A Korean Child's Developmental Changes in L2 English Interactional Competence through Conversation-for-Learning: A Longitudinal Case Study

영어 학습을 위한 대화에서 한국 아동의 상호작용 능력 발달상 변화에 관한 장기적 사례 연구

2023 년 2 월

서울대학교 대학원

외국어교육과 영어전공

권 상 우

A Korean Child's Developmental Changes in L2 English Interactional Competence through Conversation-for-Learning: A Longitudinal Case Study

by

Sangwoo Kwon

A Dissertation Submitted to

the Department of Foreign Language Education

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in English Language Education

At the

Graduate School of Seoul National University

February 2023

A Korean Child's Developmental Changes in L2 English Interactional Competence through Conversation-for-Learning: A Longitudinal Case Study

영어 학습을 위한 대화에서
한국 아동의 상호작용 능력 발달상 변화에 관한
장기적 사례 연구

지도교수 오 선 영

이 논문을 교육학박사 학위논문으로 제출함
2022 년 12 월

서울대학교 대학원
외국어교육과 영어전공
권 상 우

권상우의 박사학위논문을 인준함
2023 년 2 월

위 원 장 ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ (인)

부위원장 ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ (인)

위　　원 ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ (인)

위　　원 ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ (인)

위　　원 ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ (인)

A Korean Child's Developmental Changes in
L2 English Interactional Competence through
Conversation-for-Learning: A Longitudinal Case Study

by

Sangwoo Kwon

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Foreign Language Education

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English Language Education

at the Graduate School of Seoul National University

February 2023

APPROVED BY DISSERTATION COMMITTEE:

_____

KITAEK KIM, COMMITTEE CHAIR

_____

JIN-WAN KIM

_____

JUNGEUN CHOI

_____

JU YOUNG MIN

_____

SUN-YOUNG OH

ABSTRACT

A Korean Child's Developmental Changes in L2 English Interactional Competence through Conversation-for-Learning: A Longitudinal Case Study

Sangwoo Kwon
Department of Foreign Language Education (English Major)
Graduate School of Seoul National University

This dissertation describes the process by which a nine-year-old child Korean learner of English as a second language (L2) developed L2 English interactional competence (IC) by participating in Conversation-for-Learning (CfL, Kasper & Kim, 2015) weekly for 14 months with a proficient adult Korean conversation partner. A database of 28 hours of 51 CfL sessions was examined line by line and turn by turn using conversation analysis (CA).

The study's primary aim was to explore the child learner's L2 IC over the long term. The child participated in 51 half-hour sessions over 14 months. Each CfL session consisted of "new and good" events and post-book reading activities. The focus of the study was to trace the data over time to compare how the child responded to the question, constructed her turns, and unfolded her storytelling. By regular participation in the CfL, the child developed various linguistic and interactional resources in telling her stories regardless of her limited L2 linguistic resources.

The detailed analysis demonstrates that the child gradually showed more active participation, which coincided with several vital interactional features of her interactional behavior: increased participation by self-selecting her turns and using longer turn constructional units (TCUs) while engaging in developing stories, using diverse methods of repairing practice; using various L1 resources contingently, and expanding the story to a wider arena. At later stages (M8–14) she also demonstrated agency, acted humorous and playful for fun, and used embodied actions and realia to accomplish social goals.

The interaction between the two L1-sharing conversation partners demonstrated advantages for the child in soliciting help from the adult and in reducing breakdowns in intersubjectivity. The gap in linguistic competence between the two was clearly not linked to troubles in communication. Over time there were fewer examples of misunderstanding, and problems with the talk-in-interaction were solved by effectively adopting different interactional frameworks for L1 resources. Data analysis confirmed previous research findings that a child is not a deficient communicator. Additionally, the study empirically demonstrates that the child speaker was able to become a competent L2 communicator by using several resources at hand.

These data demonstrate the possibility of developmental changes in L2 interactional competence in a foreign language. CfL furnishes the resources to develop L2 IC, in particular by adopting more diverse, efficient, and sophisticated methods for novice speakers to achieve their goals as a storyteller when the conversation partner shows consistent alignment with her storytelling. This structure of dyadic CfL can be pedagogically applied to L2 child learners in the context of English as a foreign language (EFL).

The conversational analytic method has afforded new insights into L2 learning (CA-for-SLA, Markee, 2000) and the development of L2 IC. The proficiency level achieved by an L2 speaker demonstrates the developmental changes in L2 IC from minimal responses to active participation over time. When the L2 speaker showed more willingness to talk, the repair practice showed improvements in the use of diverse resources, including pause devices and filler resources over time; new L1 resources were used to achieve social transactions.

Lastly, these findings clearly demonstrate that the developmental changes in L2 proficiency are not limited to the realm of cognition but extend to the social arena. Without the help of the CA framework, these detailed and vivid snapshots of each developmental moment could not have been achieved. This study is significant in broadening research on CA-for SLA and extends its scope to child learners' development of both their interactional and linguistic resources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF EXCERPTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is organized as follows. First, the background of the study is presented in Section 1.1. The purpose of the study externalizes discussed with the research questions in Section 1.2. Based on this background, in Section 1.3, the gaps in current research will be adduced to demonstrate the significance of the study and its contributions to the relevant research. The chapter ends with the organization of the dissertation in Section 1.4.

1.1 Background of the Study

Before the concept of interactional competence (IC) received much attention in second language acquisition (SLA), Young (1999) pointed out that there were few detailed descriptions of the configuration of interactional resources, stating, "*we await descriptive and pedagogical studies of how novices become expert participants in a given interactional practice*" (p. 119, italics added). His wish over 20 years ago still echoes in this researcher's long-standing aspiration to uncover the language development of novice second-language (L2) learners. In particular, the interest lies in the interactional level of communication because it is the primary human instinct when learning a language as a social tool.

It has often been noted that child L2 learners with limited interactional and linguistic resources experience difficulties in participating in L2 interaction. Two of the frequently applied methods for improving language learning are to make them recipients of storytelling, such as bedtime stories, or to encourage them to become a storyteller themselves, because storytelling, which draws on one's life and past experiences, provides a meaning-and-fluency context (Seedhouse, 2004). It has also been shown to benefit various aspects of L2 learning

both in receptive and productive skills (Kasper & Monfaredi, 2021; Lucarevschi, 2016). In addition, it also offers great joy and satisfaction to the learner. Children learners also show more active participation when they are given free choices about what to tell than when they have no choices besides those offered by adult speakers. So far, storytelling has been explored both in the classroom and as an extra-curricular preplanned instructional tool to promote L2 learning. However, Kasper and Monfaredi (2021) have claimed that "the question of how student participation evolves in the interactional organization of the storytelling is not raised" (p. 3). In response to these research gaps, the current study tries to uncover the changes a child L2 learner achieves, and examines her participation in recurrent storytelling over the long term regarding her L2 interactional behaviors.

The L2 classroom for K–12 education in South Korea affords sparse opportunity for active conversational interaction for several practical and curricular-related reasons. Quite a number of eager-minded parents send their offspring to private institutes conducted in English in the children's pre-K and kindergarten years to provide them opportunities for L2 interaction. The convictions behind their choices seem to come from the beliefs that "the earlier, the better" and "more chances to use the L2 enhance the ability to communicate better." These two beliefs on language learning and language use are good topics to examine longitudinally with empirical data.

Unfortunately, however, there has not yet been active research on the second issue above in the Korean context, probably due to the unavailability of longitudinal data, as well as other methodological hurdles. As Young (1999) stated in the quote above, it is essential to consider the issues of how novices improve their interactional practices over time (Waring, 2019). Furthermore, it is always helpful for researchers in SLA to trace the trajectories of the developmental change of L2 learners (Ortega & Iberri-Sha, 2005). Therefore, more active research on language learning in everyday interactions has been called for (Firth, 2009; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Theodorsdottir, 2011; Wagner, 2004; Wong & Olsher, 2000). Accordingly,

more attention has been given to L2 IC and L2 use.

It has also been acknowledged that L2 learning contexts in non-pedagogical situations hold great potential in ensuring opportunities and conditions for L2 learning (e.g., Eskildsen, 2019; Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017; Theodórsdóttir, 2018; Wagner, 2015). The extra-curricular setting provides more room for child L2 speakers to take the initiative in choosing the topics of conversation than in the institutionalized classroom setting, where teachers often initiate the first turn. The second turns by students in the talk sequences are usually short, with constrained chances for further talk (Edwards- BGroves & Davidson, 2017; Willemsen, Gosen, Koole & De Glopper, 2020). Thus, the classroom setting creates limitations on gathering dialogic conversational data.

To examine the developmental changes in an L2 speaker's language use in social contexts, extra-curricular situations create a more favorable condition for child L2 speakers to join the conversational interaction for a longer period of time. Participating in recurrent social activities of becoming a storyteller is likely to bring changes in their use of interactional resources as well as linguistic resources. It is necessary to collect longitudinal data to examine the changes in interactional behaviors. Pekarek Doehler (2021b) claims that interaction-based longitudinal studies fall very short, and "there is an urgent need to clarify the notion of IC, which is not to be understood as a sub-component of communicative competence (CC)" (p. 420). In this vein, it seems reasonable to conduct research that carefully examines the developmental changes of a Korean novice child L2 speaker in her L2 interaction in the extracurricular setting. However, child L2 learners' interactional behaviors have received far too little attention to date in the L2 IC research in South Korea.

Conversation-for-learning (CfL; Kasper & Kim, 2015) is considered one of the most practically and pedagogically applicable formats of interaction that could be managed by the researcher in the non-institutional context. CfL has been implemented for language practice and eventually learning. Abundant studies have examined interactions in CfL (Hauser 2003, 2005, 2008, 2013; Kasper, 2004; Kasper & Kim 2015; Y. Kim, 2019; Kivik, 2012; Markee &

Seo, 2009; Mori 2003; Nao, 2010, 2015) and have found that CfL demonstrating asymmetries in knowledge and language expertise can provide a good site for L2 learners to use the ability to "navigate competently in locally contextualized settings, socially and linguistically" (Eskidsen & Theodorsdottir, 2017, p. 18). To improve the chance of maintaining the conversational interaction, the interactant with the child Korean L2 speaker was the researcher, whose first language is also Korean. In the EFL context, it is challenging to design the setting for a novice L2 learner's participation in talk-in-interaction with the same person over time even in the wild. One of the primary purposes for the researcher choosing CfL was to secure longitudinal data by preventing the likelihood of its termination. Longitudinal data involve numerous factors that render them vulnerable to external conditions that could lead to terminating the sessions.

To probe the nature of language development at the interactional level, the current study plans to examine the recurrent storytelling activities of a child L2 learner. The study also opens a wide selection of topics by inviting the young L2 speaker to talk about her current life events and news. The recurrent topic for the child to talk about is whether she had encountered something new and good in her life during the weekly interval between their sessions. This question was raised at the beginning of each CfL session before moving on to the post-book reading activities. This question served to "maximize opportunities for interaction and to prompt extended learners' turns" (Sert, 2019, p. 137). The topic of something new and good in one's life, similar to "news of the day" (Greer, 2019, p. 1) and "how was your day" (Kim & Carlin, 2021), gives easy access to the content, even though it might be linguistically challenging. Children's storytelling practices have never been explored in the EFL context.

The definition of the term "storytelling" in this study includes Berger and Doehler's (2018) definition: "a stretch of talk to which both speaker and recipient orient as a telling about events situated in the past whose chronological ordering is recognizably displayed by the storyteller" (p. 73). In addition, the study takes the stance that "stories can be situated in the future when a storyteller refers to the events that will be soon to occur. Stories may be based

on real-life events, may be elaborated truths, or may be fictional or imagined" (Filipi, Ta, & Theobald, 2022a, p. 3).

The social actions of storytelling are meaningful and context-based, so the motivation is greater to talk more and to build a close relationship with the story recipient. The task of telling one's life updates for a Korean learner of English in a dyadic conversation is not easy, nor is it usual. This unique setting in the format of CfL is a type of socializing. The issues of socialization and building a relationship with the interactant create an important background for social interactions. Interactional routines help the L2 learner acquire socialization skills in the setting of talk-in-interaction using English with an adult whose L1 is Korean. This is a new social setting that the child learner of English gets used to gradually as she overcomes the difficulties resulting from the situation.

Pekarek Doehler (2010) points out that learning a language "involves the routinization of patterns of language-use-for-action through repeated participation in social activities" (p. 106). In the same vein, the current study seeks changes in language use in natural conversational interactions. This environment can be a circumstance favoring L2 use in social contexts without having any designed instructional settings. This can offer a child L2 learner chances to open his or her heart to a conversational partner. In addition, when the context is non-institutional, the conversation can be more socially oriented.

The current study begins from the same starting point as the socio-interactional basis of language learning (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Hall, 2004; Liddicoat, 1997; Markee, 2004; Mori, 2007). Learning an L2 is also can be defined as a social practice (learning-in-action, Firth & Wagner, 2007). L2 learners are no longer considered deficient communicators but rather capable speakers[1] and active agents in the social context who can successfully achieve social

---

[1] In this study, both terms "speaker" and "learner" are used when referring to the child subject. Speaker is preferred over "learner" when the child is described as a capable communicator in the context of social action of conversation or storytelling. In the meantime, "learner" is preferred when the discussion describes the subject as an entity that learns an L2 in the EFL context.

interactions (Firth & Wagner, 1997). This perspective requires various contextual factors, such as how they interpret the interactant's utterances, how they respond to them, how they solve their difficulties moment by moment, and what types of resources they use in their journey to become more efficient communicators. These features are important indicators of L2 learning, since it is widely believed that children acquire and learn to communicate by participating in meaningful interactions with adults and other children (Tomasello, 2003; Wooton, 1997). In a similar vein, Wong and Waring (2017) demonstrated a remarkable similarity in the use of resources such as seeking assistance, pursuing uptake, and signaling delicacy by comparing the audio recordings of monolingual and multilingual L2 speakers.

With the recent burgeoning research on L2 IC, some researchers have raised the issue that "little is known about the process by which learners develop their L2 IC, nor about the stages this development goes through" (Hall, Hellermann & Pekarek Doehler, 2011, p. 7). Echoing this concern, other researchers have presented the research agenda for fruitful and meaningful exploration of L2 IC. For instance, Pekarek Doehler (2019) raises questions such as "what aspects of L2 IC develop at what level of proficiency?" (p. 48). The current study cannot offer an absolute answer to the question, but the relevant changes that a L2 child learner experiences during her long journey to become a more engaging interactant will be discussed throughout the description and discussion of the research findings.

It is expected that a novice L2 Korean speaker will experience various developmental changes in her L2 IC when he or she is participating in talk-in-interaction in the extra-curricular setting on a regular basis with an L1-sharing adult. By joining social interactions, the L2 speaker will experience diversifying her practices in her interactional behaviors while handling her difficulties using resources at hand and achieving her own goals. The primary interest here rests on the changes in the novice L2 learner's interactional behaviors when she joins conversational interactions with an L1-sharing interactant on a regular basis over time.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

It is hoped that the current study will contribute to the growing body of knowledge in this field by empirically demonstrating changes in a Korean L2 child learner's interactional behavior in CfL sessions over a longitudinal period by adopting a conversational analytic approach (CA-for-SLA; Kasper & Wagener, 2011; Pekarek Doehler, 2010). The dissertation aims to elucidate the various gradual interactional practices and resources by analyzing a novice child L2 speaker's conversational data in face-to-face interactions over 14 months.[2] The focus of the analysis will be on the changes in methods and practices that the child L2 speaker deploys on her long journey to become a more active participant in the talk-in-interaction as an L2 speaker. The changes in her L2 IC will be the primary analytic focus of the study, which examined her turn-construction process, including repair and interactional organization such as turn-taking and sequence organization in the process of unfolding her life updates in the form of storytelling.

In this descriptive CA study, the changes captured in the interactional data differ from the traditional cognitive aspect in being more participant-centered in orientation. The changes are usually the "recognizable and describable actions" of interacting parties (Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, & Olsher, 2002, p. 5). These descriptive analyses aim to find the evidence of learning by asking "why doing that now?". Also, they try to find how that particular action helps her achieve her own goals in the context *in situ*. Her action of doing an action is co-constructed and displays her understanding of the other party's prior turn (Kasper, 2009). Therefore, it is necessary to examine a specific type of recurring activity to trace different responses and deployments of diverse resources and to trace the changes in L2 IC in the course of CfL sessions over time within an individual L2 speaker. This condition provides the

---

[2] The face-to-face CfL interaction shifted to an online platform in the fourth week of the seventh month of the longitudinal period.

rationale for probing the same question and different versions of answers to it to examine the changes in the L2 IC in the longitudinal framework.

The L2 speaker is considered capable of doing things with her limited linguistic and interactional resources (Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007). This view of L2 learning and learners can serve as a baseline perspective for approaching conversational interaction as a favorable environment enhancing learning while joining in social interactions. The aims of the study are specified in the following research questions.

1. What will happen to the novice child Korean L2 English speaker's interactional behaviors when she participates in conversation-for-learning while updating "something new and good" in her life?
2. In particular, what resources and methods will be used, and when and why?

The first research question examines the changes in the novice L2 speaker's interactional behaviors while joining the CfL sessions and whether or not she will show practices different from her prior ones. If so, what will the changes be? The second research question probes more specific actions and choices she makes in constructing her turns and continuing the interaction while joining the regular conversational interactions. For example, when does she use different practices, and why does she use them? Finally, the functions of these new practices are analyzed in the contextual background by turn-by-turn analysis of the data.

1.3 Significance of the Study

This conversation analytic study is expected to contribute to the existing research by addressing definite gaps in the literature. First, this study will be the first to examine the

developmental changes in L2 IC in the CfL setting in the Korean EFL environment. A longitudinal CA-SLA study that examines the L2 speakers' change in their practices and methods has not been carried out in the local Korean context. IC development needs data from longitudinal periods of 9 weeks at a minimum (Waring, 2013) to 27 months (Wootton, 1997) it is expected to find changes in the interactional features during this time period. For example, how does the child speaker respond to the question in different time spots? This question can demonstrate the child L2 speaker's turn-taking skills. What does she do when she faces difficulty in understanding, speaking, and listening? This question can elicit details of and changes in the emerging self-repair practice of the child L2 speaker. Moreover, the repair work of a novice Korean L2 speaker has never been explored in a longitudinal timeframe. The findings will thus show many aspects of the speaker's status in language development and the developmental features of his or her L2 IC. Longitudinal CA studies tracing changes in L2 IC remain in their embryonic stage, and there are still many unexplored areas to be uncovered.

The second research gap concerns novice child speakers as the main subjects of a CA-for-SLA study. Robust evidence of IC at various performance levels is needed (Seedhouse, 2012). Many previous L2 IC studies have used adults as the main subjects and examined their changes in interactions over time (Hellermann, 2011; Nguyen, 2011a, 2011b; S. Kim, 2019). The process of how a novice child L2 speaker's L2 IC develops has not been examined closely in the field of CA-for-SLA in the context of Korean as the first language. With limited linguistic resources, it is expected that the novice will deploy more diverse resources to achieve social actions. In addition, the developmental changes in the novice L2 speaker will show different features than in intermediate and advanced adult groups. Once an accurate picture of a child L2 speaker's changes in his or her IC is revealed, the educators and teachers can design a curriculum and activities that can enhance IC development based on a holistic understanding of language use and interaction.

Third, the study will contribute to the effect of interactions in an extra-curricular setting in the EFL context. It is expected that these types of data can contribute to SLA with different

insights from classroom interactions (Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017; Theodórsdóttir 2011). The scarcity of chances to use L2 in the wide world seems to have instilled the unproven belief that sending L2 learners to L2-speaking countries is the most efficient option of all. However, this CA-SLA study highlighting how L2 speakers use their linguistic and interactional resources in their home country will empirically display what happens in their conversational interaction occurring regularly over a longitudinal period. This study can demonstrate the dynamic and dialogic aspects of L2 use in the foreign language setting when an L2 novice child speaker is involved in a recurrent activity of storytelling of her life over time will bring some changes in both interactional level and linguistic levels. This issue has not been explored thoroughly, so this study will make a contribution to research by providing an example of repetitive interaction with the same partner in the local EFL context.

Lastly, the study will provide a better picture of the L1-sharing interactant in CfL. The myth of the native speaker (NS) as a better and more beneficial interactant has been widely prevalent in the local context among parents and some educators. In the findings of CA studies, whether a native speaker or a non-native speaker (NNS) is identified only when it is relevant (Bae & Oh, 2013; Carroll, 2000; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Pennycook, 2001). In addition, many researchers (Braine, 2010; Davies, 2003; Galloway, 2008; Kurniawati & Rizki, 2018; Medgyes, 1992; Pham, 2021) have questioned the native speaker fallacy. The membership categories in the talk-in-interaction in social practice become visible and activated only when the contingency touches on identity issues. This qualitative CA-for-SLA study, by examining the micro-details of talk-in-interaction between the two parties, will provide an excellent opportunity to uncover the role of the co-participant. It will also afford a good opportunity to define the role of a shared L1 between interactants in CfL. This study can offer a more precise judgment on the decision or preference prioritizing the NS as an interactional partner.

1.4 Organization of the Study

This introduction has provided the study's motivation, purpose, and significance. The following chapter offers a theoretical and empirical review of the literature relevant to the present study. Chapter 3 explains the methods used for conducting the current research. It introduces the research design, research participants, data collection, and data analysis. Chapter 4 presents the child learner's changes in her L2 IC from the initial stage (M1–3) of the dyadic interaction. Chapter 5 contrasts the interactional practices the child learner uses in the initial and later stages. Chapter 6 shows newly emerging practices witnessed in the later stage. Chapter 7 discusses the essential issues from the results of the study. Chapter 8 concludes with a summary of the findings and methodological considerations and pedagogical implications. Finally, directions for future research are provided.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The current chapter reviews the literature pertinent to this study, and includes six key literature items crucial to the research. First, in Section 2.1, the emergence of IC in the field of SLA is introduced. The analytic apparatus for examining developmental changes of IC, CA, is explained in Section 2.2. The constructs of IC are then reviewed in Section 2.3. Longitudinal L2 IC studies drawing on the conversation analytic method are introduced in Section 2.4. Next, L2 storytelling from the aspect of CA is reviewed together with the relevant studies in Section 2.5. Last but not least, doing humor and language play in the L2 interaction are introduced in 2.6.

2.1 L2 Interactional Competence in Second Language Acquisition

Successful L2 interaction has long been a goal of learners, educators, and parents in Korean society. However, the goals and criteria of that dream have yet to be concretely specified in the interactional level. Kramsch (1986) used the term IC first in her discussion of the "dynamic process of communication" (p. 368), emphasizing that successful interaction requires not only a shared knowledge of the world but also the construction of a shared internal context of intersubjectivity with the other interactants. This can be gradually built through the collaborative efforts of the interactional partners by engaging in repeated conversational interactions.

This collaborative effort in the local contingency plays a critical role in successful L2 interaction. The concept of intersubjectivity and IC, however, were seldom the focus of the academic research field of SLA before the seminar work of Firth and Wagner (1997) on the paradigm shift of L2 learning and the social turn (Block, 2003). Scholars have since devoted

greater attention to the pedagogical effects of such interaction and the importance of social factors, and have increasingly focused on the contextual and dialogic aspects of L2 use and learning. As a result, with the increasing calls to explore the nature of L2 IC, the term IC has entered the field of applied linguistics. However, an agreed-upon definition of IC has not appeared, though researchers have actively explored the nature and its features.

In Young's (2019) view, intersubjectivity is an essential component of IC, as the resources deployed by participants are contingent on the local situation. In other words, what speaker *A* perceives the other *B* doing and thinking makes the next step of the interaction. He also adds that IC is not a permanent trait nor an ability that can be deployed in any other context. He expresses doubts about the term "competence," saying that "competence" does not describe IC adequately, having often been used to refer to a characteristic of an individual speaker. For example, when competence is used in "communicative competence (CC)," it is interpreted that "competence" can be deployed regardless of the context and the other participant(s).

Though IC builds on the theories of competence, it is quite different from CC, one of the previous parameters for measuring L2 learners' competence (Canale & Swain, 1980; Hymes, 1974). As the traditional model of CC considers language ability a stable trait (Canale & Swain, 1980), research on CC has tended to focus more on individual speech production, which has been considered a static, internal, and cognitive property of individual learners (Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011). These attempts to operationalize and investigate CC (e.g., Bachmann, 1990; Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell, 1995; Nunan, 1989) have thus not been successful in demonstrating the diverse aspects of L2 speakers' communications in social contexts. The sub-divisions of CC into linguistic, sociolinguistic, strategic, and discursive competence (Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980) have focused "on the individual production of the L2 learner, rather than on the learner's participation in social interaction and the related process of mutual adaptation" (Pekarek Doehler, 2021, p. 22). In

13

sum, CC has been considered more a decontextualized cognitive property that aligns with social conventions from the monologic perspective.

Contrasting with the concept of CC (Canale & Swain, 1980; Hymes, 1974), IC is not inherent to individuals' capacities but is locally situated and externalized in the moment-to-moment dynamics of interactants' understanding and deployments of actions in the talk-in-interaction (Kasper, 2009; Taguchi & Roever, 2017; Young, 2011, 2019). In addition, the features of IC can only be examined at the interactional level. Moreover, there are no pre-specified expected routes for developmental changes nor concrete stepwise indicators that generally apply to any L2 speaker. It is sometimes assumed that an L2 speaker with a developed IC would communicate efficiently in any context with any interactants. However, this perspective reflects the traditional view of the CC, which is considered a permanent possession. This researcher contends that the developed IC ability can only be visible in the context of contingent situations via the actions and moves L2 speakers make in the unfolding conversational interactions.

The developmental features of L2 IC started to be explored relatively recently in the history of modern linguistics. Studies with empirical data on the changes in L2 IC only appeared about a decade ago (Pekarek Doehler, 2021b). There are still some disagreements in using the term IC. For example, Hall (2018) suggests using the alternative term "interactional repertoires," and Markee (2019) proposes "language learning behavior." These different understandings of IC indirectly confirm the necessity for more empirical research and discussions among scholars and researchers. Above all, it is important to understand and study the key features of IC and its definition. Shea (1994) and Saville-Troike (2003), who examined what persons do in their interactions, posited four defining features of IC (Young, 2019, p. 96):

1. IC is observed in spoken face-to-face interaction;

2. Participants recognize and respond to expectations of what to say and how to say it;

3. IC is not about the ability of a single individual to deploy those resources in social interactions, and it is not permanently carried on by each individual;

4. IC varies not only with participants, but also varies with the discursive practice in which they are engaged.

The first feature explains that IC can only be observed in talk-in-interaction but is not measurable or detectable in written language production. These IC studies exclude experimental laboratory settings. The second feature concerns the speaker's sensitivity to contextual factors such as the type, purpose, and co-participant in the interaction. A speaker in the interaction *in situ* needs to figure out what to say and how to say it based on their understanding of the other party's action at each moment. The third feature emphasizes that IC is not an individual's permanent trait that can be applied in any situation or with anybody. Resources at each talk-in-interaction are mutually and reciprocally deployed to create intersubjectivity. As a result, a change of interactant creates a different setting. Intersubjectivity is created out of collaborative activity in linguistic interaction. According to Wells (1981), any act of linguistic communication has three variables, creating a triangular relationship: the sender, the receiver, and the context of the situation. Interaction cannot proceed smoothly without considering the interactive forces between these variables. The component of IC is therefore visible through the speaker's construction of turns and the turn-taking sequences. Lastly, IC is not permanent but varies not only with the co-participant but also with the discursive practice.

Therefore, social and contextual conditions must be considered in each moment of interaction. For example, an L2 speaker who deployed a high level of IC in a particular discursive practice cannot guarantee his or her same level of participation and responses in a

different set of interactions with a different participant. This non-permanent nature even applies to recurrent interactions with the same participant if there is a time interval between the interactions. This feature is also one of the challenges that IC studies encounter. Whether a change is due to development or to a change in the local context remains uncertain (Hall, Hellermann, & Pekarek Doehler, 2011). It is challenging to clearly describe the contributing causes and effects of the speaker's changes, because the field is still building "an empirically grounded and epistemologically coherent understand of what IC is" (Pekarek Doehler, 2021b, p. 418).

Moreover, CA is concerned with the competencies that ordinary speakers use when participating in socially organized interactions (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984), and is not developmental in nature (Pekarek Doehler, 2021b). Given this background, this study recognizes this boundary in seeking to detect the changes the child L2 speaker experiences during the recurrent CfL sessions over time. However, it cannot yet be claimed that these changes constitute strong indicators of IC development.

As explained above, the development of IC has not been widely communicated but has been introduced to a comparatively tiny group of researchers and educators during the decade of history of its empirical research. The term is explained as the ability to "mutually coordinate" (Hall and Pekarek Doehler, 2011, p. 2) and co-construct actions in order to interact with other participants (Hellermann, 2008; Jacoby & Ochs, 1995; Nguyen, 2011a; Young 2011) with locally contingent methods and conduct (Pekarek Doehler, 2010). Balaman (2016) also summarizes IC development as increased participation (Pekarek Doehler, 2010), the diversification of members' methods (Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015), or a change in the surface manifestations of socially distributed cognition (Markee & Kunitz, 2015).

IC is based on the capacity to perform a joint action mutually guided by two participants. Thus the granularity in each turn-taking in the sequences is significant. IC views language ability as a dialogic construct, locally situated and jointly construed, shaped, and accomplished by participants in discourse (Hall et al., 2011; Young, 2011; He & Young, 1998). The abilities

quoted from Balaman (2016) are all facets of IC. The term development carries a connotation of improvement in applied linguistics and is not substantially tangible in L2 IC studies. Likewise, Pekarek Doehler (2021b) claims that the field has limited knowledge about "the nature and the development of the intricate abilities needed for managing the situated dynamics of social interaction" (p. 20). In contrast to the past century-long research on linguistics, L2 IC has witnessed just a single decade of empirical research on the development of L2 IC. Therefore, it is difficult to provide a succinct categorization and features of L2 IC development generalizable to L2 speakers. This is one of the rationales for describing the practices and methods the subject experiences as "changes" or "gains."

2.2 Conversation Analysis for L2 Interaction

IC is the first barometer that considers the interactional level of communication that is visible in the moment-to-moment interaction. In traditional research on SLA, the surface errors of L2 learners were considered significant indices of learners' developing competence. As a result, research focused on language forms rather than the interactional behaviors of L2 learners (Gardner & Wagner, 2004). As this research trend resulted in a tendency to view L2 learner performance from the perspective of inadequacy or deficiency (Firth & Wagner, 1997), a new analytic framework was needed to strategically explore L2 speakers' interactional behaviors, collaborative work of constructing utterances, and sequences.

To accurately describe each moment-by-moment action performed by the participants, researchers need a bottom-up analytic approach that can describe the participant's emic perspective in the discursive discourse. The bottom-up analytic method, with the participant-oriented and context-embedded perspective, is an appropriate tool to examine questions such as "What do people do to have a conversation?" and "How do people solve difficulties in

conversation?". CA is a unique and appropriate method to examine the collaborative work of co-constructive behavior in having a conversation, which is the product of much joint effort (Schegloff, 1997a) from a CA perspective. Because of its strength in describing language use at the interactional level, studies drawing on CA to investigate L2 talk-in-interaction have contributed significantly to the understanding of L2 oral language and L2 IC (Hall et al., 2011).

With the increasing popularity of CA in the diverse research contexts of L2 studies, the term CA-for-SLA (Markee & Kasper, 2004) or CA-SLA (Kasper & Wagner, 2011) was coined by Kasper and Wagner. The conversational analytic method can allow the researchers to access scenes of how co-participants jointly engage in talk-in-interaction. Within this context, the method of CA, which is oriented toward observing the granularity of talk-in-interaction, has become an efficient tool for observing the architecture of the sequential organization. Moreover, it has contributed to revealing the minute procedures and changes in using diverse methods in spontaneous conversational interactions on vertical and horizontal time scales.

CA is rooted in ethnomethodology[3] (Garfinkel, 1977) and is now widely used in the study of human interaction. The central goal of "conversation analytic research is the description and explication of the competencies that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participating in socially organized interaction" (originally Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; quoted from Markee et al., 2021, p. 2). This quote shows that CA originally was not interested in developmental issues but instead sought to describe the organized and systematic patterns occurring in interactions. This feature is well described in the following quote: "CA has identified systematic ways in which generic interactional requirements, such as turn-taking, repair, sequence organization, or the overall structural organization of conversation, manifest themselves and are dealt with in a multitude of situations, in a (growing) range of natural

---

[3] Garfinkel coined the term combining "ethno-," which means "common" or "folk," to denote a methodology commonly used by any normal member of society, which might differ from the deterministic viewpoints of outsider social scientists.

languages, and by a wide array of participants" (Wagner, Pekarek Doehler, & González-Martínez, 2018, p. 7). CA is one such efficient tool for examining the architecture of interaction. Wagner et al. (2018) also summarize CA as initially involved in generic interactional problems, and historic time was not a concern. In addition, it was not initially concerned with not-yet-competent members (Schegloff, 1989). Thus, in early CA research, practitioners' analytic interests and methodological practices crystalized based on data drawn primarily from adult and adolescent speakers interacting with their peers, as per Wagner et al. (2018). Soon, however, the boundary and participants of the talk-in-interaction expanded to embrace the conversation analytic work of other ethnic groups (Goodwin, 1990), children (Kidwell, 2005; Kidwell & Zimmerman, 2006), and multilingual populations (Li, 2002). CA's meticulous analysis of the sequential turn-by-turn procedure in the unfolding interaction provides an attractive tool for L2 use and learning.

According to Pekarek-Doehler (2020), CA-SLA studies share the following basic CA methodological principles: "(1) the subject for the analysis is from naturally occurring data, either audio or video ones; (2) the starting point for analysis is an activity but not language form. The focus is on how learners repair, take a turn, open a story, or close a conversation; (3) collections of such doings are established to identify recurrent 'methods' for accomplishing social actions and recurrent interactional format that provide opportunities for learning; (4) am emic perspective is brought to bear on the data; (5) systemic sequential analysis is undertaken to uncover the micro-details of the moment-by-moment unfolding of talk-in-interaction" (p. 289).

This descriptive-analytic method can elaborate on how the speaker uses the L2 in their use of language rather than examining how they use formal rules. In other words, the method specifies distinctive choices L2 users make in their situated language use (Richards & Seedhouse, 2005; Wong & Waring, 2010). Thus, CA's findings on L2 English tend to put

greater value on L2 use in the production of turns and actions (Kasper, 2009; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Waring, 2012). Two or more participants in conversational interactions are sometimes metaphorically compared with dancers in a ballroom. Each partner predicts future actions based on previous actions, given incomplete information to launch their interactional moves, which is termed contingency. Partners coordinate each other's moves and proffer a contingent next action acceptable to the other party. The capacity of dealing with interactional moves is thus only externalized via the choices and actions made in the interaction's local contingency.

One of the strengths of the conversational analytic approach in SLA lies in its capacity to trace the developmental changes of language by recognizing changes in L2 use. However, early ethnomethodological CA studies were not interested in change over time (Wagner, Pekarek Doehler & González-Martínez, 2018). These changes can be recognizable objects of learning for analytic comparison and include various phenomena of L2 use. In contrast to traditional SLA studies that treat changes in L2 use as the outcome of learning, CA studies consider the changes as "the object of analytic specification" (Lee & Hellermann, 2014, p. 765), and itself as language learning as participation changes across time.

Concerning the subject of CA studies, adult L2 speakers have been the primary target subjects for analysis because the primary purpose of CA is to examine the procedures used in the production of ordinary conversation. However, since Wooton's (1997) pioneering longitudinal CA work with his child, studies analyzing children's language data have steadily increased, though the numbers remain small among CA studies as a whole. Every child shows language development over time in both L1 and L2. Thus, children can also be good subjects to trace developmental changes over time regarding their interactional behaviors. Many more longitudinal CA studies of IC are needed for both linguistic resources and interactional practice.

In the CA-for-SLA, there are three lines of research. According to Y. Kim's (2019, p. 309) summary, 1) the first strand shows how learning is accomplished as a social action in interaction as participants orient to it; 2) the second one is a group that demonstrates learning as changes over time, and concerns the development of L2 speakers' interactional and constructional competence, and 3) the third strand can be characterized as an effort to describe the interactional architecture of pedagogical settings such as classrooms and other settings. The second line of research necessarily requires examining the same L2 speaker's same or similar interactional activity with an interval between different time locations to trace the changes in interactional practices for an extended period. The current study follows the second line of research, tracing the empirically demonstrated changes in the learner's repertoire of interaction resources.

The developmental changes in L2 IC have recently been studied in comparison with other subjects in SLA. So far, the developmental changes in L2 IC have been investigated in participants' co-construction of participation frameworks (Cekaite, 2007; Dings, 2014; Hall, 1999; Ishida, 2011; Kim & Carlin, 2021; Pallotti, 2001; Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Young, 2000, 2013), repair (Hellermann, 2009; Kim, 2019; Brouwer & Wagner, 2004), engagement (Hellermann, 2008; Ishida, 2011; Watanabe, 2017), and recipient design (Hellermann, 2008; Ishida, 2011; Nguyen, 2011b; Taguchi, 2014). The analytic objects can therefore range from the practice of routine inquiries (Waring, 2013) to story prefaces (Hellermann, 2008; Monfaredi, 2022), story openings (Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2016), more precision timed

self-selected turn-taking (Cekaite, 2007), increased participation (Watanabe, 2017), and story recipiency (Barraja-Rohan, 2015; Y. Kim, 2016).[4]

Studies of L2 IC have been conducted both in the classroom (Cekaite, 2007, 2012, 2017; Hellermann, 2008, 2009; Kanagy, 1999; Monfaredi, 2022; Pekarek Doheler & Berger, 2011; Seedhouse, 2004; Sert, 2015; Watanabe, 2017, 2018) and in the wild (e.g., Eskildsen, 2019; Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir, 2017; Kim & Carlin, 2022; Pekarek Doheler & Berger, 2016; Theodórsdóttir, 2018; Wagner, 2015). L2 interactions in the wild have only recently been the subject of research. Non-instructional settings include study abroad (Barraja-Rohan, 2015; Ishida, 2009; 2011; Masuda, 2011), homestay contexts (Berger & Pekarek Doehler, 2018; Pekarek Doheler & Berger, 2018), conversation-for-learning (Y. Kim, 2016), and business and service encounters (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; S. Kim, 2019).

As listed above, L2 interaction studies have been backed by the conversational analytic method. However, as mentioned before, the CA framework has not yet been adapted to developmental issues in nature, which is one reason why it is challenging to connect the descriptive data with the concept of development in L2 IC. However, it may be expected that the perspective on learning as participation or learning as doing will make it possible to discuss changes in L2 IC by connecting the issues to discover the underlying mechanisms in the developmental spectrum.

---

[4] The list of categories and relevant studies are drawn from Balaman (2016), and the recent studies have been included by the researcher.

2.3 Constructs of Interactional Competence

IC is the ability to accomplish meaningful interactions and is the speaker's ability to respond to the other participant and to maintain a competent engagement (Hall et al., 2011). IC-CA studies pay attention to the participants' capacity to co-construct meaning and actions for mutual understanding and to accomplish social actions using various resources such as linguistic forms, interactional organization, and nonverbal semiotic systems (Markee, 2008). An L2 speaker's orientation to various resources can become an indicator of developmental changes. For instance, participants' gradually opening up and becoming accustomed to the interactional contexts can contribute to their different choices and actions, thereby demonstrating positive changes for the development of L2 IC.

IC is subject to assessment as well. For example, Roever and Kasper (2018) argue that IC is a key construct in assessing language proficiency, even though the co-constructed nature of IC poses challenges in language assessment contexts (Youn, 2020). For example, Youn examined different proficiency groups' proposal sequences and applied rating criteria of speaking performance to differentiate their interactional moves as follows.

The criteria in Table 3.1 above indirectly specify the possible candidate objects for analysis of an L2 speaker's interactional behavior. The item "Coherent Delivery" pertains to the analytic point of repairing practice. The resources used for the repair process can demonstrate the changes in an L2 speaker's improvement in the delivery of her message. The item "Language Use" provides the rationale for examining the linguistic resources the L2 speaker uses over time. When the subject of CA studies is a novice L2 speaker, the data collection period needs to be long enough to demonstrate the changes. Youn's study examined different proficiency groups so that the different linguistic resources could be observed. Pragmatic understanding can also be an object for analysis when examining the changes in L2

IC. The third item, "Sensitivity to Situation," shows the necessity of providing appropriate responses for one's actions in the local context. The fourth item, "Engaging with Interaction," shows the interactive aspect of interaction that expresses one's understanding of the prior turn by the other participant and creates relevant questions. The fifth item, "Turn Organization," demonstrates that fluid turn-taking and appropriate pauses and overlaps are important features of the development of L2 IC.

Table 3.1 Rating Criteria of Interactive Speaking Performance

	Score 3	Score 1
Coherent Delivery	• Clear, concise, fluent • Smooth topic initiations	• Delivery is choppy, fragmented, and minimal (due to a lack of language competence)
Language Use	• Good control of grammar • Pragmatically appropriate linguistic expressions	• Expressions sound abrupt or not polite enough (e.g., *I'm busy*, *I can't*) • Linguistic expressions are inaccurate and quite limited
Sensitivity to Situation	• Consistent evidence of awareness and sensitivity to situations exists in an appropriate sequence	• Little evidence of situational sensitivity (e.g., absence of providing accounts for disagreement)
Engaging with Interaction	• Evidence of engaging with the conversation exists (e.g., clarification questions, backchannel, acknowledgment tokens)	• Noticeable absence of discourse markers • Evidence of not achieving a shared understanding
Turn Organization	• Complete adjacency pairs (e.g., question & answer)	• Noticeably abrupt overlap • Noticeably long pauses or noticeable cutoff between turns

Adapted from Youn (2020, pp. 104–105)

As Youn's criteria above show, the constructs of IC are related to the organizational aspects of conversational interaction. According to the findings of empirical IC studies, IC constructs include meaningful output, engagement, and listener response, and are categorized as repair, turn-taking, and sequence organization. These constructs are important keys to

understanding the features of the developmental changes in L2 IC, which can be externalized as diversified methods that the L2 learner uses during participation in conversational interactions over time.

Along with Youn's (2020) rating criteria, Galaczi and Taylor's (2020) key features of IC will be helpful in understanding the constructs of IC. The table is adapted from p. 339.

Table 3.2 Key Features of Interactional Competence

Turn management	Interactive Listening
• Starting	• Backchanneling
• Maintaining	• Comprehension checks
• Pausing / Latching / Inserting	• Continuers
Topic Management	**Breakdown Repair**
• Initiating	• Joint Utterance Creation
• Extending	• Self/Other
• Shifting	• Recasts
• Closing	

The table also shows that the features of IC include the interactive and co-construal nature of L2 interaction. The development of IC needs to be measured from many viewpoints. The current study cannot examine every possible feature, but will thoroughly examine (a) turn management, (b) breakdown repair, and (c) topic management while demonstrating the storytelling practice.

Regarding repair practice, several studies have explored the repair practice of L2 speakers (Farina, Pochon-Berger, & Pekarek Doehler, 2012; Hellermann 2009, 2011; Hosoda, 2006; Kim, 2020; Sert & Balaman, 2018). The change in repair practice can be a positive indicator of one's development of IC. For example, Pekarek Doehler and Pochon-Berger (2015) argue that L2 speakers with more developed L2 IC can use repair for different purposes, not only for a remedial purpose.

Repair is "the 'self-righting' mechanism" (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977, p. 381), and is defined as actions that a speaker takes to solve a problem in the process of constructing their own turns. Trouble is defined as "anything which the participants judge is impending their communication" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 34). These difficulties in hearing, speaking, and understanding are subjects of the objects of repair. Therefore, everything can be the subject of repair or accessible to a possible repair source (Schegloff, 2007). In SLA, repair is viewed as invaluable for its critical role in communication and its facilitative role in L2 speakers' learning. SLA researchers emphasize the important role of repairs as follows: "repair is responsible for keeping the cradle (of language acquisition) rocking" (Wong & Waring, 2020, p. 212), and plays a role similar to pressure points for learning (Skehan, 1996).

There are four repair types distinguished by (a) who initiates repair and who completes it (Schegloff, 2007; Schegloff et al., 1977); (b) self-initiated self-repair (SISR); (c) self-initiated other-repair (SIOR); and (d) other-initiated self-repair (OISR) or other-initiated other-repair (OIOR). It has been found that more interactionally capable L2 speakers tend to follow "preference for self-repair" (Schegloff et al., 1977). This finding has been supported by the results of Hellerman (2009 & 2011), Martin and Sahlström (2010), and Farina, Pochon-Berger, and Pekarek Doehler (2012), who paid attention to L2-related problems and the ways in which a speaker fixes linguistic difficulties.

For a better understanding of repair work, 10 different operations of SISR in native English speakers' speech data are presented, based on the categorization of Schegloff (2013)[5]:

1. Replacing refers to a speaker's substituting for a wholly or partially articulated element of a TCU-in-progress;
2. Inserting refers to the insertion of one or more new elements into the turn-so-far;

---

[5] More descriptions and pertinent excerpts are provided on pp.43–68 (Schegloff, 2013).

3. Deleting is when a speaker deletes one or more elements already articulated fully or in part in the turn-so-far;

4. Searching refers to the speaker finding a target item due next that was temporarily unavailable;

5. Parenthesizing is the addition of the clausal TCU to the already projected TCU;

6. Aborting is abandoning not a part of TCU but an already started TCU.

7. Sequence-jumping is similar with "aborting" in that it abandons the TCU; however, it differs in that it turns sharply to something unrelated to the turn and sequence in progress.

8. Recycling refers to the speaker's repeating some stretch of talk—but almost always less than a full TCU.

9. Reformatting refers to a change of the already produced TCU into a new TCU with a different grammatical structure while retaining its content.

10. Reordering is an operation that speakers can use when trying to work out the order in which elements of a turn-in-progress should be arrayed.

Research on the emerging features of self-repair has been conducted with native English children (Forrester, 2008; Wooton, 1997). L2 novice speakers' repair work also needs to be explored for a more empirically based understanding of L2 IC and L2 development. It was found that intermediate and advanced groups of L2 Korean speakers use different types of operations in self-initiated self-repair (D. Kim, 2020). In L2 interaction, word-search has been a popular topic among researchers when tracing L2 speakers' lexical improvement in the process of composing turns that fit the intended message. Word-search is technically one form of SISR. The novice L2 speaker usually shows quite frequent self-initiated self-repair practice in each turn construction. This is the rationale for examining the novice L2 speaker's repair practice to assess how she overcomes any difficulties and what resources she uses in her repair

practice.

This section will next briefly introduce turn-taking, a basic block of sequence organization. Turn-taking is another important construct measuring the development of L2 speakers' IC over time. A turn-constructional unit (TCU) is the basic building block of a turn, and an adjacency pair (AP) is the building block of a sequence. For example, a question is raised by person *A*, then the answer is expected to be produced by a different person *B*. The first pair-part (FPP) and second pair-part (SPP) is a sequence where a particular type of FPP is expected to have a particular type of SPP. However, the speaker who initiates the FPP does not always expect that the SPP will be provided. Types of APs are greetings and answers, questions and answers, and offering and accepting. This is one of the core social actions that human beings perform in their social communications. When a question is posed, the response can be delayed at inter- and intra-turns, indicating a lower degree of mutual understanding and a lack of interactional and linguistic resources for L2 speakers. The delays can be shortened with recurrent participation in L2 use in social contexts.

Sequential development or organization is also a key construct of IC development. For example, CA-SLA research has examined the initiation of openings and the provision of time locators for storytelling (Barraja-Rohan, 2015; Hellerman, 2008; Roever & Kasper, 2018).

The above constructs are subjects for examination and analysis in research on IC development. L2 IC studies go beyond examining the occurrences of language errors, requiring an eye for mutual display involving collaborative and interactional co-work between the interactants. This fine-tuned description of L2 use is a prerequisite for describing the developmental features of L2 IC.

