to give a reason for liking New Year. However, the stretched sounds, pauses, and the non-lexical token “ah” provide evidence that she is having trouble with her turn. The nature of the trouble is brought into clearer focus as she says “what is it called”. This is very similar to the phrase used by the Lisa in the ‘expert’ speakers’ video, and we can therefore see that her problem is in producing an upcoming item in her turn.

In Excerpt 3, Rina uses a similar expression to initiate a word-search, but does not immediately make public what the searched-for item is. However, while Chikako pauses briefly, she does not leave a long gap and continues her turn in order to make clear what she is searching for. She first says “that”, which prevents speaker-change, before briefly pausing again and saying “ah”. Having initiated a word-search she is continuing her turn to specify what the problem is. She then provides a Japanese equivalent for the searched-for item, although this is embedded in an English phrase (“in Japanese *shinseki*”). The rising intonation suggests uncertainty, while making it absolutely clear to her partner what the sought for item is. This makes her partner’s participation in the word-search possible, and Arisa attempts to help find the searched-for item.

Arisa’s turn in line 5 is not clear, and there is then about two seconds of silence, in the middle of which Chikako says “mm” with try-marked intonation, which evidences her continued attention to the problem and her lack of a solution. Finally, in line 9, Arisa suggests “acquaintances” as a candidate item in the word-search. However, her try-marked intonation also suggests uncertainty, and this suggestion is in fact not a suitable translation for *shinseki*.

While the outcome of the word-search may not be seen as completely satisfactory from a learning perspective (the suggestion of “acquaintances” as a translation of “*shinseki*” is incorrect, and therefore a possible learning opportunity

has been missed), we can argue that the word-search as a whole demonstrates the participants' interactional competence in the practice of initiating a collaborative word-search in English. After Chikako demonstrates that she is having trouble, she uses a *wh*-question to initiate the word-search, which is a practice commonly seen in English word-searches. She also helps secure the participation of her partner by preventing speaker change to make the searched-for item public. Although she uses Japanese to do this, the Japanese is embedded in an English phrase, and this turn-design demonstrates her understanding of English as the proper medium of interaction, while also recognizing her partner as a Japanese speaker. All of this allows her partner to understand that a word-search has been initiated, what the searched-for item is, and that her participation in the search is possible.

Discussion and conclusions

We can see a definite change in the use of word-searches between the first and second round of interactions. In the first round, there was only one word-search (shown in Excerpt 2) in 15 minutes of data, while in the second round there were four attempts to initiate word-searches in 15 minutes of data. Furthermore, while the word-search in the first round of interactions was initiated with the use of Japanese phrases (such as *nan dakke*), the word-searches in the second round of interactions involved appropriate English phrases. The phrases used seem to have been borrowed, or appropriated, from the video of the more proficient speakers. The exact phrase used by Lisa ("what's that called?") was used by Rina in Excerpt 3, while Chikako used a very similar phrase ("what is it called?") in Excerpt 4. In short, after watching the video of the more proficient speakers, our participants produced more word-searches and used phrases that we might expect to see in English word-searches.

We might conclude, then, that our study provides evidence that our participants' competence in performing word-searches in English interactions has improved. We may also tentatively suggest that this improvement is a result of the

task repetition and the analysis of the proficient speakers' video. Through watching and analyzing the video of the more proficient speakers, our participants were able to notice how those speakers engaged in a word-search, and were able to attempt to use similar language items in word-searches in their own interactions. So, in some respects, the second round of interactions demonstrate greater interactional competence in the initiation of collaborative word-searches in English. Prior to watching the video, we see little evidence of English resources typically used in word-searches being used by our participants. However, after watching the video the participants use *wh*-questions in attempts to initiate word-searches.

However, we might also judge the interactions to not be entirely successful. For example, in Excerpt 3, while Rina diligently follows instructions by choosing a practice from the list on the handout and attempting to use it in her own interaction, she attempts to repair an already-known item, and her partner apparently fails to understand that a word-search has been initiated. This may be because Rina did not precisely copy the practice that she saw on the video. The focus in the classroom analysis of the proficient speakers' video had been on the language used (i.e. the phrase "what's that called"), and not how this language was fitted into the interaction. In the video, Lisa prevents speaker change and immediately clarifies the item that she is searching for, allowing her co-participants to understand her. Rina does not immediately do this.

We cannot know why she does not do this, but one possible explanation may be related to the artificiality of the search. As she does not seem to be genuinely searching for this word, as it is apparently already known to her, she may instead be performing the practice to display to the teacher, who will listen to the recording later, that she is following instructions. It is only after Yuki does not display uptake of the word-search that Rina begins to clarify what she is searching for, but to no avail. Perhaps if the classroom analysis had focused more carefully on how the co-participation of others in the word-search had been achieved, Rina may have had more success in securing Yuki's collaboration.