2.4 Longitudinal Studies in L2 Interactional Competence

Since about a decade ago, several longitudinal studies on L2 interactions have uncovered diverse facets of the development of L2 IC. These studies have helped us toward a holistic understanding of L2 learners' abilities (Deppermann & Pekarek Doehler, 2021; Kasper & Wagner, 2014; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2015, 2019). As CA can effectively document progressive change over time in demonstrating participants' accomplishment of social actions, it has been chosen as an adequate method for research, having contributed empirical evidence of the trajectories of interactional development (Markee, 2015). Longitudinal CA-based studies were rare until pioneering longitudinal CA studies of both a first language (Forrester, 2008; Wooton, 1997) and a second language (Hellermann, 2008, 2011; Rine & Hall, 2011). The accepted period for a "longitudinal" span ranges from nine weeks (i.e., Waring, 2013) to several years. CA studies have been pursued as an analytic method over a long span of time to compare changes in individuals' interactional practices in natural talk (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Cekaite, 2007; Dings, 2014; Greer, 2016; Greer, Ishida & Tateyama, 2017; Hall et al., 2011; Kasper & Roever, 2018; Pekarek Doehler et al., 2018; Waring, 2022). Some of these studies are micro-longitudinal (Markee, 2011), attempting to uncover the temporary turn-by-turn unfolding of an interactional practice, while others are macro-longitudinal, comparing the L2 speaker's interactional practices across specific instances and over longer spans of time.

In the following summary of L2 IC studies that deal with data from longitudinal settings, the core features relevant to the current longitudinal study will receive more space than other studies. In general, longitudinal studies concentrate on interactional practices, such as turn-taking practice, sequence organization, or repair organization. Turn-taking is a basic form of

organization of conversation (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Speakers coordinate when to hold the floor, and organize and respond conditionally and sequentially to relevant locations. One example of a turn-taking study is Cekaite (2007) which showed how a seven-year-old Kurdish girl's self-selected turn-taking chat became more precision-timed. Also, Watanabe (2017) showed in a longitudinal study how a young EFL learner displayed more self-selected turns in a post-expansion sequence and increased participation in the talk-in-interaction.

The ability of L2 speakers to "organize the sequence or course of action implemented throughout talk" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 9) has also been reported to improve gradually. CA-SLA scholars (Dings, 2014; Hellermann, 2008; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2016) have demonstrated this using longitudinal data. For example, Pekarek Doehler and Berger (2016) showed how an L2 French speaker's story-opening techniques improved over nine months. Gradually the *au pair* student, Julie, developed systematic prefatory techniques over time by using disjunct markers and providing referential works to project the upcoming story, or by securing recipiency through turn-taking designs.

As the current study deals with a child subject, it is relevant to review studies examining children's L2 IC. Palloti (2001) conducted one of the first studies to examine a child L2 learner's interactional behavior, finding that the young speaker showed patterns of increasingly carrying out self-selected turns rather than relying on the other party's dominant turn allocations and leading. The focal student, a 5-year-old Moroccan girl Fatma in an Italian nursery school, self-selected her turns in an interactionally timely manner, as well as covering more topically relevant subjects over time.

In addition, it has been reported that L2 speakers generally show increased participation when they develop more L2 IC than before (Pallotti, 2001, Watanabe, 2017; Young & Miller, 2004). One student, Eisaku, a young Japanese English learner, was the subject of the study of Watanabe (2017), demonstrating an increased ability to monitor the details of the ongoing talk and the appropriate use of interactional resources. Examples include taking the initiative in participating orally and deploying a reversed identity role as a teacher. Not only turn-taking

strategies but also both linguistic and non-linguistic resources increased and fitted well with the local contingency in their appropriateness in self-selecting turns.

Self-selection by the L2 speaker has also been reported by Cekaite (2007). A novice L2 speaker in a Swedish classroom showed turn-taking in a more precise manner, and his turns developed to better fit the institutional norms. His appropriate use of linguistic and interactional resources increased over time, and his self-selections were accepted as interactionally appropriate by the teacher and his classmates. The three studies mentioned all had young child L2 learners as subjects.

In addition, Kim and Carlin (2021) examined the talk between a father and a child and showed how the initial sequential structure changed over 18 months. The child initially listed activities in short sentences, but as the sequence gradually expanded, the interaction underwent a transformation. The child showed more developmental indices, such as the emergence of three-part structure, as well as more details of the activities, story prefaces, and the emergence of assessment response. Also, heavy reliance on the father's managing of the talk decreased as the talk volunteered by the child increased.

Adult L2 learners' IC has also been explored by several researchers. Hellermann (2008) examined L2 (English as a Second Language; ESL) adult students' storytelling abilities. He found that the more they practiced turn-taking-based social practice in the L2, the more the adult L2 learners started to show story prefacing. For example, as they became more experienced in the use of L2 in a social context, story pre-facing markers started to emerge, such as a discourse marker or a time referent (e.g., "when I was, I was, yesterday").

Some key studies had adult L2 subjects. One was carried out by Pekarek Doehler and Berger (2015) with an *au pair* in France. They found that the subject, Julie, increased her repertoire of practices, deploying conducts that increasingly fit the local interactional circumstances and co-participants. The fitted conduct was context-sensitive and recipient-designed in the local situation. Also, Rover and Kasper (2018) demonstrated that more advanced speakers display a tendency to provide the pre-context of the conversation more

frequently and appropriately. Nguyen (2011a) also documented how an L2 learner used interactional resources in her ESL class. The findings revealed that the learner's responses in the beginning stages were brief, containing only simple turn construction units and non-verbal resources. However, in the later stages the learner produced multi-unit responses that were syntactically and lexically more elaborate. The researcher described the learner's changes as learning-as-participation while participating in responding to the topic proffered by the teacher.

In general, longitudinal studies concentrate on interactional practices, such as turn-taking practice, sequence organization, and repair organization. Turn-taking is a basic form of organization of all conversations (Sacks et al., 1974). Speakers coordinate when to hold the floor, organize, and respond to conditionally and sequentially relevant locations (Schegloff, 1968). The current study also seeks to define changing practices occurring in storytelling in the CfL format over a longitudinal period. Among the three strands[6] of CA studies of L2 interaction (Y. Kim, 2019), the current study belongs to the second strand of studies, attempting to define the change in an L2 speaker's deployment of various resources in the talk-in-interaction over time. The subject of the current study is a child in the EFL context. To describe previous findings and identify research gaps, we will examine the key empirical findings of the CA studies that have explored the development of L2 IC.

---

[6] "First strand attempts to show how learning is accomplished as a social action in interaction as participants orient to it. The second strand is characterized as an effort to show learning as changes over time such as the development of L2 speakers' interactional and constructional competence over time. The last strand is concerned with describing the interactional architecture such as classrooms and other settings" (p. 309).

2.5 Storytelling and Conversation Analysis

Storytelling is ubiquitous in everyday human interaction. Storytelling enables us "to make sense of our experience, to derive comfort and enjoyment, and to understand what we share with others" (Filipi et al., 2022a, p. 3). A conversation analytic approach (Sacks, 1984, 1992) has identified a different dimension to storytelling that distinguishes it from the findings of research on storytelling as a narrative and as a genre (e.g., Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). From a CA perspective, storytelling is a recognizable, collaborative, and interactional activity between teller and recipient as they accomplish a range of social projects (Mandelbaum, 2012) during the course of talk-in-interaction. In the book edited by Filipi et al. (2022b), it is stated that storytelling is not limited to telling about past events but can be situated in the future as well when a storyteller refers to events that will shortly occur. The current study also follows the broader conceptualization of storytelling by Filipi et al. (2022b).

Personal stories that people share with another interactant range from sharing our experiences or events to anecdotes. The goal of this communication might be to inform, complain, or have a good time (Schegloff, 1997b). These different interactional actions are now broadly called "tellings" (Theobald, Busch, Mushin, O'Gorman, Nielson, Watts, & Danby, 2022, p. 126). Tellings can take various forms, such as jokes (Sacks, 1974), updates (Searles, 2019), news (Butler & Weatherall, 2006), and reporting of troubles (Jefferson, 1988).

Mandelbaum (2012, p. 142) also comments regarding the storyteller and recipient that "they're not then simply telling a story for no good reason or telling of something that happened once to somebody else, or that happens to people, but they're offering something that does something now, i.e., describes, explains, accounts for, our current circumstances—mine, yours or mine and yours" (Originally in Sacks, 1992, p. 465). Sacks (1978) also points out that all stories, even jokes, are designed to achieve some kind of social work in that the tellers, through their storytelling, address norms and concerns about their everyday social

worlds by carrying out an activity that constitutes an important social action (Barraja-Rohan, 2015). In sum, ordinary storytelling is a co-construction, an interactional achievement, a joint production, and a collaboration (Schegloff, 1997b).

Storytelling in L2 is a challenging but excellent method for improving turn-construction and sequence expansion skills, and can be a useful place to practice applying interactional skills and resources in the talk-in-interaction, because their trajectories are sensitive to local interactional contingencies (Jefferson, 1978; Mandelbaum, 1989; Sacks, 1974). As noted thus far, the opportunities to present one's ideas verbally in social contexts can be a good place for using diverse methods *in situ*. The design and constructional features of storytelling differ from other types of talk-in-interaction. It is said that "when a story is launched, recipients for the story do not compete, but allow him or her to proceed by not taking full turns alternating with the teller" (Hellermann, 2008, p. 84). This constructional feature of suspending the turn-taking machinery (Mandelbaum, 2012; Sacks, 1974) can constitute a beneficial type of communication for L2 learners in which they have more space and time to construct their stories than those involving more interactive communication.

Concerning the unique sequence organization and turn-design of storytelling in CA, Sert (2019) claims that a major focus of research on L2 IC development in real-life situations, outside of the instructional settings, has been storytelling (Barraja-Rohan, 2015; Wong & Waring, 2021). Storytelling has been studied in its interactive nature, such as collaborative storytelling, as stories are produced interactively and co-constructed by the teller and recipient cooperatively. Kunitz and Jasson (2021, p. 29) state that "CA research has focused on storytelling as a recognizable activity that involves a three-part structure of preface, telling, and response sequences." Interactants implement a variety of social actions with these structures.

Novice L2 speakers might experience difficulties in engaging in the three-part structure of stories. It has been found that L2 speakers with low proficiency levels tend to launch into a story in the classroom abruptly without properly introducing it with a preface (Hellermann,

2008; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2016). Barraja-Rohan (2015) examined an adult Japanese L2 speaker and found that the student's storytelling increased in complexity and length with multiple TCUs and turns over time. Such research has indicated the direction of subsequent research, and the current study also tries to demonstrate changes in the child L2 speaker during her recurrent storytelling activities over time.

As the subject of the current study is a pre-adolescent child, it will also be useful to examine more studies of storytelling by children. It has been found that storytelling can play various roles for children. For example, those children who participate in storytelling can gain opportunities to build identity (Goodwin & Kyratzis, 2011; Theobald, 2019). Storytelling can also play an important role in children's mental health when they have chances to share their traumatic events in everyday conversations (Bateman & Danby, 2013; Bateman, Danby, & Howard, 2013, 2015).

In addition, children sometimes perform spontaneous and planned imaginative storytelling with peers, teachers, and parents (Bateman, 2020; Theobald, 2019; Waring, 2022). Their imagination can be enacted as pretend play (Bateman, 2018, 2022; Nicolopoulou, 2016). Likewise, the child L2 speaker in the current study showed pretend play in her storytelling in later stages while introducing humor into the conversation.

The studies reviewed so far identify an increased variety of resources and changes in structural aspects of interaction as essential features of IC development. The structural aspects include turn complexity, sequential positioning, and sequence expansions, which will be assessed and discussed in the current and later chapters. Wong and Waring (2010) proposed applications of conversation-analytic research on storytelling in pedagogical practice both in EFL and ESL settings. In addition, Kasper and Prior (2015) have recommended extensions of storytelling research in teaching English as L2. Echoing Firth and Wagner's comments on L2 speakers (1997, 2007), Wong and Waring (2017) also question the designation of L2 speakers as deficient language users, calling (2021) for concerted efforts to explore storytelling in multilingual interaction.

Finally, but very importantly, CA-based storytelling studies so far have focused on "a younger age (1–6) either in school or family settings, with the exception of Goodwin's (1990) study on pre-adolescent of ages between 9 and 14" (Waring, 2022, p. 48). The L2 child in the current research is a pre-adolescent (ages 10–11). This setting is unique, as it is set in neither a school nor a family setting. In addition, the context of the setting is in the EFL context, which has not been observed in any studies thus far. Most of the storytelling studies involving children have been conducted in contexts where the L2 language is used widely both outside the classroom and in the children's homes. The current study is unique in its context and in the age of the child L2 speaker. The interlocutor was a stranger to the child in the beginning, though the two developed a close relationship during the study. Searles (2019) notes that talking about one's day and past events is a documented component of close relationships; prior research has documented that people in a close relationship sustain a working knowledge of each other's activities, concerns, and involvement (Pomerantz & Mandelbaum, 2005), with such intimates telling each other about their lives, in the form of both good and bad news (Freese & Maynard, 1998; Maynard, 1997; Schegloff, 1988), and storytelling (e.g., Lerner, 1992; Mandelbaum, 1989; Ochs & Taylor, 1992).

The recurring question initiated by the adult speaker in the current study has the capacity to build a close relationship between the two, as the contents of the answer involve "something new and good," which could be her life updates, her activities, or her storytelling. The change that the L2 child speaker showed during her participation in the storytelling can be expected to have been strongly affected by the ever-closer relationship between the interlocutors. However, the study will only document the resources and interactional skills displayed in the unfolding sequences. The findings of this study will hopefully shed light on an unexplored aspect of children's storytelling within the perspective of the study subject's development of L2 IC over time.

2.6 Doing Humor and Play in L2 Interaction

L2 IC has been described as the development of abilities to participate more efficiently in social interactions (Pekarek Doehler, 2021b). Playing a trick for fun and using humor can be an interactional resource if it helps L2 speakers move forward in their interactions or create a certain social effect during the course of the talk. It therefore deserves to be examined under the umbrella of the changes and facets of L2 IC for the following reasons. According to Pekarek Doehler and Berger (2019), researchers interested in IC development examine the L2 speaker's interactional behavior through the lens of how participants "negotiate, challenge or affirm such categories as learner vs. expert, or implement other categories and social relations, as part of their understanding of the situation at hand" (pp. 73–74). The novice L2 speaker can challenge the categories of themselves as "learner" and "non-dominant figure" and implement categories such as a "joker" or a "dominant and powerful interactant" using humor and language play. Any interactional practice or method that a novice L2 speaker deploys deserves attention, because it shows their maneuvering of the interactional contingency based on their understanding of the context and their social needs to achieve. Using humor or playing tricks for fun using L2 is quite engaging and deserves meticulous examination and analysis.

It has been acknowledged that children's interactions are often characterized by spontaneity, creativity, and playfulness (Cekaite, 2017). It is known that language play is a cultural tool (Vygotsky, 1986) that makes it possible for children to explore language in entertaining ways. These attempts can have an educational impact in promoting L2 interaction (Cekaite & Aronsson, 2005; Cook, 1997, 2000). Humor and play in and outside the language classroom have been less explored. However, humor has recently attracted the attention of researchers in the field of SLA (Reddington & Waring, 2015), though there have been few empirical studies of L2 humor (Bell, 2011; Reddington & Waring, 2015). Three themes around

37

humor are categorized by Bell and Pomerantz (2019): "humor as an aid to L2 pragmatic development, humor as a resource for L2 Interaction, and humor as an aspect of the L2 to be learned" (p. 63). They also call for a more robust perspective that can introduce greater methodological diversity into research on L2 humor. In this study, the second theme, humor as a resource, will be touched upon with empirical data.

Using the conversation analytic framework, researchers can access how L2 learners produce humor and analyze its functioning in the unfolding sequences of talk-in-interaction so as to specify how humor is used in a given interactional context (Reddington & Waring, 2015). Tarone (2000) has called for systematic observations of language play and humor among different groups of learners, but so far there has been little written on the topic of Korean novice L2 speakers' using humor during L2 interactions. In addition, the majority of humor studies have been conducted in the classroom setting. Classroom-based studies will next be presented.

Classroom-based studies of humor include the following: 1) Lehtimaja (2011) found that teachers in an L2 Finnish classroom could still accomplish pedagogical work by playing along and affiliating with students. 2) Waring (2013) examined adults' ESL classes on how adult learners explored "being playful." The findings revealed that the L2 learners used identity as their key resource. For example, a student took the teacher role by taking the teacher's sequential feedback slot (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Other examples of play related to personal identity, such as telling a humous narrative to portray oneself as an obsessive shopper.

According to Waring's analysis, three types of identities were used in being playful: situational, relational, and personal identities. (3) Reddington and Waring (2015) found that humor occurred when students manipulated the sequence organization by producing an unexpected turn or by using a turn component to switch to something new. One example is

excerpted below. The teacher wraps up by providing instructions on the upcoming presentation with a concluding remark in a question format, "Simple. Right?" (L256).

```
256          Simple. Right?

257   Carmen: For you.

258   LL: [hahahahah    ]

259   T1: [$For you ↑too.$]
```

(Reddington & Waring, 2015, p. 7)

The TCU, "for you," by Carmen fits the extension slot of the teacher's prior turn as it is grammatically connected to "simple." Though, in contrast to the surface level, Reddington and Waring argue that the turn is pragmatically misaligned with the teacher's assessment and has the humorous effect of creating laughter among the whole class.

The social functions of humor and play have also been explored by several researchers, drawing on the methods of CA in classroom settings. These studies examine the possibility that humor and play can facilitate various forms of participation. In the current study, the child subject tended to participate more actively as she built up more sequences involving playfulness with the other interactant. In the later phase, where she actively engaged in "doing playful" and "doing humor," she even initiated a musical performance for the other adult interactant in the middle of the CfL session.

Several studies of the function of humor and language play show that play and humor can create the effect of allowing room for making mistakes, achieving a higher level of participation in class. Van Dam (2002) showed that language play was used to accomplish

facework. Low-proficiency learners could participate without experiencing the typical face threats associated with individual participation in the L2 by inviting others to laugh at their mistakes. Garland's (2010) work on humor and identity described the case of a student who made repeated use of humor to create a positive identity as a "funny guy."

So far, the majority of research on humor and language play has been conducted in the classroom setting, and there has been little or no research on humor and play in the L2 extracurricular setting. The data from a dyadic CfL session in the longitudinal timeline can illustrate different aspects of humor and play in L2 learning. The data from the current study show that using humor and being playful did not appear in social interactions in the earliest period, but only begin to appear in the later months (M8–14), because the interactants were strangers in the beginning. What distinguishes the current study from others is that humor and play were used in the storytelling sequences by faking the story and adding some visual effects. The play seen in this L2 interaction is not a simple example. The excerpts that are described in exemplary cases include a bigger scenario of making fun by playing a trick on the other party. This is not a simple turn-by-turn humor or joking but involves playful storytelling and tricks.

The child L2 subject's use of humor and play in this context can be related to her new identity as a storyteller in the L2. As Reddington and Waring (2015) show, humor and play are closely related to personal identity. The social identities between the two interactants have been developed and undergone transformations during the course of their regular CfL session. The language socialization theory (Peters & Boggs, 1986) demonstrates that situational contexts are routinized in children's communication. This routinization provides a favorable environment for language learning, and the following commentary describes how a child language learner becomes reinforced both linguistically and socially.

Such routines provide a considerable amount of linguistic input to the child's developing linguistic systems, enabling her to perceive and analyze speech in a

40

predictable and recurring context and to practice utterances with immediate reinforcement. (p. 94)

Thus, the recurrent routinized questions raised by the child L2 speaker seem to greatly affect her practice of language use by engaging herself in both inquiry and storytelling routines. This facilitates not only her linguistic development but also, her social positions and identity in the CfL sessions. Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) state:

Children develop social and cognitive skills through participating in structured cooperative interactions with more mature members of society. Indeed, as children interact with others, they acquire a tacit understanding of their own social identities vis-à-vis others in their environment. (pp. 6–7)

The social interactions in which Sora participated over the period of 14 months follow the routinized patterns of language use in the beginning of the sequential structure. As she became used to the interaction patterns, she could also predict them, analyze the responses, and receive immediate reinforcement from the more mature interactant. It seems certain that Sora's understanding of her social identity while joining the CfL sessions would have changed from the onset to the later months. Her identity as a Korean child with a limited linguistic and interaction resource conversing with an adult Korean at the beginning of the project was expected to transform over the longitudinal period of CfL. The ways in which the adult speaker interacts with Sora might have afforded her the opportunity to use humor and play. Identity has a feature of fluidity in accordance with the contextual situations and the dynamics of sequential development. This study will thus examine Sora's "being playful" and "doing humor" in the second sub-section in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter will cover the participants, research procedures, and data analysis. Section 3.1 will present information on the research participants such as the child L2 speaker's experience with and attitude toward learning English and the adult researcher's experience learning and teaching English. Section 3.2 includes information on research procedures. Section 3.3 will include data collection, data summarization, and data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

3.1.1 Setting

This section will describe the research setting. The research ultimately included dyadic CfL sessions between one adult and one Korean child learner of English as a main setting. The project began with the aim of gathering and analyzing the naturally occurring interactional data of Korean novice speakers of English in the EFL context. It subsequently went on to examine the changes occurring in practices and methods in the interactional setting. Securing the participants for spontaneous conversation-for-learning (Kasper, 2004; Kasper & Kim, 2015; Kivik, 2012) over a long-term period was the first and most important task before launching the research study. To reduce the possibility of dropouts and to extend the data collection period as long as possible, the researcher planned to participate in the long-term project as both an interlocutor and an interaction manager (Hauser, 2003). This would make the setting more consistent for gathering longitudinal data. The researcher's commitment does not guarantee the continuation of the CfL sessions for a long enough time to meet the requirements of a longitudinal study The researcher, however, could create the opportunity and make her best efforts to encourage the child participant, Sora, to continue her commitment to the interactional gatherings for CfL.

As English teaching in the public school curriculum in South Korea does not start until the 3rd grade in elementary school, the majority of students do not have minimum English skills in listening or speaking. However, those who received private language education earlier can use a minimum level of English for reading and listening. Even with the help of the private sector in L2 teaching, it is still difficult to achieve spoken fluency in the Korean EFL context. The researcher therefore targeted elementary school students who had practiced enough reading and listening beforehand.

It is generally known that speaking English requires a longer interactional practice to improve, so speaking proficiency was not a core qualification to join the project. It was assumed that one to two years of exposure to English audio and video resources in kindergarten or elementary school would not sufficiently raise the level of basic conversing skills in English. Thus, 1st and 2nd graders in elementary school were therefore excluded from the subject recruitment. In addition, 5th and 6th graders were excluded for the very practical reason that mandatory classes in the last two years of elementary school are much busier than the previous years, and 5th and 6th graders tend to have more afterschool private hagwon classes to prepare themselves for a higher educational institute. The researcher could foresee that it would be challenging to set regular times to meet with 5th or 6th graders for this unique project. Accordingly, the primary targets of the research were limited to 3rd and 4th graders. A second subject participated in this project for eight months; however, Sora was chosen because of her longer span of time commitment to the project. 3.2 Participants

3.1.2 Recruiting the Participant

Recruitment of participant(s) [7] was launched in May 2015 in the researcher's neighborhood, a western part of Seoul, South Korea. The participants were recruited from the

---

[7] The researcher recruited three children in total; however, two dropped out before they reached 10 months.

3rd and 4th grades in the local elementary school. The recruiting advertisement was posted online, and it involved a brief description of the longitudinal project. The first condition for subjects to participate in the research was basic reading and listening skills. In addition to basic reading and listening skills, speaking skills sufficient to hold conversations would be the minimal requirement for completing the CfL activity on a regular basis. It was noted in the posting that no monetary transactions would be involved. The main participant, Sora,[8] was a fourth-grade girl. Her mother contacted the researcher after reading the online post and later visited the researcher's house with Sora. After an introduction to the project and with Sora's agreement, the weekly sessions were arranged. From the beginning, the researcher tried to make the mood friendly and cheerful with Sora by complimenting her English at the diagnostic reading session and during the early ice-breaking conversations. The researcher considered that creating a good relationship was the most critical variable in conducting the longitudinal project, knowing that the participant could drop out unexpectedly at any time.

It was expected that letting the child learner talk about her life would open her heart to the researcher. Listening to the speaker with full attention was always a top priority for the researcher during each session. These contextual variables helped the sessions continue for more than a year. Sora continued her weekly session from June 2015 until August 2016, for a total of 51 sessions.

3.1.3 Sora

Sora is a novice Korean learner who participated in conversation-for-learning in this study. She is an only child living in Seoul, and she enjoys family activities on weekends, such as going to the movies on a regular basis and visiting her grandparents. She has also had quite

---

[8] All names in the study are pseudonyms.

extensive experience traveling abroad to Japan and European countries. Sora has artistic talents and is very imaginative; sometimes she was very playful and played tricks, teasing the researcher by creating fake stories. She greatly enjoyed coming to the researcher's house and opened up her heart and shared many of her life events, thoughts, and feelings. The researcher could tell that Sora thought of the researcher as a mentor as well as an interlocutor. The medium of interaction was English, a foreign language. Overall, their mutual trust and love seemed to surpass her limited linguistic capacity. Of course, some social and power relations were involved in the dynamics of CfL. The following quote in one of her later sessions in 2016 expresses Sora's stance on the weekly gathering, "I prefer to talk in English with you. It feels more equal and relaxed when talking in English with you."

Sora was nine years old when she first joined the CfL session. She started receiving a private English education when she was five years old and had had 1:1 private English conversations with a Korean English speaker who had lived in an English-speaking country. Since entering elementary school, Sora had attended an English library program consisting of an extensive reading program run by a private academy for two years during her 1st and 2nd-grade periods. The following year she switched to a small English academy and learned English for half a year. From February 2015, during her 4th year in elementary school, she was receiving private short lessons from a Korean teacher who visited her on a weekly basis. When the researcher met Sora in June 2015, she was at the level of reading a simple English storybook and could understand daily spoken English fairly well but not completely. Her command of English skills in speaking was not yet developed highly enough to produce sentence-level utterances, but she had a great interest in improving her speaking skills. She never felt distressed or reluctant to have the CfL sessions. Instead, she gradually started to enjoy sharing her life updates as their regular sessions became sufficiently comfortable.

3.1.4 Nari

Nari is Sora's conversation partner in the dyadic CfL sessions. She is also the researcher and the author of the dissertation. Nari is a pseudonym. She is currently a PhD candidate and a public middle school English teacher. She has a bachelor's degree in English education and completed her master's degree in English education. Her thesis was on the use of the L1, Korean, in young adult peer groups' CfL. She had taught English at a public middle school for eight years in total when she launched the current research project. Continuing her interest in Korean English learners' speaking proficiency, she has explored gathering diverse English data from acquaintances and ex-students; however, the data sets were all short-term and she encountered difficulties in having L2 spoken data sets based on a longitudinal time span.

The researcher is very interested in exploring ways to improve Korean students' speaking skills to dismantle the patterns of reliance on English speakers from English-speaking countries, because these resources of NSs are strongly limited in the EFL context. The researcher herself had not received any formal education in English-speaking countries during her K–12 schooling. She graduated from a regular high school, and simply started to practice English conversation and writing skills right before her college entrance. During her time at college, she joined diverse activities such as an intensive English learning program run by the language center at the university, as well as joining English conversational gatherings at a language café and finding a language exchange partner.

The researcher experienced that active participation in the L2-medium interactions could improve both her linguistic and interactional competence. The researcher also visited the USA for about seven months. During her stay, she traveled to different parts of the country and took writing classes in the community center in the Boston area for three months right before starting her teaching career in 2005. She also joined a teacher's training program for six weeks at a language center of a university on the east coast of the USA.

Potentially contentious points in the researcher's control and analysis of data as a researcher and interactant in the CfL sessions can be excluded, as the researcher did not have a clear analysis point while gathering the data. In other words, doubts of the researcher's impartiality during data analysis can be resolved. In addition, the pseudonym was chosen to give a more objective third-person perspective in the data analysis process, because using one's own name could cause unsubstantiated thoughts and memories.

Other CA-SLA studies conducted by an analyst-as-participant (Boblett, 2020; Hauser, 2017; Markee, 2018; Reddington, 2020; Waring, 2022; Woolley, 2002) could also have proceeded because the requirements for analyst honesty can be met with the simple test of the next turn proof procedure (Sacks et al., 1974; Seedhouse, 2005), which prevents the analyst from being over-subjective or over-inferential during data analysis. Waring (2015) also claims that the validity of the analysis lies in whether the "descriptions of the practices based on the data are convincing to the reader, who has equal access to the data" (p. 48). Therefore, the issue of the analyst as a participant as well can be resolved from the results of the data analysis.

3.2 Procedures

3.2.1 Routine Activities

During the regular CfL session, the interaction involved routine activities performed during each session in the same order. It is known that children and novices in society acquire social order and systems of belief through participation in language-mediated interactions (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Likewise, it is expected that the child speaker will experience learning not only through language but also through social issues or matters. According to Peters and Boggs (1986), certain routinized situational contexts for children to communicate with others create a language-learning environment for the child "enabling her to perceive and

analyze speech in a predictable and recurring context and to practice utterances with immediate reinforcement" (p. 94).

Here are the procedures for each session the researcher conducted. Once the child arrived at the researcher's home, the two would hug and exchange greetings. When the child wanted to have a snack or beverage, the warm-ups would begin with the food. The researcher paid careful attention to the child's condition, and tried not to push the conversation forward too quickly.

Each conversation session was composed of three parts. The first part included warm-ups in which they would talk about their lives, especially something "new and good" that had happened in their lives during the past week. Depending on the enthusiasm of the child for the topics, the time spent on the daily updates might expand to over 10 minutes. Sometimes Sora's portion of this part of the conversation was larger, particularly because she really enjoyed talking about her daily life and her past childhood experiences with the researcher. The second part of the conversation concerned topics related to English book reading. First, Sora chose English books at her home for a few weeks. Next, the researcher suggested that Sora read "The Magic Tree House" series at home, which she accepted. The researcher usually asked questions about the contents of the book, the characters, and the child's own experiences related to the story. In the later part of the project, when the subject was finding it difficult to continue extensive reading at home, the researcher switched the source of the talk from books to a six-cut picture story and connected the story to their lives in order to keep the conversation going. This middle portion of the conversation varied from approximately 10 to 30 minutes, depending on the children's enthusiasm and willingness to continue the talk. The final wrap-up part usually ended with something they were looking forward to in their lives over the coming week. The researcher's plan was to help the participants build a positive attitude in life, believing that this would help them appreciate what they currently had and eventually help them build their own autonomy in learning responses to the questions posed. Also, the

researcher's attitude toward the children was greatly influenced by the guidelines of respect for young people in the belief that they have great intelligence and power within them.

In sum, the 14-month period of this longitudinal project involved several internal and external variables in language learning, given the socio-interactive approach to the research.

3.2.2 Data Collection

The current study aims to describe the trajectory of changes in the child L2 speaker's participation in the talk-in-interaction. In addition, to amplify the range of data and collect more L2 data, the researcher included post-reading activities with the child. The book reading was pre-arranged as an assignment for the child. Once the initial updating of "news and goods" was completed, the researcher first checked the child's book reading completion and overall status, such as whether she enjoyed the reading or whether the assigned pages were burdensome, as a way to monitor progress. Next, the researcher checked the child's understanding of the book by asking content-based questions drawn from the book.

During the questions and answers, the child sometimes jumped to her own stories connected to the book, either through her own volition or at the prompting of the researcher. In addition, in the first few months the researcher asked the child to summarize the book content in English. However, this post-reading activity, which the child should have done herself was skipped several times due to the difficulty of the task. Thus, the summarizing activity was discontinued. The post-book-reading activities and other expanded talks arising from the assigned books were therefore not included in the scope of analysis, as the thesis needed consistency to measure the changes in the practices that the child used during her participation in the longitudinal conversational interaction. To ensure the comparability of the data, the study needed to focus on the repeatedly conducted practice of updating one's new and good activities and events in life.

The data collection was completed on a weekly basis. The researcher hoped that more frequent data collection could demonstrate more changes in her management of linguistic and interactional resources. However, more frequent data collection could not be realized due Sora's busy schedule. The data were recorded for 30 to 40 mins on average. The date and the length of sessions in each gathering are provided in Table 3.3 summarizing the dataset. The session number (S.N) and the length of recording (L.R) are provided. The length of sessions is in minutes and seconds. Sora's age is marked only in two locations: when she started the CfL session and when she turned 10 years old, which are the 1st and 40th sessions, respectively.

Sora completed 51 sessions over 14 months, with regular weekly gatherings except for the last 4 sessions at the end of the data collection period. Her total recordings lasted over 28 hours and the transcript covered about 26 hours, because the L1 chatting and other miscellaneous minutes were excluded from transcription.

When L2 speakers participate in regular social interaction, particularly when joining in recurrent activities over time, it is very important to guarantee data comparability (Kim & Carlin, 2021; Cekaite, 2007; Pekarek Doehler & Beger, 2016; Watanabe, 2017). Technically, to establish the comparability of the data, the research design should gather data at different focal time points but with the same recurrent activities. This ensures that the comparability of the data is above criticism. Studies need to show that "a given action is accomplished differently at time X than at time X +1" (Pekarek Doehler & Berber, 2016, p. 557). In this study, the recurrent activity was concerned with updating the focal student's life updates at the beginning of each CfL session. Set phrases were used regularly, such as "Something new and good in your life?" or "Can you say something new or good in your life?". This is the reason for limiting the primary analytic focus to the recurring question-and-answer. The L2 speaker's storytelling is related to the fact that the warranting consistency of collations is the central issue that needs to be addressed.

The design of this question-and-answer format arose reflected an approach of allowing the speaker's selections of topics and the scope of discussion. In addition, the chance to talk

50

about a genuine personal story encourages a deeper bond and gives more choices to the L2 speaker.

The initial and later stages are categorized by the key features the child speaker demonstrated in the time period. The initial stage comprises the first 12 sessions from June to September, and the later stage the last 19 sessions from Session No. 32.

Table 3.3 Summary of the Data-set: Sora's Session Dates, Length of Interaction

No.	Date	Length	No.	Date	Length	No.	Date	Length
1	Jun. 19[9], 2015	27:31	**18**	Oct. 29	37:37	**35**	Mar. 16	29:50
2	Jun. 26	41:28	**19**	Nov. 06	33:53	**36**	Mar. 26	27:46
3	Jul. 3	57:48	**20**	Nov. 11	35:30	**37**	Mar. 31	24:23
4	Jul. 10	32:33	**21**	Nov. 20	49:50	**38**	Apr. 07	25:28
5	Jul. 22	29:05	**22**	Nov. 24	19:42	**39**	Apr. 14	77:58
6	Jul. 31	40:08	**23**	Dec. 04	35:22	**40**	Apr. 21	22:29
7	Aug. 4	31:57	**24**	Dec. 11	36:51	**41**	Apr. 30	20:16
8	Aug. 13	3:06	**25**	Dec. 23	23:05	**42**	May 04	25:52
9	Aug. 20	30:34	**26**	Jan. 04, 2016	31:40	**43**	May 12	32:17
10	Aug. 28	29:45	**27**	Jan. 12	1:12	**44**	May 19	35:03
11	Sep. 04	30:53	**28**	Jan. 20	29:36	**45**	May 26	28:31
12	Sep. 18	39:23	**29**	Jan. 27	36:29	**46**	Jun. 02	24:55
13	Sep. 23	32:47	**30**	Feb. 03	38:52	**47**	Jun. 09	38:49
14	Oct. 02	35:02	**31**	Feb. 16	38:22	**48**	Jun. 23	31:37
15	Oct. 08	35:40	**32**	Feb. 24	39:36	**49**	Jun. 30	24:49
16	Oct. 16	47:07	**33**	Feb. 29	42:24	**50**	Jul. 11	22:11
17	Oct. 23	29:10	**34**	Mar. 12	29:17	**51**	Aug. 17	34:40

---

[9] Sora was 9 years old when she first joined the CfL session.

3.2.3 Data Transcription

All the spoken data were audio-recorded digitally and transcribed by the researcher, and then re-examined by another student majoring in English language and literature, who was a paid part-time assistant. First, the researcher transcribed all the recorded data of each session using foot-pedal-controlled *Express Scribe Transcription Software*, which allowed control of the audio playback during transcription. Next, the assistant examined the first draft of the transcripts to find missing words or inaccurate spellings of English words, which the assistant noted and color-shaded. The researcher then checked the assistant's records and revised them after listening to the audio file to eliminate any discrepancies between the transcriber and the second examiner.

The study employed the basic guidelines of transcription conventions for a conversation analysis (CA) framework. These transcription conventions are provided in Appendix A. The transcription of a novice L2 speaker's interaction took more time than advanced L2 speakers' interaction, because it had numerous overlaps, as well as Nari's frequent back-channels such as "uh hm" and "um::" between Sora's short turns. Recognizing sound values in the overlapped turns are especially challenging. The Korean language is transcribed in the transcripts using the Yale romanization system. There are two sub-lines for the sentence-level Korean utterances. The second line below the L1 provides a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss, and the third line provides an equivalent translation intended to deliver the meaning as clearly as possible. Here is one example of the L1 use in Sora's turn construction unit and how the two sub-lines complement each other.

```
1 Sora: uh (7.0) °a.i.tu.han.they cal.han°°°ta.ka°°
2        children to (I) well do + SUB?
3        (what is) I am nice to children?
```

Simple L1 nouns in the TCUs occur in the second line, which conveys the functional meaning. The abbreviations used in the glosses are appended at the end of this dissertation in Appendix B.

3.2.4 Excerpt Numbering

The ways the title of each excerpt are presented are as follows. First, each excerpt is numbered according to the order of its appearance in the thesis. Second, the title of each excerpt includes the key utterance of the excerpt with a single quotation mark on each side (e.g., "Yes, Yes"). Third, the source of the excerpt is provided. Each session is numbered from the first to the last. Most sessions were separated by one week, except for a few sessions in the later stages. Thus, if the excerpt title shows "Session No.4," this means that the excerpt originates from the 4th CfL session. For readers' ease in determining the month in which the data occurred, the excerpt title provides this information. For instance, the excerpt title "Excerpt 1 'Yes, Yes' from Session No. 4 (M2)" shows "(M2)" at the end, which means that the data collection was done in the second month of the longitudinal CfL period. The bold type of some lines in the excerpts included by the researcher are intended to enhance readability when following the line-by-line analysis. The following examples are from Excerpt 6.


```
09→     Sora: yes.
10      Nari: um:: what kind of bag? ( 0.6 ) back↑pack?
11→     Sora: yes.
12      Nari: um have you decided or are you going to see and choose?
13→     Sora: choose.
14      Nari: um:: what color- do you want to?
15→     Sora: mint.
```

Lines 09, 11, 13, and 15 above are in bold to highlight Sora's simple one-TCU responses. The analytic focus of each excerpt tends to be in bold.

3.3 Data Analysis

The transcribed data were first examined several times using unmotivated looking (ten Have, 2007) by the researcher. Next, the noticeable interactional behaviors related to Sora's IC were collected. The features came from the constructs of IC presented in Section 2.3 in the literature review section. These are (a) turn-taking practice, (b) repair practice, and (c) sequence organization in storytelling [10] practice. In addition, some noteworthy practices discovered in the later stage of the CfL sessions were analyzed with a focus on "Why does Sora use this now?" and "How does Sora's choice in action affect the interactional move?".

First, the turn-taking practice in the beginning stage was examined carefully, as it changed notably within a short period. Sora's second position action to the first position action of asking a question on her newsworthy story was analyzed turn by turn along the time line. The analysis prioritized finding the ways she deployed a more context-sensitive conduct over time.

Second, Sora's capacity to construct each turn was thoroughly examined. The analytic focus was placed on the actions she chose when she encountered difficulties in continuing her turn. Also, attention was given to the resources that Sora relied on during her turn construction process. These resources included pauses, various fillers including conjunctions, and L1 resources, chosen in the process of repairing turns. As the subject was a novice L2 speaker, her ways of constructing turns with either a short TCU or multi-unit TCUs are useful sites for

[10] In the current study, storytelling refers to the subject's report on newsworthy events in her life. Her telling usually concerned events that had a story in them.

researchers and educators to understand an L2 speaker's handling of the moment-by-moment contingency. Analysis focused on different types of repair practice in the later stages.

The different patterns and functions of L1 resources were also compared and analyzed at two different time points, because they underwent major changes over time. In addition, Sora's storytelling competence was examined to describe her storytelling moves in the later stages concerning whether she deployed more engaging conducts such as active initiation and expansion of stories.

Third, the analytic focus was on the new practices and methods observed in the later stage of the CfL sessions. The discursive practice in the local ecology introduced several new types of practices in the process of conducting the social actions of storytelling. The three focuses in the later months lie in her exerting agency, using humor and language play, and deploying embodied action and realia as interactional resources.

The above analytic focuses were assigned to three categorical findings based on the time variable of initial vs later: (a) initial changes, (b) developmental changes by comparing the initial and later stages, and (c) new practices in the later stage. This analysis helped to reveal significant changes in her practices of coming up with questions through the effective management of turn-taking and unfolding sequential management of her storytelling.

CHAPTER 4. CHANGE IN L2 IC IN THE INITIAL STAGE

Three chapters (Chapters 4, 5, and 6) will show the results of the data analysis of longitudinal dyadic conversations between the child L2 speaker and the adult interlocutor. The focus will be on the diversification of the methods demonstrated by Sora during her participation in the L2 talk. The changes in her practice will demonstrate her changes in L IC that involve her "growing ability to design turns and actions to provide for their fittedness to the local circumstantial detail of the ongoing interaction" (Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2016, p. 21).

The process of repeated participation in the social action of storytelling of newsworthy events for the previous week in the L2 over 14 months provides enormous benefits and opportunities to use the language for social actions. The changes in the diversified methods and practices are divided into three chapters according to the longitudinal timeline of CfL. The first chapter will show the changes in the initial stage (M1-3). The other two sections will be provided in chapters 5 and 6, respectively, on changes from the comparative angles of the initial and later stages, and new practices that emerged in the later stage (M8-14).

The rationale for dividing the material into three chapters is that the evidence of IC development by L2 learners is neither linear nor consistently found within specific time trajectories (Hall & Pekarek Doheler, 2011; Pekarek Doheler, 2018). Some methods emerge in the earlier stages, and some features of IC are displayed in the later stages of the dyadic CfL sessions (M8-14). Changes in L2 IC, in other words, can occur within a short interval, which is demonstrable in the initial stage. Meanwhile, some methods and practices of L2 IC development emerge only in the later stages of the data collection period. Thus, a simple comparison between the initial, middle, and later stages of the discursive practice is not appropriate for capturing detailed changes in the practice and procedures of Sora's overall management of her L2 interaction. Nor is it suitable for assessing the student's ability to participate in the locally contingent discursive practice of talk-in-interaction and the level of

achievement of social actions in the dyadic conversations.

4.1 Change of Turn-Taking Practices

Section 4.1 will highlight the developmental changes in L2 interactional practice in the initial stage of Sora's recurrent participation in the CfL talk. During the initial three months, a greater contrast is evident between participation in turn-taking and turn-constructing in the first four to six weeks than in the second and third months of the examined period. Further progress in interactional practice is evident in her active participation in the talk-in-interaction while making longer turn-construction units.

In the initial stage of the first 4–6 weeks, Sora shows difficulties in participating in the turn-taking practice with the relatively proficient and more knowledgeable co-participant who speaks the same first language (L1). For a Korean child learner of English, it is not unreasonable to posit that participation in talking about their newsworthy life events in L2 conversation is a challenging activity. L2 novices start with a silent period and use simple summons, taking an inactive part in interactions (DaSilva Iddings & Jang, 2008). Sora's L2 conversational data shows somewhat unnatural turn-taking practices, passive and hesitating turn-construction, and sequential development in her storytelling.

Regarding the turn construction units, first Sora produces very simple and short responses during her turns in the initial stages. Most of her TCUs are incomplete and involve grammatical errors. Second, they contain speech perturbations such as filled (uh, um), unfilled (silent), intra-turn and inter-turn pauses, and vowel lengthening. These can be interpreted as a signal of dysfluency in the aspect of speaking assessment. Third, the newsworthy event—the topic of the storytelling—has not been expanded but is terminated unless "the intended recipient" (Sacks, 1974) pursues a further story elaboration.

After having three months of recurrent participation in weekly social interactions, however, Sora displayed diversified versions of practices in her turn-taking and sequence organizing. Two phenomena will be explored in-depth in each sub-section of 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 below. The sub-sections of Section 4.1 will illustrate a different practice of participation in the interaction: 1) the first sub-section (4.1.1) will focus on her increased pragmatic awareness of her turn-taking sequences on question-and-answer adjacency pairs; 2) the second sub-section (4.1.2) will involve a significantly increased ability in the turn-construction and expansion of the sequence development in the storytelling. In the current section (4.1), the excerpts that display the most noteworthy turn-taking moments—in contrast with the under-developed practices of IC, and the positive change in L2 IC—will be provided together with analytic descriptions.

4.1.1 Initial Turn-Taking Practice: Minimal Response

Sora participated in the social interactions regularly by sharing her newsworthy events of the previous week. Slowly, she demonstrated her adaptations to the local conversational environment when participating in social interactions in the L2 with a newly acquainted Korean adult interlocutor. Regarding the turn-taking practice, she gradually adapted to the local context and designed well-fitted and recipient-designed turns.

The excerpts from the initial stage (W4- W6/ M2-M3) show that the child speaker interprets the other party's request for newsworthy events as checking whether she has any, or whether she can share it with the co-participant. However, the co-interactant does not remain satisfied with the other party's simple yes/no answer. She anticipates more to come in Sora's second position action before her elicitation turn. The young learner conceptualizes the request as a locutionary force, not an illocutionary one (Searle, 1969), and does not actively engage in

conversational interaction.

However, after a few weeks, Sora's sensitivity to the local contingency changes. During the repeated social action of telling her life updates, she shows more active participation in turn-taking and sequence development. Also, regarding her pragmatic awareness of the illocutionary force, she begins to encounter the other party's responses based on her interpretation of the question at the level of the locutionary force. Sora receives responses such as "Go ahead" or "Can you tell me?" in the third turn position when she responds with a simple token "Yes" to the question "Do you have something new and good in the past week?". While interpreting the action as a request and recognizing its illocutionary force, she increases her displays of telling newsworthy events for the co-participant, by eradicating the practice of answering a question with a simple token of "yes". Here are the excerpts that show her responding to the question-and-answer format in the initial stages of weeks of 4 and 6.

4.1.1.1 Turn-Taking: Responding with a "Yes" Token Only

The first excerpt from the fourth session (4th week) displays Sora's hesitancy to engage herself in storytelling with a relatively new figure in her life. The initial topic elicitor produced by the adult speaker is understood by the young learner as checking whether she has some news or not, not as a request for action. The excerpt below illustrates this:

Excerpt 1 'Yes, Yes' from Session No. 4 (M2)

```
01    Nari: today is July ↑eighth ah tenth.
02    Sora:   tenth.
03    Nari: um tenth two thousand fifteen (0.8) okay ((chewing snack))
04          before doing this something ((chewing)) [new and ↑good?
```

59

```
05      Sora                                                    [um::

06           (1.0)

07→     Sora: yes.

08           (1.0)

09      Nari: do you have something new and ↑good ((chewing)) tsch.

10→     Sora: yes=

11→     Nari: =can you tell ↑me?

12      Sora: uh::: (2.5) I playing with my friend.

13      Nari: um::.

14      Sora: uh twu. pen.i.na. nol.ass.ta.kwu.yo.

                  Two times played +POL

                  I played two times

15      Nari: two times.

16      Sora: yes.
```

In Excerpt 1, after checking the date, Nari uses "okay" to transition to the "next-positioned activities" (Beach, 1993, p.329), and ushers in the initial topic elicitor (Button & Casey, 1984), which asks for Sora's newsworthy events of the past week (L04). In each CfL session, Nari first poses a question such as "do you have something new and good from the past week?". However, in this episode, she omits the part "do you have", and simply utters, "something new and good?" with a rising tone.

As Sora understands the other party's action just by hearing "something," she starts to ponder on the event to share in line 05, producing the filled pause "um," which overlaps with the prior speaker's ongoing turn. "Um" here exhibits Sora's orientation to take the sequentially relevant next turn and her intention to do so (Schegloff, 1982). In the meantime, the turn beginning with a lengthened filled pause "um::" projects her difficulty with finding the appropriate response and indicates her cognitive status of finding the proper response.

Before Nari's first pair part (L04) is completed, Sora's utterance "um::" overlaps with

60

Nari's ongoing turn. Sora's "um::" displays her understanding of Nari's prior utterance "okay before doing this something." As this question was made in the prior sessions as a ritual, Sora recognized the intention of the other party. Also, the overlapping showed that she started getting herself ready to provide second position action to Nari's first position action displaying her word-search activity with "um::." Sora, however, does not immediately take her turn. One second of silence ensues (L06). This reflects the difficulty with producing the next utterance. Then her utterance in line 07 is just one-word level TCU—a brief, affirmative "yes." Sora understands the other party's question implies the action of request and responds that she has something new and good, demonstrating that she can offer a preferred action. In the meantime, she does not introduce the material in the same turn in a straightforward manner. The affirmative token "yes" conveys that Sora has some newsworthy event to tell. Thus, assuming the turn projection, Nari does not take the third turn but waits for Sora to launch the action of storytelling[11].

Sora, however, does not provide anything else but stays silent for another one-second-long period. In line 09, Nari finally takes the third turn by asking the same question with a fully formatted question including the phrase, "do you have," which was omitted (L04). Sora responds quickly by saying "yes" (L10). Upon Nari's request for Sora's "new and good in life" story, Sora responds "yes" only twice (L07 & 10). Next, Nari directly requests Nari to launch into her storytelling by saying "Can you tell me?" (L11). Upon the reiterated requests (L04 & L09), Sora starts the turn with a lengthened filled pause, a hesitation marker, "um::," and a relatively long pause ensues. The hesitation markers display Sora's difficulty in producing the next utterance. Breaking the silence, she produces "I playing with my friend" (L12), which shows her lack of linguistic grammatical resources. However, this grammatical error does not

---

[11] The rationale behind the interpretation is that the two parties talked about doing this recurrent activity of sharing something new and good in Sora's life; thus, by mentioning the expression, "something new and good," Nari is reminding Sora about their mutually assigned task of sharing a newsworthy event in her life.

hinder the understanding of the co-participant. Nari, in general, does not attend to the grammatical error nor repair it while joining the CfL session in the period of the longitudinal study.

After Nari's response token (L13: "um::"), which acts both as a token of confirmation and a continuer, Sora begins her turn with "uh"—a filled pause that signals her difficulty in finding an appropriate utterance. Next, without a silence longer than a 0.5-long second, she resorts to her first language (L1), Korean (L14), and adds the information on the number of times she played with her friend (L12).

The use of L1 resources displays how she maneuvers her difficulties strategically in the trajectories by using the L1 resources to continue her turn in the prescribed L2 language. Answering the first pair part of Nari's request for a newsworthy event (L03-04, L09 & L11), her second pair part of the sequence is located in two places and provided in both English and Korean in a separate turn (L12 & L14). Feeling the necessity to add more to her newsworthy event (L14), she adds additional information on her news item, namely the frequency of her play, using the L1 resource. With limited interactional resources, Sora relies on one of the most familiar resources available to her. This swift code-switching might indicate some urgency and anxiety in her role of telling the event in the L2. As she adjusts to telling her story, her capacity for storytelling increases and the strategy of resorting to the L1 resources as a whole TCU decreases.

The pattern of providing a brief "yes" to the request disappears within 2–3 months. The recurrent practice of turn-taking with the interlocutor, who consistently seeks the full account of the delayed second position action, can be a good stimulus to change Sora's turn-taking practice. This is reminiscent of the role of the interaction manager, an expert-speaker in CfL (Kasper, 2004). The child L2 speaker could rethink her action as a second-position person and correct her response practice. For example, Nari's turn (L13), "can you tell me" is a good example of her helping Sora readjust to interpreting the intended social action of the prior speaker as launching an action, not providing a "yes/no" response. A repeated and

more direct request in the recurring sequential structure has given Sora the awareness that only providing "yes" in the turn is not sufficient to establish the flow of the conversation. Rather, she realizes the necessity to elaborate on the event or news to coordinate the local contingency. The basic principles of the socio-interactive approach in L2 learning promote the idea that participating in these conversations and achieving one's own social goals can be a learning process (Young, 2007).

Sora's storytelling in her beginning months (M1–2) has relied heavily on the active participation of the story recipient. Sora's participation in the storytelling has been limited to short TCUs with almost no self-selecting turns being made. Instead, the majority of her turns are the second pair part to Nari's elicitation questions. Comparatively, the topic in the early months is terminated sooner than the ones in the later stage, which are sometimes expanded over six to ten minutes.

In excerpt 1, upon Nari's initial topic elicitor, "something new and good?" (Excerpt 1, L04 & L09), Sora first provides one simple TCU, "yes." Nari pursues more information from the other party by raising questions such as "Can you tell me?" (Excerpt 1, L11, and some prompting questions such as "Can you go ahead?", "Can you say more?" and "Tell me more" are heavily used by Nari in the first and second months. Nari displays her cognitive status as "not being content" with Sora's simple answer, "yes", and elicits more from the child L2 speaker. Thus, Sora might have gained a better understanding of the other party's action of asking about her newsworthy event in her life, as their regular conversation session extended over two months.

In Excerpt 1, the child L2 speaker whose proficiency has not developed enough interactional skills displays minimal responses in the turn-construction and turn-taking system. Especially when the L2 speaker lacks experience in participating in interactional conversation—which is a great learning opportunity for performing various social actions— the interaction creates great hurdles for a novice speaker in several aspects. The data show that one aspect is pragmatic awareness along with linguistic and interactional resources for a

Korean child learner of English.

4.1.1.2 Interpreting the Same Question as a Social Action

Not surprisingly, Sora's increased participation in the storytelling of her life events is evident in the first three months of participating in the weekly CfL sessions. Along with her active participation and adaptation to recurrent social activities, Sora demonstrates a different turn-taking practice on the same question about her newsworthy event. It is also related to language socialization, in which humans become socialized through language (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). It is one of the benefits of joining recurrent routinized conversational interactions that provide a language-learning environment for the child, "enabling her to perceive and analyze speech in a predictable and recurring context and to practice utterances with immediate reinforcement" (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986, p.2).

Sora has adapted to a new type of social interaction. This process allows her to acquire and transform the knowledge to act and interact in appropriate ways. In the aspect of IC, she shows increased sensitivity to the local context and provides information in a recipient-designed manner (Hellermann, 2008; Ishida, 2011; Nguyen, 2011b; Taguchi, 2014). According to the changes found in her responses to the same question, it can be assumed that the interconnectedness of language use and cultural norms are reflected in Sora's turn-taking practice.

The following two excerpts will show the adeptness of Sora's responses to the request to share her newsworthy event straightforwardly. These provide evidence of her improved pragmatic awareness. The first excerpt comes from the 7th session (W7). When Sora shares her newsworthy event of the previous week, she transforms her prior orientation to the simple response of one single word TCU, "yes"—a more recipient-designed manner. In the initial

phase, Sora just addresses the literal meaning of the question and remains inactive in providing the contents of her news before being asked by the recipient to share it. The following excerpt also shows progress in turn-taking practice, with the recurring question related to the newsworthy event that happened during the previous week. The turn does not address the literal meaning of the question. Straightforwardly, Sora starts to think about the answer with the lengthened filled pause "um::::" (L02) as a token of orientation to the sequential relevance of her taking the turn and her intention to do so (Schegloff, 1982). In the meantime, this perturbation also signals the speaker's trouble with producing an answer to the request. What is noticeable in the following segment is that the young L2 learner provides more detailed information on the event such as the location, the purpose of her visit, and the time locator (Jefferson, 1978) without relying on the other party's elicitation. This may indicate Sora's more active participation in conversations, demonstrating the changes in Sora's interactional behaviors.

Excerpt 2 'I go phal.phal.chey.yuk.kwan' Session No.7 (M2)

```
01      Nari: um can you tell me something good or new that happened last time last week?
02→     Sora: um::[::,
03      Nari:    [weekend?
04→     Sora: I (2.5) I go phal.phal.chey.yuk.kwan.
                          88 Gym
05      Nari: uh hm.
06→     Sora:  uh water play.
07      Nari: uh hm.
08→     Sora: and (2.5) °ku° ↑Monday.
09      Nari: uh hm on Monday.
```

Nari's turn begins with the recurring initial topic elicitor on Sora's newsworthy event, with the specific time frame of "last time last week" (L01). Sora soon produces a signal of thinking via a hesitant marker, lengthened filled pause of "um::" (L02). While Sora ponders on the response with her filled pause, Nari makes a delayed repair to "last weekend" overlapping with Sora's utterance of "um::". Sora begins her turn with the subject "I" (L04) and uses a relatively long intra-turn pause of 2.5 sec, then does a restart with "I go". The repetition of "I"in the turn initial is one of the repairing strategies (Rieger, 2003) that speakers can use to secure more time resources. Rather than keeping silent in the space between the first "I" and "go", inserting "I" after the silence creates the effect of a shorter pause. This repeating of a part of the TCU she has previously said is called "recycling" (Schegloff, 2007).

The emergence of repetition is another signal that Sora is paying more attention and gaining more resources under time constraints. In her early sessions, she does not use repetition in her same-turn repairs but rather leaves the space empty, creating a long period of silence. It is known that repetition is not a marker of dysfluent speakers but a social activity and a part of everyday conduct (Schegloff, 1987), and can be used as a repair initiator. Also, same-turn pairs are closely related to the signs of language development, in which self-corrections are made (Gass & Selinker, 2008). Thus, it can be interpreted that the recycled turn beginning (L05) is more evidence that Sora's understanding and awareness of turn-taking are heightened, which is critically linked to the developmental change of L2 IC.

In the same turn in line 04, she directly proffers the expected action of delivering the newsworthy event. Sora expresses the event of going to the gym called "88 *chey.yuk.kwan*" (L04). The hesitancy at the beginning of the turn projects a possible upcoming difficulty, and it is externalized with her use of the L1 resource of "*chey.yuk.kwan*,"gym, in the L1 resource.

Compared to Sora's previous response pattern shown in Excerpts 1 and 2, she chooses a different response pattern and turn-constructions to the action request to share newsworthy events of the previous week. In the previous Excerpts (1 and 2), she responds to the requests expressed in the following forms such as "something new and good? Can you ~" "Do you

66

have~?" with an affirmation mark, "Yes." However, the action performed in the above excerpt displays that she can now interpret the first position action of request as her doable action. In other words, her pragmatic awareness regarding interpreting the other party's request as a social action encourages Sora to directly proffer the social action of sharing the newsworthy event. This is a substantive increase in her ability to use interactional resources in responding to the prior turn based on the local contingencies in the conversational interaction.

Another excerpt that displays Sora's improved adaptation to the local contingency and her socio-pragmatic awareness is provided in the following excerpt. It shows not only her improved turn-taking and turn-construction skills but also her better recipient-design increases, which are considered evidence of the overall development of IC (Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2016).

As shown in several earlier instances, the lack of tense marking of Sora's verbs ("I go") is not oriented nor considered wrong by Nari. Nari, as a story recipient, accepts the story and confirms the referent, and provides a go-ahead signal with a continuer "uh hm" (L05). Next, Sora continues her story by explaining that her purpose in visiting the gym is to play in the water. "Water play" is a literal translation of the Korean expression "*mwul.no.li*" (water play) meaning "playing in the water" (L06). Her next turn delivers the information on the time locator.

The turn in line 08 begins with "and" a continuing index, which demonstrates that she has more to say. The turns above (L08) are quite short. The turn (L08) is composed of two English words ("and" and "Monday"), and one Korean discourse filler "*ku* (that)," which functions as a resource—helping the speaker to search for the next word. Nari displays her understanding by repeating the word "Monday" (L09) and adding the preposition "on" as a way of repairing the accuracy of the prior utterance.

Excerpt 3 above has shown us Sora's change in how she responds to the recurrent question in her life-updating turn. Her increased socio-pragmatic awareness allows her to bring the content of the newsworthy event straightforwardly. The following excerpt also shows

Sora's adaptation to recipient-designing Nari's requesting to share by saying "anything else that's something new and good?".

Excerpt 3 'And I will go Pwu.san' Session No. 9 (M3)

```
01      Nari: that's good anything ↑else that's something ↑new and ↑good in your life?
02      (1.0)
03→     Sora: [a:nd.
04      Nari: [quitting the guitar class is something really good for you.
05→     Sora: an:d (3.0) I will go Pwu.san.
06      Nari: ↑HUH:: when are you going?
07      Sora: um::tomorrow.
08      Nari: TO↑morrow?
09      Sora: because my grandmother birthday [or my grandfather birthday
```

Before the excerpt above, Sora shares her news about quitting her guitar class. Nari seeks another newsworthy event from Sora (L01). She first provides a positive evaluation of the prior news and shifts to another, possibly new, topic. After the first pair part is delivered, the next turn is delayed for a second. Sora takes her turn (L03) by beginning with the utterance "and,",which shows that she has something more to say to the other party. She is providing a different sequential organization from saying "yes." Her turn begins "and", overlapping with Nari's turn initiation. Due to the delay, Nari gets the turn and completes her turn saying, "quitting the guitar class is something really good for you" (L04).

The overlapping turns (L03 & L04) align with the findings that novice L2 speakers have a relatively longer pause than other levels of proficiency between turns (Roever & Kasper, 2018; Youn, 2020). It might be more favorable for L2 speakers to participate in the interaction if the co-participant shows more tolerance for their delayed turn beginnings. Once Nari's

turn—beginning with overlapping—is completed, Sora recycles her turn beginning (L05) by producing "an::d" first. After having the continuing index "and," her next utterance is delayed a relatively longer period of 3.0 seconds. After the delay, she produces a complete sentential TCU of "I will go *Pwu.san*" (L05). The second pair part of the adjacency pair (L01) is finally provided after two overlapping turns.

What is noticeable in this turn is that Sora does not use the brief affirmation response to the request, but rather provides the content of the newsworthy event that has been sought by the other party. She has transformed her pattern of executing the sequence and turn organization. Not responding only with "Yes" to the question on her newsworthy event by Nari, Sora first provides the continuer indexing utterance "and." This response itself projects an upcoming preferred action. Skipping the minimal response of "yes," she responds with "and::," which indicates that she has some newsworthy event to share with Nari.

Another noteworthy point in this excerpt—in addition to her producing the newsworthy event in a full sentence, "I will go *Pwu.san*"—is that she provides a detailed reason (visiting her grandparents). So far, additional information on the newsworthy event has been sought by the story recipient. As shown in line 06, Nari asks Sora about the time of her visit, then Sora simply provides a one-word TCU in the next turn, which begins with a filled pause "um". However, Sora produces "because" (L09) at the turn beginning to Nari. This is one of the newest pieces of evidence that she is putting herself in the story recipient's shoes in the process of her storytelling. She can anticipate that her visiting a southern port city, *Pwu.san*, might provoke curiosity in the story recipient.

Another excerpt that provides evidence of Sora's improved turn-taking skills and her heightened pragmatic awareness will follow. The usual initial topic elicitors are "something new and good in your life for the past week," "anything new and good?" or "Can you tell me something new and good?". Here, however, the elicitor is in a different style and format, namely, "How have you been?" (L02).

Excerpt 4 'WHY because' Session No. 10 (M3)

```
01      Nari: okay today is August 28th Friday okay let's get started

02            okay we have jelly day okay how have you been?

03→     Sora: um:: um::: um::((chewing snack)) (1.4) today.

04      Nari: uh hm.

05      Sora: is not good day.

06      Nari: um.

07      (1.4)

08→     Sora: ↑WHY because (2.4) ((clapping hands)) (2.3)today is,(0.5)

09            hak.kup. im.wen. sen.ke.
              Class representative election
              Election for class representative

10      Nari:um:: ah:: election you had an elec-you had a vote to choose

11            the class president [class president pan.cang.
                                                   class president

12      Sora:                    [yes.
```

 Upon the request for her life update in a slightly different linguistic format than in the prior sessions, Sora shows a great reluctance to provide her second pair part, and produces three lengthened filled pauses, "um::::." Turn beginnings are structurally important because they project the upcoming turn construction and sequence. The three filled pauses in a row projects the difficulties in sequence organization. In addition, the filled pause, or a hesitant marker, is used to announce the initiation of a more serious delay in the upcoming speech production than "uh" (Clark & Tree, 2002). Holding the turn with the filled pauses, and a 1.4-second silent delay, Sora produces the first utterance—a time locator, "today" (L03). This one word in the turn is very important because she has not chosen to stay silent nor simply to provide "good" or "bad." Instead, Sora provides a time locator (Jefferson, 1978) of her upcoming story as a pre-sequence to introducing a newsworthy event (the topic that she has

70

been telling Nari about for the past two months). She has now adapted to the local interactional circumstances and is aware of the other party's intention behind the question. The adeptness in their local contingency has helped Sora to achieve more appropriate turn-taking and turn-construction skills, as displayed in the excerpts above.

As Nari provides her "go ahead" signal with the supportive continuer marker, "uh hum" (L4), Sora completes her incomplete prior turn by adding the utterance "is not good day" (L05). Nari does not take a turn and is patient with Sora's slow pace in her turn-taking. This is indicated by her offering "um" in response to her announcement of her bad mood. The delayed turn after a 1.4 sec-long pause begins with a relatively louder voice and a pitch asking "WHY." Sora projects that her inquisitive question will be self-answered by producing "because" without a pause gap after "WHY." Then, she uses several repair initiators such as pauses and an embodied action of clapping hands (L08: ↑WHY because (2.4) ((clapping hands)) (2.3) today is (0.5). She uses a multimodal resource of clapping hands in the repair process. The embodied action is another resource for Sora to progress in the turn construction[12]. After the embodied action of clapping, however, the utterance is delayed for 2.3 seconds. During the period of two pauses and clapping her hands, which almost reaches 5 seconds, she is possibly planning to produce the reason for her utterance "because." She resumes her turn by recycling the prior expression "today is," but after a short delay, she relies on the L1 resource "*hak.kup.im.wen. sen.ke*," election for the class representatives. She raises the L1 content as a preface to her story to explain why this "is not good day."

Her turn-taking and turn-constructional skills displayed in lines 08 to 09 provide substantive information on the L2 young learner's resourceful handling of her turn-taking and turn-construction skills. First, she is capable of recipient design in terms of the development of the story, by providing a story preface to the time and the topic. As she mentions that that day is not a good day, she anticipates that the story recipient might be curious about the reason

---

[12] Chapter 6 will examine embodied actions as interactional resources.

behind that evaluation. She provides the question-and-answer format for the storytelling (L08-09) before the recipient's elicitation. Second, it might have taken a longer length of pause to produce the content in the turn, and she relies on the multimodal resource of clapping hands to break the long silence (L08). A long silence (over 3.0 seconds) is considered a communication breakdown, so it rarely happens in regular conversation. By clapping hands in between two long pauses, that total 4.7 seconds, the communication breakdown is prevented. Thus, Sora's use of multimodal resources in her turn-construction may be evidence of her improved interactional skills.

In L2 conversations, the L2 speaker inevitably takes a long pause, as a strategy to secure more time for planning the next utterances. Sora's use of multimodal and L1 resources (L08-09) helps her to advance the topicality of the story. Sora has not relinquished continuing her turn and eventually accomplishes the social action of sharing her information about the reason for her bad mood. As Sora provides a strong clue, Nari produces an understanding token, "um:: ah::" and provides the L2 counterpart of the L1 resource in lines 10 to 11, "ah:: election: you had an election and you had a vote to choose the class president." Here, Nari tries to understand the prior turn and makes the utterances of understanding in the L2, which is a natural exposure to the L2 expressions. As she is urgently in need of the expression in situ in the context, her attention to the data might be higher than other new lexical items. Further down in the sequence (not shown), Sora uses the expression "choose classroom president" to which she has been exposed.

In sum, the section examines four excerpts from Sora's earlier stages, with a focus on the changing practice in turn-construction and turn-taking, displaying her awareness of the L2 socio-pragmatic aspects of the social actions. The focal time points are relatively closely spaced (M2–M3), considering the entire longitudinal period of data collection (M14). However, paying full attention to these micro-changes seems to be important and meaningful, since the changes at a particular time point show different patterns and progress for each L2 speaker in his or her journey. In the initial stages, the awkward turn-taking practice of

providing only "yes" to the question-and-answer sequence disappears.

The awkward turn-taking practice disappears without any explicit explanations or pattern drilling practice. According to the data in this study, it occurs with the L2 speaker's increased chances of participating in the social interaction and the co-construction of the sequential trajectories with the co-participant. The cooperative work achieved while steering the course of social actions in the interaction is the learning process, as well as the result of learning a different practice of turn-taking.

The experience of joining CfL for a relatively short period (M2–3) in the month helps the L2 young learner achieve fruitful results in terms of her L2 IC development. Not only has she gained increased awareness in her socio-pragmatic understanding, but she also displays better adaptation to the local contingency. For example, she demonstrates using the time locator of her story as a prefacing strategy. In addition, she can understand different formats of questions and provide a recipient-designing response.

4.2 Changes in Storytelling Practice

In this sub-section, the changes in Sora's storytelling practice will be examined with pertinent excerpts and analysis. Her changes within a short period will be highlighted in two sub-sections that contrast with each other.

4.2.1 Soliciting Lexical Help and Passivity

In the first month (M1), Sora relies heavily on an explicit call for help from the other party and is hesitant when continuing her turns. Her maneuvering of storytelling has been rudimentary . In addition, the sequential development has been furthered by the conversation

73

manager's active elicitation work on the topic of the story. The following two excerpts are from the third and fourth week of CfL and illustrate the features of conversational interactions that are quite inactive in developing storytelling in the conversation.

Excerpt 5 'I am: not fight my mom' Session No.3 (M1)


```
01      Nari: something new and then you can tell [me later and then something negative.

02      Sora:                                       [ah.

03      (1.5)

04→     Sora: uh:: i.pen. ↑cwu.lul ?

                this week +OBP?

                (What's this week in English?)

05      Nari: uh hm. [↑uh uh this week.

06      Sora:        [°°mwe.la?°°

07      Sora: This week (1.0) I-I am: not fight my ↑mom?

08      Nari: uhm:: ↑umm that's good sign you [didn't

09      Sora:                                 [yeah

10      Nari: fight you didn't have an argument (1.0) no like blah blah blah

11      Sora: Yes I don't like uh::(1.5)

12→           che.um.ey.lul mwe.la.ko hay.yo?

                At first+OP what is it called?

                What's in the beginning (in English)?

13      Nari: uh che.um.ey.in the beginning

                In the beginning

14      Sora: in the beginning.

15      Nari: [or,

16      Sora: [my [my and me arGUing,

17      Nari:     [um.

18      Nari: °um m° arguing.
```

74

```
19      Sora: but (1.0) go and go
20→            em.ma mwu.si.ha.ta.ka mwe.yey.yo?
               Mom ignores what is it +POL?
               What's "mom ignores me" (in English)?
21      Nari: ignore.
22      Sora: ignores me so I am (0.8) mad [so (1.0)
23      Nari:                             [um::
24      Sora:  I am (1.0) I say sorry to mom [but my
25      Nari:                                [um
26→     Sora: mom don't(0.6)°an.pa.ta.cwu.ta.ka°
                             do not accept+ SUB
                             what's "not accept me" in English?
27      Nari: accept my ↑apology?
28      Sora: YES.
```

Before the excerpt, Sora asks whether she can begin with something bad that happened in her previous week. Nari does not accept the request. Thus, in line 01, Nari maintains the stance of prioritizing positive events and letting the negative come later. Sora's acceptance token "ah" (L02) overlaps with Nari's ongoing turn. The location of overlapping shows her level of structural understanding of the verb "tell" which is fine for her as she is able to use the structure without having the object.

The second pair part turn is delayed for a 1.5 sec-long. Sora begins her delayed turn with a lengthened filled pause "uh::"(L04), which projects her difficulty in producing the next utterances. The rest of the turn is composed of the L1 resource, "*i.pen. ↑cwu.lul*." The L1 utterance delivers explicit help for the expression "this week" by raising the intonation at the end. Being provided with the target L2 expression by Nari (L05: "uh hm. uh uh this week"), at the same time, her second request "° ↑ *mwe.la*°°?" (what is it?) overlaps with Nari's ongoing turn. In the following turn, Sora picks up the target item—the time locator of her story "this

week"—and then continues, "I-I am: not fight my mom" (L07). With explicit lexical help from the other party, she eventually delivers her second pair part of the question-and-answer adjacency pair, although with some verbal inaccuracy.

Nari positively evaluates Sora's prior turn and changes the verbal tense and usage by providing a more appropriate expression (L08 & L10). Sora aligns with Nari's restating of her point, and provides the agreement token overlapping her turn with Nari's line 09 (["yeah"). Her overlapping location is quite unnatural, however, showing that her alignment itself displays her improved participation in the conversation.

In the following turn in lines 11–12, Sora displays her will to continue her story. First, she begins with the agreement token "yes," which is another case of L1 transfer regarding the agreement with the negative statement. Then, she produces "I don't like uh:: (1.5)." The unspecified something is not produced even after the delay of a lengthened filled pause and a 1.5 silent pause. The time resource is not sufficient for her to produce the next utterance. Finally, she switches her language code and relies on the L1 resource (L12). Her second active solicitation for help from the other party is another explicit call for lexical help. Like the previous sequencing pattern in lines 04–07, a similar sequence organization ensues. First, Sora's lexical solicitation occurs. Next, Nari provides the target L2 item, then Sora picks up the target item for her turn designing.

A turn competition occurs in lines 15 and 16. Nari shows the possibility of providing a different expression for the L1, "*che.um.ey*," with "or" [projecting that she has more to say (L15). Overlapping Nari's turn (L15), Sora also starts her turn in line 16, "[my [my and me arGUing." Once Sora recognizes that her initial "my" has been overlapped, she repeats the word "my" to secure her turn. Nari yields the turn by saying "um." Once Sora's turn is completed, Nari repeats part of the prior turn, saying "arguing" while changing the accent.

Sora continues her talk in line 19 by offering four words expressing "but (1.0) go and go." In the following line, she uses the L1 resource again and asks for. explicit help from the adult speaker. This is her third solicitation for lexical help in the L1 resource. The pattern in

which Sora solicits lexical help in the face of the problem of continuing her turn is identical in the respect of using the L1 resource. She tries to produce some repair initiators but they resort to the L1 resource. The solicitation sequences continue with Nari's provision of the expression and Sora's pick-up of the L2 expression. In line 26, she uses a lower voice when soliciting lexical help in the L1 expression.

The use of the L1 resource will not be the subject of an analytic focus at this point. This topic will be dealt with in Section 5.2. Instead, in this section, the focus is on her pattern of soliciting explicit lexical help from the adult speaker whenever she has difficulty with continuing her turns. She shows great uncertainty and lack of confidence in progressing with the limited L2 linguistic resources, but she does not yet have the capacity for these L2 expressions.

The sequences develop around Sora's solicitations and the provision of lexical help by the other party. The turn-taking patterns resemble a vocabulary lesson in an institutional classroom setting. Sora feels her lack of vocabulary and difficulty with continuing the story, and Nari provides supportive markers and the L2 target items. Sora relies heavily on word search while soliciting Nari's help by using the L1 resource.

The child L2 learner's conversational interaction shows this type of sequential development in the initial stages of her talk in CfL. Those who lack linguistic and interactional resources deploy other resources available to them. Thanks to the back-and-forth of the turn-taking—while working out the L2 expressions—progress is hampered by the four insert-expansions for word search in the above excerpt. The trial-and-error efforts to continue the storytelling within her limited resources show the learner's willingness to continue the conversation. The discussion on the developmental changes of L2 IC will be evidenced in later sections.

The following excerpt illustrates a different aspect of Sora's conversational interaction practice in her initial stage of the longitudinal CfL period. It illustrates her turn-taking practice, which shows her passivity in turn designing, and a simple TCU. In the meantime, the adult

speaker displays active initiation and elicitation to encourage the child L2 speaker to participate actively.

Excerpt 6 'Yes' 'Yes' Session No. 4 (M1)

```
01      Nari: ↑AND anything else.

02      Sora: um:: AH (1.8) today,

03      Nari:      um.

04           (1.0)

05      Sora:   I'm I will go to ku: (2.0) ah Time Square.

                                 that

06      Nari: °uh hm° ((eating snack))

07      Sora: to sa-¹³ buy my backpack.

08      Nari: um:::: right after this ((eating snack))?

09→     Sora: yes.

10      Nari: um:: what kind of bag? ( 0.6 ) back↑pack?

11→     Sora: yes.

12      Nari: um have you decided or are you going to see and choose?

13→     Sora: choose.

14      Nari: um:: what color- do you want to?

15→     Sora: mint.

16      Nari: mint um:: hold on ((move)) okay give I'll give it more

17           (2.0)

18      Sora: um I will buy it in (2.0) Cath Kidson.

19      Nari: AH:::: ((sounds come from some distance)) you know- you

20           know that that brand brand [°name° ((not clear))
```

---

¹³ "*sa*" is the first syllable of the verb "*sa.ta*," which means "to buy."

```
21    Sora                              [yes
22    Sora: um [Cath] Kidson,
23    Nari:    [very famous] .
```

In lines 02–05, Sora speaks of her plan to visit a shopping mall called "Time Square" to buy a backpack. From lines 08–14, Nari initiates several questions about Sora's visit to the mall. Sora's responses in lines 09 and 11 are a simple one-word answer, "yes," as a second pair part. In lines 13 and 15, Sora responds with one lexical word to the prior first action sequence "choose" and "mint" respectively. These simple responses during her turn-taking contrast with Nari's inquiring attitude toward Sora's plan. The situational context of their having a snack might have affected Sora's choice of action; however, she shows a different participation pattern in the later stage even while snacking. Here, she simply relies on the other party's managing of the conversation while providing a minimal response. As time progresses, she shows more active participation and story expansions in her storytelling.

4.2.2 Active Participation

Contrasting with the practices occurring in some of Sora's initial sessions that feature short TCUs, awkward turn-taking, and heavy reliance on the other party's action, Sora starts to deploy an active role as a conversationalist when telling some topics and events that she feels comfortable about and finds interesting. The recurring routinized question-and-answer sessions probably help her to become more comfortable and relaxed in her storytelling since it is a socially and locally co-constructed social action.

In this sub-section, the author will examine two episodes in which Sora demonstrates active participation in her turn-taking and expansion of her talk. She often self-selects her turns and produces longer TCUs. She elaborates on her stories by expanding the scope of the story, showing recipient-designed conduct.

Excerpt 7 below tells Sora's experience of going to the gym and having fun in the water with friends that she encounters on her way to the gym. In addition, she delivers the play event at the playground and eating out at a restaurant with her friend. The recipient of the story does not ask any further questions on the topic, which contrasts with her degree of participation in the prior excerpts. Nari's utterances are all categorized as continuers "uh hm" or "uhm"—active signals for the storyteller to continue, while not eliciting it (Schegloff, 1982).

In addition, the excerpt provides evidence that the novice L2 learner delivers storytelling with multiple turns, while the supportive continuer signals the overcoming of her limited linguistic resources. Attention can be given to this storytelling format in a dyadic setting through the presence of a story recipient who actively displays full listenership and patience. The following excerpts will help to demonstrate the importance and benefits of having a dyadic conversation with a proficient and patient interlocutor.

In addition, Sora shows a low pace of turn construction, having relatively long pauses and inter-and intra- turns; however, she never relinquishes her turn constructions. Rather she relies on using L1 resources and soliciting help from the other party. The competitive turn-taking system here has been exempted, which gives more room for Sora to audition offering utterances, and create new linguistic constructions.

Excerpt 7 'We play very very very excited' Session No. 7 (M2)

```
01      Nari: uh hm.
02      Sora: I (0.6) go (0.9) with my friends Kim. So.yen
03      Nari: uh hm.
04      (0.9)
05      Sora: um (1.1) and we meet (2.0) wu.yen.hi.ka wu.yen.hi.ka
                              by accident+SUB by accident+SUB
                    What is "by accident" "by accident" (in English)?
```

```
06      Nari: um:: by accident.
07      Sora: by accident (4.2) ku friends.
                               that
08      Nari: uh hm.
09      Sora: name Pak.Ceng.swu Kim.Min.ho.
10      Nari: uh hm.
11      (0.9)
12      Sora: and we play very very very excited
((three lines omitted))
16      Sora: um:: and (2.0) we (2.0) tha.ta.ka take a boat
                               To take +SUB
                               What is "to take" (in English?)
17      Nari: uh hm.
18      Sora: and (2.2) water slide.
((eight lines omitted))
27      Sora: yes and (1.6) we play playground (1.5) and we go (0.6) and me,
28      Nari: uh hm.
29      (0.5)
30      Sora: eat noodle.
```

In the above excerpt, Sora continues to produce self-selecting turns in developing her storytelling (L 05, 07, 09, 12, 16, 18, 27, & 30). The story recipient does not elaborate on any further questions, but simply provides a continuer token. Sora elaborates her story by adding more information on her outing with a friend (L02) and encountering other friends (L05 & 09). Also, she provides the names of her friends (L09) and the fact that she and her friends have a fun time (L12), taking a boat and riding a water slide (L16 &18), going to the playground (L27), and eating noodles (L30).

The story recipient allows Sora enough time by giving her a continuer marker, yielding her turn as well as creating a supportive mood at appropriate places (L3, 8, 10, 17, & 28). In

81

addition, Nari's patience and attentive listenership provide favorable conditions for the novice L2 speaker to continue telling her story. Sora's increased repair processes are frequently found in the turns that she initiates. One good example is Sora's frequent inter-turn delays in lines 05, 07, 16, 18, and 27 where the pauses are longer than 1.0 seconds. In the dyadic setting accompanying an attentive listenership in Excerpt 7; the novice L2 speaker makes multiple turns by actively participating in the storytelling, eventually leading to story expansion.

Here, Sora's meaningful interactional practices deployed in her CfL sessions will be presented. Excerpt 7 above shows active self-selection in turn-taking in the process of maintaining her storytelling. Most of the turns are composed of incomplete sentences, though the topic progressivity has not interfered at all. In addition, the limited linguistic resources in grammar and lexical items do not hamper mutual understanding between the two participants. This shows that the novice L2 speaker is not a deficient communicator (Firth & Wagner, 1997). The co-construction of the turns is successfully coordinated between the two parties, and the social actions are accomplished in situ within a few weeks of conversational practice for language learning.

The following excerpt also illustrates the storyteller's active participation in developing her story, although it is quite discursive. The excerpt comes from Sora's 9th session, which is one of her exemplary sessions exercising her active agency in developing the story without the story recipient's requests for elaboration.

At the beginning of the session, Sora says she has quit her guitar classes as the good news of the previous week. After the storytelling on the guitar class is terminated, Nari asks for anything that has not been shared, "anything else that's something new and good in your life?". Does Sora have some newsworthy event in her life besides her quitting her guitar class? The answer will be evident in Excerpt 8. After receiving another initial topic elicitor, Sora leads the story trajectories and develops her story about visiting her grandparents in a city called Busan.

Excerpt 8 'Because my grandmother birthday' Session No. 9 (M3)

```
01     Nari: quitting guitar class is something really good for you.

02     Sora: an:d (3.0) I: will go Pwu.san.

03     Nari: ↑HUH when are you ↑going?

04     Sora: um:: tomorrow.

05     Nari: TO↑morrow?

06     Sora: because my grandmother birthday [or my grandfather birthday.

07     Nari:                                  [um

08     Sora: no (1.0) tomorrow of tomo- tomorrow.

09     Nari: that means the day after tomorrow?

10     Sora: yes the day after tomorrow.

11     Nari: ah:[:.

12     Sora:    [and,

13     Nari: uh hm.

14     Sora: and we go (1.0) a.i we eat chicken.

                        oh gosh

15     Nari: uh hm.

16     Sora: and (0.6) I want to go no.lay.pang with my sister

                                singing room

17     Nari: ah::[::,

((13 lines omitted))

31     Nari: um: she doesn't really enjoy going with you.

32     Sora: yes.

33     Nari: um.

34     Sora: uh BUT she play with me good.

35     Nari: um: I see.

36     Sora: she is Ko[14] i (( number two, 2)).
```

---

[14] Abbreviation of High school (first syllable of Highschool "***ko.***tung.hak.kyo")

83

```
                    2ⁿᵈ grade in high school
37       Nari: a high school [girl a second grade.
38       Sora:              [yes.
```

In Excerpt 8 above, in line 01 Nari gives her assessment of the previous story of Sora quitting her guitar class. Once Nari's assessment turn is over, Sora responds with her second newsworthy event—her travel plan to *Pwu.san* (L02). She does not respond with "yes" or "no" to the question about her newsworthy event. With Nari's active alignment to her story and her further question about the travel date (L03), Sora provides not only the day of her travel but also the reason for traveling. The provision of the future question that might be raised by the other party is further evidence of her active engagement in storytelling.

In the continuing sequences (L08–10), Sora completes the delayed other-initiated self-repair on Nari's repair initiation "Tomorrow?" (L05) in line 08 ("no (1.0) tomorrow of "tomo-tomorrow"). She aims to provide the reason for her travel before completing the other-initiated repair in line 06. Thus, the repair completion is delayed. A noteworthy point in line 08 is related to her way of creating the expression to explain why she is not available. Sora is trying to create a new L2 expression, saying, "tomorrow of tomo-tomorrow." In the novice L2 speaker's concept, the repair based on her lexical knowledge sounds acceptable. Luckily, the other party understands Sora's point and reconfirms the answer in line 09 by providing a more suitable expression *in situ*. Giving an affirmation token "yes," Sora repeats the utterance from the prior turn, saying, "the day after tomorrow" (L10).

Once the schedule is cleared, Sora shows her willingness to continue telling more about her travel and initiates a turn that overlaps with Nari's understanding token "ah::" (L11). The overlapping displays her increased willingness to engage actively in the storytelling, and the turn beginning "and" (L12) displays her strong will to take the turn and continue talking. As Nari yields the turn to Sora in line 13 by providing a go-ahead signal, "uh hm," Sora repeats the continuation index "and" at the onset of her turn in line 14. She explains that she is going

to eat chicken, which is on the menu for the birthday meal. She repairs her turn by providing a more concrete plan "we eat chicken" after using the L1 linguistic resource "*a.i.*," a discourse filler. By repairing to a more concrete plan, Sora recipient-designs a turn for a better mutual understanding, as well as a finer granularity (Schegloff, 2000). As Nari permits multiple turns for Sora, the storyteller, by providing the continuer token "uh hm", Sora continues her storytelling with more details about her future trip. Without receiving a request from the other party, she even shares what she wants to do with her older female cousin (cousin sister[15]) in line 16.

So far, Sora is actively participating in her storytelling. This is a noteworthy change in terms of turn-taking organization and her willingness to progress her story; in other words, Sora is exerting her agency[16] without relying on the co-participant's elicitation.

By providing the continuer token "uh hm" (L13), Nari creates favorable conditions for Sora to take a more active position in the conversation. Sora continues her storytelling by delivering details of the activities planned for her future trip. Sora expresses that she does want to go to the singing room with her cousin sister (L16). In the space of omitted lines, Sora shares that her cousin keeps saying "later on" in the Korean language. Nari interprets Sora's disappointment and paraphrases the prior turn (L31: "um: she doesn't really enjoy going with you"). Sora, however, gets confused here with the L1 pragmatics of answering "yes" when she agrees with the prior turn, no matter whether the content is negative or positive. Thus, upon Nari's utterances, Sora responds "yes," which reflects how they are transferred from the Korean language. The response is supposed to be "no" if Sora follows the English rule, as she thinks that her cousin sister is hesitant to go to the singing room with her. However, Sora just follows her L1 pragmatics, and this grammatical error does not interfere with their mutual

---

[15] Cousin sister is a literal translation of "*sa.chon.en.ni*," an older female cousin. "*Sa.chon*" means a cousin, and "*en.ni*" means a sister.

[16] This section will not involve the L2 speaker's agency but this will be discussed in section 6.1 in Chapter 6.

understanding. This inaccuracy in answering the negative question will be corrected in Sora's later sessions. Section 5.1.2 will examine this phenomenon in depth.

With an acknowledgment token "um" (L33) provided by Nari, the turn-taking is again available for Sora. As Nari's interpretation involves something negative about her older female cousin, Sora provides a positive aspect by saying, "uh BUT she play with me good" (L34). Her linguistic resources shown in the turn are limited by inaccurate verbal usage, but again this does not hamper the progress of the conversation between the two parties. After receiving Nari's acknowledgment token, Sora continues to talk about the sister, explaining that she is a 2nd grader in high school. The reason for informing the other party that her cousin is a high schooler is a reasonable excuse for postponing the fun time in the singing room. Sora is balancing her talk about her cousin by saying something negative and something positive. Her choice here is to understand her cousin, rather than blame and criticize her. The contents of the story are all initiated by Sora, and she exercises her role as an active storyteller.

In Excerpt 8 above, Sora displays several new interactional practices in her conversation. First, she initiates her turns more actively, to provide more information about the stories to the other party—overcoming the limited linguistic resources and winning the overlapping turns. Second, in sequencing the story development, she provides the reasons for her visiting a southern city (L06) without being asked by the recipient. This type of action demonstrates that she can project future sequential development based on contingency. Upon her declaration about her travel plans, the story recipient asks about the time of the trip, using the question, "when?". Based on the minute turn-taking sequences, she projects that she can provide the other party with the reason for her travel beforehand (L06). This can also be interpreted as an improvement in recipient design. Third, she can take multiple turns in continuing her story, and make repairs for better turn designing and mutual understanding (L14). Fourth, she can express her frustration and disappointment in the story and try to understand the cause of the frustration in the conversation with the story recipient. Fifth, her repairing skills improve in the use of diverse repairing resources, such as the L1 discourse

filler (L14) and linguistic resources (L16, 36), and both filled (L34) and unfilled pauses (L08, L14 & L16).

Overall, it has been found that the L2 novice learner experiences positive changes within a short period of participating in conversational interaction. The turn-taking practice and Sora's active participation in her storytelling are externalized through self-selecting turns and story expansions, without being asked to elaborate on the topic. Although the TCUs are still grammatically inaccurate, the length of TCUs progresses, in contrast to the initial TCUs—characterized by one or two words with long silences that lacked filled pauses and lengthening of syllables.

In Section 4.1, Sora's changes in interactional practices in the period of her two months of participation in the talk of CfL have been analyzed. First, her turn-taking skills based on increased pragmatic awareness have improved to a status where she can provide more appropriate responses to the first pair part in the adjacency pair. This could be achieved simply by Sora having participated for 7–9 weeks of recurring conversational practice that included some routinized sequences in the L2. Second, her participation in conversational interaction becomes more active. Her active engagement in the talk is based on her initiative and self-selecting turns have extended her topics without explicit requests from the recipient. The talk in the first few weeks is steered substantially by an adult interaction manager doing 'interactional pivot' work (Hauser, 2003; Kasper, 2004). However, the managing job has been handed over to the young L2 speaker, though she has limited interactional and linguistic resources.

In the following chapter, the changes in Sora's interactional practices between the two periods: the initial stage (M1-3) and the later stage (M8-14) will be examined. The interactional practices appear in both periods but show quite different aspects over time.

87

CHAPTER 5. COMPARING THE PRACTICES IN THE INITIAL AND LATER STAGES

This section will show the changes in Sora's interactional behaviors in the longitudinal 14-month-long CfL sessions. The diversifications of methods and practices while participating in conversational storytelling (M8–14), which are core elements of IC development in the L2, will be compared with the less developed methods being shown in the beginning stage (M1-3). The changes in the diversification of methods of social actions increase the efficacy of recipient-designed conduct and active story expansion while sustaining mutual understanding or intersubjectivity in her conversational storytelling. The recurring practices of recounting her newsworthy event to the co-participant have brought substantive changes in Sora's interactional behavior. By participating in discursive storytelling regularly, Sora's storytelling competence and use of other resources in her social interactions increases.

In this section, there will be a limit in the scope of the examination to the three practices that show substantive changes in the interactional aspects. Those changes that possibly constitute the constructs of L2 IC are the primary concern of this thesis. The three noteworthy aspects are repair practice, usage of L1 resources, and storytelling competence through self-selecting and story expansions. The noticeable and meaningful evidence displayed by Sora will be thoroughly examined using an emic perspective.

5.1 Repair Practice: Diversification of Repair Practice

The development of language involves the ability to construct ideas into linguistic units from a phrase to a sentence level. To conduct spontaneous speaking in the social context, L2 speakers require several key skills. One of the central abilities is to monitor what has been produced. Depending on the monitoring ability, the speaker's utterances can be well

understood by the other participant in the talk-in-interaction. It is considered that one of the central pieces of evidence for IC development is the speaker's increased ability to recognize their utterance as repairable and complete the repair (D. Kim, 2019 & 2020).

The data set of longitudinal recurrent interactional sessions shows different types and features of repair. The different repair practices captured at different time points will show the changes in Sora's L2 IC. The repair practice in the initial stage (M1–3) will be presented first, and the excerpts of the later months (M8–14) will be shown later, following the timeline. The scope of the examination will be limited to the three categories that can document substantial changes in the repair organization. They are: 1) the uses of filled and unfilled pauses, discourse fillers, and repetition for SISR; 2) the emergence of self-initiated self-repair (SISR) on grammatical accuracy; and 3) the emerging pattern of initiating repair by using the language pattern "What is X?" when she experiences trouble with understanding the previous turn.

5.1.1 Using Pauses, Discourse fillers[17], L1 Fillers, and Repetitions

It is a big hurdle for L2 child speakers to create a sentence following the L2 linguistic rules before considering a successful delivery of meaning. Specifically, starting a sentence with a subject and linking the predicate with this is not easy because the syntactic word order of the Korean language is quite different from English.

Given this context, novice L2 speakers show significant fragmentary utterances in their speech productions, and they often make repairs in the process of constructing the TCU. It is well known that the speaker resorts to non-lexical perturbations to initiate repair (Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff et al., 1977). Non-lexical perturbations are cut-offs, pauses, filled pauses of

---

[17] The term is coined by the researcher to group fillers that are lexical items used by Sora when she experiences difficulties with speaking. They do not have the function of delivering any lexical meanings, but fillers such as "that" "but" and "*ku*" (L1 demonstratives) are used by Sora to fill up the space between lexical utterances that do convey meanings. They are distinguishable from discourse makers and fillers such as "uh" and "um." Moreover, they are discernible in the local context.

"uh" and "um," other discourse fillers such as "so" and "that" (Ko, 2013), and lengthened vowels. In the L2 speakers' talk-in-interaction, those non-lexical perturbations are commonly found and are interpreted as indicators of their fluency and proficiency (Griffiths, 1991; Kahng, 2012, 2014, 2018; Riazantseva, 2001; Riggenbach, 1991). Thus, researchers who are interested in the assessment and testing of L2 speaking ability pay close attention to the silence, pauses, and fillers.

However, in the CA-SLA approach in the L2 IC studies, they are not interpreted as evidence of lack of fluency but can be utilized as an active interactional resource. So far, among the emergent features of SISR, the functions of fillers and filled pauses of novice L2 speakers have not been examined as interactional resources. However, as the diverse purposes of repairing in the talk-in-interaction can be a good indicator of the positive change in L2 IC, the findings in this section can shed light on the development of repair practice of novice L2 speakers.

Additionally, the current longitudinal data shows that the novice L2 speaker uses conjunctions such as "and, so, but" as discourse fillers that function like the filled pauses such as "uh" and "um." The data display how the non-perturbations and discourse fillers are used as resources in connecting or devising their moment-by-moment turn-constructional units—like weaving fabric—and eventually accomplishing their social actions in the talk-in-interaction which will eventually lead to their L2 learning.

First, the diversification of Sora's repertoire of repair practices will be presented. Examining a child L2 learner's turn repair practice is similar to using a micro-lens that allows us to identify their versatile trials and methods to make meanings and accomplish social interactions. Excerpt 9 is extracted from the period of Sora's 10th month of participating in conversational storytelling with the same co-participant. It is unique because the extract is not from the typical beginning location of the session, but from the ending part of the session. The adult interaction manager sometimes asks something that Sora is looking forward to in the upcoming week, with the similar purpose of eliciting Sora's authentic talking. Likewise, the

90

initial topic elicitor at the beginning of the session is one of the opportunities for Sora to initiate conversational storytelling.

Before excerpt 9, Sora shared her story, using conversational storytelling, together with a post-activity for her assigned extensive reading. Among the question-and-answer adjacency pair, the following excerpt shows one of the longest second pair parts made by Sora.