In Excerpt 4, Chikako has more success in securing Arisa's collaboration in the word-search, and it could therefore be argued that Excerpt 4 provides greater evidence of interactional competence in the performance of a word-search than Excerpt 3 does. She does so, however, by using Japanese to achieve understanding. Many English teachers may not approve of L1 use in the classroom, but here L1 use is central to the success of the word-search. A number of studies have found that use of codeswitching in word-searches, both outside (e.g. Eskildsen, 2018) and inside (e.g. Stone, 2019) the classroom, may lead to learning opportunities arising for L2 speakers. As a consequence, we may wish to give consideration to whether or not this practice is problematic in our classrooms. L1 use in word-searches such as these may provide useful learning moments. Further, Chikako has displayed awareness of her situation and the interactional identities available to her. First, she maintains an orientation to speaking in English, by attempting to find a suitable English word (when understanding could have been achieved in Japanese), and by also embedding her L1 use in an English phrase. She is therefore performing her identity as an English student engaged in an English-language classroom activity. However, she is also making relevant the identity of 'Japanese speaker' that she shares with Arisa. One question we may wish to ask, though, is whether or not this provides useful practice for interactions in which a Japanese co-participant is not present.

A final point we would like to raise concerns how closely we should expect our learners to copy the practices they see more proficient speakers performing, especially in the case of this particular practice. As just discussed, word-searches have been found to be a useful site of language learning, yet Lisa and Jane in the video of the more proficient speakers orient not to learning, but to maintaining intersubjectivity. That is, they sidestepped the language problem and continued the talk once understanding had been achieved. As teachers, we may wish to see our learners making the most of learning opportunities should they arise. This is not to say that we should ignore the expert speaker data, as the way in which they

handled the word-search provides useful learning objects that our learners can use. However, we may also wish to highlight how the more proficient speakers attempted to sidestep the problem, and encourage our learners to actually find the items in their own word-searches. Although, as it turned out, our learners did indeed attempt to find the searched-for items, and so did orient to learning.

References

- Ahmadian, M. J. 2012. Task repetition in ELT, *ELT Journal*, 66(3): 380–382.
- Bygate, M., & Samuda, V. (2005). Integrative planning through the use of task repetition. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Planning and task performance in a second language* (11 ed., pp. 37-74). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chen, T. (2003). Reticence in Class and On-line: Two ESL Students' Experiences with Communicative Language Teaching. *System*, 31, 259–281.
- Ellis, R. (2005). *Planning and task performance in a second language* (11 ed., pp. 37-74). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Eskildsen, S. W. 2018. 'We're learning a lot of new words': Encountering new L2 vocabulary outside of class. *The Modern Language Journal* 102: 46-63.
- Gafaranga, J. 2000. Medium repair vs. other-language repair: Telling the medium of bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4: 327-350.
- Goodwin, M. H., and C. Goodwin. 1986. Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica* 62: 51-75.
- Greer, T. 2013. Word search sequences in bilingual interaction: Codeswitching and embodied orientation toward shifting participant constellations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 57: 100-117.
- 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.
- Hayashi, M. 2003. Language and the body as resources for collaborative action:

- A study of word searches in Japanese conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36: 109-141.
- Hayashi, M. 2012. Claiming uncertainty in recollection: A study of *kke*-marked utterances in Japanese conversation. *Discourse Processes* 49(5): 391-425.
- Heritage, J. 1984. A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In *Structures of social action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage, 299-345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G. and Kim, Y. 2007. Handling sequentially inapposite responses. In *Language Learning and Teaching as Social Interaction*, edited by Z. Hua, P. Seedhouse, L. Wei, and V. Cook, 22-41. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- 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.
- 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.
- Majlesi, A. R., and M. Broth. 2012. "Emergent Learnables in Second Language Classroom Interaction." *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction* 1: 193-207.
- Mori, J. 2004. Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *Modern Language Journal* 88: 536-550.
- 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