Excerpt 9 'Um (0.5) uh this (1.9) ah this Saturday' Session No. 39 (M10)

```
01      Nari: okay you did a very good job today Sora what are you looking
02            forward to this weekend?
03→     Sora: um (0.5) uh this (1.9) uh Saturday (3.6) ah this Saturday
04→           (0.5) uh uh (1.2)that that that that (0.5) my (2.5) uh (1.6)
05            my cousin and uncle and (0.6) uh(0.5)uh oy.swuk.mo
                                                  mother side aunt
                                        ((the wife of mother-side uncle))
06            and my grandmother come our house
```

Upon Nari's elicitation of Sora's weekend plan (L01–02), Sora begins her response with a series of hesitant markers combined with a filled pause "um," a short pause, and another filled pause "uh." These repair initiators display Sora's turn-initial repair. The turn-initial is an essential location as it projects the difficulties the speaker might experience in an array of projected repair work. A silent pause (shorter than one-sec long) located in between one or two filled pauses (discourse fillers), "um (0.5) uh this (1.9) uh" (L03), is one of the repair patterns that occurs in Sora's later months (M8-14). It is one of the indicators of improved turn-construction skills in her same-turn repairing process. Starting with a filled pause such as "uh" and "u(h)m," or inserting the discourse fillers in the delayed time point makes a significant difference from leaving the turn silent for a relatively long period. Leaving longer

91

silences between turns demonstrates a speaker's limited interactional skill in managing turn-taking and sequential development.

The analysis of several prior excerpts shows that perturbation markers have always been present in the utterances of the child novice speaker; however, the patterns of using them changed over time. Using discourse fillers is one of Sora's repair strategies in managing the trouble with speaking. The length of the delay is reduced by using filled pauses, "uh" and "um"—an action taken to fit the local context for a better understanding and smoother recipient design.

Sora's repair practice changed from long silent pause changes to more diversified methods of filling up the silent space with "filler resources[18]". Using filler resources provides the benefits of maintaining the turn while planning the next utterances. This is a prototypical process that a novice L2 speaker goes through in improving their turn-constructional practice.

Sora's first lexical word "this" (L03) (following the initial repair signal of mixed perturbations) is not smoothly followed by "Saturday." Rather, it is followed by another combination of silence and filled pauses: "(1.9) + uh." She progresses by recycling the initial phrase "this Saturday" smoothly without producing detectable pauses or fillers between "this" and "Saturday." The story is successfully prefaced with the time locator (Jefferson, 1978) in line 03. However, the subject of the activity is not introduced quickly. Sora again heavily relies on the filled pause "uh," the discourse filler "that," and silent pauses like the following, "Saturday (0.5) uh uh (1.2) that that that that (0.5) my (1.6)" (L04). After producing an array of filler resources before the subject, she finally devises the lexical utterance "my" in line 05. She again faces difficulty with producing the noun which fits next to "my," and she uses the repair strategy of repetition and the filler resource. This is the typical filled pause adjacent to

---

[18] The term, "filler resource," is also coined by the researcher to emphasize the different functional aspects of filled pauses and other discourse fillers as resources in the talk-in-interaction. They ease the speaker's repair process by providing more possibilities to devise the next utterances—reducing the length of the silent period.

silent pauses at both ends, in lines 04–05 as evident in the following: "my **(2.5) uh (1.6)** my cousin and uncle and **(0.6) uh (0.5)** uh…".

The micro-analysis of the turn-constructional process displays the continued adaptive efforts to make the utterances by deploying all the resources available to her. In line 05, the name for one of the family members is not easily produced. Sora tries to provide the lexical noun in the implicitly prescribed language, however, the repairing process with the expression "aunt" does not happen swiftly. She uses the L1 resource available, "*oy.swuk.mo*," for the word "aunt" and then continues her storytelling relatively smoothly by delivering the message that her grandmother is also visiting her house.

The use of "that," which has no lexical meaning, but eases the retrieval of the next utterances, as a filler resource, has not been used in the early months. As shown, in the prior excerpts from the early months (M1 and M2), Sora uses the L1 word "*ku*"—the counterpart of the English word "that" (Line 9 of Excerpt 3, Line 07 of Excerpt 8). The discourse filler "*ku*" has been transferred from the L1 to the L2 "that" in the later stage of her longitudinal CfL period. The utterances made in the initial stage provided in Excerpts 3 and 8 are provided below for a close observation with a detailed description.

[Originally from Excerpt 7(M2)]

```
06      Nari: um:: by accident
07→     Sora: by accident (4.2) ku friends
                              that
```

[Originally from Excerpt 7 but lines 19 & 20 omitted]
```
18      Sora: uh water play
19      Nari: uh hm
20→     Sora: and (2.5) °ku° Monday ↑Monday?
                          that
```

Both cases of "*ku*," the L1 discourse filler, are used in the process of repair work before producing the intended target L2 words. Both lines (L07 and L20) have a long pause (4.2 and 2.5 sec-long, respectively) before the L1 discourse filler "*ku*." Interestingly, there have not been filled pauses such as "uh" and "um" in the early months. During the period of silent pauses, the L2 child speaker tries to find the right word but fails to produce the target item. Then, the next available resource chosen by Sora is the L1 discourse filler "*ku*." The filler resource has helped the L2 novice speaker to produce the lexical items, "friends" and "Monday". The L1 discourse filler "*ku*"—chosen by Sora in her early months—transforms into the L2 "that" in the later months, as seen in line 04 in Excerpt 9.

In addition, the section shows that the long silent pauses are frequently found in the early months of her sequences. However, the long pauses proportionally decrease in the later months. Two sentences created by Sora in the early months are presented as evidence of a contrasting effect.

```
Sora: uh: (6.5) I'm (1.5) help other friends
(From Session No.8)


Sora: We have (3.3) ku.ke choose (1.6) classroom present
                  that thing
(From Session No. 10)
```

Two representative sentences do not have filled pauses or discourse fillers except the first "uh::" in session No.8. The pauses over three seconds are rarely found in the later stage, mostly because the longer pauses are shortened by inserting diverse filler resources into the silent space. In other words, it can be claimed that finding filled pauses and various fillers in the delayed space in the repairing process is not a natural outcome in novice L2 speakers. The delayed space can have a long pause (four or five seconds) but they are shortened by the L2

94

speaker's purposeful use of filled pauses and discourse fillers.

The changed repair practice is an achievement of participation in regular conversational interactions. The ability to use "filler resources" is a positive change in Sora's L2 IC. Her repair practice diversifies using different methods while doing repair work over and over while simultaneously participating in social actions.

By tracing those focal points with close observations and analysis, it is possible to access the developmental phases of the young novice L2 learner and capture the changes over time. There is a paucity of longitudinal IC studies, with young L2 learners as subjects, that prioritize the detailed descriptions of the turn designing and repairing process. Therefore, studies that examine child novice learners' participation in social interactions will give us a better understanding of the development of language use in the social context.

Returning to Excerpt 9, from lines 03 to 05, Sora repairs her turn and connects her utterances while repairing in various ways—including the L1 resource, filled pauses, and silent pauses. The space for the other party to intrude has been structurally blocked by filling up the silence with filled pauses and discourse fillers. In her utterance, she delivers the information of "when, who, what, and where" in one single turn (L03–06). Her improving management of turn-constructional skills demonstrates the possibility that a novice L2 speaker is fully capable of participating in a conversation and delivering her social action of conversational storytelling, as Cabrero (2013) showed in his thesis.

The following excerpt comes from Sora's 45th session, two weeks before the first anniversary of their CfL sessions. In this excerpt, Sora shares the newsworthy event that she has received three new books so she has the entire series of her favorite book. She shows improved skill in her turn construction as well as repairing her turns.

Excerpt 10 'My favorite book series is ' Session No. 45 (M12)

```
01      Nari: anything else that you want to share with me something new
02            or something good for the past one week?
03→     Sora: ah (1.2) I uh (0.7) my favorite book series is (1.3) uh
04            smart girl (0.6), and I have smart girl but I don't have
05          uh three uh smart girl, cwung.ey. sey. kwen.i. ttak. ep.seo.yo.
                            among three books exactly (I) don't have+POL
                              I don't have three books among the series
06      Nari: uh hm.
07→     Sora: so I buy uh my mom buy for me and uh I I have all
08            all smart (0.7) girl book.
09      Nari: book the the book series.
10      Sora:  yes.
```

In this excerpt, after going through a recurrent heavy reliance on filler resources, Sora deploys better turn-construction skills. Due to the increased turn-construction ability, the TCUs are substantially longer than the prior ones. In addition, it has fewer perturbations and shorter pauses. One noticeable change is the emergence of repetition in her repair, which is another resource substituting for her limited interactional and linguistic resources in first pursuing the repair and then accomplishing her goals for long-term interaction.

Upon Nari's further seeking out a newsworthy event, Sora begins her turn again with a series of filler resources such as filled and silent pauses, "ah (1.2) I uh (0.7)," signaling that she has trouble in continuing her turn smoothly in line 03. After producing the subject "I," she takes another filled pause and a 0.7-sec long silent pause (L03). The initial repair process gives Sora time to plan and produce the next utterances. She successfully offers the sentence on her favorite book and the fact that she does not possess three books out of the entire book series. Having two sentences in a row in one turn illustrates substantive progress in her turn

construction in the longitudinal time frame. The second compound sentence, "I have smart girl but I don't have uh three uh smart girl," doesn't have inter-turn delays, or silent pauses, which means that producing her turn has become easier and smoother. This is clear evidence of her improvement in interactional competence in terms of her turn-constructional techniques that include a variety of repairing resources.

In line 05, Sora continues the story by switching to the L1 resource. She paraphrases what she has said in English (about the lack of three books) into the Korean language. Here, Sora's pattern of using L1 resources[19] after a year-long participation in weekly CfL conversations, has changed from a soliciting to a more relaxed method.

With the continuer marker provided by Nari in line 06, her second turn on the book continues. In line 07, the discourse marker "so" is used as a filler (Ko, 2013), and she continues producing utterances. She replaces "I buy" with "my mom buy" and she uses repetition as a repair strategy using "I" and "all" twice. This sentence has fewer filler resources, such as "uh" and "uhm," than the previous excerpt. Instead, it introduces a brand-new strategy of repetition substituting as filler resources, which gives the speaker time to think and plan and offers a recipient-designed action by providing notice that she has more to say, not by simply being silent. Ultimately, the length of pauses is shortened and the number of fillers is reduced in line 07 ("so I buy uh my mom buy for me and uh I I have all all smart (0.7) girl book"). Here, it can be tentatively claimed that the repairing resources for the novice L2 learner expand from a small repertoire of silent pauses to a broader repertoire including discourse fillers, filled pauses, and repetitions.

Another significant aspect of progress, which is partially thanks to the improved turn-taking process, is the framing of the pretext of the storytelling before exhibiting the highlights of the newsworthy event that she now has all the smart girl book series. Compared to her initial stage of CfL sessions, this is significant progress in sharing her newsworthy story.

---

[19] A more in-depth analysis of the use of L1 resources will be provided in Section 2 in Chapter 5.

It used to involve direct action-related expressions without the pretext such as "I go" and "I play." The difference now is that she can frame the background of the story while recipient-designing by providing the pretext of the story or the time locator for the topic. The improved turn-construction and repairing skills help her to produce more fluent utterances that can efficiently deliver her messages in the local contingency.

The excerpts and analysis above show the repair practice regarding the use of filler resources and other repair strategies such as repetition. Sora's improved fluency in turn-constructional techniques has enhanced her conversational storytelling competence through more detailed and contextual information in setting up the pretext.

Besides the resources including discourse fillers such as "that," and pauses, including filled pauses, Sora uses conjunctions as her discourse fillers in her turn-construction. The use of conjunctions as a discourse filler has not been highlighted enough in the above excerpt. The following two excerpts—that have an increased number of conjunctions as a discourse filler resource—will strengthen the claim that the young novice L2 speaker's increased ability in turn-construction and sequence organization has resulted from participating in recurrent CfL sessions in a regular and longitudinal time frame. In addition, the phenomenon provides empirical evidence that the novice L2 speaker uses a variety of filler resources available in the process of repairing her turn. The excerpt below is about Sora taking classes at a new English academy.

Excerpt 11 'Korea (1.2) and but yesterday (1.6) uh' Session No. 39 (M10)

```
01      Nari: so your is your teacher a Korean?
02→     Sora: um yes uh grammar teacher is uh:: Korea (1.2) and but
03            yesterday (1.6) uh vocabulary teacher is (0.6) uh (1.2)
04            Canada teacher [Cana,-
```

```
05      Nari:                    [Cana- Canadian.
06      Sora: yes.
```

In the omitted lines before the excerpt above, Sora and Nari were talking about Sora's new English hagwon, a private institute. In answering the first question by Nari in line 01, "so is your teacher a Korean?". Sora provides a positive affirmation by saying "um yes" (L02). Then, she continues providing more detailed information by saying that "the grammar teacher is uh:: Korea." Sora is not yet ready to specify the two words lexically, "Korea" and "Korean."

Continuing the answering turn in line 02, she provides extra information that she has two teachers for the grammar and the vocabulary parts. In lines 02–03, she tries her best to deliver detailed information from the recipient's perspective. This shows her increased efforts in recipient design and more active participation in her storytelling, which is a good indication of her improved IC (Eskildsen, 2018; Hall, 2018; Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011).

After saying "Korea" in line 02, she takes a 1.2 sec-long pause and produces "and but yesterday" as a chunk followed by a 1.6 sec-long pause and a filled pause "uh." The turn composition, with a silent pause and the coordinating conjunction "and," indicates that she has more to say. Interestingly, after saying "and," straightforwardly without a noticeable pause, Sora utters the contrasting conjunction "but". Then, she goes back to the past by saying "yesterday". It is contextually very unnatural to have two conjunctions with contrasting meanings next to each other. It is evident that Sora is using these conjunctions as a repairing resource to fill up the space before producing the next appropriate utterance, "vocabulary teacher is".

As the previous section has revealed, it is a key requirement for an L2 speaker to connect the ideas smoothly while constructing the turn and performing the planned social actions. Here, like the prior excerpts 10 and 11, the combination of a filled pause "uh" and a silent pause occurs in lines 02 and 03 is used. After using these filler resources, Sora can successfully produce the content which is "Canada teacher" in line 04. After having a period

for pauses, the additional information on the topic is successfully produced with the aid of filler resources.

In addition, the new types of filler resource "and" and "but" deserve more attention. By filling up her turn with "and" and "but," the two most frequent conjunctions she produces, Sora can break the silence that has lasted for 1.2 sec-long (L02). Using the conjunction "so" as a discourse filler is a known strategy of Korean English speakers (Ko, 2013) as it does not impose a range of interpretations on the subsequent segment. However, the use of "and" and "but" as discourse fillers have not been explored in the studies examining the features and facets of L2 IC development—in particular the resources for repairing practice.

The use of easily producible lexical items such as "so," "and," "but," and "that" does not occur in the initial stage. However, they are used frequently in the process of making her turns more appropriate. This also aims at a better mutual understanding with the co-participant. Using the filler resource has several benefits. These filler resources help the speaker to "hold the floor" and prevent the other party from taking a turn as the delay gets shortened. Thus, the other party does not take turns easily when the length of silence is shortened by the insertion of filler resources. Also, by having these fillers, the speaker can secure more time for planning additional content for the storytelling. Thanks to the turn-holding strategy in the repair practice, the L2 speaker can provide more elaborate details in the contingent context. This is critically linked to the ability to expand her stories and exercise more agency in choosing the topic and personal content in the storytelling. This is another critical change in Sora's L2 IC while adjusting for a better mutual understanding, and co-constructing the context with the co-participant for intersubjectivity.

So far, the excerpts and analysis show how the filler resources used in the repair practice provide beneficial effects for Sora to construct her turns more successfully by expanding her turns by using the turn-holding resources.

5.1.2 The Emergence of Repair of Grammatical Inaccuracy

One of the recurring grammatical errors that Sora makes from the initial stage to almost the end of the year is related to her answering the negative question. For example, Sora answers "yes" to the question, "You don't like him?" when she does not like the referred person. She can interpret the content of the question; however, she follows the Korean way of answering negative yes-no questions, which differs from the English language method. This is one of the pragmatics transferred from the Korean language.

It is said that grammatical errors transferred from the L1 are among the most challenging areas for progress and show the slowest change in language development (Eskildsen, 2012). The case that will be examined does not simply concern grammar but relates to discourse-level pragmatics. This thesis prioritizes the interactional aspect of language learning; however, this does not mean that it is possible to exclude the grammatical aspects of conversational interaction because grammar is the backbone of language-based social actions.

While documenting Sora's substantial changes in repairing her discourse during the conversational interactions, the grammatical aspect was also involved. This provides insight into the power of connecting conversational activities in shaping the linguistic structure. This sub-section will "shine a light" on the changes in grammar in the discourse level socio-pragmatics. However, to narrow the width and deepen the depth of the research, the scope will be limited to the grammatical repair process when answering the negative question in this section.

In the current study, when grammatical errors occur in the turn-by-turn sequential development, the majority of grammatical errors have not been oriented by both sides, and the intersubjectivity has not been hampered. However, the relatively proficient speaker rarely treats the novice speaker's error as an item for a grammar lesson. One unique item used for a grammar lesson is related to the answers to negative questions. According to the Korean

language, when being asked the question, "You don't like it, do you?", the answer is: "Yes, I don't (like it)" or "No, I like it," as the addressee first acknowledges the general statement that the questioner asks—either agreeing or disagreeing with the previous statement as a whole—and then specifies their status as to whether they like it or not. So the response to the question, "You don't have it, do you?" can have the following format: "Yes, I don't have it" in Sora's L1. Due to the different conventions for answering the negative question, Sora makes inappropriate responses to Nari's negative statements and questions. Six inappropriate excerpts that do not hamper the progression of the talk will be presented.

First, the focus will be on Sora's answering pattern to the negative question in her initial stage of CfL. Two excerpts show her positive response "yes" which is supposed to be "no" in the sequential organization. Before the following excerpt, Sora talked about her trip to a resort and complained about the inconvenience she had experienced at the facility. From line 01, she shared the fact that there was no hot water provided at the resort.

Excerpt 12 'No hot water. yes no hot water' Session No. 8 (M2)

```
01      Sora: ha: ((the sound of a sigh)) the warm water not Na.o.ta↑ka?
                                             Come+SUB?
                                             To come (what) is?
02→     Nari: ah no hot water.
03→     Sora: yes so there's only [cool cool,
04      Nari:                      [cold cool and cold water.
05      Sora: yes so we are very cold.
```

In line 01, Sora begins her turn with a sigh, which signals the trouble the speaker has either in terms of the contents or the speech production. She produces, "the warm water not," and switches to the L1 resource, the Korean expression "*na.o.ta.↑ka?*". The basic form of a

102

verb, "*na.o.ta*," in Korean means "to come out." The subjective particle "ka" with a rising tone displays Sora's action of soliciting lexical help from the other party. She is requesting the L2 equivalent of the Korean word "*na.o.ta*" by omitting the implicit meaning of "what is it." In line 02, Nari provides an understanding token "ah" and reiterates the other party's prior turn (L01) by saying "no hot water" (L02).

In the following turn, Sora agrees with the prior speaker's interpretation by saying "yes so there's only cool cool", clarifying that there was no accessible hot water at the resort. According to the English language discourse rules, Sora is supposed to offer "No" as a response, since her utterance in line 01 contains the content of "no access to the hot water". However, Sora follows the Korean way of responding to the statement that includes the negation in the content. This is also relevant to the pragmatic awareness at the discourse level, which appears in Section 4.1.1. in Sora's answering pattern to the question, "Can you tell me something new and good?". The current case is also a transferred effect of the Korean pragmatic knowledge that novice L2 speakers display in their conversational interactions (Kasper, 1992).

The following excerpt shows another example affected by the Korean pragmatic knowledge when responding to the expression that begins with "You don't trust" and "You don't think." Sora shows the tendency to agree with the prior speaker's stance as she has shown in the previous excerpt. This excerpt is about Sora's complaints about her guitar teacher. She shares the reasons for quitting her guitar lesson, complaining about the teacher's weirdness.

Excerpt 13 'You don't trust him. Yes' Session No. 9 (M3)

```
01      Sora: when I (0.8) question to him,
02      Nari: uh hm.
03      Sora: uh: (1.6) ⟩ he?- ⟨
```

```
04      Nari: he ↑answers?

05      Sora: He answer yes I did y[es I did °yes I did°].

06      Nari:                        [↑ah every every ] question you made

07→         always answers yes I did yes I did [but you don't trust him.

08→     Sora:                                      [yes.

09→     Sora: yes because he is he.sey.

                                  show-off

10→     Nari: ah:: he is °not° you don't think he is honest.

11→     Sora: °yes°.

12      Nari: ah he sometimes making (0.6) a lie.

13      Sora: ey.hyu:: ((deep sighing))
```

Before the excerpt, the two parties engaged in question-and-answer sequences about the guitar teacher. In line 01, Sora delivers the situation of her asking him a question. With Nari's supportive continuer signal of "uh hm," Sora tries to continue her turn. However, in line 03 the turn initial is perturbed with hesitancy markers of a filled and silent pause, and she suddenly cuts off with a rising tone expressing uncertainty and a sense of asking for help. Witnessing Sora's trouble, Nari tries to complete the incomplete previous turn by providing "the answers."

In the following turn, in line 05, Sora picks up the basic form "answer" from Nari's proffered item "answers." In the same turn, she imitates the guitar teacher's answer, "Yes I did," three times. Overlapping with Sora's turn, Nari displays her understanding "ah" and paraphrases the interactions that might have occurred between Sora and her teacher, "every every question you made always answer yes I did yes I did" (L 06-07). In line 07, Nari provides her interpretation that Sora does not trust her guitar teacher, "you don't trust him." Sora's "yes" in line 08, which overlaps with the initial of the sentence "but you don't trust him," is a response to Nari's interpretation in line 07. The second "yes" by Sora in line 09 is her response to Nari's opinion on Sora's distrust of the teacher in line 07. Though Nari mentions, "you

don't trust him," Sora answers "yes." Contextually, she is supposed to say "no" following the prior trajectories of their sequence development as Sora shows evidence of disliking him in the prior sequences. She provides additional information about why she does not trust him by saying "he is *he.sey*." The L1 word "*he.sey*" literally means "a show-off." She supports her position of disliking him by providing a rationale behind her stance.

In line 10, the sequences expand to Nari's second check on Sora's distrust of him, saying "you don't think he is honest" (L10). Upon Nari's comment on Sora's relationship with her guitar teacher, she demonstrates the same pattern of agreeing with the other speaker's prior turn by saying "yes." In the meantime, Nari does not get confused with Sora's L1-transferred response at all. Nari does not initiate a repair nor try to provide an explicit grammar tip here. In addition, the topic progressivity of the storytelling is not interfered with. This might be related to their commonality of sharing the same linguistic resource of the Korean language.

Another excerpt in the initial stage of the longitudinal CfL is provided in the following excerpt. Sora expresses her wish to go to the singing room with her cousin when she visits her grandparents in the southern city, Busan, on the weekend. However, according to Sora's words, the cousin postpones the chance to go with Sora later.

Excerpt 14 'She doesn't enjoy. Yes' Session No. 9 (M3)

```
01      Sora: and I want to go no.lay.pang with my sister.
                               singing room
((5 lines omitted))
7       Sora: but uh my sister says na.cwung.ey. na.cwung.ey.
                               later        later
((7 lines omitted))
15→     Nari: um: she doesn't really enjoy going with you.
16→     Sora: yes.
```

```
17       Nari: um.
18       Sora: uh but she play with me good.
```

Sora expresses her wish to go to the singing room with her female cousin, but the cousin says "*na.cwung.ey*," which means "later." In line 15, Nari sums up the prior sequences that Sora's cousin does not enjoy going with Sora to the singing room. Upon this affiliative stance toward Sora's unpleasant feeling about the cousin's postponing of going to the singing room, Sora responds "yes," expressing her agreement with the other speaker's prior turn "she doesn't really enjoy going with you" (L15). In the following turn, Nari provides the understanding token "um" only. She does not raise any issue around the appropriateness of the response here. In line 18, Sora self-selects the turn and expands the story, providing more information about the cousin—that her cousin plays well with her.

The same response pattern occurs in her later months as well. The two following short excerpts occur in her 9th month and 11th month of the CfL. Both cases show Sora's responses that are pragmatically transferred from the L1 to the content that has negation in the prior turn.

Excerpt 15 'You don't go. Yes' Session No. 31 (M8)

```
01       Sora: yes:: uhm maybe (1.0) uh::: sam.wel.i yeng.e.lo mwe.yess.cyo?
                              March in English what was it
                              What was March in English

02       Nari: March [ch-.
03       Sora:       [March yes uhm in March.
04       Nari: um.
05       Sora: uh::(0.6) school is restart.
06       Nari: ah:: so you don't go to school in February anymore.
07→      Sora: yes.
08       Nari: so good do you do you just go to hagwon and stay at home?
```

```
09      Sora: yes.
```

In Excerpt 15 above, Sora first solicits lexical help for "March" to provide her response to the prior question that is omitted in the excerpt. In line 02, Nari provides the lexical item, "March," then Sora swiftly picks up the item in line 03. Nari's upcoming utterance beginning with "ch-" after "March" in line 02 overlaps with Sora's pick-up of "March." In line 03, Sora continues her turn, reiterating the expression "in March" and provides the content in line 05 after having Nari's continuer marker "um" in line 04. What Sora shares in line 05 is the news that her school restarts in March. Although she displays incorrect verb usage, this does not create any problems.

In line 06, Nari expresses her understanding of Sora's previous turn on her school schedule that she does not go to school in February. As a response to Nari's interpretation of her school schedule in line 07, Sora displays alignment by agreeing with the content of the prior turn by saying "yes." With Sora's provision of "yes" to her negativity-involved statement, Nari tries to make sure by asking a question of Sora about her going to hagwon and staying at home rather than initiating an other-repair on the content. Sora again provides an agreement token "yes." Nari, without explicitly judging her response, based on grammatical accuracy, just moves on while implicitly checking on the content of Sora's turn. In sum, her inaccurate response to the negative question by Sora does not hamper their mutual understanding at all.

The following excerpt also displays the same response pattern to the prior speaker's turn with negativity.

Excerpt 16 'No plan this weekend. yes' Session No. 44 (M12)

```
01      Nari: ok then what are you looking forward to this week this weekend?
02      Sora: nothing.
```

```
03      Nari: nothing? no plan this wee↑kend?
04→     Sora: yes
```

In line 01, Nari asks at the end of their session what Sora is looking forward to on the weekend. Sora produces a short one-word TCU, "nothing" in line 02. Nari repeats Sora's response and reiterates the fact that she has no plans for the weekend, with a rising tone at the end of her turn in line 03. In the following turn, Sora aligns with Nari's understanding of the situation by saying "yes." This is another example of Sora's understanding of discourse-level pragmatics in the L2. However, the inappropriate nature of the conversation has not broken the intersubjectivity of the two participants. The following excerpt shows a different response pattern toward the statement with negation.

Almost a year after the two parties regularly met for CfL, Sora finally shows a performance of self-repair in giving the response to the statement with negation in a correct manner, although it is other initiated by the relatively more proficient co-participant. Sora's self-correction regarding the discourse-level pragmatics when responding to the negation-involved statement will be presented.

Excerpt 17 'Nothing much . ah no' Session No. 46 (M12)

```
01      Nari: okay, um: what else something fun or something ↑good?
02      (1.5)
03      Sora: [°no:°.
04      Nari: [⟩did you have something ⟨ fun or something yummy or something exciting?
05            (0.8)
06      Nari: ↑or some interesting (0.8) ↑BOOK or TV program,
07            (3.5)
08      Sora: um::
```

108

```
09           (1.0)
10    Nari: noting ↑much?
11           (0.8)
12    Sora: yes
13→   Nari: ↑no? >°no°<?
14→   Sora: °ah [no°
15    Nari:      [you know you know Sora that today this this session is
16           our (0.6) it's been a YEAR with you
17           (1.0)
18    Sora: AH real?
19    Nari: a ↑year
20    Sora: Today?
```

Before the excerpt, Sora shows reluctance and tries to trick Nari. However, Nari continues to pursue the initial topic elicitation during her turn. It is continued in the omitted lines before Excerpt 17 above. Nari asks Sora for her extra newsworthy event (L01). After a 1.5-sec long silence, Sora answers "no" in a quieter voice. Sora's answer "no" overlaps with the turn beginning of Nari's second initial topic elicitor on something to share with her. In Nari's second attempt, she provides more explicit and concrete candidates for topics to raise from Sora's previous week (L04 and L06). However, as Sora does not take a turn and chooses to stay silent for 3.5 seconds long, the second position turn gets delayed too long. The turn comes back to the prior speaker Nari, and she clarifies once more by asking Sora with the utterance "nothing ↑much?" (L10). Sora again provides a response that she aligns with Nari's understanding that she has nothing to share by saying "yes" in a delayed turn (L12).

As Sora says "yes," Nari quickly initiates a repair on Sora's response by saying "no?" with a rising tone first, and then with a lowered tone and faster volume and speed. The signal that says "yes" can be a source of trouble in their mutual understanding, so Sora quickly repairs her prior turn to "°ah no°" (L13) in a relatively quieter voice than before. Her "ah," the

109

acknowledgment token, here displays her understanding of the different rules applied in the English language. The sequential organization between the two parties shows that Sora is now aware of the rule, but the application of the rule in her turn construction does not yet occur automatically. However, she now understands that her response to the question "nothing much" is supposed to be "no" in the sequential context, and she is now capable of repairing it by herself, though this is prompted by the other party's repair initiation.

5.1.3 Repair Initiation for the Trouble with Understanding in the L2

In this sub-section, Sora's new repair practice related to her understanding of the prior turn and the sequential organization will be presented. So far, Sora's repair practice in the process of her turn construction has been presented. She solves her difficulties in constructing her turn by using various inter-turn repair resources such as discourse fillers, L1 fillers, and conjunctions. In addition, there are successful examples of self-repair regarding her difficulties in lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic issues. In this section, repair initiation on the co-participant's prior turn will be highlighted. What is noteworthy is that she can initiate other-repair in the L2 in the later months, which marks a substantial change in her repair practice from what occurred in earlier months. In addition, initiating repair upon the other party's utterances shows her active involvement in her listenership and willingness to show an accurate understanding of the context and the situation. This progress occurs after eight months of weekly L2 interactional CfL sessions. The two following excerpts illustrate her repair initiation to the previous turn when she has trouble understanding the other party's previous turn.

The first excerpt comes from one of the sessions in the ninth month of the dyadic CfL. The topic of the conversation is the beginning of Sora's new school year. Nari asks Sora whether she likes her classmates and homeroom teacher (L01–02). Being provided with a

simple response of "yes," Nari seeks more information about Sora's homeroom teacher (L03) and receives the information that "um my teacher is little scared" (L05). Moving on, Nari seeks more information and encourages Sora to say more about her homeroom teacher.

Excerpt 18 'Uh anything ↑else' Session No. 34 (M9)

```
01      Nari: um: do you like your classmates and homeroom teacher?

02      Sora: yes.

03      Nari: um can you tell me more about (0.5) your class and (0.6) um::(0.5) ↑teachers?

04           (1.8)

05      Sora: um my teacher (0.6) is little scared,

06      Nari: huh scary she is she is strict?

07      Sora: a little.

08      Nari: um a little.

09      (0.6)

10      Sora: ye:s.

11→     Nari: anything else about ↑her? I'd like to know.

12           (1.0)

13→     Sora: uh anything (0.5) ↑el°se°?

14      Nari: anything can you describe her to me?

15      Sora: uh her name i:s .

16      Nari: um.

17      Sora: Kim. Sen.ceng.

             Family name Kim, first name Sen.ceng
```

In the omitted lines before the excerpt, Sora shares with Nari that her school is good. In line 01, Nari now throws out a question about whether Sora likes her classmates and homeroom teacher. Sora simply responds "yes" in line 02. Next, Nari tries to elicit more about

them (L03). In a delayed turn, Sora provides the information that her homeroom teacher is a little bit strict (L05). Nari's acceptance and repair initiation turn is followed by paraphrasing the prior, "huh scary she is she is strict?" (L06). Sora downplays her comment by saying a short TCU "a little" (L07). Then, Nari repeats Sora's utterance, beginning with "um" to indicate her acceptance. Then, after a 0.6 sec-long pause, Sora offers a confirmation token "ye:s" (L10). Next, Nari pursues more elicitation from Sora by asking "anything else about her? I'd like to know" (L11). In a second-long delay (L12), Sora repeats part of the prior utterance as a repair initiation "uh anything el°se°?". Repeating part of a previous turn is a new strategy she opts to use in responding to a question. Sora's action in line 13 can be interpreted as either repair initiation because of difficulty understanding the prior turn or as her turn-holding strategy before producing her response to hold the floor. The co-participant, Nari, interprets Sora's utterance as repair initiation. Nari provides a different format of her previous question by paraphrasing it to "anything can you describe about her to me?" (L14).

Sora's action to request further information about the prior turn as an active repair initiation to the co-participant demonstrates that she is exercising her agency as a speaker participating in interactive social actions. Sora's initiation of repair in line 13 progresses the conversation without a halt in the topic's progress. As Nari provides a more detailed description of her question, Sora gives more information about her homeroom teacher, developing the topic to introduce the name of the teacher.

The sequence development followed by Sora's repair initiation to the prior turn demonstrates that the child L2 speaker's repair initiative can encourage Nari to prompt Sora to engage more in the interaction. In other words, Sora's more active participation in conversational interaction changes the trajectories of their talk-in-interaction. This is different from the inactive and passive attitude of participating in the conversation in the earlier stages (M1-3). Now in her 7th month of recurrent CfL, she displays an active role in developing the trajectory of the talk, by involving herself in steering the interaction with her input as an other-repair initiator.

The following excerpt is different from Excerpt 18 above, which is about repair initiation on the other party's entire turn. The range of the repair in the following excerpt specifically narrows down to vocabulary items. Sora's repair initiation to the content of the co-participant's previous turn in the L2 language has been observed in the later stage of the CfL sessions. It is examined around the time of her 9th month of CfL.

The following excerpt shows Sora's difficulties in understanding the three unfamiliar lexical items: "conversation," "speaker," and "mother tongue." In the earlier months (M1-3), she would display behavior of staying silent or using the L1 resource for initiating a repair by saying "*ney*?" with a rising tone (*ney* is "yes" in Korean) when encountering difficult lexical items. In the current study, it takes Sora about eight to nine months of weekly practice to initiate a repair on a lexical item for clear understanding. It has been found that raising the question "what is X?" for a young novice L2 speaker does not provide them with an easy action to perform. Using the linguistic pattern of "What is X?" and the social action of request both emerge only after sufficient practice through participating in the conversational interaction. Her increased use of responsive turns has been witnessed in the longitudinal data between Sora and Nari over the 14 months of CfL sessions. The responsive turns need a level of listenership attending to the previous utterance. This type of alignment through responsive turns has also been argued to be an indicator of L2 IC (Dings, 2014).

In the following excerpt, the two parties are having a conversation about Sora's English class at a private institute. She shared her newsworthy event of taking an English class at a new private academy. The following sequences include an extended story on her newsworthy event of going to a new English class.

113

Excerpt 19 'What is conversation' Session No. 39 (M10)


```
01      Nari: do you go three times a [↑week?

02      Sora:                          [yes

03           (0.8)

04      Sora: yes uh Monday Wednesday Fridays uh ↑I went,

05           uh:: (0.5) hagwon:: yesterday.
                           private academy

06      Nari: um:: and what did you learn?

07           (1.0)

08      Sora: uh I learn about vocabulary.

09→     Nari: um:: and what about conversation? did [you?

10→     Sora:                                      [what is conver↑sation?

11      Nari: conversation is like this talking to each other.

12           (0.6)

13      Sora: ↑UH yes.

14      Nari: um: with a native speaker ↑teacher?

15           (0.8)

16      Sora: ↑UH?

17      Nari: with uh with uh English native speaker?

18           (1.2)

19→     Sora: ↑speaker?

20      Nari: ↑NATIVE do you know like American or Canadian who speaks

21           English as a mother tongue?

22           (1.5)

23→     Sora: mothe°r°- what is mother ↑tongue?

24      Nari: mother tongue means uh:: your language Korean is

25           mother tongue for us
```


First, the sequences above show noticeable progress in Sora's production of L2 utterances, with fewer pauses that are longer than 0.5 sec-long and less frequency of filler

114

resources. In addition, the minimization of gaps and overlaps is found following the principle of "one party talks at a time" (Sacks et al., 1974, p.696). In lines 01 to 05, Nari and Sora are talking about Sora's experience of going to a private institute and her frequency of taking classes. In line 06, Nari asks what Sora learns in class. In a delayed turn, Sora answers, "uh I learn about vocabulary" (L08). In the following sequence, Nari tries to find out whether Sora has had a chance to practice her English conversation skills in line 09. Her second question which begins with "did [you?" (L09) overlaps with Sora's repair-initiation, "[what is conversation?" (L10).

Sora's self-selecting turn in line 10 is a significant change in her L2 IC. First, overlapping with the previous turn at a syntactically appropriate position shows her improved understanding of turn-taking rules, as well as a heightened awareness of the structure of the language. Comparatively speaking, her overlapping positions in the early months show her lack of understanding of the chunking of the structural utterances. Now she has a better understanding of inserting her turns in the flow of sequential development. Youn (2020) provided different rating criteria, accounting for the abruptness of the l2 speaker's overlapping turn organization.

Moreover, Sora put herself in the first position, which is a brand-new action, while engaging in a repair initiation. In the prior sessions, the majority of her sequences are the second pair part in answering the question, because the two parties' interactions rely heavily on the adult speaker's elicitation questions and initiations of other-repair.

The most noteworthy point here is that Sora starts to initiate repair in the L2 without relying on the two participants' common L1 resource of the Korean language. In the initial months, she relied heavily on the L1 in the process of repairing her problems of understanding and speaking, and did not make a repair initiation mediating the L2, such as "What is conversation?" (L10). This repair initiation in the conversational interaction, where English is implicitly prescribed, shows her increased sensitivity to the local context. This change is expected to eventually enhance efficiency in the progression of the talk. By preventing the

conversation from having an insert-expansion in the L1 for a lexical explanation, the conversation can sustain the prescribed language and the progression of the talk.

Returning to the sequential analysis of Excerpt 19 above, upon Sora's repair initiation in line 10, Nari responds to her question by explaining what the word "conversation" means in the L2 (L11). In line 13, Sora acknowledges Nari's explanation of the term, "conversation" by saying "↑UH yes." In the following turn, Nari self-selects and elaborates more on her prior question on the teacher for conversational practice in line 14, "um: with a native speaker ↑teacher?". As s second pair part, in a delayed turn, Sora initiates a repair upon the previous turn. Nari interprets "uh" as a projection of Sora's trouble in understanding, and she provides more information on her previous turn "with uh with uh English native speaker?" adding the new information "English" in the repair. Nari's second trial does not bring Sora's answer but rather invites a second repair initiation (L19).

For Sora, the expression "English native speaker" is difficult to understand; so she initiates a repair by repeating the head noun "speaker" (L19) with a rising tone. Upon Sora's repair initiation, Nari tries to repair her prior turn by asking Sora whether she knows people who speak English as a mother tongue, such as "American" or "Canadian" (L20). However, this repairing involves another difficult vocabulary item, "a mother tongue," which causes Sora more difficulty in understanding.

There is a 1.5 sec-long delay before Sora begins her repair initiation. Like the turn in line 10, Sora initiates a repair in the format of "What is X?". First, she verbalizes the word "mothe°r°" and recycles the word. Then she completes the repair-initiating turn, "What is mother tongue?" (L23). This empowering move of asking a difficult expression for her understanding can be a good, externalized indicator of her agency in taking turns to pursue her aims in social actions. Leaving behind the pattern of relying on an L1 source, she progresses to requesting a repair initiation in the medium of the CfL language. In other words, she can conduct the query in the target language, and her involvement in the conversation has become more active. This is clear evidence that her L2 IC has improved while participating in the

social activity of regularly updating her newsworthy events.

5.2 Different Patterns of Using L1 Resources Over Time

Learners of a second language often face moments when they inevitably rely on the L1 or the L3 (multilingual resource), in the process of participating in L2 social activities. Previous research on the use of the L1 as a resource , here the L1, shows that the L1 can be a pragmatically useful tool for L2 speakers (Carroll, 2005; Kurhila, 2006; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2001). The current study explores the sequential development of Sora's use of L1 resources in the developing sequences. The study distinguishes itself from previous research in the way the two participants share their mother tongue.

Here, the second sub-section of Chapter 5 compares the changes in Sora's L2 IC between the periods from the initial stage to the later stage. In particular, this sub-section examines Sora's different styles of using the L1 resource in different periods. First, the initial stage of her CfL sessions will be examined, when Sora relied heavily on the L1 resource in the repair process.

5.2.1 Use of L1 Resources in the Initial Stage

In this subsection, the examination of how Sora uses L1 resources in the early months of her CfL sessions will be presented. The following excerpt is from Sora's second CfL session. First, Sora's use of L1 resources in the turn-taking organization will be provided.

```
01      Nari: uhm (tsch) so, can you tell me something ↑NEW in your life-

02            good something good happened in your life?

03            (1.0)

04      Sora: uhm::. (1.2) yes.

05      Nari: uhm:: (1.0) (tsch) just hold on, ((checking something))

06            (3.0)

07      Nari: °uhm::°

08            (1.0)

09→     Sora: Sen.sayng.nim,

                      teacher

10      Nari: uhm,

11→     Sora: kun.tey. ec.ku.cey.ka yeng.e.lo. [mwe.yey.yo?

              by the way, two days ago in English what is it?

               by the way what is 'two days ago' in English

12      Nari:                                  [um::::,

((four lines of vocabulary teaching omitted))

17      Nari: ku.lem  the day (0.5) before yesterday la.ko.hay.=

              then                           is it called

18      Sora: =↑ah (1.2) ⟨the day before yesterday,⟩
```

Upon hearing the recurrent initial topic elicitor, "Can you tell me something ↑NEW and good in your life" (L01&02), Sora begins her turn (after a sec-long delay) with a lengthened filled pause "uhm:::" as a weak acknowledging token (Gardener, 1997). and "yes" in a consecutive way, which simply announces to the other party that she has something to share. This phenomenon is presented in section 4.1. Her lack of L2 pragmatic awareness in her first month is externalized by her response of saying "yes," rather than choosing to introduce the content directly.

In the following turn, Nari asks Sora to wait some time for checking something. After 3 sec-long pause ensues, Nari makes a lengthened filled pause during the delayed time block. After a sec-long silence, Sora self-selects her turn and calls Nari "*Sen.sayng.nim*" (L09). This self-selecting turn as her first position move demonstrates Sora's active participation in the conversation, as she has rarely initiated a first pair part of an adjacency pair in the initial stage.

By calling Nari "*Sen.sayng.nim*" Sora displays her L2 learner identity by positioning herself as a learner and Nari as a teacher. This can also be interpreted as actively using her learner agency in her speaking situation when facing difficulty, by not keeping silent but rather taking the initiative. The strategy of calling the other party a "teacher" transforms the conversational framework into an institutional one (Seedhouse, 2004). The framework does not change the environmental space but only the dynamics of the turn-taking between the participants. Sora's status as a second-language learner indicates that the upcoming sequences can be related to a learning opportunity for her difficulty. What is noticeable here is that she actively constructs the environment for herself as a learner by using relational reference in her process of repairing (Hosoda, 2006).

Before using the term "*Sen.sayng.nim*," the two parties were just co-participants sharing their personal life stories in the conversational interaction. Although the asymmetry in language expertise is always a relevant feature for CfL participants (Hauser, 2003; Hosoda, 2006), Sora in the talk in CfL does not always orient to this feature. She uses the referential term "teacher" in Korean first as an orienting signal to their unequal knowledge. After the interactive positioning of the other party as an expert on the L2 linguistic resource, Sora asks the question in the format of "What is X in English?" in Korean as the L1 resource. In the above excerpt, X is "*ec.ku.cey.kkey*" (the day before yesterday in Korean). The question in line 11, "What is X in English," shifts the interaction to a vocabulary lesson. The omitted lines (L13–16) become an insert-expansion on vocabulary learning sequences to explain the meaning of "the day before yesterday" as an L2 item.

There exists a difference in using this L1 resource in Sora's initial stage (M1) when she relies on it to shift the framework of the conversation to a learning chance, as well as a resource for soliciting help for her trouble in designing her turn in progress. A similar pattern of using the L1 resource "What's X?" is provided in the following excerpt.

The format, "What is X in English," in Korean for soliciting lexical help is not used in Sora's later months of interactive CfL sessions at any point in her 14 months of interaction. Instead, in the later months, Sora does not use the two constructional parts, which both mean "what's" and "in English," when she solicits help for word search using the Korean language. She uses only the following format of "X+ Korean subjective particle" in the L1. The following excerpt contains two examples of "What is X?" and "X+ objective particle(*ka*)?" in the Korean language. In the second format, she uses the strategy of omitting the two parts "what's" and "in English" and just produces the target word, "X," and its objective particle, "*ka*." The analysis will focus on why Sora uses Korean resources. Also, it will be helpful to examine how the L1 resource affects the unfolding sequence organization in the dyadic CfL session.

Excerpt 21 'Uh:: i.pen cwu.lul' Session No. 3 (M1)

[Part I]
```
01      Nari: FIRSt something good=

02      Sora: =ah:[:::

03      Nari:      [something new and ↑then you can tell [me something ne°ga°tive

04      Sora:                                             [ah

05      (1.5)

06      Sora: ugh:: i.pen ↑cwu.lul?

                  This week +↑OBP (is)?

                  What is this week (called in English?)
```

```
07      Nari: uh hm [↑uh uh this week.
08      Sora:      [°°mwe.la?°°
09      Sora: this week (1.0) I- I a:m not fight my ↑mom?
10      Nari: uhm:: ↑uhm, that's good sign you [didn't fight.
11      Sora:                                  [yeah.
```

Before excerpt 21, after getting Nari's initial topic elicitor, Sora asks if she can talk about something negative that happened in her past week. The topic has been limited to something new and good, but Sora wants to try a new one. Upon Sora's request, Nari in line 01 emphasizes the initial utterance, "FIRST" saying it loud and insisting on a positive one first. Sora quickly acknowledges Nari's stance by saying "ah:::." Nari reiterates her message in the previous turn, before Sora's acknowledgment token "ah:::" ends in line 03. In line 04, Sora's understanding token "ah" overlaps with Nari's ongoing turn at an abrupt location, but she takes her turn in line 06 after having a 1.5 sec-long pause (L05). The pause projects that there might be difficulty on the way in her turn-construction. The difficulty projected by a pause is confirmed again with her lengthened filled pause "ugh::" at the onset of the turn in line 06. The difficulties that Sora is experiencing are related to the lexical item in her use of the L2 equivalent for the L1 resource in line 06. Sora is soliciting lexical help from Nari for "*i.pen ↑cwu.lul*?" which means "this week?" in English. What she produces is the L1 expression, "*i.pen ↑cwu.lul*?"composed of "this week + objective particle?". Sora does not ask in the L1 for "what is (what do you call)" "in English" in line 06. She just raises the tone at the end. She is presumably omitting the expression, "*mwe.la.ko hay.yo* (how do you say in English)?". Sora does not create a full sentence when conducting the request in the L1 resource by soliciting lexical help from Nari.

In the previous excerpt, Sora used a full L1 sentence with the following format "X *ka* (X+ subjective particle) + *yeng.e.lo* (in English) + *mwe.yey.yo* (what is it)?" format, when soliciting help from the other L1-sharing speaker in the word search. In this current Excerpt

121

No.25, however, she delays the expression ""°°*mwe.la*°°" when asking for a time locator of "this week" (L08).

Upon Sora's solicitation for lexical help in line 06, Nari first provides a supportive marker, "uh hm" and she quickly switches the stance saying "uh uh," and provides the L2 "this week" the counterpart of "*i.pen.cwu*." Sora's uptake of the repair "this week" in line 09 occurs smoothly in the following turn, and she finally returns to the topic talk and brings up her positive news after having a pause and recycling the subject "I" (L09: this week (1.0) I- I a:m not fight my ↑mom). In the turn, she verbalizes a lengthening predicate "a:m." However, the next utterance is not a complement to the predicate "am", but "not fight"—an inaccurate negation of the verb "fight." Although producing an inaccurate linguistic form, she successfully delivers her social action of sharing her good news. The linguistic error is not oriented by Nari at all. Nari orients to the content of the news and provides a positive evaluation of Sora's news in the following turn (L10).

Sora's turns show that she is in charge of the process of self-initiated self-repair while experiencing difficulties in continuing her turn. In addition, she shows her capability to know how to design a turn that fits well with the context. The method of using the L1 resource in soliciting help from the other party is a positive change in her L2 IC that fits well with the local contingency.

As mentioned earlier, the grammatical inaccuracy does not create any hurdle for sustaining their mutual understanding (Excerpts, 16 & 17, L04 & L12 each). The two excerpts above show the L1 resources used by Sora at the beginning of her turn for lexical items in a word search. The use of the resource shifts the framework of the conversation to a more institutional setting that involves vocabulary teaching and learning. A noteworthy point is that this has all been initiated by the young L2 speaker, and displays her learner's agency in solving her problems while not blocking the progress of the talk at all. The following case of the L1 use occurs in the middle of Sora's turn construction. The excerpt above on "no argument with mom" continues below.

Excerpt 22 'Che.um.ey.lul mwe.la.ko hay.yo' Session No. 3 (M1)

[part II]

```
12     Nari: you didn't have an argument.

13     (1.0)

14     Nari: no like blah blah blah.

15→    Sora: $Yes$.(1.0) I don't like uh::(2.0) che.um.ey.lul mwe.la.ko hay.yo
                                     At first +OBP+ what do you call
                                     What's at first I n English?

16     Nari: uh che.um.ey (0.6) in the beginning?

17     Sora: in the beginning

18     Nari: or

19     Sora: my-[my and me (1.0 ) arGUing,

20     Nari:    [um

21     Nari: um °um° arguing

22→    Sora: but (1.0) go and go em.ma 〉mwu.si.ha.ta.ka mwe.yey.yo 〈
                                   Mom ignore+SUB what is it+POL?
                                   What's "mom ignores me" in English?

23     Nari: ignore?

24     Sora: ignore me so (0.8 ) I'°m° (0.6) mad [so (1.8)

25     Nari:                                     [um::

26     Sora: 〈I: am〉,(1.0) I say sorry to mom [but my mom (0.5)

27     Nari:                                   [um

28            don't (0.6) °an pa.ta.cwu.ta.ka?°
                                   Not accept+SUB
                         (what's) "not accept me" (in English?)

29     Nari: accept my a↑pology?

30     Sora: YES
```

In Excerpt 22, the topic continues from the prior excerpt on the relationship between Sora and her mom. In line 12, Nari shows her understanding over Sora's prior turn that "I I a:m not fight my mom" which means that Sora does not argue with her mom. However, Sora does not provide an affirmation marker such as "yes," "uh huh," or "right," but rather stays silent for a second in line 13. This non-participation can be a signal for Sora not understanding that the prior turn has the relatively difficult word, "argument." Non-fluent novice L2 speakers have pauses within utterances and clauses when they are not able to access any candidate words for production (De Jong, 2016; Freed, 1995; Kahng, 2014; Lennon, 1990; Tavakoli, 2011). Sora shows this pattern quite often in her early months of taking a pause when a difficulty is encountered, but this pattern changes over time, with shorter and less frequent pauses and the involvement of other filler resources.

As the response is absent, the turn goes back to Nari (L14). In a second attempt, Nari provides an easier version of her previous turn (that included the word "argument" (L14)) to an easier version for Sora, by saying "no like blah blah blah." In line 15, Sora gives an affirmative "yes" in a smiley voice and continues her turn. Sora tries to expand the content of the ongoing topic, her relationship with her mom. In the ongoing turn, she says, "I don't like uh::," and takes a 2.0 sec-long pause. The filled and silent pauses, the repair initiators, suggest that the following utterance might be related to her difficulty. She chooses to use the L1 linguistic resource for soliciting lexical help from Nari. She asks for the L2 equivalent of the Korean word, "*cheo.um.ey*"[20] and uses the L1 equivalent for "What is X called?" in her turn. Sora does not omit the part "What is X called" in line 15.

Returning to the sequence analysis, in line 16, Nari first repeats the L1 item, and provides a possible candidate expression for the item Sora is searching for, "in the beginning" with a rising intonation. Sora takes up the repair in her turn beginning in line 17. Nari, however,

---

[20] The ending particle "*lul*" is the objective particle attached to "*che.um.ey*" which means "at first" or "in the beginning."

has not finished her turn, so she self-selects a turn and produces the word "or" which projects that she has more to tell. In the meantime, Sora does not wait for Nari to continue her turn but self-selects her turn beginning with "my," and then repairs her turn, "my- [my and me (1.0)" before coming up with the lexical verb "arGUing." Sora delivers the message that she has argued with her mom in an inaccurate form and accent.

What is noticeable is the word "argument," which first appeared in Nari's turn in line 12, but is now chosen again by Sora six lines below its first appearance. As she is not familiar with the word, she uses the incorrect accent and verbal form, "my [my and me arGUing" (L19). The young L2 speaker still tries to use the new lexical word to continue her argument with her mom. She challenges herself by using an unfamiliar word. This is another indicator of her active participation in the conversation, challenging herself by using a rather new vocabulary to express her meaning fully, following the co-participant, a story recipient.

Nari provides a repair of Sora's utterance, "arguing" (L21) after showing an understanding token "um °um°" without repair being requested by Sora. Without orienting to Nari's repair with a different accent, Sora returns to the ongoing topic beginning with the word "but" (L22). After her initial utterance, "but," Sora takes a sec-long pause, a repair initiator, indicating possible upcoming difficulty. After saying "go and go", she switches the language and uses an L1 resource, the L1, to solicit lexical help from Nari. Sora considers that keeping the prescribed language, English, is important, however, she cannot progress with the topic because of her limited L2 linguistic resources. She solicits help from Nari by using the L1 resource (L22). To move the storytelling forward, Sora needs critical L2 expressions for her storytelling, so she asks for help from Nari.

Once Sora takes up the lexical item, "ignore," which she has been searching for, and using the word to develop her story, she says, "ignore me so (0.8) I'°m° (0.6) mad [so (1.8) ⟨I: am⟩ (1.0)" in line 24, and continues the turn in line 26, "I say sorry to mom [but my mom (0.5) don't (0.6) °*an pa.ta.cwu.ta.ka*?°". With limited linguistic resources, she delivers the message using repairing strategies and soliciting lexical help from Nari. The researched

lexical items, such as "ignore" (L24) and "accept" (L29), are quite complex ones for a novice L2 speaker to use in the unfolding sequences. With the lexical help from Nari, Sora develops her story further and her sequence development does not get stalled.

In contrast to the later stage of Sora's use of the L1 in the section of this chapter 5.2.1, in the earlier stage (M1) she does not use the L1 resources, the L1, when she needs them in the unfolding turn. Some repair initiators occur instead, and Sora solicits lexical help for the searched-for L2 item by sharing the L1 resource. In this context, her ongoing turn usually gets interrupted, and she uses lexical solicitation. Topical progression can therefore be delayed.

5.2.2 Use of L1 Resources in the Later Stage

In this sub-section, the use of L1 resources in the latter stage (M10) of the CfL will be presented. In the excerpt below, Sora uses the L1 resource, Korean words, in her turn construction process. She does not ask for permission nor solicit any help to overcome her difficulties in her lexical selection. In the later stage of her L1 use, she does not solicit word searches from the other participants and uses fewer hesitation markers before using the L1 resource. She just uses the L1 as a resource without checking whether her use is acceptable or appropriate.

In the sequences before the excerpt, Sora tells Nari that her birthday gift from her parents was a kickboard[21]. The following excerpt will show the L1 resource Sora uses. It will be important to keep the point in mind "Why that now?" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), i.e., why a particular talk is produced at that particular time.

---

[21] Here, a kickboard means "a kick scooter." In South Korea, most parents and children use the word "kickboard" when referring to kick scooters.

Excerpt 23 'Thayk.pay is come' Session No. 40 (M11)

```
01      Nari: ↑Oh you will get it? soon?

02      Sora: ↑Ah ⟩no⟨ yesterday.

03      Nari: yesterday you already got it,

04→     Sora: yeah yes thayk.pay is↑come
                      Parcel delivery

05→     Nari: AH:: it's now on your way ho:me [WOW.

06→     Sora:                                [yes so uh um yesterday I

07           go Daiso with my mom to use kickboard and uh before this uh

08→          I go um Morning Glory and::(0.5) uh cafe café ccok
                                                         side

09→          café café ccok cwu.thayk.tan.ci. ccok and go
                      Side residential area  side

10           and go °uh:°cwung.ang.kong.wen.
                      the central park

11      Nari: um::: I see I mean did you ride the kickboard?

12      Sora: yes.
```

In the beginning, the two parties are talking about the delivery of Sora's birthday present, a kick scooter. In Line 01, Nari is checking with Sora whether she is going to get it soon ("↑Oh you will get it? Soon?"). In the following turn, Sora provides a simple response by saying "↑Ah ⟩ no ⟨ yesterday" (L02). The three words "ah no yesterday" project the completion of the delivery, since the adverb "yesterday," describing the past, delivers the meaning that something happened yesterday.

Nari tries to initiate other-repair for mutual understanding (Hosoda, 2006) by repeating the time locator as to whether Sora already got the present yesterday—"yesterday you already got it," (L03). Upon Nari's evaluation turn about the delivery, Sora provides an agreement

127

token of "yeah" and "yes." Then, she adds additional information using the L1 resource "*thayk.pay*" (parcel delivery). However, the predicate form of the turn "is ↑<u>come</u>" (L04) creates confusion for Nari. Nari interprets the predicate "is come" to signal a future event. She tries to confirm the content of Sora's previous turn by saying "AH:: it's now on your way ho:me WOW" (L05).

Overlapping with the final utterance, "WOW" of Nari's turn, an expression of a surprise is used as an affiliation (Stivers, 2008; Jin, Kim & Chen;2022), Sora acknowledges Nari's checking point by saying "yes" and beginning her long turn about her experience of riding the scooter from line 06 to 09. Here, a mutual understanding is in peril. Nari understands that the gift has not been delivered by providing the answer "yes" to indicate her understanding—"it's now on your way home" (L05). However, Sora does not understand the statement accurately. For her, Nari's words such as "now home wow" might have been easy to follow, but not the idiom "on one's way." So Sora does not get the point of Nari's statement that the delivery is in progress.

Sora's overlapping turn in line 06 initially shows that she tries to engage more actively in continuing the storytelling. In addition, the overlap is not abrupt but occurs at an appropriate location. She elaborates on her riding experience in her turn relatively fluently, without long pauses and discourse fillers (lines 06 to 09). In the storytelling of riding a kick scooter, Sora uses L1 resources of the Korean expressions equivalent to the L2 words, "side" (L08), "residential area" (L09), and "central park" (L10). These are key content words for her narrative to progress. Here, one noticeable indication of her use of the L1 resource is that she swiftly resorts to the L1 resource without any hesitancy or solicitation to the relatively fluent co-participant.

In some sense, this turn provides important evidence of her change in storytelling practice, as well as an indicator of positive changes toward her IC development in terms of her turn-construction and sequence development, which contrasts with her use of L1 resources in her early sessions. In the latter stage of her CfL, around the time of her 8th ~9th month of regular

weekly sessions, Sora simply uses the L1 resource in the process of constructing her turn and developing her story further. This active use of the resource does not interfere with the topic progression, but rather establishes mutual understanding without creating any breakdown of the turn-taking sequences. As Sora does not solicit lexical help as she did in the early months, any additional insert-expansions for word search do not happen either.

After listening to Sora's riding experience (Line 06-10), Nari does not express any excitement or provide a congratulatory mood for Sora, but produces a simple response, "um I see" as a story recipient in line 11, which is not her usual affiliative reaction to Sora's exciting storytelling. According to Sora's utterances, Sora has already revealed that she did ride the kick scooter, exploring different places in her neighborhood. However, Nari tries to make clear whether Sora did ride the kickscooter or not (Line 11: "did you ride the kickboard?"). This question displays a breach of mutual understanding, which originates from lines 04, 05, and 06. Nari said, "it's now on your way home" (L05) and Sora answered "yes" (L06); however, the story that follows is not consistent with the projection she has made by answering "yes" to Nari's question.

Aside from the misunderstanding in the above excerpt, the use of L1 resources has been useful in progressing her storytelling, although the misunderstanding caused by Sora's lack of grammatical accuracy causes a less active listener response to her experience of scooter riding.

The following excerpt shows a consistent pattern in using the L1 resource in developing Sora's storytelling. She uses the L1 resource, the L1 expressions that are equivalent to English expressions "sports day" and "Mt. *Pwul.kwuk*," respectively. In the same vein, she utilizes the resources smoothly when she needs them in continuing her turn and developing her topic without trying to solicit lexical help from the other party.

In the following excerpt, Sora introduces her newsworthy event of having a sports day at school. Before the excerpt below, in the space before line 01, the two parties exchange greetings. Also, they exchange a casual conversation about the snack Sora is having.

129

Excerpt 24 'We have chey.yuk.tay.hoy' Session No. 42 (M11)


```
01     Nari: ah:: (1.0) $looks 〈yummy〉 hhh okay $first of all let's share something

02     new or something good in your life for the past (0.6) almost ten days

03          (4.0)

04     Sora: umm::: (6.0) °uhm°

05     Nari: anything?

06          (0.8)

07     Nari: anything ↑new or [anything-

08→    Sora:               [teacher] I (0.6) I (0.5 ) we have chey.yuk.tay.hoy:,

                                                  Sports Day

09     Nari: ↑uh huh,

10          (1.6 )

11     Sora: ku::, (5.0) so we hike: [mountain.
                that

12     Nari:                         [um.

13     Nari: AH::((the sound of something falling down)) we went- you

14          went hiking (0.6) 〈I see〉 all the students in your school?

15          (1.0)

16     Sora: NO. only five- fifth grade.

17     Nari: ah:::only 5th graders which mountain did you go? did you hike?=

18     Sora: =n(y)eah?

19     Nari: which mountain?

20     (1.5)

21 →   Sora: uh:: (1.5) ((sound of chewing crispy snack)) Pwul.kwuk.san

                                                  Mt. Pwul.kwuk
```


In line 01, Nari first comments on the snack then shifts the topic to the newsworthy event using the topic terminating marker, "okay" (Beach, 1993) in between the two topics and continues her turn by providing the recurrent initial topic elicitor (L01-02). After having a 4.0-

sec long delay, Sora begins her turn with a lengthened filled pause and uses six sec-long silences, which indicates her difficulties in providing her past newsworthy event. Another filled pause "°uhm°" is her last utterance in line 04.

Upon perceiving Sora's delay and hesitancy, Nari reiterates the question in a simplified format, repeating only a few selected words of the previous turn by saying "anything" (L05). After a short delay in line 07, Nari tries again, saying "anything ↑new or anything-" (L07). Before the completion of Nari's turn, Sora self-selects her turn referring to Nari as "teacher," which overlaps with Nari's ongoing TCU "anything" in line 07. Sora continues her turn by providing the second pair part of the question-and-answer pair. After completing a self-initiated self-repair, "I (0.6) I (0.5)," Sora introduces the school event of sports day as her newsworthy event, "we have *chey.yuk.tay.hoy*" in a sentence-level TCU (L08). Rather than choosing the L2 expression, "sports day," she just utters the L1 resource, the Korean expression "*chey.yuk.tay.hoy*." This L1 resource that Sora uses is not a troublesome resource for Nari either. She just provides a supportive continuer marker of "↑uh huh" as a response token in line 09.

After a 1.6 sec-long delay, Sora self-selects her turn and continues her storytelling by providing the information that they went hiking (L11: *ku*:: (5.0) so we hike: [mountain]) without being requested to elaborate on the event. In the following turn, Nari initiates repair on who went hiking—whether all the students went or not (L13-14). Sora replies in her turn with a self-initiated self-repair on a lexical item "NO only five- fifth grade" (L16). In the evolving sequence development, Nari tries to elicit more information about Sora's hiking and asks the name of the mountain she hiked (L19: which mountain?). While responding to the first pair part question on the name of the mountain (L19), Sora experiences difficulty in providing the second pair part quickly. After taking a 2-sec long delay, Sora's perturbated turn initial "uh:: (1.5)" begins. Then, she just utters the name of the mountain she hiked in the L1 resource, "*Pwul.kwuk.san*," with greater stress on each syllable. The L1 resource is the name of the Mt. called "*Pwul.kwuk*."

Rather than asking for help, she just decides to provide the Korean name. This is notable evidence of her new style of using the L1 aforementioned in analyzing the prior Excerpt 21. In the earlier stages of her CfL sessions, up to the first three to four months, she displays the pattern of soliciting help from the other adult speaker utilizing the format of "What is X in English?" "X is?" in the Korean language, indicating that she is a language learner by verbalizing her lack of knowledge (Gardner & Wagner, 2004). However, as time goes by, as shown in the above two excerpts, Sora just uses the L1 resource in her turn construction when she needs the expression to move her topic forward. In other words, she does not check with the other participant to get the L2 equivalent and validation from the other party. She just exercises her agency by using the L1 resources available for her as she needs them. If we suppose that the conceptualization of learning as a change in the action or practice of participating in the talk-in-interaction is widely accepted, then Sora's learning in this stage is orientated toward interactional skills to progress the topic rather than learning new vocabulary. As the earlier excerpts showed, the progress of the conversation is hindered when Sora inserts a word-search sequence in the middle of the storytelling. In that case, she is more focused on vocabulary learning with the aid of the adult speaker and the fluency of the conversation will be diminished (Housen & Kuiken, 2009). This might have been influenced by her adjustment to her storytelling and her awareness that her use of L1 in her story will not hinder the understanding of the recipient. Schegloff argues that "design and constructional features of stories are shaped as well by an orientation to who the recipient(s) is, … and who they are to one another and to the teller and what they can (or should) be supposed to know" (1997b, p.98). In different stages of proficiency and the context of the talk, the learning orientation changes. In the initial stage, learning was oriented toward active word search for L2 vocabulary with the aid of the adult speaker. However, the orientation to learning changes as Sora's engagement in the interactive conversation increases.

Another interesting dynamic occurs in the later stage of CfL in the eighth month, which will be presented in the following excerpt. When Sora uses the L1 resource in her storytelling,

132

the co-participant requests that she switch the L1 linguistic resource to the L2 as a way of achieving word research while constructing an L2 classroom context (Seedhouse, 2004). This shows that the context is "talked into being," by the participants (Heritage, 1984b, p.290; Seedhouse, 2004). In detail, in the seemingly non-pedagogical talk, Seedhouse says: "By introducing a pedagogical focus in orientation to which turns in the L2 are produced, the institutional context of the L2 classroom is talked into being, and the interaction produced is L2 classroom interaction" (2004b, p.200).

While turning the request into action, a new type of usage of L1 linguistic resource occurs. She uses onomatopoeia in the process of her turn construction. Sora considers that onomatopoeia can deliver the message efficiently, given her limited linguistic and interactional resources. This phenomenon has not occurred in the earlier sessions of her CfL. The use of onomatopoeia, though it is conducted in the L1 resource, represents noteworthy progress in terms of the novice L2 speaker's management of her turns and sequence organization, which are important criteria for measuring improved L2 IC.

Sora's newsworthy event of the day in the following excerpt is having a new curtain in her room. She shares that some men came to her room to put up the curtain. Sora uses the L1 resource to express the L2 meanings of "came to put up" and "in my room." Upon Sora's use of the L1 linguistic resource, Nari asks Sora to try to express her turn made up of the L1 resource to English. As Nari asks Sora to switch from the L1 resource to English, the participation framework (Goffman, 1981) changes from two equal partners having a social conversation to the institutional setting of the teacher and the learner. Nari orients her responsibility as an "interactional pivot," taking on a teacher or expert participant role (Hauser, 2008). In addition, it then becomes visible that the two parties are different in their L2 linguistic knowledge. A thorough examination of turn-by-turn sequential development will be presented below.

Excerpt 25 'Curtain ppi.kek. ppi.kek. ppi.kek' Session No. 32 (M9)


```
01    Sora: uh:: (1.5) curtain tal.le. was.se.yo. cey.pang.ey.
                             to put up came+POL in my room
                                      came to put up

02    Nari: how [can-

03    Sora:     [in my] room

04    Nari: how can you say that in English?

05    (0.8)

06    Sora: [$I DON'T KNOW$.

07    Nari: [I-

((4 lines omitted, encouraging Sora to go for it))

12    Nari: give it a try (0.8) you know curtain ↑right?

13         (0.8)

14    Sora: um:: (3.0) ((snacking sound)) ↑TOday,

15    Nari: yes.

16       (1.2)

17    Sora: some men,

18    Nari: GOOD.

19       (1.0)

20    Sora: come (0.8) uh come (1.0) ﹥to﹤ in my room,

21    Nari: uh hm,

22       (1.0)

23    Sora: an[d,

24    Nari:   [uh hm.

25→   Sora: uh curtain ppi.kek. ppi.kek. ppi.kek,
                       Creaking creaking creaking

26    Nari: yeah put up
```

In line 01, at the beginning of the turn, the repair initiators—a lengthened filled pause and silent pause, "uh:: (1.5)"—are non-lexical speech perturbations (Schegloff, et al., 1977) which indicate Sora's upcoming difficulty in continuing the turn-construction. The lengthened filled pause and a 1.5 sec-long pause are followed by the topic "curtain." However, the rest of the turn is made using the L1 resource, "*tal.le. was. se. yo. cey.pang.ey*." Similar to her pattern of using the L1 in the previous two excerpts, without hesitancy markers before using the L1 resources, she just uses the L1 resource following the subject "curtain." In line 02, Nari's turn beginning "can [you-"is overlapping with Sora's L2 "[in my] room," a delayed turn completion, which is equivalent of "*cey.pang.ey*"—the ending L1 utterance of her line in 01.

Skipping from the recipient token to the news item, Nari, in line 04, displays her orientation to the sequence as a learning activity, "to her interactional charge as the provider of an environment for a learner to talk" (Kasper, 2004, p.557), by asking Sora to deliver the message in line 01 in the L2. After a short delay in line 05, Sora claims her insufficient knowledge by displaying her L2 speaker identity and verbalizes her failure to find the word by saying "I DON'T KNOW" in a relatively loud and smiley voice. Sora's mistaken action projects the shutdown of the word search and leads to the termination of the other-initiated repair.

Upon Sora's claims of insufficient knowledge, during the omitted lines (L08-L11) Nari pursues her orientation to the pedagogical activity and encourages Sora to try. In line 12, Nari suggests Sora try it by checking that she knows the word "curtain". After a short delay, in line 14, Sora begins with a lengthened filled pause, "um:: and a relatively long silent pause (3.0), then starts with the time locator "↑TOday,". Having Nari's affirmation marker "yes" and a 1.2 sec-long delay, Sora continues with the expression "some men" (L17). Slowly but steadily Sora performs the requested action in the sequential organization at her own pace. Nari complements Sora's turn beginning with "some men" by saying "GOOD" in a loud voice in line 18 showing her teacher identity. Next, Sora continues constructing her turn. In line 20, Sora repairs her turn "come (0.8) uh come (1.0) 〉 to 〈 in my room" repeating "come" and

135

shifting the preposition "to" to "in" before "my room", thus successfully delivering the meaning that "some men came to her room", which she delivered in the Korean language at the beginning of the excerpt (L01).

Seeing that Sora has conveyed the message in the L2 proves that she has enough linguistic resources to express her intended meaning. The lack of production experiences and skills at the talk-in-interaction level might discourage her from acting at the discourse level at the beginning of line 01. The data shows that making utterances at the interactional level with the co-participant forms a favorable condition for the novice L2 speaker to explore beyond the level at which she trusts herself. It is to be expected that L2 speakers keep putting themselves in the environment for using linguistic resources in the talk-in-interaction.

Once Sora delivers the message that some men came to her room, in the following turn, she begins with "and" she puts the topical object "uh curtain" first, then relies on the L1 resource of onomatopoeia. The adverb of manner, *ppi.kek ppi.kek ppi.kek*, is an onomatopoeia that imitates the sound of creaking made when fixing and attaching objects. The use of onomatopoeia is chosen by Sora when she does not know an appropriate verb to use for delivering the meaning of "putting up the curtain." The onomatopoeia in the current context allows Sora to progress with her turn. For a novice L2 speaker, the L1 resource of onomatopoeia can help the speaker to efficiently deliver the context and the intended message. Using L1 onomatopoeia in the talk-in-interaction is good evidence of Sora's improvement in managing the difficulties in the L2 social interactions by working out the best solution. The more chances she has while talking in the L2, the more fresh opportunities arise for her social actions. It is difficult to evaluate this use of onomatopoeia as evidence of improvement of L2 IC. However, her choices and actions in the local contingency enable the talk between the two to progress. IC is not generalizable to every interaction but is rather visibly demonstrated in the fitting contingency. A newer use of L1 in this context indirectly shows Sora's improved adaptation ability in a troubling situation. Sora's choice here to produce that onomatopoeia (leaving behind other options) causes us to ponder what IC means. She could have solicited

136

lexical help for "put up" or produced the entire content in the L1. Instead, she selects the most versatile resource available for Nari and herself considering that her choice to rely on the L1 would cause the least trouble for their L2 conversation.

Sora's use of L1 resources at the later stage of her CfL (session No. 32 to No.42) has been examined. Along with other developing methods of her L2 IC, such as repair practice and turn-taking practice, she has progressed in her overall ability to deliver her newsworthy events as a storyteller.

The aim of this section is, first, to contrast the changes in her pattern of using L1 resources from the initial stage to the later stage and to examine the patterns in the later stage (M8-). The use of Korean as a resource occurs more naturally and smoothly, without interrupting the current topic progression while participating in the turn-constructional process. The Korean language itself can be considered a practical L1 resource for the young L2 learner to access and utilize whenever she wants. Admittedly, both parties do not orient to the different language codes in their sequence development in the later stage of the CfL sessions. However, Sora's use of the L1 resource contrasts with the periods showing different features in the sequential development, as well as the topical progression shown in the above excerpts. In her first month of dyadic conversation, constructing a turn in the L2 is a difficult job, so the L1 resource is a great resource for her, and she mainly uses it for getting the L2 lexical resources from Nari who shares the same L1.

In the following section, Sora's use of L1 resources in her initial stage of joining the sessions of CfL will be presented.

5.2.3 L1 Resource in the Process of Word Search

It is known that when the young L2 learner uses L1 resources, the locations in the turns and sequences create a different effect. The usage patterns and functions of the resources are

diverse, depending on the locations and contexts. In this section, the use of the L1 linguistic resource as a discourse filler in the process of repairing or technically initiating a word search is discussed. A speaker indicates that he or she is engaged in a word search through perturbations in the talk (M.H. Goodwin & C. Goodwin, 1986). In this study, the speaker uses the L1 resource when she engages in a word search. It is a way to help the production of the target L2 items in the ongoing turn. According to the data analysis, the novice L2 learner lowers the cognitive burden by producing the L1 first and secures time for producing the L2 target expression that she has in her vocabulary stock. This eases the production of the L2 item.

As it has been found in the prior section, the moment the speaker produces the L1 resource is too early to categorize it as an alternative L1 resource used as a tool for soliciting help, or as a discourse filler. A conversation analytic approach examining each utterance's accomplishment in the sequential context is very important. In this section, another usage of the L1 resource occurs; the L2 speaker first produces the L1 lexical item, then quickly switches to the L2 equivalent of the L1. The initial production of L1 resources can offer the chance for the L2 speaker to gain a time resource before launching the (quasi) equivalent L2 utterance.

The following four excerpts all display the switch of the L1 resource to the L2 equivalent in the process of word search in self-initiated self-repair work. They were all extracted from Sora's early period (M2–M3) of the CfL sessions. The abundant opportunities to produce in the L2 in the dyadic interactional conversations make Sora's cognitive transitional work quite productive. The activation of the L2 lexical knowledge slowly takes over from the L1 in producing L2 utterances. In addition, the most frequent occurrence is witnessed in the earlier stage (M2–M3). Technically speaking, Sora's repair process, which includes the change of L1 to its L2 equivalent, does not occur in the first month. However, this is supportive evidence that her L2 IC in her repairing work has improved. Her active participation and agency in working out the solution—given her capacity and resources available in conducting the social actions—can be interpreted as an improvement of L2 IC. The occurrence of a previously observed pattern of soliciting or asking for help in word

138

searching, such as "What is X?" "X is?" reduces over time.

The following excerpt comes from the interaction data from Sora's 7th CfL session (W7). Her newsworthy event is having fun with her friends at the gym. When she encounters difficulty in producing the expression she is looking for, she first produces the Korean expression, the L1 resource, and then switches swiftly to the L2.

Excerpt 26 'Tha.ta.ka? take a boat' Session No. 7 (M2)

```
01      Sora: name Pak.ceng.swu  I.min.ho,

02      Nari: uh hm.

03      (0.9)

04      Sora: and we play very very very excited.

05      Nari: um:: in the swimming ↑pool?

06      Sora: yes.

07      Nari: um::.

08→     Sora: um:: and (2.0) we (2.0) ⟨°tha.ta.↑ka°⟩ take a boat,
                                        take +SUB
                                 (what is) to take (in English)

09      Nari: uh hm.

10      Sora: and (2.2) water slide.

11      Nari: uh hm.
```

In line 01, Sora lists the names of her friends with whom she ran to the pool. After receiving Nari's supportive continuer marker "uh hm" and a short delay, Sora continues her storytelling, expressing the excitement that she felt at the pool by using the repetition strategy (L:04 "and we play very very very excited"). The use of the lexical "excited" is inaccurate but is not oriented by the story recipient. In the following turn, Nari initiates a repair of the prior turn saying "um:: in the swimming ↑pool?". Sora provides a positive second pair part of "yes"

in line 06. After Nari's acknowledgment token of "um::" in line 08, Sora self-selects her turn and tries to provide additional information about her fun activity in the pool. However, the beginning of her turn involves speech perturbations, "um:: and (2.0) we (2.0)," which project a possible upcoming difficulty with continuing her turn.

The self-selected turns begin to emerge more frequently in the later stages than in the earlier stages. In line 08, though the turn begins with a lengthened filled pause "um" and "and," Sora produces "we" after a 2-sec long pause. After producing "we," Sora still finds it difficult to produce the next utterance, so she takes another 2-sec long pause in the same turn, which signals huge difficulty. In line 08, she reveals the lexical item that causes difficulty in continuing her turn. She uses the L1 resource, the Korean verb, "°*tha.ta*°" in a quieter voice and a slower pace, which means "to take." The one-syllable "*ka*" attached to the end of the verb is a subjective marker. The omitted part, "what is (X, here *tha.ta*) English," is mutually understood, and thus Sora relies on the one syllable for soliciting lexical help from the other party. In the prior excerpts as well, the formula of using a "subjective particle" at the end of the L1 word and a rising tone is employed by Sora.

Interestingly, in this excerpt, she asks first and answers herself in the same turn; the question "°*ta.da.ga*°?" expressed in the L1 resource quickly transforms into the L2 expression, "take a boat." While producing in the L2, Sora specifies the meaning more precisely to "take a boat." By delivering the meaning successfully she can move the storytelling forward. In the following turn, she expands her story by sharing another activity of riding a water slide in line 09.

It has been stated that the ability to carry out self-repair is an essential skill for a second or foreign-language learner, so it is important to examine learners' self-corrections to have insights into their oral proficiency (Gass & Selinker, 2008; Scarcella, 1988) as well as their development of L2 IC (Hellermann, 2009, 2011; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015) Recently, Kim (2019) found that the novice level speaker tends to self-repair to correct lexically problematic items. Among various types of self-initiated self-repair, the above case

of L1 to L2 transformation in the same turn demonstrates that the L1 resource, the L1, can be a useful resource that the L2 speaker can utilize. The time resource for transforming the lexical knowledge into a vocalized utterance needs extra time and cognition when the speaker has not been regularly practicing the conversation for social actions.

One noteworthy phenomenon is that most of the conversion of the L1 lexical item to the (quasi)-equivalent L2 transformation occurs in the 2nd and 3rd months. This provides us with empirical insight into the possibilities that there might be a certain developmental stage of transformation for novice L2 speakers in using the L1 resource. This also relates to the L2 IC development, because the ability to repair one's utterances for a better understanding between co-participants belongs to the sub-component of interactional competence.

The following three excerpts from the 8th to 10th week of the CfL weekly sessions involve the self-initiated self-repair using the L1 resource. The data will involve the sequential context of each self-repair in word search along with the sequential development.

Before the following excerpt No.27, Nari and Sora were talking about the aspects that Sora is proud of in herself. Before the sequences presented below, Sora shares that she has a neat appearance. In the meantime, however, she honestly tells Nari that her mother does not agree with Sora's pride in her neatness. This is the pre-context of the sequences at the beginning of excerpt No.29. Sora and Nari are talking about something Sora likes about herself. Before Excerpt 9, Sora mentions that she is good at making things neat in the L1.

Excerpt 27 'A.i.tul.han.they. cal.han.ta [kind to other friends' Session No.8 (M2)

```
01     Nari: put things in order?

02     Sora: yes but °my° (0.5) [ ⟨°°room is°°⟩
((four lines omitted))
07     Sora: uh because my mom said (0.5) uh you good at (0.7) neat,
```

141

```
08      Nari: uh hm,

09      Sora: but your (0.5) why? your hh[hh] °〈room is〉°

10      Nari:                              [HHH]

11      Nari: mean your clothes shoes and things are so neat?

12      Sora: °yes°=

13      Nari: =and clean but your room is [except

14      Sora:                             [↑AND] I like neat.

15      Nari: uh hm.

16→     Sora: an:d (0.5) uh (7.0)°a.i.tul.han.they° cal.han° °°ta.ka°°?

                              children  to(I) well   do + SUB

                              (what is) I am nice to children?

17            [I-

18      Nari: [uh〉 how can you say that in [English 〈?

19      Sora:                              [kind (0.5) to (0.5) other friends=

20      Nari: =very ↑good you're so nice and kind to your friends

21            that's SO GOOD,
```

In line 01, Nari checks with Sora what she meant in her previous turn. Sora confirms that Nari's interpretation is accurate, and adds more counter-evidence of her prior comment beginning by saying in a slower and quieter voice that her room is not neat (L2: "yes but °my° (0.5) [〈°°room is°°〉 "). In line 07, Sora backs up her claim by referring to her mother's comment, (L07 and 09: "uh you good at (0.7) neat but your (0.5) why? hh[hh] 〈°°room is°°"). In line 10, Nari actively responds to Sora's mimicking by laughing (L02), and affiliates with her story by providing her interpretation of the message that Sora receives from her mother (L11 and L13). Sora provides an acknowledgment token "yes" in line 12 affiliating Nari's interpretation of her utterance. In line 14, Sora tries to defend herself by self-selecting an overlapping turn, beginning with "[AND I like neat".

The active initiation of an overlapping turn shows Sora's increased will to take part in the storytelling by self-selecting turns more often than before. Nari yields her incomplete

overlapping turn in line 13 to Sora. In line 16, Sora continues her turn beginning with an adverbial "and", which signals that she has more to say to Nari. However, after filling up the silence with a filled pause "uh", she cannot produce her next utterance for seven seconds. The length of silence projects that a significant problem is looming for the speaker.

After this 7 sec-long pause in line 07, Sora breaks the silence by using the L1 resource as part of her repairing work. She uses the resource straightforwardly in her turn. This time she is not actively using the L1 resource, but rather stays passive by lowering her voice at the end of the L1 resource. She also tries to say more after the L1 expression, "*a.i.tul.han.they*° *cal.han.*° °°*ta.ka*°?" beginning with "I," which overlaps with Nari's turn beginning. In line 18 Nari does not provide the L2 equivalent for the target item for word search, but requests Sora to try to make the expression in her way (L18: "[uh 〉 how can you say that in [English 〈?"). Thus, Sora's repair-initiation is not completed by Nari, but another repair-initiation on the repairable item is made instead. Upon the repair initiation by Nari, Sora successfully completes the repair by saying "[kind (0.5) to (0.5) other friends=" (L19). Her completed repair receives a compliment from Nari. It has been found that Sora uses L1 resources in her turn construction for several reasons. In line 16, when facing a significant difficulty in speaking, she solves it by relying on the L1 resource. Until then, it is difficult to discern whether she has the linguistic resources to deliver the message in the L2. Sora is just having trouble speaking and no other resources are available. When Nari takes the turn and gives Sora time, as well as a permitted chance to try in the L2, Sora successfully produces the L2 expression that she has been searching for. Going through the turn-taking discourse, the novice L2 young speaker can have an opportunity to display their linguistic resources in talk, *in situ*.

This usage pattern of the L1 resource in her repairing work has been observed in the prior excerpt as well (Excerpt No. 26: "*tha.ta.ka*" to "take a boat"). By soliciting lexical help by using the L1 resource, she also lessens the difficulty of producing the target L2 expressions. She has the lexical resources for the L2 utterances in her vocabulary basket, although it seems that her production requires some extra time resources. The time resource could have been

secured by the L1 resource. Thus, the L1 resource in the sequence plays a positive role in the sequence development of the conversational interaction.

Another case with a similar usage of L1 resources will be provided below. In the following excerpt, Sora answers the question on word search by herself in the storytelling about her guitar teacher on the day she decides to quit the private guitar lessons.

Excerpt 28 'Ttok.pa.lo. an ssun.ta. he put it very strange' Session No. 9 (M3)

```
01      Nari: dye? his dyed his hair.
02      Sora: yes and he: (1.2) $hairband everyday.$
03      Nari: um::
04→     Sora: uh:: ttok.pa.lo. an ssun.ta ﹥°mwe.yey.yo°﹤
                     Properly Not + Put on what is it
                  What is (he) doesn't put (it) on properly
05      Nari: kind of like (0.6) um:(1.5) how can I say?=
06→     Sora: =she (0.5) [he put it ﹤very strange﹥?
07      Nari:              [he
08      Nari: ah in a kind of stran[ge way
09      Sora:                       [yes and (0.6) $he dance everyday.$
10      Nari: in ↑class?
11      Sora: $yes he$ (0.8) look (1.5) mirror everyday
12      Nari: um:[::
```

In Excerpt 28, Sora lists what she doesn't like about her private ex-guitar teacher. Before the beginning of the excerpt, Sora uses dying in the L1 word, and in line 01, Nari provides the L2 equivalent and the sentence-level expression. Next, in line 02, Sora confirms Nari's expression and hesitates before saying "hairband everyday" in a smiley voice. After Nari's

144

continuer marker "um::" in line 03, Sora self-selects the turn and tries to continue. However, the turn begins with a lengthened filled pause, "uh::" projects her difficulty with continuing the turn. The next utterance is composed of the L1 resource, L1 utterance, that solicits lexical help related to the way the guitar teacher puts on the hairband (L04). She asks straightforwardly, using the L1 resource, "*ttok.pa.lo. an. ssun.ta*" (doesn't put it on a proper way) first, and then lowers the volume for "*mwe.yey.yo*" (what is it) and speaks the phrase faster than the prior utterance in the same turn. She distinguishes the L1 utterances with her voice volume and rate of production. The two parts are vocally differentiated in the process of speech production; the first phase, the L1 expression which Sora is having trouble with producing in the L2, is vocalized in the normal volume and rate; on the other hand, the second phase, the question format, "What is (X)?" is produced more quietly and quickly. Sora shows a different attitude in using the format "What is X?" in the current session—the beginning of the third month of CfL. In the earlier months (M1–M2), she would not differentiate in speech production of the L1 resource of different types. In other words, the more Sora becomes adjusted to the talk-in-interaction, the more independent she seems to be in producing the content of her storytelling, reducing her reliance on the other party.

In the following turn in line 05, Sora asks Nari for lexical help, and does not provide the L2 equivalent straightforwardly; rather she repairs by saying "kind of like (0.6) "um:" and a 1.5 sec-long pause as repair initiators. Then she speaks her thought out loud, "how can I say?". Upon hearing Nari's dispreferred response for her request action, without having a break in between lines, in line 06 Sora completes her self-initiated self-repair: "she (0.5) [he put it very strange."

The completion of self-initiated self-repair in line 06 demonstrates that the novice child L2 speaker can successfully produce the L2 expression faster than the expert adult L2 speaker. Though Sora asks for the expression in the L1 while constructing her turn, when she cannot produce the L2 expression, it does not mean that she lacks the linguistic resources in her vocabulary basket. The back-and-forth turn-taking interaction requires more resources for her

to activate speech production. In this talk-in-interaction contingency, linguistic knowledge is not inherent in human cognition but can be visible/tangible when it is activated and performed at the interactional level. Whether lexical knowledge is successfully produced or not is subject to the local sequential environment. In addition, the novice L2 speaker's self-repair shows the dynamic fluidity of expert-novice relations in the interactional framework (Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991).

The turn with the initiation of self-repair experiences a mid-turn overlapping with Nari's corrective feedback "[he" to Sora's use of the pronoun "she" at the beginning of line 06 referring to the male teacher. When overlapping occurs, Nari yields the turn to Sora. When Sora's turn is complete, Nari picks up Sora's repair and changes a part of the turn, "ah in a kind of strange way" (L08). Continuing the storytelling, Sora self-selects her turn by overlapping the onset of her turn in line 09 "yes." In line 09, she adds another crucial piece of information that supports her decision to quit the lesson, saying that "yes and (0.6) and $he dance everyday$." The flow of Sora's storytelling is quite straightforward in listing the aspects that she doesn't like about the guitar teacher. This shows that a novice L2 speaker can logically proffer her ideas to make herself understood, by providing concrete facts that support her position in the story regardless of her limited linguistic and interactional resources. What drives her to progress in her storytelling is related more to her eagerness to share the content with Nari and to help her gain a mutual understanding of her stance.

What the above Excerpt 28 demonstrates to us is significant, not only because of the use of the L1 resource but also because of the dynamic fluidity of expert-novice relations in the talk-in-interaction. Each turn offers possibilities to achieve a dynamic fluidity of identities.

The following Excerpt (29) displays another example of an L1 resource transforming into an L2 equivalent in Sora's same turn. What is noteworthy is that Sora picks up the lexical items used by the other party in the prior turns in the conversation. This also demonstrates her improved skills in paying attention to the linguistic resource while listening to the other party's turn. Also, the speaker shows the attitude of trying a new expression that she has just been

exposed to for the first time. The application of a new lexical input into speech production requires trial and error. In the following excerpt, Sora first relies on the L1 resource, then produces the lexical input offered by Nari in the prior sequence. The L1 resource seems to help activate the knowledge and enable Sora to apply it in speech production.

The content of the talk is the election of the class president in Sora's class. She is not elected, and she feels disappointed by her friend's untrustworthy behavior.

Excerpt 29 'Ccik.ta.ka? I choose you' Session No. 10 (M3)


```
01      Nari: okay how have you been?

02→     Sora: um::: (1.2) toda:y,

03      Nari: uh hm.

04      Sora: is ↑not GOOD day, ((rustling sound of snack bag))

05      Nari: °um:°

06      (1.2)

07→     Sora: ↑WHY because (2.4) ((sigh)) (2.3) today is

08            (0.5) 〉hak.kup.im.wen.sen.ke 〈
                    Class representative election
                    election for class representatives

08→     Nari: um:: AH:: election=

09      Sora: =ney
               yes

10      Nari: you had an you had a vote (0.5) to choose the

12            class president

13      Sora: ye[ah

14      Nari:   [class president pan.cang?
                             class president

((9 lines omitted, continues the topic))

24      Nari: I see (0.5) sorry that you didn't become the class president
```

147

```
25      (2.0) ((Sora drinking beverage))

26→     Sora: an:d

27      Nari: uh hm

28      Sora: I fight with my friends,

29      Nari: um::: tell me everything.

((6 lines omitted))

36      Sora: ↑fall semester, ((the sound of taking jelly from the jelly bag))

37      Nari: uh hm.

38→     Sora: I (2.0)((the sound of jelly bag)) ccik.ta.ka? I choose you
                                          vote+SUB?
                                          (what's) to vote?

39      Nari: uh [hm

40      Sora:    [but she didn't.

41      Nari: ↑HUH she DIDN'T she lie[d

42      Sora:                        [yes (1.0) and she (0.5) hem.tam.
                                                              backbiting

43      Nari: ah::: spoke ill of you

44→     Sora: yes (1.0) so I fight with my friend
```

In the initial greeting sequence, Sora begins in line 02 by signaling difficulty in sharing her status by initiating her turn with repair initiators—a lengthened filled pause and a silent pause followed by the time locator, "today." Expressing her supportive attitude, Nari provides a continuer token "uh hm" and gets the time locator of the future story. Soon, Sora completes her sentence saying "is ↑not GOOD day" (L04). Sora successfully delivers her bad mood as a second pair part of the question in line 01. Nari provides a quieter response than the prior response token "°um°," expressing her curiosity for the upcoming story.

After a 1.2 sec-long delay, in line 07 Sora begins with a self-inquiry expression, "↑WHY" using a louder and rising tone to her statement of "today is ↑not GOOD day" (L02 and L04). After producing "WHY," soon she answers beginning with "because." Answering

her question is positive evidence of Sora's increased ability in recipient designing for both mutual understanding and the smooth flow of sequence development, intensifying the topical interest as a storyteller. She anticipates that Nari will inquire about her feeling, so she tries to provide an answer before receiving the question. She has a much better general sense of the sequential development of the talk-in-interaction than she did previously.

Although Sora tries to provide the reason behind her bad mood, she halts her utterance for several seconds. She first has a 2.4 sec-long pause, then makes a deep sigh in lines 07 and 08. After another pause, she repeats the prior turn beginning "today is" and then produces the L1 resource, "*hak.kup.im.wen.sen.ke*" at a faster rate, which can be translated into "election for class representatives." In the following turn, the story recipient, Nari, offers her understanding, "um:: AH:: election." Without a break, Sora provides an agreement token in the L1, "ne" in line 09. In her following turn Nari tries to provide Sora's L1 resource (L07) into L2 expressions in an implicit way, "you had and you had a vote (0.5) to choose the <u>class</u> president" (L11-12). Sora confirms Nari's interpretation by saying "yeah." Part of Sora's response overlaps with Nari's repetition of the ending of her prior turn and its Korean equivalent, "class president *pan.cang*?" with a rising tone. Sora's use of L1 resources provides a chance for her to learn the L2 expression equivalent for the L1 resource in the unfolding sequence. This lexical input from Nari is later used by Sora in the following sequences.

Skipping nine lines down in the above excerpt, Nari provides an affiliative comment about Sora's not being chosen as the class president (L24). After a 2.0 sec-long delay while drinking her beverage, she produces a continuer index, "an:d" projecting that she has more to say about the topic (L26). After receiving Nari's go-ahead signal, "uh hm," Sora brings up a new topic (L28: "I fight with my friends"). With Nari's encouragement to tell her everything (L29: um:::: tell me everything.), Sora shares the episode that she experienced with her classmate in the first semester (while asking in the omitted lines for the expressions that she needs such as spring semester and fall semester). In line 36, Sora begins with the expression, "fall semester", a time locator for her story. Nari provides a continuer "uh hm" (L37). In the

following line, Sora delivers what her friend was going to do in the fall semester, which was to vote for Sora. In line 38, "I" the subject is Sora's friend whom she fought with. Sora tries to quote what her friend said, but she runs into difficulty with continuing the turn and takes a 2 sec-long delay. Breaking the silence, Sora switches to using the L1 resource for soliciting lexical help, "ccik.ta.ga." The Korean word, "*ccik.ta*" is a basic form of the verb "to vote (choose)". Sora attaches "*ka*," the subjective particle at the end of the basic verb form with a raised pitch and rising intonation. Interestingly, however, as soon as she finishes completing her solicitation, she produces the searched item by herself, "I choose you" (L38). Line 38 shows that the novice L2 speaker can produce the lexical item in the process of repairing while using the L1 lexical resource.

In line 38, Sora can finally produce "I choose you". The combination of a verb and an object is produced by Nari in line 10, "a vote to choose the class president". At the beginning of the talk in the current session, Sora could not use the expression "choosing somebody". However, she produces the pattern after being exposed to Nari's utterances during the talk-in-interaction. The verb for help, "*ccik.ta*" can be translated into "to choose". After being exposed to the pattern, she is now trying to use a relatively new lexical input for making her meaning understood by overcoming the limited linguistic resources.