- Task repetition: Opportunities for learning and development (Paul Stone and Matthew Kershaw)
- classroom realities in Japan. *Tesol Quarterly*, 42(1), 133-138.
- Sacks, H., and E. A. Schegloff. 1979. Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, edited by G. Psathas, 15-21. New York: Irvington.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Salaberry, M. R. and Kunitz, S. 2019. Introduction. In *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice*, edited by M. R. Salaberry and S. Kunitz, 1-22. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Sahlström, Fritjof. (2009). Conversation Analysis as a Way of Studying Learning—An Introduction to a Special Issue of SJER. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*. 53. 103-111.
- Sasuga, M., and T. Greer. 2014. Forward-oriented medium repair in Japanese/English bilingual interaction. *Japan Journal of Multilingualism and Multiculturalism* 20: 1-16.
- Schegloff, E. A. 1982. Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of ‘uh huh’ and other things that come between sentences. In *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk*, edited by D. Tannen, 71-93. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, E., A., G. Jefferson, and H. Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53: 361-382.
- Seedhouse, P. 2004. “The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective.” *Language Learning* 54: 1–300. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.00268.x.
- Stone, P. 2019. Repair sequences in ‘off-task’ conversations in an EFL university classroom in Japan: Japanese language resources and learning opportunities. *Classroom Discourse* 10(2): 188-208.

- Stone, P., and M. Kershaw. (2019). 'Task repetition and interactional competence: designing a rubric for use in the classroom'. *Language, Culture, and Society* 17, p. 83-109.
- 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.

Appendix 1: The classroom handout

Look at the following moments from the video again. For each moment, what do you think the speaker's words are doing? Choose (at least) one option from the following table for each moment.

Starting a topic collaboratively	Supporting the speaker	Challenging/questioning the speaker
Asking for help	Giving help	Clarifying what the speaker means
Developing someone else's topic	Clarifying the speaker's point	Softening an expression
Evaluating another person's turn	Showing understanding	Checking shared understandings
Giving a reason for not answering a question	Paraphrasing	Hedging an answer
Commenting on what another person says	Giving a reason for an opinion	Moving the discussion forward

Time	Phrase	Function
0:00	but specifically talking about Tokyo, right?	
1:19	that's a very good description	
1:40	what's your point?	
1:47	what's that called?	
1:57	what's the problem?	
2:00	some people have fall allergies, so...	

Appendix 2: Transcription conventions

[Point of overlap onset
]	Point of overlap termination
=	Indicates that there is no gap between utterances
(3.2)	Interval between utterances (in seconds)
(.)	Very short untimed pause
:::	Lengthening of the preceding sound
?	Rising intonation, not necessarily a question
ˊ	Slightly rising intonation
CAPITALS	Louder sounds relative to surrounding talk
<>	Talk surrounded by angle brackets is produced slowly and deliberately
><	Talk surrounded by reversed angle brackets is produced more quickly than neighbouring talk
.	Falling (final) intonation
(())	Nonverbal actions or researcher's comments
-	Abrupt cutoff
∞	Utterances between these signs are noticeable quieter than surrounding talk.
↑	Indicates higher pitch

タスクの反復：習得と発展の機会

Paul Stone

Matthew Kershaw

この論文では、授業におけるタスクの反復と学習者自身がパフォーマンスの振り返りと分析を行う過程が、学習者の相互行為能力 (Interactional Competence, IC) を向上させるかを調べるプロジェクトについて報告する。目的は、学生が授業ディスカッションにおける IC をより理解できるような教材をデザインし、学生に自分自身の対話行為を向上させる機会を提供することである。

以前に提案されていた Communicative Competence は個人が保有している能力という前提があった。一方で、IC というのは相手との関わりの中で、会話に参加し、行為を遂行していく能力のことである。IC は文脈によって違うものなので、一つの場合に適切な IC も、他の場合においては、異なることもありうる。授業におけるディスカッションでの IC は、実際にどういうものかを見せるため、熟達した英語の話し手がディスカッションを行う場面を録画した。そして、学習者も熟達したスピーカーと同じトピックでディスカッションを行っている場面を録画した。

研究者が作成した教材を使用し、学習者は熟達したスピーカーのビデオを分析し、自分自身のパフォーマンスと比べた。この教材は、学習者が熟達したスピーカーの使用する特定の表現に注視して、その表現が相互行為能力において何を達成しているかを問う。また、学習者に学習の短期的な目標を書くように依頼し、もう一度同じトピックでディスカッションを行った。

この論文では、学習者達自身が集中した一つの特定の実践活動である、「言葉探し」という実践に焦点を当てる。会話分析を使用して、学習者の対話を分析すると同時に、熟達したスピーカーを録画したディスカッションも分析した。1回目と2回目のディスカッションにおける「言葉探し」がどの様に異なるかを示し、それだけでなく、熟達したスピーカーの対話における場合も比較した。2回目

の対話に学習者が「言葉探し」の実践を開始する量は上がったが、他よりも上手くいかなかったと判断されうるケースもあった。最後に、プロジェクトの教育的な意味について討論した。