Going back to the use of the L1 resource, when listening to the syllable of the subjective particle "*ka*" at the end of the verb, "*ccik.ta*," she uses the L1 resource to solicit help, although it turns out that the resource helps her to test a new method. It seems that using the L1 resource for solicitation helps Sora to complete her self-initiated self-repair. While producing the L1 resource, "*ccik.ta.ka*," Sora might have devised the relatively new expression, "I choose you." In other words, the use of L1 resources has played several roles for the novice L2 speaker in continuing her turn in the process of self-repair. It has been a resource for lexical solicitation and a discourse filler for producing new utterances.

Due to Sora's completion of self-repair, the sequences consistently unfold without having an insert expansion for word search that can sidetrack the progress of the storytelling.

150

In line 36, Nari simply provides the supportive continuer marker, "uh hm", yielding her turn to Sora. Then Sora continues to develop her storytelling.

In the following sequences, Sora speaks about her friend who had promised to choose her as a class president for the second semester but did not choose her (L40). In addition, the friend spoke ill of her, "*hem.tam*" (backbiting). In line 44, Sora wraps up the story by saying, "yes so I fight with my friend," which is identical to the onset turn of the storytelling, "and I fight with my friends" (L28). Sora successfully completes her storytelling by explaining the cause of her fight, though her sequences have short TCUs and some intra-turn delays.

So far, the previous section has provided a micro-analysis of Sora's use of L1 resources in two different periods and two unique phenomena are observed regarding the L1 use in the longitudinal CfL. The current study supports the results of previous studies in terms of the usefulness of the L1 resource in continuing the progress of the talk-in-interaction and completing the self-repair (Sert, 2015).

In the following sub-section, the focus will be on Sora's increased IC in terms of her development of storytelling competence in the interactive turn-taking systems.

5.3 Changes in Storytelling Practices

One of the most noticeable changes in Sora's L2 IC during the longitudinal period of CfL is her willingness to talk more as she actively participates as a storyteller about her experiences. She has joined storytelling activities regularly for more than 20 minutes per session. Researchers have shown that storytelling can be a good measurement tool for indexing and describing the improvement of L2 learners' IC development in the longitudinal time framework (Barraja-Rohan, 2015; Kim & Carlin, 2021; Y. Kim, 2016; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2016). Sora has shown significant improvement in her turn-taking skills, the sequential development of her talk, and her repair practice while developing her storytelling activities.

Her active initiation and expansion of stories have measurably improved with her recurrent interactional practice over the longitudinal period.

In the early period (M1–M3), it has been observed that the talk-in-interaction relied heavily on the adult speaker's overall management, such as eliciting, wrapping up, and shifting the topic. The young L2 speaker made minimal responses to elicitation questions from the adult co-participant. There were long pauses and speech perturbations in almost every one of Sora's turns. It was rarely observed that Sora self-selected turns for story expansions in the early months.

However, in the later stage (M8–14), Sora shows more confidence and willingness to share her experience in storytelling, and she is developing her storytelling skills. She also expands her topic and the boundary of the story to a broader context.

The following section will examine Sora's willingness to continue her storytelling in the sequential talk-in-interaction in the face of topic-shifting and terminating signals from the story recipient. Sora shows a pattern of moving the topic forward, providing details in the story when she has specific content to share with Nari. One of the longstanding issues for L2 language educators is how to increase L2 learners' opportunities to talk more in their interactional conversation. The following excerpt gives a possible clue to a solution.

This section will highlight the findings drawn from the later stage of Sora's changes regarding the L2 IC. The focus will be on the increased evidence of active participation in Sora's storytelling, in particular when trying to pursue her thoughts further to share them with Nari.

The following excerpt is about Sora's storytelling of her family trip to the Gang.won.do area. The story recipient, Nari, shows actions that intend to shift the topic and terminate the storytelling (L24 & L45). However, Sora does not yield her turns but pursues her storytelling.

Excerpt 30 'Weather good and second day uh' Session No. 31 (M8)


```
01      Nari: ↑ah::, (0.7) can you tell me more about

02            your family trip to Kang.wen.to?

03      Sora: uhm:: we went uh:: some:: (1.0) cel.

                                          temple

((18 lines omitted, continues the topic of visiting a temple))

22      Nari: ↑AH::  I've heard about that boy group uhm::.=

23      Sora: =yes BTS.

24→     Nari: I see: an:d (0.6) when did you come back?

25      Sora: uhm:: (0.8) Satur(0.3)↑day?

26→     Nari: uhm:: you got you came back home on Saturday was [it] fun

27      Sora:                                                   [yes]

28      Nari: how was >°the°< the weather?

29      Sora: uhm:: it's good and:, se↑co:nd,

30      Nari: um

31→     Sora: second day uh:: we:(0.5) uh::(1.0) °we° (0.8) take

32            take ba.da.yeol.cha

              Sea train

              Seaside train

33      Nari: OH:: train that that °>ku<° that runs next to the ocean?

34            very close to the ocean?

35      Sora: yes.

36      Nari: uhm [::

37→     Sora:     [Ceng.tong.cin.

38      Nari: I see I've heard about that train rail

39            that's very [next] to the ocean uhm::

40      Sora:             [nex°t°]

41      Sora: yes (0.6) very good.

42      Nari: uhm::
```

```
43      (0.8)

44→     Nari: ok sounds ↑GOOD you had [a] good time

45      Sora:                            [ney/inaudible]

                                        yes

46→     Sora: and second day↑s::,

47      Nari: hm.

48      Sora: uh hotel is very good,

49      Nari: uhm:: you stayed at a different place

50            different ↑hotel? [fir- first night and,

51      Sora:                   [yes]

52      Nari: and second night uhm::

53      Sora: yes second night uh hotel is better than first day hotel
```

The excerpt begins with Nari's initial topic elicitor, asking Sora to talk about her trip to Gang.won.do. In line 03, Sora begins her second pair part with a lengthened filled pause "uhm::" and tells Nari that they visited a temple. She relies on the L1 lexical word for "temple," "*cel*." She successfully uses the past tense, "went," and provides "some" before using the L1 resource (L03:uhm:: we went uh:: some:: (1.0) *cel*.), because it is difficult for her to specify the name or other details about the temple. As the previous section has shown regarding the use of L1 resources in Sora's 8th month of CfL, she does not solicit lexical help for the L1 word from Nari, but simply uses it as a resource in her ongoing turn construction.

In the space of omitted lines (L4–L21), she shares the story that at the temple she wrote her wishes on the roof tile. She made good wishes for the boy group, BTS. In line 22, Nari affiliates with the content about the boy group saying, "AH:: I've heard about that boy group uhm::." In response to Nari's affiliation, Sora quickly offers the affirmation in the following line (L23: =yes BTS.). In her following turn in line 24, Nari self-selects the turn and asks Sora what time she came back to Seoul, as a way of shifting the topic from the boy group. Sora responds "uhm:: (0.8) Satur↑day?" with a rising tone at the end, indicating her uncertainty

154

(L25). In line 26, Nari self-selects her turn and reassures Sora about her return to Seoul by making a sentential level TCU out of Sora's single word, "uhm:: you got back home on Saturday".

In the same turn, Nari asks two questions in a row, "Was it fun? How was the weather?" (L26). On Nari's paraphrasing Sora's arrival day as Saturday (L25), Sora responds "yes" in line 27, overlapping with Nari's new sentence beginning with "Was [it fun?". In the new sentence, Nari seeks an account of Sora's overall evaluation of her trip and the weather. This displays her implicit intention to shift the topic to the weather from the events of her trip, as an indirect way of wrapping up the sharing of Sora's travel itinerary because the next activity is on hold.

After responding to the question on the weather with "uhm:: it's good" in line 29, Sora revisits her storytelling of her trip to the Kang.wen.to area and shows she wants to continue her storytelling by saying "and se↑co:nd." Nari introduces consecutive topic shifting in her two turns in lines 24 and 26. Sora is not influenced by these signals and indicates she wants to continue sharing her travel episode on the second day in *Kang.wen*, even though Nari has signaled a topic shift. This shows that Nari's three questions about Sora's return, having fun, and the weather (L24 & L26), an insert-expansion initiated by Nari, do not affect Sara's plan to continue telling the rest of her story. She simply responds to the question, but signals that she has more to say to the other party by saying "se↑co:nd". She also raises the tone of the last syllable of the word "se↑co:nd" as a way of securing her turn. Catching Sora's projection, Nari provides a supportive and continuer marker, "um" yielding her trajectory of the talk.

Finally, Sora goes on to tell what she did on her second day in lines 31 and 37. After the time locator, "second day," Sora makes some perturbations in the process of repairing her turn construction, "uh:: we:: uh:: (1.0) °we° (0.8) take take" before using the verb "take." The strategy of repeating "we" and using two filled pauses of fragmented construction of the "subject + verb" pattern displays how hard the young learner is trying to continue telling the

story of her experience.

Regardless of several hurdles, Sora endeavors to continue talking about her second-day activity during her trip. This is very meaningful because the side topic on the second day of her travel is initiated by Sora. Nari, the story recipient, has not shown any curiosity at all about Sora's second day of her travel itinerary. This is a different pattern from that previously shown by Sora in the early months when she simply responds to the questions passively made by Nari. In this segment, Sora initiates talking about her travel activities by overcoming serious difficulties arising from her limited linguistic and interactional resources. Though Nari tries to shift the topic, Sora shows a strong will to continue her travel story. The instinct to share one's experience with a supportive listener is inherent in human nature. Sora seems to experience the joy and pleasure of telling her story to Nari while sharing newsworthy events regularly. This development shows that the social action of sharing her travel story with her friend-like mentor is a meaningful action for Sora.

When Sora shares her activity of taking the seaside train, Nari fully affiliates with the story by checking with Sora that she knows that the train runs next to the ocean (L31). Sora makes an affirmation marker, "yes" to Nari's check-up. Upon Sora's affirmation, Nari also signals her supportive continuer marker "uhm." Before Nari's completion of her vocalization, overlapping the ending syllable, Sora provides the name of the location, "*Ceng.tong.cin*." Her proffering of this name here can be interpreted as an action of recipient-designing, aiming to heighten mutual understanding between them, which is further evidence of Sora's positive changes in L2 IC. Sora's proffering the name of the area spurs a more active response from Nari as a listener. She tells Sora that she has heard about the train rail that runs next to the ocean.

Both the storyteller and the story recipient are interested in each other's story and pay close attention to each other's utterances. One example is Sora's action of "joint-completion" in line 36. She provides the lexical item that Nari is just about to produce, "next," in a coincidental manner. This action of joint co-construction also displays Sora's improvement in

156

her L2 IC regarding her increased attention to the other's talk, rather than simply paying attention to her own words and actions. After Nari finishes her affiliative comment on the seaside train, Sora provides her evaluation, adding "yes (0.6) very good" (L41).

After finishing the talk of the seaside train ride, nothing more is added in line 39. Sora does not initiate her turn for a 0.8 sec-long pause. Then Nari takes the turn and begins with the topic-shifting discourse marker, "okay" (Beach, 1993), and tries to terminate the sequence of Sora's storytelling about her travel to "*Kang.wen.to*" by making a gist-formulation, "okay sounds good, you had a good time" (L44). However, Sora does not interpret Nari's action as a topic-shifting gesture, either due to her lack of pragmatic awareness or because she has not finished yet, according to Sora's utterances in line 46.

Sora produces the continuer signal "and" and restarts talking about her activities on her second day. The rising tone and the lengthening of the last syllable of the word "day↑s::," by adding "s" to the word "day," is an inaccurate usage of "day," as the prior word is "second." This additional syllable attachment and lengthening of the last syllable are one of the strategic actions that L2 speakers choose to hold their turn for their next action (Carroll, 2005). Somewhat unexpectedly, after receiving a continuation signal from Sora, Nari provides a short acceptance token "hm" (L47). Sora offers a new topic, the accommodation during the travel, and the pretext of the upcoming sequences, "uh hotel is very good" (L48).

As an understanding and acknowledgment token, "uhm::," Nari interprets Sora's prior turn by making a repair initiation, "you stayed at a different place, different hotel?" Sora's response to the repair initiation overlaps with Nari's further elaboration of her repair initiation. In line 53, Sora smoothly completes the repair by producing the comparative construction without pausing longer than 0.5 sec and having only one single filled pause "uh" (L53: "yes second night uh hotel is better than first-day hotel"). This is a significant improvement for Sora to make a full sentence without noticeable speech perturbations. Also, her initiative to expand her experience on the second day of her travel demonstrates a significant accomplishment as a storyteller. Sora now decides what to tell and to what extent from her

plan, not depending on the other party's elicitation questions on her story. The novice child L2 speaker has taken more ownership of her storytelling.

The following excerpt shows Sora's active storytelling while sharing the movie called "Goose Bumps," which she watched with her mom. She shares the movie story fluently, with fully animated manners for different aspects of the movie story. She often self-selects the turns and does not get interfered with, despite her limited linguistic resources in continuing her story. This is a significant contrast to her prior limited participation in the storytelling where the interaction manager Nari leads the interaction in the initial stages (M1–3). Now Sora is showing active participation and demonstrating her willing attitude toward conversational interaction. The old pattern of reliance on the interlocutor is absent from the later stage. Next, the excerpt that has Sora's active participation in turn-taking and topic development in steering the storytelling activity will be presented.

The excerpt below is from the recurrent activity of sharing newsworthy events that occurred in Sora's last week before their CfL session. Before the excerpt below, during the lines omitted, Sora first checks with Nari using the Korean language whether she has shared the movie "Goose Bumps" in their previous session. When Nari says "no," Sora starts to talk about her experience of watching the movie "Goose Bumps." In the following excerpt, the examination will focus on how she progresses with the storytelling of the movie story as she develops the sequences.

Excerpt 31 'Wow…uh ku Jack Black said' No. 37 (M10)

```
01      Sora: I saw (0.5) uh goose bumps movie with my ↑mom.

02      Nari: uhm:: (0.5) did you like ↑it?

03      Sora: yes good.

04      Nari: can [you can you tell me the story 〉 a little bit 〈?

05      Sora:     [↑〉fun〈.
```

158

```
06      (1.2)

07      Sora: uhm:: (1.4) there are Jack Black,

08      Nari: um.

09      Sora: and Jack black's uh daughter,

10      Nari: um.

11→     (1.9)

12      Sora: and (0.6) some boy main character,

13      Nari: um

14→     (1.0)

15      Sora: main character and (0.7) uh Jack black's daughter is friend,

16      Nari: uh hm.

((26 lines omitted, continues the topic))

43      Sora: so they (0.5) know uh Jack Black is writer,

44      Nari: uh hm.

45      Sora: Rastein,

46      Nari: uh hm.

47      (1.2)

48      Sora: uh and (2.5) uhm (1.0)〉↑ah ↑ah ↑ah 〈(1.8) °〉uh they uh 〈°

49            Chef is ↑fam goose bumps,

50      Nari: uh hm.

51      Sora: WOW are you are out (?) story((dramatic voicing)) and u

52            uhm:: (1.8) and (0.5) uh (1.0) uh ku Jack Black said oh
                                                                    that

53→        no (0.8) Hena be good we have to go moving it so,(0.6) but

54→        there are many ghost so,(1.2) they can't (?) (0.7) they catch.

55      Nari: um:: the°y°- ↑pardon? what did you say ↑they?

56      Sora: they catch all ghost

57      Nari: they catch all ghost ah::=

58      Sora: =yes and um::: (1.6 ) neh(?) uh Jack Black love: uh (0.5)

59            ↑his ku main character's (0.6) aunt,
                    that
```

159

```
60      Nari: aunt aunt?
61      Sora: aunt and(1.5) uh main character love uh Jack Black's daughter.
62      Nari: ah:: I see.
63      Sora: ↑AH teacher (1.6) and (1.2) Jack Black's daughter is um character too.
64      Nari: um.
66      Sora: goose bumps character so,
66      Nari: um.
67→     Sora: uh when uh almost catch and that uh daughter is so uh
68→           disappear too (0.6) but uh Jack Black (0.8) write write
69→           story again so(0.5)only daughter so daughter can can um yes.
70      Nari: can can uh be alive?
71      Sora: yes but (1.5) but (3.0) thwu.myeng.in.kan
                                      the invisible
```

After hearing the newsworthy event from Sora that she watched a movie with her mom, Nari asks whether Sora liked the movie (L2). Sora responds with a positive comment, "yes good." Nari elicits a further question on the movie, beginning with "can you~" (L4). As Nari begins the question, Sora self-selects her turn and adds an evaluation of the movie, "fun" using a rather quick manner of talking. Her turn initiation overlaps with Nari's ongoing turn in which she requests that Sora talk about the movie a little bit more. During their segment on sharing Sora's newsworthy event, Sora sometimes raises her experience of going to the movie. Nari then requests Sora to talk about the movie story that she watched in their prior sessions along with their longitudinal CfL sessions. Sora showed great reluctance to talk about the movie stories in the initial stage. In contrast, in this segment, Sora actively participates in the storytelling.

Upon the request from Nari to tell the movie story, Sora first takes a 1.2 sec-long pause. After this delay, Sora begins her turn with "uhm::," a lengthened filled pause for thinking about the next utterance and another silent pause of 1.4 sec-long in line 07. It has been repeatedly seen in Sora's speech data that the filled pause functions as a resource for earning

time as well as easing her cognitive burden. At the same turn, Sora introduces the characters in the movie one by one using the construction of "there are X and Y" pattern in lines 07 and 09. This is noteworthy because she can introduce the main characters as an action of recipient-designing. For the novice L2 speaker, the plot or storyline seems to be rather more difficult than listing the main characters.

In addition, another pattern that Sora demonstrates is first taking a silent pause after receiving the recipient's supportive continuer marker, and then continuing the storytelling. In lines 11 and 14, Sora takes silent pauses before progressing the movie story. In lines 09, 12, and 15, Sora introduces the main characters and their relationships. Though Sora begins her turn with a topic, it takes time for her to plan how she will unfold the story and what kinds of utterances she will use. It is quite challenging for a young L2 learner to tell a movie story to another party. However, Sora keeps initiating turns and continues moving the story forward without any solicitation requests from Nari at all. In the storytelling sequences, most of the grammatical errors and awkward expressions are not oriented by either the teller or the recipient. The delivery of the story is prioritized by both parties.

In the space of lines 17 to 42 (omitted), Sora shares some episodes that make the story more exciting. In the following line, Sora adds information about the main character, Jack Black, who is a writer named "Rastein" and the boy character "Chef," who is a fan of the book "Goose Bumps" (Lines 48-49), which was written by the character of Jack Black. In line 51, Sora tries to imitate one of the characters, "wow are you are you story" with an animated voice. Imitating the voice from the movie is another use of multimodal resources to overcome her limited linguistic resources. She experiences great difficulties continuing the turn beginning at line 51. The difficulties are externalized in line 52, which is filled up with filled pauses, silent pauses, and the Korean discourse marker "*ku*" (that). By filling up the silence with all the resources available, she is creating time for her next utterances while maintaining the turn. In the coming lines (53 to 54), Sora keeps talking about the movie story in a relatively fluent manner with fewer speech perturbations, thanks to the time earned in line 52 and the

perturbation markers such as "uh" and "*ku*".

The content is not concise, but she makes a significant effort to deliver the movie story to the other party by producing sentences. One of the resources useful to her in a difficult situation is the filler "so." It has been observed in lines 53 and 54 that she uses it when she encounters some "slack" before producing the next word. The pattern of using "so" and a silent pause in an adjacent location is how she repairs herself amid current difficulties.

The turn from line 51 to line 54 is entirely produced by Sora and is quite long. This longer span of her turn is evidence of her increased ability as a storyteller who oversees her storytelling rather than being directed by Nari's elicitation questions. She delivers quite a bit of information about the movie story from lines 51 to 54. The last sentence in line 54, "so, (1.2) they can't (?) catch (0.7) they catch," lacks a proper object, thus making it difficult for Nari to follow Sora's storytelling, and causing a breakdown in mutual understanding. In line 55, Nari initiates a repair request about what Sora refers to as an object of the verb "catch." Sora self-repairs successfully by adding the object "all ghost," saying that "they catch all ghost" in line 56. In the following turn, Nari repeats Sora's prior turn by making a slight change from "ghost" to "ghosts" and produces an understanding token "ah::" at the end of line 57.

In the following sequences from line 58, Sora self-selects her turn and continues the love story of Jack Black's character. In lines 58 to 59, Sora explains that Jack loves the main character's aunt (L59), and the main character loves Jack's daughter (L61). The contents of the movie are delivered quite smoothly, without pauses longer than 0.5 sec-long nor frequent discourse fillers (except the L1 discourse filler "*ku* in line 52"). Sora can now talk for relatively long spells while delivering the key contents of the movie from lines 67 to 69, without any pauses longer than 0.5 sec-long.

The ability to keep the talk progressing without noticeable pauses is a sign of the maturity of the L2 speaking skills, as well as the change in her storytelling practices. Additionally, it is noteworthy that Nari has not elicited any further information on the movie story from Sora but simply provides supportive markers. Sora responds to the developmental

direction in her storytelling with more active interaction, as Kim and Carlin (2021) have found in the young child's storytelling over time. Both indexical measurements of the longer TCU and increased actions of recipient designing represent the developmental changes in Sora's L2 IC.

The following excerpt also shows Sora's advanced skill in storytelling. In her recurrent activities of updating newsworthy events to the other party, Sora has not often delivered the newsworthy event in a stepwise topic-shifting manner. In the initial stage (M1–3), Sora has a pattern of "dumping" the topic abruptly on the story recipient, usually at a phrase level. Nari then displays active engagement to elicit more information on the topic. After regular participation in the CfL sessions with the same speaker over a year-long period, however, Sora has shown significant improvement in her storytelling abilities, including initiating turns, expanding stories, and repairing the turns, as prior Excerpt No.33 has shown.

In later stages, the story-prefacing work (Hellermann, 2008) also emerges in her storytelling session. Sora starts to engage prefacing work before fully engaging in the details of her newsworthy event. This prefacing work helps both parties to gain mutual understanding.

The following excerpt comes from the 45th of Sora's 50 total weekly sessions with Nari. This year-long period has consisted of talking with the same partner, using the same routines composed of updating newsworthy events in life, and question-and-answer sessions on Sora's extensive book reading (the current study has not dealt with the latter). In the following excerpt, her storytelling design differs from her style in the earlier stages. In the following excerpt, her newsworthy event is receiving three new books.

Excerpt 32 'My favorite book series' Session No. 45 (M12)

```
01      Nari: anything else that you want to share with me something ↑new
02      or something ↑good for the past one week?
03      (1.0)
```

163

```
04→     Sora: AH (1.2) I uh (0.7) my favorite book series is (1.3) uh

05            smart girl (0.6) and I have smart girl but I don't have uh

06             three uh smart girl cwung.ey. sey kwen.i. ttak eps.e.yo.

                              among three books exactly don't have

                              I don't have three books among the series

07      Nari: uh hm,

08→     Sora: so I buy (0.5) uh my mom buy for me and

09→            uh I (0.5) I have↑ALL all smart (0.7) girl book.

10      Nari: book 〉 the the 〈 book series?

11      Sora:  yes.

12      Nari: so you've got three books now the the whole series.

13      (1.0)

14      Sora: yes.
```

The excerpt begins with Nari's initial elicitor on Sora's newsworthy event for the past week (L01 to 02). In the first pair part of the question, Sora tries to provide the second pair part with a somewhat disfluent beginning, "AH (1.2) I uh (0.7)" which signals her trouble in coming up with her next utterance. The *eureka* sound, "AH" is followed by a 1.2 sec-long delay, and the subject "I" is produced. However, another filled pause, "uh" and a 0.7 sec-long pause follow. This is Sora's initial repair work before providing the topic of her talk, "my favorite book series" in line 04. As she claims, the topic for her newsworthy event is related to her favorite book series. At the beginning of her turn, Sora specifies her favorite book series before introducing any related event or action. This introduction of relevant information for the upcoming story provides a pretext for her upcoming story.

In the ongoing talk-in-interaction, Sora mentions that she has some copies of the book series (L06), but she does not have three books out of the whole series. In line 06, she uses the Korean L1 resource, expressing that she is only missing these three books out of the entire series ("*cwung.ey. sey kwen.i. ttak eps.e.yo*"). As the prior section has shown, Sora uses the

L1 resource more confidently and comfortably in the later stage without checking with Nari or soliciting lexical help from her. Nari does not raise an issue with Sora's L1 use, and simply provides a continuer marker as a token of understanding in line 07. Sora continues providing information about her book series in lines 08–09. She mentions that she buys it, but then repairs this statement by saying that her mother buys the books ("so I buy uh my mom buy for me"). In the following line, she claims that now she has the whole book series ("I I have all all smart (0.7) girl book"(L09). Sora uses a skillful repetition strategy for smooth repairing and with comparatively fewer speech perturbations than her TCUs in the earlier months. This is more evidence of her improved L2 IC skills of repairing in her turn designing. In response to Sora's claim about her new books, Nari makes a confirmation check that Sora now has all the book series in line 11. Sora responds with a confirmation marker, "yes" in line 11. In the following line in 12, Nari confirms again that now Sora has the whole book series. After a sec-long delay, Sora again confirms Nari's comment in line 14.

The excerpt above clearly illustrates Sora's improved storytelling skills by first providing a pretext, then moving on to the main event. Compare this to her earlier stage, where she just simply produces the event in the format of noun phrases, splitting her newsworthy event into several turns, or beginning by soliciting Nari because of her trouble in continuing her turn. According to the sequential development that Sora has shown, her recipient-designing ability has increased over time, along with more active participation in her storytelling by providing a reasonable pretext and more detailed information. This is strong evidence that the young L2 speaker's IC is developing over time by participating in the recurrent practice of social actions in the format of authentic CfL.

CHAPTER 6. EMERGING PRACTICES IN THE LATER STAGE

Several researchers have provided directions for research concerning different aspects of L2 IC development at different proficiency levels (Skogmyr Marian & Balaman, 2018; Pekarek Doehler, 2019). The current study has shown that different dimensions of developmental changes exist in which practices and methods are achieved at different focal points in time.

The previous sections (chapters 4 and 5) have shown that Sora demonstrates different interactional practices and methods in conducting her social actions at different focal points in time. This is one reason why the author separated the findings into three chapters focusing on different developmental features of L2 IC. Lastly, Chapter 6 will highlight Sora's newly emerged practices deployed during her later stage of conversational interaction(M8–14).

The three emerging features described in the sub-sections of Chapter 6 are a new phenomenon that has not been witnessed in her early participation period in the dyadic CfL sessions. Sora has developed her unique practices over time, contingent on the local context, that she has adapted and developed over the year-long period.

The three sub-sections are: 1) the L2 young learner's agency; 2) the learner's doing humor and language play; and, 3) the learner's use of embodied actions as an interactional resource. They are deployed in her later months[22] (M6/9–11/14), which helps Sora to conduct her plans of social actions successfully and creates more opportunities to steer sequential structures in the direction she is orienting. Adapting to the dyadic conversational interactions has enabled her to exert her agency more actively, thus deploying diverse practices such as

---

[22] One exception exists; one embodied action occurring in the fifth week is included in 6.3 since it is the first and rarest case of Sora's deployment of embodied actions in the second month of CfL.

playing tricks and using embodied resources. First, the examination will focus on Sora's agency in sequence development in the process of storytelling.

6.1 Improved Learner Agency of the Child L2 Speaker

Section 6.1 will introduce the agency that Sora exerts from her ninth month of joining CfL regularly. Agency is defined as one's capacity to act purposefully and autonomously (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998) and is used to refer to "students' active role in the process of seeking, receiving, generating, and acting upon feedback information" (Nieminen, Tai, Boud & Henderson, 2021, p.1). It has been discussed that the individual agency of the participant plays a significant role in the co-construction of linguistic and cultural competence in the process of joining social interactions (Duff, 2010). L2 learner agency has been studied in several fields such as sociocultural theory and constructivism. In the current study, the analytic scope of the work of the agency will be limited to the sequential structure to allow a better understanding of its role in sequential development in the storytelling of the talk-in-interaction. Furthermore, examining Sora's agency in the unfolding sequential development will show researchers and educators the newer perspective and stance of learners on their participation in achieving their social actions.

Agency is important in that it can help the L2 learner to form their new social identity, transforming from being quiet and passive learners to active and initiating participants. In this section, the focus will narrow the scope to Sora's action formation as a first-position maker to demonstrate agency. In general, a speaker in a second position is not in a good place for exerting learner agency, because sequence-initiating or first-position actions constrain their responses (Schegloff, 2007). Clayman (2013) also has shown that turn beginnings are a primary location for agentic work. Recently, Waring (2022) found a young English speaker's increased agency in her storytelling during meal table conversations at the ages of three and

167

eight. She used turn-initial or preface terms that are used by Clayman (2013).

As a young L2 learner, it is not easy to take the first position in the sequence structure, which is a position proper for having agency and social influence (Heritage, 1984a). Most of the sequence-initiating in the recurrent activities of telling a newsworthy event has been done by the adult speaker, Nari. Not surprisingly, in Sora's earlier months, the exerting of agency is not observed much. However, Sora starts to exercise her agency after six months of steady and regular interactional conversations. The sequential structure of the interaction is shaped over this period.

6.1.1. Initiatives of Greetings and Turns

The excerpt below displays Sora's initiative in the greeting sequences. Greetings are the display of social recognition between interactants (Goffman, 1963; Schiffrin, 1977). It is one of the important social actions to be acquired by L2 learners. Greeting sequences are typical at the opening of conversations. In the first six months, their greetings have been conducted in the L1 before recording their voices, and usually are accompanied by hugging before launching the L2 CfL sessions.

After Sora moved to a suburban city, their interactional conversations were conducted via video conferencing (from Session No. 27). The changes in her greeting sequences occur after having eight more online conferencing CfL sessions.

In general, the interaction manager, Nari, initiates the greeting sequence as the first position action. Then, Sora usually responds by returning a greeting to Nari, though sometimes her greeting response is skipped. The excerpt below, however, shows a different dynamic in which their greetings are partially overlapped. Technically, Sora initiates the greeting.

The initiation of greeting by Sora before Nari demonstrates significant progress in terms of her agency as an equal conversational partner. It also shows her willingness to participate as an active agent who is interested in storytelling and social interaction. This evidence of

change is noteworthy because greetings are an essential aspect of social actions. It is also interesting to follow the changes in the direction toward a more active deployment of her human agency as a speaker while getting involved in the recurrent social activities of personal storytelling.

Excerpt 33 'Hello: initiating greeting' Session No. 36 (M10)

```
01→    Sora: hel[lo?

02→    Nari:    [↑hello: ↑gir::l,

03     (1.5)

04     Nari: good to see you (0.6 ) hhhh °did you have lunch?°

05     Sora: yes.

06     Nari: uhm 〉brun 〈 brunch ↑or lunch?

07     (1.5)

08     Sora: ↑lunch.
```

The above excerpt demonstrates Sara's social action initiative in the greeting sequence. She does not wait for Nari to initiate the greeting but "jumps on the floor" to initiate the greeting in line 01, although part of her greeting overlaps with the other party's greeting. This is one of her first active initiatives in the greeting sequence. She is no longer a simple respondent to the adult speaker's first pair part. In particular, she shows in her greeting that she is ready to be an active participant by being the first person to speak in the L2. She is now more in charge of her choices about when to start to talk and what to talk about in the talk-in-interaction. This demonstrates her active agency—doing.

Once the partially overlapped greeting is over, there is a 1.5 sec-long delay. Sora finishes her greeting hello in line 01, but she does not demonstrate further action. In line 04, Nari self-selects the turn and adds an additional greeting, "good to see you" and a culturally

influenced greeting of checking in line 04 whether Sora's meal is finished. Sora's response is a simple "yes" in line 05, then Nari takes another turn to check the status of Sora's meal.

It has been observed that Sora's participation structure changes, depending on her understanding of the context and the extent to which her agency is exercised. The social actions in each different time block change according to the sequential environment and the agency exerted. Sora's degree of active participation in the dyadic CfL changes. The degree of agency and the level of automaticity and purposefulness shape the different sequential structures and bring a different level of achievement to the social practice. The analysis shows Sora's development as characterized by increasing agency as she initiates more, tells more stories about herself, and launches new sequences.

Sora's exertion of active agency is evident in the following excerpt. Here, she addresses Nari before initiating the greeting sequence. The analytic focus will be on Sora's management of her sequential development after she refers to Nari by using the referential term, "teacher."

Excerpt 34 'Teacher this is my gummy pudding' Session No. 37 (M10)

```
01→    Sora: ⟨tea:cher:?⟩

02     Nari: hello.

03     (1.2)

04→    Sora: ⟩teacher?⟨

05     Nari: yes?

06     (0.5)

07→    Sora: this is my gummy pudding.

08     Nari: OH:: it's uh ↑new (0.5) ah it's pudding I I thought

09           my gummy jelly °but pudding is° first time that I ↑saw.

10→    Sora: uh I make this.

11     Nari: ah you ⟨MADE⟩ it.
```

```
12      Sora: yes.
```

Right at the onset of the online session, Sora calls Nari "teacher," skipping the prototypical greeting sequence. This usually occurs at the beginning of their earlier CfL stage when she self-selects her turn for soliciting lexical help or initiating a brand-new sequence that has nothing to do with the content of the prior sequential development. In the earlier months, when facing Nari's first pair part of asking Sora's some newsworthy event of her past week, Sora would refer to Nari using the same address term, "teacher," and multilinguistic resources such as "X+*ka mwe.yey.yo* (what is X)?" or "X+*ka*" as her way of problem-solving.

Although their CfL sessions occur in the extracurricular setting of Nari's home, their social dynamics sometimes change the setting to a quasi-institutional one given the fluidity of identity. The two parties show dynamic relationships according to the local contingency in each sequential environment.

The current excerpt, however, shows interesting dynamics in Sora's initiation of a first position in the sequence. Upon Sora's using the referencing term "teacher," Nari responds with a greeting, "hello" first (L02), following the prototypical rule of greeting. The addressing term "teacher" indicates that Sora has something to share with Nari which seems important for her, as she skips the greeting sequence.

In line 04, Sora refers to Nari again as "teacher," intensifying her urgency by repeating this action twice. After Nari's acceptance token "yes" (L05), Sora introduces her gummy pudding in line 07 ("this is my gummy pudding"). She takes the first position of introducing something new, which is an exceptional pattern, quite different from those observed in their previous turn-taking sequences. The general turn-taking patterns demonstrate Nari's initial topic elicitor and Sora's response to her newsworthy event from the previous week. Now she proffers the newsworthy event as a first position person, breaking their typical pattern similar to Julie in Pekarek Doehler & Berger's (2016) study who opens stories told in first position (cf. Schegloff 1997b)

171

As Sora is aware of the recurrent routines between them, she is taking a different, initiating path. She introduces her newsworthy item by first skipping the greeting sequence. Second, she does not wait until Nari asks for some newsworthy event—a first pair part in a question-and-answer sequence. This taking charge of the initiation of the sequencing is also clear evidence of her active agency and participation in the talk-in-interaction. Third, Sora voluntarily initiates the topic omitting the greeting routine. She can now put her topic of interest "on the table" before being requested to talk by Nari. Sora's prioritizing of introducing the gummy pudding makes it natural for Nari to skip the initial topic elicitor. The introduction of pudding reminds Nari of her inexperience in seeing gummy pudding (Lines 08–09). Sora develops the topic by sharing that she made the pudding by herself "uh I make this" (L10). Nari responds with an acknowledgment token "ah" and proffers a slightly different version of the prior turn, changing the tense to the past, "you made it" (L11) pronouncing "made" louder than the adjacent utterances.

This initiation of the topic by Sora caused the sequential structure to unfold in a new way from their typical sequential trajectories in which Nari would take the role of interaction manager (Hauser, 2003). In the above excerpt, however, Sora leads the sequential development, skips the greeting sequence, and brings her newsworthy item to the forefront of their conversation. This is evidence of her exercising her agency, actively and purposely initiating her topic instead of staying silent or passively waiting for an opportunity. Also, Sora's initiative demonstrates her increased willingness to talk in the L2, discussing her newsworthy item, regardless of her lack of interactional and linguistic resources. Likewise, as the weekly session continues, Sora's accomplishment of her planned social actions is achieved more efficiently, having fewer insert-expansions compared to the earlier months. Sora does not stay passive, waiting for Nari to take the initiative.

172

6.1.2 Topic Shifting

The following excerpt shows an example of learner agency in the interaction in which the learner shifts the topic in progress by transforming the agenda to her interest by using the L1 resource. Upon Nari's first pair part question on her newsworthy event, Sora asks whether she has shared the topic she has in mind. By not simply staying passive or uncertain of her epistemic knowledge, she actively seeks accountable information from the other interactant—a purposeful action that she uses to steer the recurrent question-and-answer sequence on her newsworthy events in life. The turn-by-turn analysis of Sora's sequential development of the talk will be provided below.

Excerpt 35 'Did I tell you this' Session No. 37 (M9)

```
01     Nari: uhm ((coughing))okay ((coughing)) today ((coughing))
02           today(0.5) March thirty first (tsch) (0.6) the last day
03           of ↑ March so how have you bee:n? ((coughing))
04     (1.0)
05     Sora: uhm:: ↑good.
06     Nari: good can you tell me something ↑new or something ↑good?
07     (0.6)
08     Sora: uhm:: (tsch) (2.5) (tsch) (1.5) ↑AH (2.0) uhm (1.5) uhm::
09→          (1.2)>sen.sayng.nim. i.ke yay.ki. hayss.na.yo cey.ka?<
                   Teacher this story told you? I+SUB
                   Teacher, did I tell you this story?
10           [I went to Goose Goose Bumps pon ke.
                                   Have seen thing
                                   that I have seen
11     Nari: [what?
```

```
12    Nari: ⟩ no no ⟨ you didn't can ↑you?=
13    Sora: =↑ah (1.3) last Friday,
14    Nari: um.
15          (0.7)
16    Sora: I saw (0.5) uh goose bumps movie with my mom.
```

In line 01, while coughing in between utterances, Nari first shifts the topic to the date of their CfL session, wrapping up the prior small talk, "okay today today (0.5) March thirty first." Then, she adds additional information that the day is the last day of the month, "the last day of March." Continuing in the same turn, she checks on Sora's recent life by asking, "how have you been?". After taking one sec-long pause, Sora provides a simple short response, "uhm:: good," as a second pair part. Sora's answer is short and does not involve any specific newsworthy event or story. In the next turn, Nari uses her recurrent initial topic elicitor about "something new or something good" in Sora's life (line 05). Upon Nari's request to share her newsworthy event of the past week, Sora demonstrates great difficulties in responding to the request in her turn (L08). The line has lengthened filled pauses and several silent pauses ("uhm:: (tsch) (2.5) (tsch) (1.5)↑AH (2.0) uhm (1.5) uhm:: (1.2)"). In the following line (L09), she switches to using the L1 resource of the Korean language, and solicits Nari's memory of content that she can't access well enough through her memory. What is noteworthy in this sequential development is that Sora is in charge of initiating the question to solve her difficulties, whereas Nari usually takes the first position action. Also, this is one of her improved storytelling skills of securing a multi-turn unit and prefacing a "big package" (Sacks, 1992) in the unfolding interaction.

This social action of asking for Nari's memory while thinking of her next topic is a brand-new action during the longitudinal data collection. What Sora needs to know at that moment is whether something in her mind has been shared beforehand in her prior session. That is her priority in solving her difficulties at that moment. She is transforming the topic

174

elicitor and answer sequence to a different sequential structure by taking the first position action. Sora acts by exercising her agency and choosing the proper linguistic resource. Rather than simply responding to the first pair part of the question uncertainly, she performs an inquiring action by taking a different sequential route. By inserting a sequence initiation turn, she is actively seeking to get the information she needs from Nari before officially launching her storytelling in response to Nari's request (L06).

Sora's question is whether she has shared her experience of watching the movie "Goose Bumps" in their prior CfL sessions. The turn (L09), "〉 *sen.sayng.nim. i.ke yay.ki. hayss.na.yo cey.ka*? 〈 (teacher did I tell you this?)" is offered more quickly in the L1 resource, the Korean language. Using the L1 resource in the contingent situation can be considered a skillful strategy to coordinate her planned social action. In line 09, she introduces the title of the movie, "Goose Bumps," and mentions that she went to see it, which overlaps with Nari's repair turn of "what" in line 11. Once she gets the confirmation that she did not tell the story, and receives the offer to continue talking about the movie in line 12, Sora begins her storytelling by producing an understating token and the time locator, "ah (1.3) last Friday" (L13) first in line 13. In the following turns, she tells how she watched the movie with her mom (L16). In the following omitted turns in the excerpt, she actively participates in telling the movie story for several minutes.

Significant progress has been observed because Sora now performs the action that she needs to do in the local contingency. She does not wait for the other party to take charge of the interaction but attempts a new action, which challenges her state of lacking linguistic and interactional resources. She pursues what is needed and receives what she needs to know from Nari. This is substantial progress in exercising her learner agency compared to the early months when she demonstrated hesitancy even in the context of using the L1 resource, lowering her voice, and hesitantly soliciting help from Nari. In the above excerpt, Sora is in charge of her environment and feels well-adapted to the resources available to her in the

175

current circumstances. As an active agent in her learning and speaking in the L2, she is accommodating the resources and abilities in the local context quite skillfully and achieving the actions she has planned.

The following excerpt belongs to a similar category in which Sora initiates her sequence first, leaving behind the second position role of responding to the greeting sequence from Nari's prior greeting sequence. Sora's turn designing and sequential development will be discussed in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 36 'I couldn't finish book reading' Session No. 38 (M10)

```
01    Nari: uh hel↑lo$

02    (1.0)

03    Sora: 〉ah sen.sayng.nim kuntey.de 〈 cey.ka.↑yo,
                Teacher, by the way, I+SUB+POL

04    Nari: um,

05    Sora: chayk.ul. (0.5) uh mos. ik.kess.e.yo.
              book+OBP, couldn't read +POL
               couldn't finish reading the book

06    Nari: ah ku.lay. pa.ppas.se. a.i.kwu. a.i.kwu.
              ah is that so were you busy? Omg omg

07          ((cell phone fell)))

((nine lines exchanged in Korean omitted, checking Sora's schedule))

17    Nari: uh okay (1.0) ↑so how have you been for the past one ↑week,

18    (1.2)

19    Sora: uh:: (2.5) good.
```

First, Nari initiates the greeting sequence by saying "hello" (L01). In the second line, Sora does not proffer the second pair part of an adjacency pair of greeting; however, she

initiates an insert-expansion sequence by using the L1 resource, saying, "ah *sen.sayng.nim kun.tey.de cey.ka.↑yo*" (ah! Teacher, by the way, I). She demonstrates that she has a message to deliver to Nari before launching into her regular turn-taking on her newsworthy event. As Nari provides a go-ahead signal, "um," Sora continues telling that "*chayk.ul* (0.5) uh *mos ik.kess.e.yo*" (I could not finish reading the assigned book chapters: L05). As her first social action at the beginning of their CfL session, Sora says she couldn't finish reading the assigned book chapters for their post-reading activities. Nari and Sora have been doing extensive book reading from the beginning of their weekly conversational sessions. After Sora's life updates at the beginning of the session, they move on to the post-reading activities to check up on Sora's extensive reading.

During their sessions from M1 to M9, Sora never talks about the status of her book reading at the onset of their interactional conversation as her first turn. Sora's initiative to talk about her assigned reading is a new phenomenon that occurs in her 10th month of conversational interactions. It is difficult to find out why she shares openly that she has not finished reading the assigned chapters. However, she prioritized this social action rather than doing the second part of the greeting sequence by replying to Nari's greeting turn.

A greeting is generally reciprocated with a greeting in an adjacency pair; however, the second part of the adjacency pair is missing above. It is a dispreferred action and breaches the natural flow of the interaction. In facing an awkward situation in the flow, though, Sora probably chooses to take that path to relieve her anxiety. By telling her situation honestly, she might have expected to escape the psychological burden of not finishing her assigned task. And once she does so, she gets Nari's response of understanding her situation in line 06 in the L1 ("*ah ku.lay. pa.ppas.* ↑*se :* ah is that so were you busy?"). Her decision to first tell Nari frankly before the greeting sequence is her purposeful agency. So far, she has demonstrated the ability to talk freely about her newsworthy events in prior excerpts. The critical change witnessed in Excerpt 38 is that now she acts on her decision to try a different social action.

As Sora omits the greeting sequence and initiates a new sequence in the Korean

177

language, Nari responds to Sora's first position action by saying, "is that so were you busy?" in the Korean language. She aligns her language by switching to the language that Sora uses. Nari gives a light-hearted treatment of Sora not having done her assigned reading, just asking whether she was busy. However, this question does not expect Sora's response but is an effort to understand Sora's situation. In line 17, by uttering "uh okay (1.0)," a topic terminating marker, Nari shifts the topic from checking on the time available for the session to another type of greeting sequence, "have you been for the past one week?".

This excerpt demonstrates Sora's agency by initiating her purposeful and autonomous action in the conversation. As a student whose L2 interactional competence is relatively lower than the other adult interactant, it is not easy to initiate a new sequence, leaving behind the constraints caused by the first pair part. The exercising of her agency, however, enables her to feel less burdened and agitated as she confesses that she has not done her assigned book reading. Also, her action of initiating a dispreferred action helps the other party to prepare the time management and trajectory of their CfL session. By being her honest self in the talk-in-interaction Sora creates an environment that adapts to the local contingency for both parties. This adaptation is evidence of L2 IC development, as it is a newly emerging method that indicates the accomplishment of social action. Here, the development is concretely externalized via Sora's agency for her local contingency.

6.1.3 Sequence Development

The following excerpt shows Sora's agency in the sequence development. She initiates her action contingent on her local situation. In responding to the recurrent question about her newsworthy event, she states, "I can't remember" rather than simply providing "I don't know," which she would have used in the earlier months when she faced difficulty in responding to the question. Additionally, she initiates her sequence by shifting the focus of the conversation from "school" to "something good in her life." Excerpt 37 will show Sora's agency in the

178

sequence development.

Excerpt 37 'This week Saturday is my birthday' Session No. 40 (M11)

```
01      Nari: um (0.5)↑how have you been for past one ↑week?

02      (2.5)

((creaking sound from Sora's table))

03      Sora: um: (2.5)

04      Nari: some↑[thing (0.5 ) something new?=

05      Sora:          [ (( inaudible sound))

06      Nari: =〉do you have 〈 something ↑new and ↑good in your life?

07      (2.8)

08→     Sora: °ugh:° (3.0)  °ugh° 〉I can't remember.〈

09      Nari: um:: uh how was your ↑school today?

10      (4.0)

11→     Sora: °um° (1.8) TEA↑CHER?=

12      Nari: =yes.

13      (0.7)

14→     Sora: uh (0.5) this uh 〉this week Saturday is my birthday.〈

15      Nari: OH ((clapping once)) your ↑birthday you I here make uh (0.5)

16           make uh (1.0) made a note here Sora. [hhhh

17           ((showing the calendar that has a mark))

18      Sora:                                    [h $thank you$ hhh
```

In line 01, Nari begins with the greeting by asking how it has been for Sora for the past week. Sora does not take the turn quickly. After a 2.5 sec-long delay, she begins with a lengthened filled pause "um:." The unfolding sequential structure projects that Sora is experiencing difficulty in continuing the sequence of the question and answer. As Sora is

179

getting used to their patterned greeting, which from time-to-time functions as a topical elicitor, she finds it even harder to come up with a response about some newsworthy event in her life.

With silence continuing, the turn comes back to Nari and she narrows it down by producing "something" at the beginning of line 04. The second half of the word is overlapped with Sora's inaudible utterance in line 05. Once the overlapping is completed, Nari reiterates "something new?" in line 04, and continues with a full sentence asking Sora whether she has something new and good in her life in line 06. Again, in line 07, Sora does not take the turn and makes a 2.8 sec-long delay. Finally, breaking the silence, Sora takes the turn, but only with hesitation ("°ugh:° (3.0) °ugh°" in line 08). Sora still finds it difficult to produce an idea and makes relatively quiet sounds of "ugh" twice while leaving a 3 sec-long pause in between. After this perturbation and delay, Sora finally says, "I can't remember," in a relatively quick manner.

As mentioned above, the second pair part responding to the question, "⟩ I can't remember. ⟨" is a noteworthy change from her previous answer of "I don't know," in providing her status of cognitive memory rather than her knowing or not-knowing. Whether one has something new and good in one's previous week to report is not in the category of epistemic knowledge. It is a matter of existence and cognitive memory. If she has experienced something new and good in her previous week, she can "go for it." However, the sequences Sora has used from the beginning demonstrate that she does not have a specific new and good thing to report in her previous week.

Her way of managing this issue in her 10th month of CfL is that she can now claim that she cannot remember some new life events in her previous week. It is hard to say technically whether she can remember anything or not; however, her turn-construction tells us that she is now able to use a different strategy by telling the other party that she cannot remember her newsworthy event rather than simply saying "I don't know." The other turn-construction unit, "I can't remember," is more recipient-designed, since one's newsworthy event does not belong

in the knowledge arena, but in the category of memory. Answering the question about one's experience with "I don't know" creates distance between the speaker and her experience. However, opting to say, "I can't remember," rather than "I don't know," demonstrates a more agency-oriented and recipient-designed action. This is further evidence of her development of L2 IC.

In addition, Sora also displays her agency when she has trouble speaking. In line 09, Nari now shifts the topic to Sora's school life, asking Sora what her school life is like. Upon this first pair part of the question-and-answer adjacency, Sora leaves a relatively long delay of four seconds. Then, she begins her turn in a smaller voice. The turn initiating in line 11 is perturbated with a filled and silent pause. Sora calls Nari "teacher" in a loud voice with a rising tone after "um" and a 1.8 sec-long delay. It has been previously witnessed that Sora refers to Nari as a teacher when she needs some help or has something to declare to shift the framework from the prior sequences to a new footing. Here, by referring to Nari as "teacher" with a rising tone and in a loud voice, she transforms her turn to a first pair part by initiating a new topic and sequence, leaving the topic of her school life unanswered. After receiving Nari's affirmation token "yes," and a 0.7 sec-long delay, Sora begins her new storytelling sequence beginning with a time locator, which involves a repetition as a repair organization, "uh this uh this week Saturday is my birthday" (L14).

Differing from the sequence development in which the adult speaker oversees the sequence initiation and topic selection, Sora now demonstrates topic shifting by initiating a topic for herself instead of the proffered topic of "school life" suggested by Nari in the prior sequence (L09).

Upon hearing the topic of Sora's birthday party that she is looking forward to, Nari provides an active affiliative response in lines 15 to 16 by clapping her hands and showing her calendar with Sora's birthday marked on it. Sora appreciates Nari for the note of Sora's birthday by saying, "Thank you" (L18). In lines 16 and 18, Nari's laughter overlaps with Sora's appreciation, and Nari's laughter also encourages Sora's laughter. Both parties laugh

together.

The following excerpt also illustrates Sora's agency, which shows another case of Sora's sequence development while correcting the adult speaker's misinformation. The excerpt is from the story of Sora's visit to a temple during her trip to *Kang.wen.to*, a north-eastern part of South Korea, and she writes a wish on the roof tile of the temple. Her wish-writing on the roof tile is for the famous boy group, BTS. As Nari seems unaware of the boy group, Sora corrects her misconception and adds additional new information as a big fan of the group. This is another aspect of her improvement in agency, which has not been observed in earlier stages. The examination will focus on Sora's agency in sequential development in particular, where she provides her expert knowledge to Nari, who lacks the knowledge.

Excerpt 38 'BTS not boyband but boy group, Idol' Session No. 31 (M8)

```
01      Sora: we::uh we go (1.0) uh::(1.0) um: we ↑SAW some (0.8) uh(0.5) priest and:,
02      Nari: uh hm.
03      Sora: I write²³ ki.was.cang.
                        A roofing tile
04      Nari: uhm: :(1.0) part of the roof ki.wa is a part uh (0.5) yeah
                                      a roofing tile
05          small (0.7) part you ↑you wrote your wish?
06      Sora: yes wish and uhm:: ah Pang.than.so.nyen.tan good.
                                      Bullet-proof boy group
                                      BTS
07      (0.5)
08      Nari: AH:: your favorite boy band?
09      (0.8)
```

---

[23] Writing one's wish on a traditional roofing tile is a custom that is performed by the temple goers in Korea.

```
10→     Sora: Group.=
11      Nari: =ah [boy group.
12→     Sora:      [Idol
13      Nari: ah:: I've heard about that boy group uhm::=
14      Sora: =yes BTS
```

Before the excerpt, Sora provides the news that she visited a temple with her parents during her trip to *Kang.wen.to*. In line 01, she initiates a turn and delivers the story that she saw priests (monks) at the temple. Sora self-repairs a source of trouble using the methods of recycling and replacing until she produces the right past form of "SAW" and the object, "some uh priest" (L01).

In the following lines, Sora talks about her wish to write on a roof tile of the temple for the boy group, BTS (L03). Receiving a continuer token from Nari, Sora continues her storytelling about writing her good wishes for BTS on the roofing tile at the temple (L03). Nari's repair initiation was completed by Sora's answer "yes wish" in line 06. In the same turn, Sora thinks for some time while producing "uhm:::" and expresses that she has come up with an idea by saying "ah" and "*Pang.than.so.nyen.tan* good" (L06). As Nari is checking on Sora's wish writing on the roof tile, Sora recipient designs her turn by providing detailed information about her wish before Nari requests its elicitation. Actively providing information related to the ongoing story is a form of recipient designing, one of the practical gains of Sora's regular participation in the CfL.

In the next turn, Nari affiliates with Sora's storytelling by mentioning BTS as Sora's favorite boy band in line 08. However, the line shows Nari's misconception about the boy group, in which she refers to the group as a "band" (L08). After a slight delay of 0.8 seconds, Sora self-selects her turn and provides an other-initiated other-repair, correcting Nari's expression "band" to "group," as BTS is not a boy band. This type of other-initiated other-repair by Sora is one of the rarest repair types that she has made. Her knowledge of the boy

group excels; thus, she repairs Nari's utterance to the correct one. This is another example of Sora's agency.

In the following turn, Nari picks up Sora's completed repair and repeats the expression "ah boy group" in line 11. Once Nari says "ah," an acknowledgment token, Sora begins her turn, which overlaps with Nari's utterance of "boy group." What Sora self-initiates in line 12 is the additional information on BTS, which is "Idol." In the following turn, Nari expresses her affiliation with the boy group, sharing that the name of the group is familiar to her. Then, Sora provides the official English name of the boy group "BTS" (L14).

This demonstrates that the repairing of the content, and provision of extra information on the topic, is locally determinant in the sequential development. It shows that Sora's proficiency in the L2 has nothing to do with repairing the content. In the meantime, the interactional competence that the speaker deploys during the talk-in-interaction is more important than linguistic competence.

As mentioned earlier, the imbalanced knowledge of the boy group creates the framework of Sora as an expert and Nari as a novice on the boy group. As a big fan of BTS, Sora can actively participate in the turn initiation and provide extra information on the group. In the following turn in line 13, Nari shares her experience of hearing about the group. Upon Nari's affiliation, Sora provides the English name of the group, which she had not provided in the prior turn in line 06 when she first mentioned them. This shows that Sora can access her cognitive data while joining the turn-taking sequences with Nari. In lines 10 and 12, Sora self-selects her turn and shows expertise on the topic, although the information is just a single word, "group" and "Idol." This action of initiation and providing extra information is one piece of evidence of exerting her agency according to the local context, as well as recipient designing. This type of agency is a manifestation of Sora's development of L2 IC.

So far, the data shows Sora's improvement in her agency in her later months (M8–10) compared to her earlier months. The more she has adapted to the environment of CfL with the same speaker, the more she seems to expand the arena of her agency when she has a practical

need for it in a locally contingent moment to accomplish her social actions.

In the following sub-section, humor and play—another practice that Sora develops in the later stages—will be introduced, with excerpts provided.

6.2 Emergence of Humor and Play

The social interactions that Sora has participated in over 14 months follow the routinized patterns of language use at the beginning of the sequential structure. As she becomes used to the interaction patterns, she can also predict these patterns, analyze the responses, and receive immediate reinforcement from the more mature interactant. It seems certain that Sora's understanding of her social identity while joining the CfL sessions changes from the onset to the later months. Her identity as a Korean child with limited linguistic and interaction resources, conversing with an adult Korean at the beginning of the project, is expected to transform over the longitudinal period of CfL. How the adult speaker interacts with Sora might have opened the opportunity for her to use humor and play. Identity has the feature of fluidity following contextual situations and the dynamics of sequential development. The following excerpts (in Section 6.2) will show Sora's playfulness and humor.

During the long practice of sharing newsworthy events with the same interlocutor, another new and noteworthy practice, "doing humor" or "being playful," is observed, which is externalized as playing tricks, making funny comments, and using a ring to pretend that she has had her nose pierced. From about the time of Month 5, Sora utilizes the practice of humor and language play to create fun and laughter in her sequential development. She also shows a more relaxed attitude when participating in the regular CfL sessions around the 5th month. Her way of conducting her storytelling demonstrates that she is now in charge of the conversational interaction as an equally influential figure who can initiate the sequential

185

development of their talk-in-interaction. This is further evidence of her improvement in achieving her attempted social actions, as well as creating a more amicable environment, which ultimately influences her motivation to join the CfL session more actively and freely.

Her practice of using humor, and sometimes playing tricks or "fooling around" with Nari, is repeated several times as "a socially purposeful action at the interactional level," which Pekarek Doehler (2019) emphasizes, is "the key to the development of IC in the L2."

In the following excerpts, the focus will be on Sora's using humor in the format of playing tricks and "fooling around" as interactional resources in the sequencing practice in her regular CfL sessions with the more proficient adult speaker. Sora's playful tricks can be categorized into two types. First, she creates a fake story regarding her experience, which occurs first in her 21st session (M5). An example is that she reports that she has visited North Korea while sharing her new newsworthy event in her life. The second type is related to the visual effect of her movements and appearance during their video conferencing in the last five months (11th month ~14th month). The following four excerpts illustrate how Sora's playful tricks and "fooling around" with Nari influence their unfolding sequential structure during the talk-in-interaction. The effect of this social action will be analyzed in the following section.

The excerpt below occurs in the 6th month of the weekly-interval CfL sessions. As usual, the first part of the session below in Excerpt 39 begins with Nari's initial topic elicitor of a newsworthy event, "Let's share something new and good."

Excerpt 39 'I go North Korea' Session No. 21 (M6)

```
01      Nari: Oh before that let's share something new and good (0.5) [I'd like to know about

02      Sora:                                                        [hm::: ((sighing))

03      Nari: your life I'm interested in you how you're doing,

04      Sora: ↑um::: ((snacking)) (1.0) I ↑go,

05      Nari: um,
```

```
06          (1.0)

07→    Sora: Pwu.khan.

            North Korea

08    Nari: ↑EY (1.0) you went ↑to North ↑Korea?

09    Sora: yes (0.5) Gang.won.do. ((the sound of snack bag))

10    Nari: Ah: Nor-Kang- Kang.wen.to is uh °South Korea° ah ↑NEAR north Korea=

11    Sora:= yes

12    Nari: AH:[::

13    Sora:  [ah ah Kang.wen.to ttak cal.la. iss.e.yo((hand gesture))
                    the name of a province,  exactly cut in half

14    Nari: um::: ↑um ↑um?

15    Sora: um,

16    Nari: ↑sorry can you say that again?

 ((sound of putting her hand in the snack bag))

17    Sora: ↑CUT.

((in the middle of the sound))

18    Nari: ah part of Gang.won.do is (1.0) [North Korea.

19    Sora:                                [yeah.

20    Sora: yo.cum. we can go to North Korea.

((9 lines omitted))

30    Sora: um I go

31    Nari: um

32    Sora: Phyeng.yang

            the capital of North Korea

33    Nari: huh WOW

34→    Sora: uh and I see big (0.6) uh (2.5) ⟨pig statue⟩

35    Nari: ↑UM

36    Sora: a.cwu. khun. tway.ci.

            a very big pig

37    Nari: pig statue.

38    Sora: Kim ↑Jong.eun,
```

187

```
39    Nari: ↑oh: HU::H did you mention did you say something negative like pig ↑statue?

40    Sora: no

41    Nari: no you did[n't say

42    Sora:          [oh Kim Jong.eun swu.lyeng.nim

                         Supreme Leader (of North Korea)

                         ((the sound from the snack bag))

43    Nari: um: you say you said so I see [and

44    Sora:                              [yeah

45    Nari: what did you do there?

46→   Sora: um we go Mo.lan.pong.

                       Mo.lan Hill²⁴

((15 lines omitted, continues the topic visiting Mt. Kum.kang, eating
choco-pie etc ))

62→   Nari: ↑ah you are now creating a ↑story?$

63    Sora: uh hmm::.

64    Nari: is it (0.5) a [true story?]

65    Sora:              [cin.cca cin.cca] pwu.khan.ey choco-pie is.seo.yo

                         Really really in North Korea choco-pie exists

                            I am serious we can have choco-pie in N. Korea

66→   Nari:>no no no no< did you really visit North ↑Korea?

67    Sora: ney?

             yes?

68    Nari: did you visit North Korea?$=

69    Sora: =yes.

70    Nari: um:: (0.7) can me can you show me the picture

71         that you took in North Korea?

72    (0.6)

73    Sora: no picture.

74    Nari: no [↑pictures.
```

²⁴ Literally Peony Hill, often Peony Peak is in central *Phyeng.yang*, the capital of North Korea.

```
75     Sora:    [but (1.6) uh they can'-(0.4)-t.

76     Nari: um.

77     Sora: uh (0.5) picture,

78     Nari: um.

79→    Sora: take picture but some sometimes they can they say can

80           but (0.8) uh my (0.5) uh cell phone bat-(0.5)-tery is,

81     Nari: um.

82     Sora: one percent.

83     Nari: um::::: so you couldn't take a picture.

((32 lines omitted, continues on topic ))

116    Sora: ah uh some bear too

117    Nari: ↑wow a bear in North Korea wow.

 ((showing pictures in her cell phone))

118    Sora: yes so cute

119    Nari: yes cute

((18 lines omitted))

138    Nari: um how were the people people were ↑kind?

139    Sora: um yes.

140    Nari: they [were nice] nice to you?

141    Sora:    [so kind.]

142    Sora: yes.

143    (1.0)

144→   Nari: okay good experience you visited north Korea I envy you.

145    (1.0)

146    Sora: yes (0.5) it's me.

147    Nari: um:[:

148    Sora:    [at my school.

149    Nari: ah your (1.5) back?

150    Sora: yes

151→   Nari: um::: (0.6) okay I see you went to North Korea

152           that's a an amazing (0.7) I mean experience.
```

189

```
153    (1.0)
154    Sora: yes.
155    Nari: okay ↑and (0.8) let's talk about your (1.2) tablet
156          I mean experience.
```

Excerpt 39 demonstrates a relatively long story development about Sora's visit to *Phyeng.yang*, North Korea. Upon this unbelievable news, Nari interprets it as Sora visiting a province called "*Kang.wen.to*," a territory of S. Korea that shares its borderline with N. Korea (L10).

Nari recognizes that some part of "*Kang.wen.to*" borders North Korea and understands that Sora simply visits one of the closest areas to North Korea. As Nari's understanding of Sora's utterance does not align with what Sora meant, she uses the L1 resource expressing that "*ttak cal.la iss.eo.yo.* (the province is exactly cut in half)" (L13). Upon Sora's abrupt resort to the L1 resource, Nari switches the framework to the institutional setting of a learner and a teacher by requesting her to verbalize in the L2 prescribed language "sorry can you say that again" (L16). Sora simply responds with one word, "CUT" (L17) using a louder voice, and Nari interprets Sora's prior turn of a minimal response "CUT" as "ah part of *Kang.wen.to* is North Korea." As Sora emphasizes that she has visited North Korea and it is possible to travel to N. Korea in line 20, Nari believes that Sora had visited N. Korea. This shows a significant change from her disbelieving attitude in line 08 "↑EY you went to North ↑Korea" to accepting the storyteller's story as if it were based on a true story.

Further down in line 34, Sora shares her experience of seeing a "pig statue" in *Phyeng.yang*, which provokes Nari's repair initiation "↑UM" as a signal of trouble in understanding Sora's prior turn (L34). Then Sora provides more descriptive information about the statue, relying on the L1 resource (L36: *a.cwu. khun. tway.ci* :very big pig). However, Nari still expresses her disbelief in listening to Sora's utterance in Korean; she again seems to have trouble believing Sora's words by repeating the phrase "pig statue" (L37). Then, Sora provides

190

the information that the pig statue is a statue of Kim Jeongeun, the North Korean supreme leader.

Hearing Sora's insulting comment about the North Korean top leader, Kim Jeongeun, Nari expresses worries about whether Sora has said the comment aloud (L39). Nari's checking on Sora's behavior and wording in North Korea displays that Nari fully affiliates Sora's story of visiting North Korea by accepting Sora's story as is. Though it is common sense that South Koreans are not allowed to travel to the North, Nari responds to Sora's visit to North Korea by fully affiliating with Sora's story, which is a fundamental condition for Sora to continue and expand her story.

After confirming that Sora did not mention a negative comment about the leader, Nari asks what Sora did in North Korea in line 45, "What did you do there?". Nari expresses more curiosity about the trip and this plays a significant role in expanding the story. Regardless of the truths of the story, its basic framework remains. In line 46, in response to Nari's question about her activities in North Korea, Sora tells of her experience of visiting "*Mo.lan.pong*" and having a Choco pie[25] (lines 47 to 61 not shown in the excerpt). Sora's ability to make up her travel itinerary is significant because otherwise, her storytelling might have ended if Sora had not mentioned a sightseeing place and having a Choco pie in North Korea.

In line 62, Nari starts to express her doubt about Sora's storytelling by saying, "ah you are now creating a ↑story?$" with a smiley voice. Nari's stance toward the story seems to change from full affiliation to a somewhat suspicious mode as she produces the expression "Creating a story?".

Sora denies this by saying "uh hmm::" (L63). Nari then asks Sora a question to establish its truth: "is it (0.5) a [true story?" (L64). Overlapping Nari's turn with "[true story," Sora resorts to the L1 resource and repeats the word "I am serious" in Korean two times and uses

---

[25] The Choco Pie is a snack cake consisting of two small round layers of chocolate-coated cake with marshmallow filling. Exports of choco pies to North Korea have been famous among North Koreans.

the L1 resource "[*cin.cca cin.cca pwu.kha.ney* choco-pie *is.seo.yo*. (really really in N. Korea we can have a choco-pie)."

Swiftly and firmly, Nari responds to Sora with "no no no no" in a faster manner (L66), and corrects her previous question that she is not asking if people can have chocolate pie or not, but if the story is based on her experience (did you really visit North Korea? (L66). Sora answers minimally with one agreement token in the Korean language (L67: "*ney*"). Still having serious doubts, Nari asks another direct question: "Did you visit North Korea?" (L68) again with a smiley voice at the end of her turn. Sora makes an English affirmation token "yes" as a second pair part. Upon asking a series of questions about the truth of the story, Nari gets relatively consistent answers from Sora that she has visited North Korea.

Nari finally requests evidence of her visit, such as pictures Sora took in North Korea (L70: "can you can you show me the pictures that you took in North Korea?"). Sora answers that she has no pictures because photos are not allowed (L73, L75) "but uh they can't" "uh picture"). Then she changes her answer to say that it is only occasionally possible to take a picture (L77-78: "take picture but some sometimes they can they say can but (0.8) uh my (0.5) uh cell phone bat-(0.5)-tery is").

Sora defends herself nicely by providing a reasonable excuse for not having photographic evidence. Sora's adept response to Nari's request for evidence demonstrates her improved ability to produce ideas in the L2 spontaneously and her improved IC in skillfully conducting the locally contingent action appropriate for her purpose. In the framework of Sora's storytelling, it is difficult for Nari to negate her logic as she provides reasonable explanations about the reality of her travel story.

The story continues, and Sora even shares that she saw a bear in North Korea (L116: "ah uh some bear too"). Hearing a unique experience, Nari responds with a surprised acknowledgment (L117 "Wow a bear in North Korea! Wow!"). Sora's storytelling expands: she has been entirely in charge of initiating a new topic in this segment. In addition, Nari is fully affiliating with the story now, soliciting more information about Sora's visit to North

Korea. At the end of the topic, Nari expresses her envy and a positive assessment of Sora's experience (L144 & L151-152).

This excerpt about Sora's fake storytelling is thought-provoking from the aspect of a child L2 learner's storytelling skills. Unlike other "news and good" exchanges between the two parties in the beginning part of their CfL sessions, which last between one to three minutes depending on the topic and the topic development, the current storytelling sequence lasts almost seven minutes. More than ever, Sora self-selects her turns and actively defends herself to persuade Nari to trust her story and to elicit active listenership and affiliation. It is challenging to know what her goal or intention behind the fake storytelling is. Despite this, she confidently creates a fake travel story, successfully delivers it, and defends herself from Nari's questions and doubts.

The young learner displays several disparities in linguistic proficiency, age, background knowledge, and institutional authority compared to the adult speaker in the socio-cultural aspect. However, despite these disparities and imbalance in power dynamics, Sora has continued her participation, and her activity in the sessions has improved significantly. For example, her self-selecting turns increase over time, and her TCU becomes longer than those in the initial phase. Moreover, this time Sora is trying to be the person with more information and higher authority, by sharing her unique but fake experience and exercising her superiority as a storyteller, thus inverting the authoritarian dynamics.

Above all, the power to trick the other party by providing a fake story gives her great opportunities to play the dominant position in taking charge of her storytelling and paving the way to the overall sequence development. Two more excerpts that include Sora's playing tricks during the video CfL sessions[26] since the eighth month will be presented.

In the following excerpt, Sora shifts the topic to the sequential development process with another trick. This is a noteworthy and new practice that Sora has developed in her later

---

[26] Their video session begins from the 4th week of the 7th month, from the 27th session.

193

months (M8-).

Excerpt 40 'The laptop computer is move' Session No. 35 (M9)


```
01      Nari: ↑ANY anything that has happened (0.8) for the past to- past ↑week which

02            which was NEW ↑or GOOD (1.0) a small thing can be (0.8) something ↑good.

03            (2.5)

04      Sora: NO.

05      Nari: ↑NO $nothing is- was ↑new?

06            (1.0)

07     Nari: okay okay okay hhh an:::d ah: what about your reading book reading?

08            (1.0)

09      Sora: um I read²⁷ chapter three

10      Nari: ah up to chapter three the ghost I mean the ghost town at ↑sundown?

11      Sora: ↑yes.

12      Nari: um did you like the ↑book?

13      Sora: ye:s.

14      Nari: um ::[:

15→     Sora:      [TEA↑CHER?

16      Nari: ↑yes.

17→     Sora: the laptop computer is: move.

18            (0.8)

19      Nari: ↑mine?

20→     Sora: ah my laptop computer is move.

21      Nari: is move means it is moving ↑now?

22      Sora: YES so uh in (0.5) uh hwa.myen  I'm ↑big small ↑big small.
                                    screen
```

---

²⁷ Pronouncing "read" as present tense.

194

```
23    Nari: hhhhh I think it's not because of your laptop I think you are moving ↑No are are=
24    Sora: =YES I'm moving.$
25        ((the sound of clapping hands))
26    Nari: hhhhhh you try to make fun.
27    Sora: YE[s.
28    Nari:    [try to make a trick um:: it's a good trial I like that.
```

Before the excerpt above, Sora declares that she has nothing new and good in her past week to share with Nari. In lines 01 to 02, Nari initiates another question, asking Sora if she can share anything small that has happened in her past week. Sora does not deliver the second pair part of giving a response for 2.5 secs long (L03). After the silent pause, Sora provides a dispreferred response, "NO" (L04), in a relatively loud voice. Nari repeats Sora's "no" and generates another confirmation question "nothing was new?" (L05). As Sora does not respond for a second, Nari finally tries to terminate the topic and offers the topic shifting marker (token) "okay" three times (L07).

After a short period of laughter, Nari initiates a new topic of checking Sora's book reading. Their normal routine is to proceed to talk about the book reading after sharing a newsworthy event in Sora's daily life. Nari proceeds with the chapter that Sora has read and asks her (L12 "um did you like the book?"). Sora offers a minimal response, "ye:s" (L13). In the next turn, when Nari is lengthening her filled pause, signaling her trying to think of her next utterance, Sora self-selects her turn overlapping with Nari's "um:::" (L14) and calls Nari "TEA↑CHER" (L 15) with a louder and rising tone.

In the previous interaction between the two parties, when Sora calls Nari "teacher," she tends to have an intention such as soliciting linguistic help or shifting the topic to the one she is planning, by letting go of the previous ongoing topic. So the referral term "teacher" signals the upcoming sequences quite apart from the prior sequences.

Sora's calling Nari "teacher" in line 19 frames their social relationship as learner and teacher, although their turn-taking does not resemble institutional features of the classroom.

Sora abruptly announces something: "the laptop computer is move" (L17). Upon hearing this information, Nari initiates a repair of whether it's her laptop that is moving (L19: "↑mine?"). In the following turn, Sora completes her repair that it is her own laptop that's moving (L20: "ah my laptop computer is move").

To clarify Sora's repair completion in line 20, Nari initiates another repair: "is move means is it moving now?" (L21). Nari does not focus on the grammatical inaccuracy of "is move," but just makes a meaning-based repair initiation as the grammatical inaccuracy does not hamper her understanding at all. Without a gap between turns, Sora replies that the "*hwa.myen*" (screen) is moving while relying on the L1 resource, "*hwa.myen*" (L22), and clarifies the meaning by adding the information that she is becoming big and small (L22: "I'm ↑big small ↑big small"). Providing a clear explanation of Nari's repair initiation is one of the improved turn-taking skills that Sora starts to demonstrate in the later months. This ability to develop her storytelling and social action with a clear purpose in mind signals that the participant is adapting her talk to the local context with greater sensitivity to recipient-designing.

The two lines about the movement of the laptop also have a significant effect in the beginning sequence of the talk on the assigned book reading: Nari poses a question ("Did you like the book?") and Sora answers, ("yes"). As Sora answers that she likes the designated book, she might expect something related to it to be the next topic for their interaction. She inserts a new sequence before Nari initiates the post-book reading activities. By initiating a new sequence while being in charge of the sequential development, she avoids the ongoing topic by generating a new topic. Sora's intention was not obvious, but she could be avoiding or postponing the post-book reading activities by inserting a playful trick.

In the inserted sequences on the laptop movement, Sora invokes Nari's laughter (L26) and receives praise from the adult speaker (L28 "[try to make a trick um:: it's a good trial I like that"). As the sequential development shows, the social action of playing a trick on the other party creates laughter, an embodied action of clapping, and a more friendly atmosphere

196

for the participants in the talk-in-interaction. In addition, by using this trick Sora successfully leaves behind the previous topic on her book reading and pursues what she intends to talk about. This segment demonstrates that she is no longer passive in the sequential development, which was previously always administered by the adult speaker. Rather, she exerts her agency by tricking the other party. This is further strong evidence of Sora's L2 IC development.

Returning to the excerpt analysis, Nari begins her turn with laughter in line 23. Nari shares her thought that the laptop is not moving, but Sora is moving. She checks by saying, "No, are are-" at the end of line 23. Next, Sora self-selects her turn before Nari completes hers by proffering an honest declaration that "yes I'm moving" (L24) with a smiley tone at the end of the turn.

Another noteworthy point is related to the linguistic form. Sora's expression "is move," which lacks grammatical accuracy in the turns (L17 & L20), has changed to a grammatically correct pattern in line 24 ("I'm moving"). Nari provides the present progressive verb form in line 21 ("it is moving now") and line 23 ("I think you are moving"). The uptake of the proper form is another advantage of conversational interactions that do not orient to explicit grammatical explanations but meaning-based interactions. The uptake evident while joining the talk-in-interaction is more evidence of Sora's improved IC, since her improved choices in grammatical turn-designs help the unfolding sequential development. The topic of the uptake of grammatical usage patterns out of conversational interactions has been also pursued by the conversation analytic approach, examining the features of IC development (Pekarek Doehler, 2021)

Playing a trick in this video-call context, using the physical resource of the laptop screen, is a very creative and unique example of the young learner's intelligence and agency. In addition, the performance of this social action of "fooling around" with the adult speaker, who is higher in the social hierarchy, as her "teacher," demonstrates the growth of their trusting and bonded relationship. Sora is confident enough that being playful and playing a trick in the L2 with Nari will be fine with her. People do not generally demonstrate the action of playing

a trick when they are in conversations with parties who are socially and emotionally distant. So this provides Sora with space and power to move forward with her plan to be playful with the other party. In addition, she is more in charge of selecting the topic of the talk by performing an action based on her plan.

In the prior excerpt, Sora has witnessed that Nari "buys into" her fake experience of visiting *Phyeng.yang*, North Korea although it turns out that Sora has created a fictional travel story. The successful experience of creating a fake story empowers Sora. The action of creating a trick through fictional storytelling can give the child speaker some subversive power. In addition, the playful tricks confirm for Sora that her lower proficiency in the L2 cannot stop her from accomplishing her planned social action. Lastly, it is unclear why she initiates this playful trick on Nari. She might have wanted to avoid answering Nari's question about the book "Did you like the book?" or she might have simply wanted to have fun in the session. Whatever her reason, Sora achieves her sense of pride and confidence by using this resource of playing a trick.

The excerpt below shows Sora playing another trick on Nari with her silver ring. She "fools around" with Nari by saying that she has pierced her nose, putting the silver ring close to hers. As the talk-in-interaction is being conducted via the screen online, Sora takes advantage of this circumstance. Also, Sora confidently relies on the L1 resource more than ever. Ignoring the implicitly prescribed rule on language use, Sora uses the Korean language without using any hesitation markers. While keeping these points in mind, the examination of the sequence development that involves Sora's playing a trick on Nari will be followed.

Excerpt 41 'Teacher me nose pierced' Session No. 46 (M12)

```
01    Nari: ↑so (0.8) how are you Sora?
02    (1.0)
03    Sora: um:: fine.
```

```
04     Nari: fine how was your school today?

05     (3.0)

06     Sora: um::::: (4.5)↑good.

07     Nari: good you answered my question with one word I'd like to hear more

08           hhh more hhhhh (0.6) what was good?

09     (3.0)

10     Sora: uh 〉with my friend.〈

11     Nari: um: you spent a good time with your friends you spent a (0.6) 〈°good time°

12     with your [friends.

13→     Sora:       [sen.sayng.nim ce.yo kho ttwulh.ess.e yo.

                      Teacher me nose pierced+POL

                      Teacher, I got my nose pierced

14     Nari: ↑OH,

15     (1.8)

16     Nari:↑OHWOO::.

17     (0.8)

18→     Sora: it's uh it is joke it's ring

19     Nari: ah::: ring.

20     Sora: i.ke un.pan.ci.yey.yo

                   This silver ring is +POL

                   This is a silver ring

21     Nari: wow it's silver ring.

22     Sora: yes.

23     Nari: um did you get it from your friends?

24     Sora: NO my mom buy it for me.

25     Nari: um:: your mom bought for you.

26     Sora: yes.

27`    Nari: nice it looks (0.5) pretty huh hhhh OH:::

28     it looks like you pierced your nose [((inaudible))

29     Sora:                                [yes hwang.so.

                                                ox
```

199

```
30      Nari: uh hm hhhhhhh yeah it looks that way (0.8) I like it.
```

Before the excerpt shown, Nari said she had trouble logging in. In line 01, shifting the conversation to a greeting sequence, Nari uses the topic transitional marker "so" with a rising tone, "↑so (0.8) how are you Sora?". As a response to the action of asking a question, after having a one-sec-long delay, Sora provides a somewhat hesitant turn beginning and a simple response, "um:: fine." Sora's hesitancy and simplicity in her response indicate her inactive participation in the upcoming recurrent activity of sharing her newsworthy event.

In the following turn, Nari repeats Sora's utterance "fine" and adds a question about Sora's school life, "fine how was your school today?" in line 04. Sora does not provide the second pair part of the question-and-answer sequence for three seconds (L05). This is another signal indicating that Sora will be inactive in the upcoming talk-in-interaction. Moreover, the turn initiation in line 06 begins with a lengthened filled pause "um::::" and is again followed by another 4 sec-long delay. After a relatively long silence, Sora finally produces one word with a rising tone of voice, "↑good" as the last utterance of the turn. This inactive and passive attitude demonstrates that she has nothing new and good to share with Nari.

In the following turn, Nari again repeats Sora's prior turn, "good" and elicits more from Sora on her school life by saying that she would like to hear more. In line 08, Nari starts to laugh after saying that she wants to hear more from Sora. Emphasizing the word, "more" in line 08, which is followed by another short period of laughter, she specifically raises another question, "What was good?". To the specific question, "What was good?" Sora answers, "Uh with my friends." Sora seems to deliver the message that she liked being with her friends at school. In the following turn in line 11, Nari provides the paraphrased version of what Sora delivered in line 10 in a full sentence. Nari recycles the full sentence once more.

While Nari repeats the paraphrased sentence of Sora's utterance in lines 11–12, Sora self-selects a turn that overlaps with Nari's turn final, "[friends" (L12). This is deployed in the middle of Nari's turn constructional work. Thus, the launching of a turn at that moment is

entirely inappropriate. What is noticeable in the abrupt onset of the turn in line 13 is that Sora conducts the TCU in the L1 resource and begins by calling Nari "*sen.sayng.nim*" (teacher in Korean). The switching of language code and the referral term "teacher" shift the sequential environment to a newly inserted expansion and leaves the previous topic behind. Also, it shifts the framework of the conversational interaction to a more institutional setting by referring to Nari as "*sen.sayng.nim.*"

In line 13, she suddenly introduces the idea that she has pierced her nose by displaying the ring on her nose online and saying, "Teacher, I got my nose pierced," in the L1 resource. In line 14, Nari shows a surprise token, "↑OH" in a relatively loud voice. After a 1.8-sec long pause, Nari expresses stronger surprise once more in line 16 "↑OHWOO::" In the following turn, however, Sora quickly reveals that it is a joke, and she shows via the screen that it is a silver ring in lines 18 and 20. In the two turns—an English utterance (L18) and the L1 utterance (L20), respectively, Sora tells the truth that she has played a trick on Nari. This honesty naturally shifts the main topic of the talk to the silver ring. In line 23, the expanded question about the silver ring is made by Nari, "Um did you get it from your friends?". In the following turn, Sora answers with a louder and more emphatic voice, "NO!" and adds, "My mom buy it for me." Nari accepts Sora's turn and clarifies, "Your mom bought for you." In line 27, Nari comments on the ring, laughs again, and validates Sora's trick that it seems as if she has pierced her nose in line 28. Sora then self-selects her turn in the middle of Nari's turn and says a Korean word, "*hwang.so*." meaning "ox" in English. In the following turn, Nari again laughs for a short period.

With the initiation of a new sequence about her nose piercing in line 13, the sequential structure develops in the direction the young L2 speaker intends. In the excerpt above, Sora's beginning sequences show hesitancy and a passive attitude due to her lack of content to share with the other party. She has worked out how to introduce a new sequence with a new topic by playing a trick with a real object available to her at that moment. Playing a trick on the other party has created the effect of steering the sequence development toward the path Sora

201

is more willing to follow. By playing a trick on the adult figure, she made the other laugh several times, which has the effect of making her feel more powerful.

It seems worth analyzing the practice that Sora has played in the above excerpt. First, it can be assumed that Sora's playful tricks were made possible by the dyadic interaction being conducted via a video call. Second, playing a trick by moving herself from the camera requires an act of courage for a young L2 speaker. In this context, Sora tries to put Nari in a confusing and chaotic situation. The effect of the playful trick converts the organized flow into a communication breakdown.

In this dyadic setting, Sora should usually answer Nari's questions, and become the storyteller through the recurrent practice of sharing her life events, as managed by Nari. It is difficult to discover Sora's hidden motivation behind the social action of playing a trick on Nari, who has been doing the CfL for more than a year. However, the data shows that Sora gets her own space in the interaction by breaking away from the adult-managed sequential development and steering the topic the way she wants it. This is also one of Sora's strategies to avert the sequential path that Nari anticipates. This type of trick toward Nari has not been witnessed in the first months, but only occurs in the later data collection period (after more than eight months).

The section has demonstrated Sora's emerging practice of playing a trick while joining the recurrent practice of talk-in-interaction. Sora has opted for this method while talking about her newsworthy events in life. As the title of section 6.2 shows, several practices have occurred after seven to eight months of regular weekly interactions. From the analytic perspective, the local contingency and dynamics between the two participants are valuable components for understanding how the participants achieve their social actions in interactional conversation. It is also closely related to Sora's L2 IC development as she creates the space on her own and keeps the conversation under her control by deploying some new interactional practices.

Moreover, the new methods emerging in the later stage seem to relate to diverse factors in conversational interaction. One of them has something to do with Sora's relationship with

Nari. Sora and Nari have built a close affiliation by sharing humor and positive assessments over a long period. In defense of the claim that making a joke or "fooling around" with the adult speaker rarely occurs in the L2 conversational interaction, jokes are usually only made when relationships are established, with a trusting and bonded connection, in particular between a young person and an adult. Besides, it is quite rare to witness jokes and tricks in communication conducted in the L2. Therefore, playing a trick on an adult speaker in the L2 is further evidence of Sora's active engagement in the interaction—using challenging new methods. This shows the developmental features of Sora's L2 IC.

The next focus will be on another emerging practice that Sora has developed during her conversational interactions with Nari in the later stage of her CfL sessions.

6.3 Embodiment Action as a Resource in L2 Interaction

It has been found that novice learners rely more heavily on embodied action through nonverbal resources to accomplish social actions (Hellermann, 2008). Nonverbal resources include gestures, body postures, movements, and embodied manipulations of objects. In this section, the focus will be on body gestures, movements, vocalizing, and playing a musical instrument. These are the participants' ways of interacting and sensing the world in an inter-subjective way (Mondana, 2018).

During the 14-month data collection period, Sora uses embodied resources when she experiences difficulty delivering her intended meanings and messages. In addition, Sora uses embodied actions to help the story recipient to retrieve the targeted item or figures that she is trying to deliver. It has been shown that the teacher's embodied actions can help to explain vocabulary items to the students (Sert & Walsh, 2013). However, embodied resources, such as those displayed by Sora over time, have not been explored. It will be valuable to examine the sequential environments to discover where, when, and why the young learner deploys an

embodied action in her turn-taking trajectories. For example, it has been reported that mime and gestures are one of the primary communication strategies used by L2 learners to compensate for their lack of L2 proficiency (Tarone, 1977). From an analytic perspective, it is possible to find more minute details of embodied actions embedded in the sequential structure. The minute and micro-perspective might provide new insight into the relationship between the embodied practice and the IC development, and the changes occurring in the longitudinal timeline of CfL.

The accumulative practice of participating in the talk-in-interaction can also be a good arena for developing embodied resources according to the local contingency. Judging from data transcribed from conversational interactions, the embodied practices in the dyadic CfL have been used as helpful interactional resources by the young L2 learner to deliver specific messages and establish inter-subjectivity.

Section 6.3 will have three different sections. The first section will examine Sora's embodied resources—related to how she uses her hands, legs, and head more than other embodied resources—in the relatively early months of CfL. The second section will show examples of real objects being used as embodied resources, including her singing in the middle of the talk-in-interaction. Lastly, Sora's performance of a musical instrument as a resource during her talk-in-interaction will be presented.

6.3.1 Deploying Embodied Actions Using Body Parts

This section will highlight Sora's use of embodied actions that occur earlier than other embodied resources—in which she uses her hands, legs, and head. Before the excerpt below, Sora says she does not like seniors in her elementary school. She says that she does not like the older brothers, 5th, and 6th graders, in the prior sequences right before the excerpt. In line 01, she explains why she does not like the senior boys.

Excerpt 42 'Make-up gesture with hands' Session No. 5 (M2)


```
01     Sora: because they (0.5 ) pyen.thay.ka mwe.yey.yo?

                            Pervert+SUB what is it+POL?

                            What is a pervert?

02     Nari: ↑per- pervert?

03     Sora: pervert because (0.5) they (0.5) said

04     (0.6) mak ya.tong yay.ki.ha.ko mak.

       Just obscene videos talking just

       They were talking about obscene videos

05     Nari: um:::

06     Sora: ↑SO (0.8) I don't like them.

07     (1.0)

08     Nari: °uh hum°

09     (3.0)

10     Sora: and (1.4) sisters (0.5)  [en.ni.tul.

                                       older sisters

11     Nari:                          [um older sisters.

12     Nari: uh huh older sisters.

13     (1.0)

14→    Sora: their ((acting putting on a make-up using her two hands))

15     Nari: ↑AH make-up?

16     Sora: make-up ⟨VERY VERY⟩

17     Nari: ↑H[uh

18     Sora:    [↑SO so I think they Ka.pwu.khi.

                            Japanese dance-drama

19     Nari: uh:::::
```


In excerpt 42 above, the turn begins with the adverbial "because" (L01); however, she
soon experiences difficulty and solicits help from Nari by requesting the L2 equivalent for

"*pyen.thay* (pervert)" using the L1 resource. According to the findings from the earlier section on the use of the L1 resources, it transpires that Sora simply uses the L1 lexical word in the ongoing turn without soliciting help for the L2 equivalent in her later period (M8–14). However, in this excerpt, which comes from the fifth week of Sora's CfL session, she requests help from the adult speaker using the pattern of "What is X?".

In line 02, Nari provides Sora with the second pair part to the question, "per- pervert?" indicating a slight uncertainty with her rising tone. Repeating the L2 lexical term, "pervert," Sora continues her storytelling by adding further rationale to support her dislike of the senior brothers. She first produces her turn in the L2, then switches to the Korean language. She displays a slow production before the L1 resource, with a pause after every other word "pervert because (0.5) they (0.5) said (0.6) *mak ya.tong yay.ki.ha.ko mak* (They were talking about obscene videos) (L03–04). While achieving the social action of developing her storytelling, she completes the development of the story by providing a reasonable reason for her dislike of the senior brothers. After finishing up her storytelling about the senior boys at school, the turn is open to either party for three seconds in line 09. Breaking the 3-sec-long silence, Sora self-selects the turn and continues talking about the senior sisters without being requested for further elaboration on her experience. This displays her active participation in telling her experience to Nari. In line, Sora begins with the continuer marker, "and" and a 1.4-sec-long silence", which indicates that she has more to tell, but faces difficulty in continuing. Soon, she switches to the word "sisters" in the L1 utterance, "*en.ni.tul*," which designates more specific groups of sisters with "*en.ni.tul*" as the L1 word meaning older sisters (fifth and sixth graders). Thus, the transfer of the word "sisters" to "*en.ni.tul*" in the L1 increases inter-subjectivity as she knows the word "sisters" can be interpreted as either older or younger ones.

Nari notices the difficulty that Sora has with her relatively long delay of a 1.4-long second before "sisters". Following Sora's story and showing her intent listening, Nari provides a candidate word for the word search item "older sisters," which overlaps with Sora's utterance of "*en.ni.tul*." Due to the overlapping, Nari repeats "older sister" in her next turn (L12). While

delivering the story of her field trip, Sora expresses that she does not like the seniors, because they do not behave well. Nari could therefore guess that Sora's utterance, "sisters" is connected to the senior ones.

After a 1-sec long delay, without paying attention to the L2 expression, "old sisters," Sora moves on with her storytelling, beginning her turn with "their" (L14) and deploying an embodied action of make-up using both hands. Soon the other party recognizes her action as make-up and produces the utterance "AH make up?" (L15). Sora picks up the word "make-up" and creates the effect of intensifying the sisters' act of putting on make-up by opting for the repetition strategy of saying "very" twice in line 16, "make-up 〈<u>VERY VERY</u>〉 ." Sora expresses her meaning through her tone, pace, and loudness in the turn by emphasizing "VERY" twice at a relatively slower pace and in a louder voice. Next, Nari provides a "surprising and supportive continuer token "huh," which partially overlaps with Sora's turn beginning in line 18. Evading the overlapping span, Sora produces "so" once more as she continues her storytelling. Sora delivers the story more interestingly by including the word "Kabuki," which refers to a Japanese dance-drama famous for thick, exaggerated make-up. She delivers her intended message skillfully, using minimal vocabulary, and creating a heightened inter-subjectivity by deploying an embodied action and an appropriate image or item that directs the story recipient to picture the scene. This is an excellent example of a young learner relying on embodied resources appropriately and efficiently, thus overcoming her limited linguistic and interactional resources.

In the following excerpt, another embodied action occurs during Sora's storytelling about her hagwon class. Before this, Sora talked about her new English hagwon or academy and one of her classmates who bothers her. Then, upon seeking to explain why she does not like the younger student, she provides the example of the junior in her hagwon interrupting the class. Rather than explaining with words, Sora demonstrates the behavior of the younger classmate by putting her two legs crossed on the desk where her laptop is located. In the following exert and analysis, the focused examination will be on where, why, and what type

of embodied action she relies on during her storytelling sequences.

Excerpt 43 'She always uh:: uh her foo:t' Session No. 29 (M8)


```
01     Sora: when (0.5) UH:: when TEST-ts,

02     Nari: um.

03     (1.0)

04     ora: ⟨uh teacher uh said to students how to test:⟩

05     Nari: um.

06     (1.0)

07     Sora: ((?)) she always tea↑CHer ↑teaCHER ↑teaCHER↑ teaCHER

08           ⟩ ↑teacher ↑teacher ↑teacher ↑teacher ↑teacher, ⟨

09     Nari: uhm:: ah [she interrupts is she interrupts ah:::while your teacher

10     Sora:         [°yes.°

11     Nari: (0.6) uh is explaining about the test she just (0.5) cut in (0.5) I [°see°

12     Sora:                                              [yes so uhm:: u

13           teacher said be ↑QUIET and she ↑AH ↑AH ↑AH not.

14     Nari:  uhm::⟩ no no no no no I wanna do whatever I want ⟨ I see. (0.5) o[kay

15     Sora:                                              [((inaudible))

16     Nari: um.

17     Sora: uh she uh:: she always uh:: uh her foo:t.

18→    Sora: ((putting up her two legs on her desk))

19     Nari: OH ↑no her leg is on the ↑desk?

20→    Sora: no like this ((putting up her two crossed legs on the desk))

21     (2.0)

22     Nari: ⟩ °ahit° ⟨ ↑AH:: crossing her le:g?

23     (1.0)

24     Sora: yes.  [↑SO

25     Nari:      [keep keep her legs crossed?
```

208

In line 01, Sora begins her turn by raising a situation in her private English academy with just two words, "when (0.5) UH:: when TEST-ts." Nari understands the meaning of these simple words and provides a continuer token "um" (L02). After a 1-sec-long delay, Sora continues with a filled pause, "uh" and produces the subject, "teacher" and then uses another filled pause "uh" as a turn-constructional resource. In the ongoing turn, Sora explains that the teacher at the academy "said to the student how to test" at a relatively slower speed (L04). The turn is preparatory work for setting up the context of the class environment before showing the exemplary behavior of the classmate. Then, hearing a continuer marker from Nari and having another delay, she continues talking about the younger classmate at the institute in line 07.

Once she has established the context of the class, Sora imitates how the junior classmate gets the teacher's attention during the class by acting out the performance herself (L07–08). Sora's imitation of the repetitive calling out plays a similar role to the embodied action because she copies the tone, voice volume, and repetition of the classmate as an embodied resource. The action of fast and repetitive calling out makes it clear that the classmate in the story is a nuisance in the class because she interrupts the flow of the teacher's explanation about the tests. The message she plans to deliver to the recipient of the story is successfully delivered by relying on an embodied resource. The vocal imitation with the fast and repetitive calling of the teacher nine times replaces the social action of Sora getting herself directly involved in blaming the younger classmate. This type of resource is an efficient and clever method for a novice L2 speaker, which can also be interpreted as her improved L2 IC during the talk-in-interaction when she reaches the limits of her linguistic resources.

Nari restates the projected action by her repetitive calling out in the prior turn in line 09. The interruptive behavior of the girl in the class is clearly expressed to Nari, and she makes a sentential TCU. Sora agrees with Nari's paraphrasing, and her acknowledgment token "yes" overlaps with Nari's "I [see" (L11), though it is not a syntactically appropriate location. In addition, without being asked for further elaboration of the story, Sora continues telling about

the things occurring in the class, reporting that "yes so uhm:: teacher said be ↑QUIET and she ↑AH ↑AH ↑AH not" (L13). Another embodied action aimed at delivering the action of the focal classmate is deployed using the medium of a short repetitive scream of "↑AH ↑AH not." This also creates a positive effect in establishing a shared mutual understanding. Nari affiliates to the story and joins in fully by acting out and imitating the voice of the junior classmate in the storytelling "〉 no no no no I wanna do whatever I want 〈" (L14). In the same turn, Nari mentions an assessment "I see" and produces a topic-terminating token "okay."

The topic terminating signal "I see okay" made by Nari (in line 14) is not acknowledged by Sora. Instead, she indicates that she has more to share with the recipient and self-selects her turn, which partially overlaps with the topic terminating marker "o[kay." The utterance made in line 15 is unclear, though, because Sora continues the storytelling with limited words and hesitation markers, "uh she uh:: she always uh:: uh her foot" (L12–13). Then, she deploys an embodied action (putting up her legs on her desk) during the turn-construction process in line 18. Again, she relies on an embodied resource to develop her story.

Nari interprets Sora's embodied action as the imitation of the behavior of the focal classmate in her hagwon class. She strongly identifies with the embodied action and shows her surprise and evaluation "OH ↑no." In the same turn, Nari initiates a repair that the girl puts her legs on the desk. Rather than responding to Nari's repair request, Sora says, "↑ no like this" and completes the repair by displaying the embodied action of putting her crossed legs on the desk (L20). After a two-sec long delay and an unclear utterance, "*ahit*," Nari provides her lengthened understanding token in a louder voice, "AH::" and adds the point that the girl is crossing her legs (L22).

The embodied actions displayed in the above excerpt are all imitations of Sora in her storytelling. She calls the teacher nine times, screaming a short "AH" twice and putting her crossed legs on the desk. While using the embodied resources during her story development, Sora provides the reasons behind her disliking the girl in her class. Sora accomplishes the social action of convincing Nari by employing embodied actions. Her embodied evidence

210

functions for Nari as a clue that the focal classmate deserves Sora's dislike.

Sora receives a strong affiliation from Nari, who responds with "I see" (L14) and "Oh no" (L19) as well as joining in the initiating action of the girl, "no no no no no I want to whatever I want." Sora successfully develops a shared understanding and active affiliation while continuing her storytelling. These embodied resources play a positive role in progressing the topic and are used as a valuable resource for the L2 learner with limited linguistic resources.

The following excerpt displays another occasion when Sora uses embodied action as an interactional resource in the process of turn-constructional work when speaking about Sora's partner in her class. The excerpt comes from their first session in the spring semester of Sora's fifth grade, at the beginning of a new school year. Nari expresses her interest in Sora's school life and asks her to share something new and good about it. Nari asks a series of questions about Sora's homeroom teacher and classmates. Sora uses an embodied resource while unfolding her story sequences.

Excerpt 44 'He head bang bang' Session No. 34 (M9)

```
01     Nari: what about your classmates (0.5)

02           how ↑many [((?))

03→    Sora:           [uh my (0.5) partner is uh little

04→           ⟩bang bang.⟨= ((rotating her head))

05     Nari: =what do you mean bang bang?

06→    Sora: $head ↑bang ↑bang.$

07     Nari: a little (0.5) strange?

08     Sora: ⟨°yes.°⟩

09     Nari: a ↑boy?

10     (0.5)

11     Sora: yes.
```

```
12   Nari: uh can you tell me about ↑him I'd like to
13         know [about your partner
13   Sora:      [uh:
14   Sora: ↑uh:: he is VERY crazy.
15   Nari: um[::
16   Sora:    [uh he said uh bad word.
17   Nari: um::
18   (1.5)
19   Sora: an:d (1.4) yes.
```

In lines 1 and 2, Nari raises a question about Sora's classmates and the number of students in the class. The second question, beginning with the words, "how many," is overlapped with Sora's self-selected turn. After hearing the topic, "your classmates," Sora introduces a new topic beginning with, "uh my partner is" in line 03. It shows that she has missed the utterance, "how many," but still orients to her partner.

Usually, Sora's tellings are delivered in the second position (Schegloff, 1997b) after Nari's question. However, here, in line 03, without being asked about her partner, she initiates talking about her partner. However, she cannot think of further utterances about her partner once she mentions, "uh my partner is uh little" in line 03. In the next line, Sora produces, "bang bang" at a faster speed. While mentioning the expression "bang bang," she rotates her head. In response to Sora's head rotation and the expression, "bang bang," Nari initiates repair of the meaning of "bang bang" in line 05. Sora just repeats the same utterance "bang bang" with a slightly smiley voice and a higher pitch (L06), which signals that she does not have an appropriate alternate expression to describe her partner. At this moment, embodied action is her best resource.

When Nari asks about Sora's classmates, her partner might have come to mind, so she moves on to the topic and uses the expression, "head bang bang." This fundamental desire to talk about what is on her mind is meaningful enough when a closer examination is made of

212

the sequential development of a novice L2 speaker. Once she hears some expressions from Nari, Sora devises a new idea, which is a good signal for the continuity of the talk. The dyadic setting is not effective when the speaker does not have any motivation to continue the talk-in-interaction, and the turn-taking can end weirdly.

Though the child L2 speaker has limited linguistic resources, her will to convey the idea in her mind is significant in its sequential structure and development. Therefore, her limited linguistic resources in this excerpt have been replaced with embodied resources, so she can continue talking about the item on her mind without breaking the turn-taking rules.

In line 07, Nari offers a candidate expression substituting "bang bang" as "a little (0.5) strange?". Sora offers the agreement token "yes" more quietly and slowly than the neighboring utterances in line 08. In the following turn, Nari uses an incomplete sentence for another repair initiation about checking Sora's partner's sex, "a ↑boy?" and asks for Sora to tell her more about him (L12 & L13). Before Nari completes her ongoing turn in line 13, Sora takes the floor with her "uh" overlapping Nari's ongoing turn (L13). The overlapping with the prior turn is further externalized evidence of Sora's active participation in the talk-in-interaction since she displays quite a long pause and frequent hesitancy markers when she has nothing to say, or is unwilling to talk, which has been clearly demonstrated in her early excerpts.

Sora shows more enthusiasm for participating in the unfolding sequence development when she initiates the ongoing topic of the talk. This is demonstrated in lines 14 and 16. She provides Nari with the reason behind her embodied action of head rotating. First, Sora mentions that the boy is crazy (L14). Second, Sora offers the evidence that "uh he said uh bad word" (L16) to justify her judgment that he is "crazy" (L14). By providing the clues and evidence supporting her claim to the recipient, she accomplishes the social action of providing a rationale for her statement.

The current section shows that the novice L2 learner uses embodied resources for the purpose of her own social accomplishment when she lacks linguistic resources. The practice of using the embodied resources does not occur in the first few weeks but gradually appears

when Sora adapts to the conversational interaction. This change occurs during the regular CfL sessions and definitely helps the topic's progress and mutual understanding. The next section will present excerpts with Sora displaying a real object and playing a musical instrument spontaneously in the middle of her talk.

6.3.2 Embodied Resources: Using Real Objects in L2 Interaction

Language is one of the most valuable resources for achieving social actions. However, it has been shown in several prior excerpts that physical actions can be an excellent compensating resource for the L2 child who has limited linguistic resources. The coming excerpt displays another meaningful embodied resource that an L2 learner can use: showing realia and playing a musical instrument to continue the talk. When experiencing difficulty in explaining the term LP (Long-Playing Record), she gets the actual object and shows it to the other party. Also, when she has nothing to talk about with Nari, she uses a musical instrument as a medium for her talk. In the following excerpt, the focus is on the sequential progress contributed by Sora's deployment of an embodied action of showing realia.

Excerpt 45 'Wait like this' Session No. 31 (M8)

```
01    Sora: $I have MANY new thing.$
02    Nari: $oh:: tell me everything$.
03    Sora: uhm: I had new notebook 28 and new my bag,
04    Nari: uh hm,
05    Sora: and (0.5) um: new LP.
```

---

[28] In the Koreanized English, a notebook refers to "a laptop."

```
06      Nari: LP mean:s what does it mean?
07      Sora: um:: (1.0) um::(1.0) um::(1.0) ↑ah wait:.
08      Nari: uhm.
09      (4.0) ((Sora goes to get it and comes back))
10→     Sora: like this.
11      ((Sora showing the LP of the Beatles))
12      (2.0)
13      Nari: AH:: ↑OH:: Beatles (0.5) music albu:m.
14      (1.0)
15      Nari: ah do you have the LP player at home?=
16      Sora: =yes
17      Nari: wo[w::
18      Sora:    [°yes°
```

Due to a technical issue, their talk-in-interaction has "been on hold" before the excerpt. Once the video-conferencing status returns to normal, Sora initiates her turn, claiming, "I have many new things" (L01) before Nari's usual turn on initial topic elicitation. This displays that Sora is now fully accustomed to the recurrent activity in which they share something new and good at the beginning of their talk. Sora self-selects the turn and proceeds to introduce new things. Receiving full encouragement to go on with her storytelling, "tell me everything::" (L02), Sora shares that she has a new laptop, a bag, and an LP. Upon Sora's pronouncing "LP," Nari initiates a repair about what an LP is. On the repair initiation of "LP" in line 05, Sora displays great difficulty with explaining what an LP is in line 07. First, she fills up her turn with three lengthened filled pauses of "uhm::" and two 1-sec-long pauses in between the filled pauses. One noticeable sign of progress is that she now shows the pattern of not leaving the span of silence long, which contrasts with her earlier months in the initial stage of their CfL. At the end of the difficult turn in line 07, she arrives at a specific idea and finishes her turn by saying, "↑ah wait." Her request for Nari to wait projects that she has created a new solution

215

for the difficulty of completing the repair initiated by Nari.

Interestingly, Sora's repair (on hold in line 07) is completed by her embodied action of bringing a real object and presenting it to Nari in line 10, "like this." Her reaction to managing the problem, which breaks the establishment of a mutual understanding, has changed to a more self-reliant solution compared to the methods that she chose in the initial period. First, she tries to speak in the L2 as much as she can, and proceeds with her turn in the L2. Second, she tries to solve the problem by herself. In this context, the adult figure needs help as she has trouble understanding "LP" in the sequences. In sum, the fact that the young L2 speaker is in the situation of completing a repair initiated by the adult figure itself demonstrates that the child L2 speaker's L2 IC is developing, particularly in solving problems in the talk-in-interaction.

As her trouble in understanding the meaning of "LP" is resolved, in line 13, Nari provides an emphatic understanding token "AH:: OH:: Beatles (0.5) music albu:m." Upon Nari's affirmation token, Sora does not continue talking on the previous topic nor does she expand the story. After a 1-sec-long silence, the turn goes back to the prior speaker, Nari. She seeks additional information about whether Sora has an LP player at home (L15). Sora swiftly responds "yes," and her second "yes" overlaps with Nari's exaggerated excitement expressed by saying "wo[w::" in line 17 (1.0)WO[W::" (L17).

This use of embodied resources plays a significant role in restoring their inter-subjectivity in the local context. Sora's ability to apply this strategy as an embodied action provides evidence that she has adapted to the local contingency, and can work out new methods and practices to accomplish her social action. The new resource that Sora used has solved the problem and provided a friendly environment for the two parties in the talk-in-interaction.

Next, the data will show how Sora plays a musical instrument to develop her story. Sora volunteers to perform the musical instrument for the story recipient and receives significant praise from the listener. While playing the musical instrument, she transforms herself from a

storyteller to a performer. The performance is another embodied resource Sora has opted to use in her storytelling process to increase the accomplishment of her social action. Her use of diverse embodied resources is not evidence of her improved L2 IC. However, this shows her active participation in the CfL, using her skill of playing the ocarina. In addition, the musical instrument becomes a good medium for expanding their talk to a broader arena.

In contrast with the other excerpts—that usually come from the beginning of the conversation—the following one unfolds at the end of their conversation. Occasionally, Sora is asked to share something that she is looking forward to in the coming weekdays or the weekend at the end of their CfL. When Nari asks Sora for something that she is looking forward to in the following excerpt, Sora unexpectedly brings up a newsworthy event of the day that has already happened. Thus, technically, the storytelling content belongs to Sora's newsworthy event of the day. The analysis will focus on where and why Sora plays the ocarina and how the interlocutor responds to Sora's new type of embodied resource in the process of their CfL session.

Excerpt 46 'Ocarina I want to play' Session. N44 (M12)

```
01      Sora: °nothing°.

02      Nari: okay then (0.8) what are you looking forward
03            to this week this weekend?

((six lines omitted))

09      Nari: no plan mea- yes means yes you have a plan.

10→     Sora: AH teacher?=

11      Nari: =uh hm?

12      Sora: today I have tong.a.li ocarina,=
                 club activity

13      Nari: =uh hm

14→     Sora: I want to play.

15      (0.7)
```

16   Nari: ah::you want to you want to ↑AH::you want to play ocarina for me,

17   Sora: yes.

18   Nari: okay.

19   Sora: ((Sora moves to get the ocarina))

20   Nari: °ah she went to pick her uh her ocarina (0.5) to play°

21   Sora: ((after coming back Sora shows it to Nari)) (4.0)

22   Nari: nice

23   (5.5)

24   Sora: it is to.ca.ki,

                          porcelain

25   Nari: uh hm.

26   Sora: it is more ex- expensive other to.ca.ki,

                          porcelain

27   Nari: uh hm.

       28   Sora: ocarina because it have more cho. pel.kwu.i.

                                biscuit firing

29   Nari: uh hm.

30   (2.0)

31   Sora: I uh I (1.0) today I first (0.5) ocarina

32   han pen.to an hay.pwass.nun.tey on.ul che.um hay.pwa.yo

       Not a single time I played this today first time I give it a try+POL

       I have never played this before, today is my first time playing it

33   Nari: =wow your first-time playing ocarina.

34   Sora: yes um uh ce cal mos.hal swu.to iss.e.yo

            I not well playing can be (possibility)

                    I may not play well

35   Nari: it's okay.

36   (1.5)

37→   Sora: pi.hayng.ki.

            the airplane

38   Nari: okay.

218

39   Sora:((playing the children's song "the Airplane",on the ocarina))

40   Nari: very good you are so good this is your first time

41   but you are doing such a good job

42   Sora: and: uh: na.pi.ya.

                    Hey Butterfly

43   Nari: okay

44   (2.0)

45→   Sora: ((performing "Hey Butterfly"))

46   Nari: ⟨°wow°⟩ thank you so much,

47   Sora: yes=

48   Nari:=I really [en-enjoy listening to your performance

49   Sora: [yes

50   (1.0)

51   Sora: it's kay.kwu.li but uh I I uh

                Frog

52   kay.kwu.li com mos hal swu.to iss.e.yo

         Frog a little not able to perform possibility exist+POL

          For the song "Frog," I might not be able to play well.

53   (1.2)

54   Nari: yeah go for it go for it.

55   (1.5)

56→   Sora: ((performing "the Frog"))

57   Nari: you did a very good (0.5) I like that

58   I like the ocarina sound it's beautiful.

59   Sora: yes it's to.ca.ki.la.se te so.li.ka coh.a.yo

          porcelain as it is the sound is better+POL

          as it is a porcelain it sounds better.

60   Nari: um::

61   Sora: cho.pel.kwi. te manh.i hay.se

     Biscuit firing the more as it gets

     Because it has more biscuit firings

Before line 01, Nari asks whether Sora has anything else to talk about before wrapping up their session. Sora responds with the utterance, "°nothing°." In line 02, Nari terminates the previous topic and shifts to something that Sora is looking forward to. During the omitted six lines, Sora says "yes" to Nari's question "no plan this weekend?". In line 09, Nari clarifies that Sora's answer "yes" means that she has a plan.

In the following turn, Sora self-selects her turn and begins with "AH," an utterance used for a *eureka* moment. This utterance signals that she remembers something meaningful, and she demonstrates her will to generate a new topic. In the same turn, after saying "AH," she calls Nari "teacher," which usually signals that she has something urgent to say or that she is trying to solicit some help from the adult speaker. In line 11, Nari accepts the referential term and provides the "go ahead" signal, "uh hm?".

In the following line, Sora initiates a new topic about her club activity, delivering the news that "today I have *tong.a.li* ocarina" (L12). This is an unexpected response for the second position action of the first pair part of the question-and-answer sequence. Therefore, instead of providing the second pair part, Sora generates a new topic. As Sora steers the conversation to her club activity, Nari again provides a continuer token "uh hm" to elicit more story content from Sora.

In line 14, Sora expresses her wish to play the musical instrument, "I want to play"—omitting the object of the verb, the ocarina. In line 16, Nari feels somewhat surprised; she begins her turn with "ah," an understanding token, and checks Sora's intention twice, repeating the question "you want to you want to" since playing the musical instrument has never happened during the entire CfL—that has lasted over a year-long. Finally, Sora shows her desire to play the musical instrument for Nari (L17). Nari takes Sora's suggested action and provides the agreement token, "okay," in line 18.

After obtaining permission to play the ocarina, she suddenly disappears from the screen without giving Nari prior notice of her absence. However, Nari quickly understands that Sora's disappearance is to bring the instrument in front of the screen. In line 16, Nari describes the

situation "ah she went to pick her uh her ocarina to play." Once Sora is back, she shows the musical instrument to the co-participant. Nari gives her assessment token "nice" in line 22. Sora then self-selects her turn and provides additional information about the ocarina, saying it is porcelain in the L1 resource (L1). As Nari provides a continuer token "uh huh," Sora voluntarily extends her talk, telling Nari about the ocarina's comparative value, which is more expensive than other porcelain, again using the L1 resource, the Korean word "*to.ca.ki*." The linguistic structure for comparative forms is inaccurate (L26). However, it does not cause any accuracy-related problems for either participant.

With a supportive continuity marker, "uh hm" (L27) provided by Nari, Sora continues talking about the reason why it is expensive "because it have more *cho.pel.kwu.i* (biscuit firing)" (L28). Her topic now reaches its climax when she is just about to play the ocarina. In line 31, Sora tells Nari that today is her first time playing it, "I uh I (1.0) today I first ocarina" (L31). The turn has a self-initiated self-repair to clarify the message. Although the sentence still lacks a predicate, this does not impede the development of the topic, and Nari does not focus on Sora's linguistic inaccuracy. In line 32, she speaks in the Korean language, repeating the message that she has never played it before. This pre-announcement of her first time playing seems to be born from her nervous feelings about the possibility of her poor performance.

Upon Sora's announcement that this is her first time playing the ocarina, Nari expresses her surprise and reiterates the message, "Wow your first-time playing ocarina" (L33). However, the surprise seems to make Sora feel burdened, instead, and she again provides a pre-caution that she might not play well in the Korean language, "yes um uh *ce cal mos.hal swu.to iss.e.yo* (I might not play well)" (L34). Sora shows her nervous feelings. Nevertheless, she pursues her plan to perform it regardless of the feelings that arise.

From line 39, Sora plays the children's song "the airplane," a viral song in Korea. Her performance brings immense praise from Nari (L40). She responds to the compliment by playing another song, "Hey Butterfly," on the musical instrument. Playing another song on the

instrument demonstrates that she feels proud of herself for playing the ocarina well enough to receive a great compliment. Once the performance of "Hey Butterfly" is over, Nari now appreciates Sora for her performance, "wow thank you so much I really [en- enjoy listening to your performance" (L46 & L 48).

Nari's appreciating turn overlaps with Sora's response "yes" (L49). After a 1-sec-long delay, Sora self-selects her turn in line 51 and introduces the name of her next song. She repairs her turn, saying that she might not be good at this one in the Korean language, "it's *kae.kwu.li* but uh I I *kay.kwu.li com mos hal swu.to iss.e.yo*" (I might be not good this time for the song, "Frog")(L51-52).

As the current section shows Sora's use of L1 resources, in the later months (M8–14), she simply used the L1 in the local context freely and efficiently, instead of soliciting lexical help for the L2 equivalents or obtaining permission to use the L1. This change in using the L1 resource demonstrates Sora's priority in continuing the sequence structure for accomplishing her aims by achieving accurate L2 expressions and keeping the implicitly prescribed language policy.

Sora's third initiative of performing a new song, "the Frog" is supported by Nari in line 54, "yeah go for it go for it," as active encouragement of the performance. Sora plays the song "the Frog" (L56), and after Sora's performance, Nari compliments her and adds her evaluation of the sound of the ocarina, commenting, "I like the ocarina sound, it's beautiful" (L58). Upon Nari's evaluation, Sora self-selects her turn again to provide the reason behind the excellent sound quality of the ocarina. This proffering of information to the recipient is further evidence of her improved skill in recipient-designing and active participation in expanding her storytelling.

Sora's series of ocarina performances have played an essential role in bringing Sora's active participation and continuing the talk-in-interaction in an amicable atmosphere. The performance elicits Nari's compliments and evaluation of the conduct, which spurs Sora to participate more actively in the embodied conduct of playing the musical instrument. This

222

shows the possibility that participating in social actions via embodied resources can contribute to the progressivity of the talk, creating locally contingent storytelling. In particular, the young L2 learner's deployment of the musical performance receives hugely positive attention and provides a broad perspective on "learning by doing."

In addition, Sora's choice of playing the instrument is based on her excellent understanding that her embodied action can be a helpful resource for her storytelling progress, as well as helping the recipient designing. This context-sensitive conduct tailored to the interaction's local circumstances proves Sora's ability to achieve social actions more freely and efficiently. She discovers that playing the musical instrument is one of the embodied actions that can best design her talk for the recipient on the topic of the ocarina club (Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015).

CHAPTER 7. DISCUSSION

This chapter will discuss the findings in relation to relevant research. The findings of the present study document a progressive change over time in how a novice child L2 speaker accomplishes the social action of presenting newsworthy events more actively and efficiently over time, while noting developmental changes in L2 IC. The description of the changing actions and practices occurring during a precisely defined course of action is consistent in its sequential and contextual features across the examined time period. In the recurrent activity of Sora's storytelling to Nari in English over 14 months, Sora showed diverse repairing practices, the active use of L1 resources, and improved storytelling skills, in addition to her increased agency and new methods for interaction in the later stages that include introducing humor and language play and deploying embodied actions.

7.1 Novice L2 Speaker as Communicator

First, these data have undoubtedly shown that the child L2 speaker is capable of conducting her own storytelling. Echoing the claim by Firth and Wagner (1997, 2007), while having limited linguistic and interactional skills, the child L2 speaker is fully capable of conversing with the other party and of transforming herself from a quasi-passive and slower speaker to a dominant agent in the talk-in-interaction. Sora showed a skillful use of a variety of resources, such as repairing methods, active turn-taking and sequence developing, use of L1 resources, embodied resources, solicitation of the interactant's linguistic knowledge, and some playful tricks and realia. Her primary goal of delivering the message to the co-interactant was successfully accomplished without any communication breakdown. She managed to figure out the solutions to the troubles that she encountered during the interaction. Interestingly, as she adapted to the CfL sessions later on, she gradually transformed her identity into that of

a fun-seeker and sometimes a fake storyteller by designing her own methods in the course of her storytelling.

Technically, the dynamic and reciprocal nature during the L2 talk-in-interaction was not activated much in the beginning stage, as Sora's experience of the early sessions showed. Sora experienced great difficulty in continuing her turn, construing the TCUs, and accomplishing the social goals of sharing the newsworthy event in her life. However, the recurrent activities over time helped Sora to develop such interactional skills as sustaining her turn through repairing work, using the other party's knowledge as a resource, and often initiating and expanding her own topics. The experience of facing each difficulty and finding solutions to it on contingency seems to have spurred her to figure out diverse methods and practices *in situ*. This supports the approach of learning-by-doing (Dewey, 1916), where Sora challenged herself to try something new and learn how to step forward in contingency while receiving continuous attention and support from Nari. Since, as Hall claimed (2018, p. 39), "we do not learn first and then use. We learn as we use," learning and using the resource cannot be separated (Hellermann, 2018). The details of all the methods and practices Sora deployed have been fully described in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, exemplifying Sora's efforts, trials, and challenges. The changes in Sora's L2 IC empirically demonstrate her diversification of interactional resources, increased precision (Watanabe, 2017), increased fitness to local contingencies, and increased context-sensitive and recipient-designed conduct (Pekarek Doehler, 2018; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015). These empirical findings echo the findings of earlier studies on the progress of L2 children's interactional behaviors in L2 interaction. One difference unique to this study is that it was conducted in an EFL context, whereas L2 use in interaction rarely occurs in the learner's daily lives. Within this context, the novice L2 communicator showed her potential as a capable communicator and the benefits of L2 interaction.

7.2 Recurrent Participation in Interaction for IC Development

The repeated use of recurrent meaningful and social interactions showed that Sora's language use developed gradually with a greater focus on the interactional aspect in this study. An approach that has a great emphasis on how patterns of language emerge is named as an interactional usage-based (IUB) by Pekarek Doehler (2018). Eskildsen (2018, p. 69) claims that IUB demonstrates "how language emerges as a socially grounded repertoire of semiotic resources-for-action" and suggests that teaching practices should be rooted in this conceptualization of language and allow for meaningful interaction where the L2 speaker can have free choice in constructing his or her learning spaces (Eskildsen & Theodórsdóttir 2017; Sert, 2017). As suggested, Sora could construct her own learning spaces and could engage herself fully in the reciprocal interaction. Her interactional skills such as turn-taking, doing repair work, and storytelling skills improved without explicit instruction but were naturally formed during the process of social interaction.

The socialization of language by participating in the recurrent use of some language patterns enlarged Sora's space for constructing other factors such as presenting the topic more smoothly, extending the current topic to the point where she wanted to terminate, and making the other party believe what she had told using several types of tactics. Having conversational interactions over a longitudinal period seems to have allowed Sora to develop her own interactional skills. The pedagogical implications of this study indicate that the interactional skills and the resources required for L2 interactions can be developed by allowing L2 learners to have repeated conversational interactions, echoing the stance that engaging in interaction is a precursor to learning. It is reasonable to expect that it is not explicit instruction in those skills and knowledge-based tips that make the L2 learners improve their interactional competence, as each discursive practice has its own local contingency. In the meantime, sharing the findings on the interactional changes gained through recurrent participation in the L2 interaction is expected to encourage more L2 learners to join conversational practices in and out of the

classroom. In addition, the study has given some clues on our understanding of how IC develops and how researchers and educators can build IC measuring constructs in the long term.

7.3 Social Relations in L2 IC Development

It has been discussed that dimensions of authority and social distance between interactants affect the shaping of conversational structure (Svennevig, 2020). In this study, it was observed that the two parties' interactions became increasingly close during the study. Their social distance could have been indirectly measured through their cooperative and affective moves for solidarity and intimacy. Kasper and Wagner (2011) pointed out that "interactional competence development cannot be separated from the development of the participants' social relations" (p. 199). It is expected that when the interactants are emotionally and socially close enough, the hesitancy level related to the appropriateness of the contents of the talk and the accuracy of linguistic forms will change. The study did not use previous relationship-involved topics as the analytic focus of the current study because they are not the primary topics of investigation. It is hard to measure relationship variables with the analytic framework of CA. The findings of Chapters 4, 5, and 6 do not include any variables at all related to the social and emotional distance between the interactants. However, the data show that the recurrent question about Sora's life updates helped her become a more active storyteller. Personal storytelling has enormous effects on social bonding and reduces the emotional distance between the storyteller and the recipient. The story recipient, Nari, showed a consistently caring and affiliative attitude to the story and the storyteller. Her display of interest and approval definitely contributed to closeness. Later on, Sora came to enjoy her turns to update new news and even expanded the story to diverse topics in her life. Eventually she began to transform her turns for storytelling into a place for having fun and playing tricks

on the story recipient in the session. In addition, the life updates for the child speaker were focused on the positive aspects, "something new and good in your life."

Talking about something positive about one's life on a regular basis can not only transform the speaker's own life perspective, but can also have a positive effect on the relationship with the story recipient due to the power of listening in the dynamic of learning (Weissglass, 2012). By sharing her own ideas and experiences with an attentive story recipient, Sora was able to experience a positive emotional discharge from troubles and worries in school and relationships. Talking about oneself to a trusted and emotionally and socially connected person may well have a similar effect to being listened to by a counselor or a mentor. This is useful to remember when a researcher sets out a plan to collect longitudinal data with an L2 speaker in the context of the wide world. As mentioned before, changes in emotional distance between the interactants were not part of the research. However, the reader can keep in mind that this relationship-related variable in the interaction played a significant role in improving Sora's interactional repertoires and extending the CfL sessions. While it cannot be succinctly summarized, the two interactants experienced significant social and emotional bonding over the longitudinal period. This seems to have encouraged the child L2 speaker's use of diverse methods and practices in the process of achieving her social actions, showing Sora's true self.

7.4 The Power of One's Own Choices in Storytelling

Storytelling as a pedagogical device has yet to be explored (Landrum, Brakke, & McCarthy, 2019). Examining the power of storytelling for learners can also contribute to a holistic understanding of it. Sora's storytelling experience presented several advantages on both the interactional and socio-emotional levels for L2 learning (Baraja-Rohan, 2015; Greer, 2019; Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2016). It can be summarized that the critical factor behind keeping the longitudinal CfL setting stable lies in allowing freedom in the topics for

storytelling and the accessible format of the CfL, in which the child L2 speaker becomes the agent for selecting the topics and extending it to wherever and whatever she wished. Sora never expressed any reluctance to have a CfL session; she mentioned in one post-session interview, "I like talking in the L2 with you. It feels different from talking in Korean." Sora's need to talk about herself and be listened were well met in the CfL sessions. The termination of the session resulted from her long hours at school. Sharing personal stories was found to be significant in continuing the interactions and making the relationship close enough for both parties to behave naturally in the L2 interaction.

Storytelling about one's chosen topic can afford L2 speakers rich opportunities to maneuver the direction of the unfolding sequences, and enhance the methods and practices they can deploy to achieve the social actions they have in mind. Drills and patterned conversational dialogues have been used extensively in the L2 classroom. However, it is now possible to offer practical tips to make the interaction genuinely motivating and encourage it to be continued over a lengthy period. It is a human's basic instinct to be listened to well and to speak similarly to others. Language educators and researchers cannot miss this fundamental point relevant to every human's inherent nature and needs.

7.5 The L1-Sharing Teacher in L2 Interaction

In applied linguistics and foreign language teaching, there has been criticism regarding the difficulty of defining the terms NS and NNS, and a new term, "L1 versus LX user" (Dewaele, 2018, p. 236) was developed. Dewaele, Bak, and Ortega (2021) claim that the field needs to "abandon the toxic terms NS/NNS and adopt neutral terms that emphasize on the equal status of first and FL users" (p. 23). Going beyond the conceptual debate, the current study examined the empirical data of conversational interactions involving an L1-sharing interaction manager or teacher. The dynamic and reciprocal L2 interaction between L1-sharing

interactants revealed how the L1 resource was used in the local context between two Korean L2 speakers. The excerpts showed that the novice L2 speaker advantaged the co-participant's L1 background when needed.

Sora's comment above in Korean, "I like talking in the L2 with you. It feels different from talking in the L1," raises the fundamental question of the interlocutor of L2 learners. She changed her language mode to L2, and did not find any disparities between NS and NNS partners. Research has shown that the resource of L1 could be rather helpful for novice speakers (Horasan, 2014; Kim & Petraki, 2009). Moreover, the direct experience of a novice child provides rational reasons for ending the controversial issue of NS/NNS. However, the findings spur curiosity about how language learning environment can create more favorable conditions for novice L2 speakers to encourage more engagement in L2 interaction.

The findings of the current study agree with the claim that linguists might have given an extraordinary place to the NS as the only reliable source of language data (Ferguson, 1983). Having been influenced by the favoritism toward NS teachers, some educators and parents of the L2 learners express concerns that L1-sharing instructors and conversational partners might decrease the chances to talk and diminish genuine interactions in the L2. The current study's findings have shown that this position is not unreasonable. Sora eventually improved her L2 IC in several aspects from the contextual circumstances of having an L1-sharing interactant. The L1 resource was used strategically by Sora for soliciting lexical help, for repair practice in a word search, and continuing the progress of the talk without stopping to translate the L1 expression into the L2 in each different phase of her interaction.

In the L2 interaction, the identity of native and non-native as well as of expert and novice are only activated and visible when a party claims the identity (Bae & Oh, 2013; Carroll, 2000; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Pennycook, 2001). In addition, many researchers (Braine, 2010; Davies, 2003; Galloway, 2008; Kurniawati & Rizki, 2018; Medgyes, 1992; Pham, 2021) have questioned the fallacy of native-ness. For example, Galloway (2008) examined 51 native English speaker teachers and "concluded that the

native/nonnative distinction is less important than the expert/non-expert distinction" (p. 127). The results of the current study support previous findings on the favoritism of native speakers. The findings of the turn-by-turn analysis of interaction provide evidence that the flow and development of the sequences are locally determined and are influenced by diverse contingencies co-constructed by both interactants *in situ*. Therefore, choosing a native speaker or not can simply be one of the variables out of many that influence the dynamics of the unfolding interaction.

Overall, these findings and discussions support the socio-interactive approach of SLA that language learning does not remain exclusively in the domain of cognitive and individual aspects, but is more embedded in the contextual and interactive aspects. This demonstrates the power of co-constructive and locally contingent aspects of discursive interactions. The Korean novice L2 speaker of English clearly paved the road for improving her L2 IC by participating in the recurrent interactional activities during the study. In addition, the evidence of the practices and methods that the child L2 speaker implemented can be precious resources for the field of SLA in which the realm of development does not reside entirely in linguistic patterns or grammatical structure. The learning and acquisition of an L2 cannot be excluded from the social-interactive arena, although the changes in different contingencies might make it difficult for researchers to dismantle their traditional approach to language development.

Also, the conversational analytic method has provided a much broader and more in-depth perspective on the L2 child's maneuvering of conversational interaction than guessing and following hunches. From this observation, it has been found that the novice L2 speaker can improve his or her own interactional competence through recurrent conversational activities and developing diverse interactional resources of their own volition and not as directed by the adult manager or teacher. The findings of this study clearly demonstrate that the novice speakers' different practices at different ages and proficiency cannot be simply compared with the routes of IC developments of advanced and adult L2 speakers. A more fine-tuned analysis and criteria are called for to discern the spectrum of L2 IC development for a

clear and accurate diagnosis, as well as for the language development of novice L2 speakers.

CHAPTER 8. CONCLUSION

This concluding chapter will provide (a) a summary, (b) methodological considerations, (c) the pedagogical implications, and (d) future directions for research.

8.1 Summary

This sub-section will present a summary of the three finding chapters.

8.1.1 Developmental Change in IC in the Initial Stage

Chapter 4 recorded the developmental changes Sora showed in the early months (M1–3). During the first six weeks, Sora relied on Nari's interaction management and showed very limited participation in the interaction, rarely self-selecting her turns. Sora's turn-taking skills remained relatively passive, with short responses with one-word or phrase-level TCUs that comprised fragmented utterances with hesitations and fillers. She also relied on the L1 resource for word searches in repairing and in soliciting lexical help from Nari using her L1 resource in the format, "What is X?".

The sentential-level TCU response to the initial topic elicitor occurred in the seventh week of CfL session. Soon after that, Sora launched her storytelling about her newsworthy events. She showed different conduct by actively engaging in storytelling, self-selecting her turns, and producing longer TCUs. In addition, she expanded her story to a broader context, moving to the post-activity of her main topic of the event. Although the TCUs were still simple and had several linguistic errors, Sora exercised her active participation in the storytelling by following her own roadmap without relying on the adult recipient's elicitation and the management of the interaction. In her ninth week, she demonstrated the initiation of a new

topic before being requested to do so. These changes in her participation in the talk-in-interaction demonstrate the features of the developmental changes in L2 IC by participating in regular conversational interactions within a couple of months.

8.1.2 Changes in L2 IC: Comparing Two Different Stages

Chapter 5 compared three noteworthy aspects that Sora showed at two different time points of the initial and later stages of her CfL sessions: 1) diversification of repair practice; 2) usage of L1 sources; and 3) change in storytelling practice with active self-selecting and story expansions.

Sora showed changes in her repair practice by diversifying the methods of her repair practice. First, Sora used various resources such as filled pauses, discourse fillers, L1 fillers, and repetition in the process of repairing her turns. In the initial period, Sora's repair practice was inactive and limited. She left long silences between her utterances and terminated her turns abruptly when various difficulties arose. In later stages (M8–14), Sora first used perturbation markers such as filled pauses, discourse fillers such as "*that*," "*but*," and the L1 fillers "*ku* (that)" and "*ku.ke* (that one)," and frequent repetitions in the process of repairing her turns. By using more diverse perturbation markers, or so-called dysfluency markers, in the face of difficulties while constructing turns, the novice L2 child speaker could secure more time for planning the next utterances, which serve the purpose of turn-holders. By deploying diverse kinds of repair resources, Sora tried to achieve fewer silent periods in her turn and to make more recipient-designed and precision-timed actions during her turn constructional work.

Two more changes regarding her repair practice are noteworthy. The first is related to Sora's self-initiated self-repair of her inaccurate answering to negative yes-no questions, such as "yes, I don't" as an answer to the question, "you don't like him, do you?" in the initial stage. During these turns of negative yes-no questions over a longitudinal period, she slowly figured out how to answer appropriately to the negative yes-no question. The novice L2 speaker could

234

self-repair her own L2 grammatical and pragmatic mishaps without resorting to an explicit grammatical explanation, but only by participating in the CfL sessions.

The other change observed regarding her repair practice is that from her 10th month of CfL Sora started a repair initiation on the trouble of understating the content of Nari's prior turn in the L2 format. At first, due to difficulty in understanding, repair initiation was achieved by repeating the prior turn verbatim, displaying her lack of understanding of the meaning of the prior turn by saying the L1 lexical item, "*ney*?" (yes?) in a rising tone. But by the 10th month, she was starting to use the "What is ↑X" format when initiating a repair on a complex lexical item from the previous turn. This demonstrated significant progress in her adaptation to the local contingency and showed her adaptation to recipient-designed turns.

Subsection 5.2 presented Sora's changed practices regarding using L1 resources. The use of L1 resources by Sora in the earlier months (M1–3) involved the following aspects that contrast strikingly with the later use of the same resources. First, Sora was hesitant to use L1 utterances in her turn-construction and tried an L2 word search for the L1 lexical item by soliciting lexical help from Nari. Under the pre-context of the lexical asymmetry of CfL, Sora first shifted the subject by referring to Nari as "teacher" in Korean, and then she asked a question about the lexical item needed. Once she gained full lexical knowledge of the target L2 expressions from Nari, she resumed the ongoing talk. In sum, she made an insert expansion for a lexical lesson during her word search in the beginning stage.

Regarding her lexical solicitation, there were variations in TCU in the insert-expansions for word-search. Some turns were composed of the whole sentential level of TCU, such as, "*mwe.la.ko.hay.yo*? (what is it called)." Others were abbreviated to a phrase-level TCU like "↑X *ka*? (X+SUB)," as she deleted both parts "what is" and "in English." As Sora's solicitations of lexical help increased in the second and third months, Nari successfully interpreted the abbreviated version of Sora's TCU.

One final notable phenomenon that occurred in the early months was Sora's use of L1 resources in the process of self-initiated self-repair. She first resorted to the familiar L1

resources and then accessed the eligible L2 expression. Here, the use of L1 resources was not caused by her limited lexical knowledge but was related to the time gap between retrieving and producing the target item. This was connected to one of the self-initiated self-repairs. Some examples demonstrate that the lexical repair was completed in the same turn. At the same time, while other completions of self-initiated self-repair occurred after one or two turns between the repair initiation and the completion.

Sora's use of L1 resources in later stages showed quite different features. The findings demonstrate that she used the L1 resources at locations when she needed them without displaying any hesitancy. Sometimes, she used the L1 resource for a turn-holding purpose. In addition, using L1 onomatopoeia such as "*ppi.kek ppi.kek ppi.kek*" functioned as an efficient and simple solution to her great difficulty as a novice child speaker in delivering the meaning in the L2.

In general, the L1 resources used by Sora helped the progress of her storytelling in CfL, and she never received any negative feedback from the other interactant. The L1 resources in the later stage of CfL played a beneficial role in Sora's achieving more active participation in the talk-in-interaction and increased her chances of developing her story and expanding it to a broader context. At Sora's level of engagement in storytelling, it seems the progress of her talk was prioritized over word-searching or vocabulary learning in the later stage, which contrasts with her practice in the early months.

Sub-Section 5.3 showed Sora's changes in storytelling practice with more frequent initiation and expansion of stories. During the first few months, Sora was hesitant to engage in storytelling; however, in the later stages (M8–14). However, she changed to a more active participant in developing and expanding her stories by taking more opportunities for self-selecting turns and pursuing her own agendas in the storytelling. Once Sora launched into storytelling, she quite enjoyed telling her story and progressed by providing more information to the story recipient without the recipient's further elicitations or requests for more elaborations. In one of the excerpts from her storytelling on the movie she watched, she

showed great fluency without relying on filled and unfilled pauses. In addition, in her 12th month of CfL she provided a pretext for her upcoming story by giving relevant information before bringing up the topic of storytelling. This demonstrates the more adaptative context-sensitive conduct of a novice L2 speaker with sufficient conversational experience.

8.1.3 New Practices in L2 IC in the Later Stage

Chapter 6 examined Sora's three new methods (M8–14) that had not been observed previously in CfL: 1) her improved agency doing, 2) language play and playing tricks as an interactional resource, and 3) deploying embodied actions. First, her agency doing involved initiating a greeting on a video conferencing call. The other agency doing witnessed in the later stage was Sora asking for Nari's epistemic knowledge of her prior storytelling experience when preparing her next topic. She skillfully relied on the other person's memory when she could not remember whether she had touched on a particular topic. This allowed her the chance to use Nari's epistemic knowledge as an interactional resource, which was a significant adaptation to the local contingency of co-constructing the sequences based on the social context. This is another excellent example of the beauty of the co-working of two parties to accomplish one's own planned social actions. Also, Sora showed a change in letting go of the topic raised by the other party and bringing up the topic she preferred to tell. This agency doing provides evidence of her having created a space for her own purposeful and autonomous actions in the talk-in-interaction.

Sora's second new practice observed in the later stage is that she started to use language to create humor by conducting playful tricks in her storytelling. Two types of tricks have been observed: 1) making a fake story, and 2) joking around with Nari using the contextual conditions of video conferencing to achieve her own planned social actions, such as avoiding the new topic raised by Nari. These joking episodes demonstrated that their relationship as conversation partners had been well enough established that their intimacy and trust had

reached a level at which a more solid emotional bonding was possible.

The third new practice that Sora deployed was her use of embodied actions and the realia as an interactional resource. For example, she used gestures with her hands and two legs when she was short of vocabulary. Using embodied actions, the child L2 speaker could develop her topic and build sequences without needing an insert expansion for an L2 word search. Also, Sora utilized the realia in the middle of the talk to Nari when she had difficulty describing the physical object during their video conferencing. She asked the other party to look at the object via the screen rather than challenging herself to explain the object. By deploying embodied actions and realia resources, the positive changes in her storytelling practice continued more smoothly and allowed Sora to achieve her planned social actions more efficiently. These diverse methods and practices that Sora used for progress show good evidence of her increased active participation as a more dominant speaker in the contingency than before, which shows her developmental features of L2 IC.

8.2 Methodological Considerations

As CA-SLA studies lack generalizability, the current study cannot entirely avoid the criticism that it is hard to generalize to the practice of L2 learning and teaching. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the current study follows developmental CA (Pallotti & Wagner, 2011) or microgenetic CA (Pekarek Doehler & Lauzon, 2015). Microgenetic CA research prioritizes examining interactional practice and how L2 speakers change their practices and methods to accomplish their social actions. According to the CA's view of cognition, knowledge exists in contextual situations (Schegloff, 1991). Following this cognition in situ, the language learning process during talk-in-interaction shows that cognition is emergent and distributed from each moment-by-moment interaction. Sora and Nari exhibited this during their sequence-by-sequence maneuvering of the discursive nature of their talk.

The study focused primarily on the methods that Sora deployed in her conversational interactions over time. The notion of "methods" (Garfinkel, 1967) refers to systematic procedures in which community members structure their actions to be accountable to others. In addition, the use of diverse methods exhibits a greater ability to communicate in the community, providing a better tailored sense of intersubjectivity in the course of social actions. These are two critical points that the current study provides to educators and researchers.

As Skogmyr Marian and Balaman have claimed (2018, p. 3), "microgenetic CA stayed away from presenting IC as a full-fledged theory and instead focused on observable, micro-levelled interactional aspects of speakers' competence." The current study does not intend to make generalizable conclusions, but simply asserts empirical evidence from the longitudinal CfL sessions in the EFL context. In addition, the practices and methods that have been observed in the study were beneficial changes for the L2 novice child. However, caution is still needed in categorizing them as the development of IC. The author perceives the changes as positive gains for the novice child L2 speaker to accomplish her goals in the social context. However, we shall avoid naming the various phenomena observed in the study "development" for now. The findings of the study also need to be considered with the challenging question, "what is due to development over time, and what is due to a change in local context?" (Hall et al., 2011, p. 7).

8.3 Pedagogical Implications

Using the conversational analytic method, the current study has provided empirical evidence of the power of regular interaction for a novice L2 child with an L1-sharing adult partner in the EFL context. The novice L2 child showed steadily increasing participation in telling her personal life. She used updates of her storytelling and the deployment of

interactional resources to convey her intended meanings in a situated local ecology. CA studies, including the current one, have clearly contributed to a higher level of understanding of language use and learning in the SLA field. Unfortunately, however, these findings have not been widely communicated to a broader audience of language educators and practitioners (Mori, 2021).

As a researcher and practitioner in South Korea, the author is convinced that CA-for-SLA studies can offer significant benefits in language education. There remain, however, huge differences in epistemological and conceptual differences in understanding of how language learning occurs among different stakeholders in the field (Pekarek Doehler, 2021b). The findings of CA research can therefore open an avenue for vital collaboration between researchers and practitioners, and so bridge the gap between theory and practice.

Both in-service and pre-service teachers can achieve a more accurate assessment of EFL learners' L2 use in socio-interactive settings through exposure to such descriptive and dialogic data and analysis. By examining L2 students' moment-by-moment activities, they can also think flexibly about what options L2 learners should choose in classroom activities. In addition, teachers' awareness of the co-constructing features of L2 interaction can contribute to developing more authentic L2 materials and programs, which will ideally reduce the overemphasis on drills using patterned dialogues that currently occupy too much space in both classrooms and in textbooks. Those who grasp the genuine nature of conversational interaction and its benefits for language learning will learn to prioritize learners' L2 practice in socially meaningful contexts. This will allow L2 speakers to gain significant benefits in their L2 IC when they participate in recurrent interactional activities in and outside of the classrooms, as has been shown in the current study. These changes in educational institutions can best be achieved when experts in the field of CA-for-SLA collaborate with practitioners in educational institutions. Such collaboration between the two groups will best be promoted by testing the use of L2 in interactional contexts in educational institutions. As a practitioner in the field, the author does not think the entire K-12 in South Korea needs to adopt the development of IC as

a goal. It should be sufficient for only a small group of teachers to adopt teaching L2 to "learning-as-participation" and to test the learners' interactional behavior in social contexts for performance tests. This will hopefully create the desired washback effect on curriculum design and teaching practices. To conduct this type of performance test, teachers need to be connected with and get together with like-minded teaching professionals with the same goal.

The whole area of L2 IC in the SLA field is still in the pioneering stage. Pekarek Doehler (2021) states that L2 is "one of the historically most under-analyzed objects of SLA research" (p. 418). She argues that this has become a major stumbling block for current educational issues, including curriculum design, teaching, and testing, as well as for educational policies. What is needed now is a decisive move toward an epistemological understanding of L2 learning when it is distributed and put to use in and through social interaction. This means that researchers and practitioners need to depart from the focus on the individual language learner and his or her language production.

L2 IC is still in its embryonic stage, and needs extensive further research to establish how L2 speakers best use interactional resources to overcome the hurdles of L2 speakers. The current research study has empirically demonstrated the process of a novice L2 speaker's change in interactional behaviors. Hopefully, it has offered a small contribution to the pioneering field of L2 IC, which will encourage more pedagogical activities among practitioners in the field.

8.4 Directions for Future Research

Each L2 speaker has their own interactional repertoires based on their own experience of L2 interactions and developmental routes. One interesting phenomenon is that Sora's motivation to learn new vocabulary from Nari decreased as time passed. She became more motivated and active in storytelling her experiences when Nari's identity as a mere story

recipient was more active than when Nari acted as a helper, interaction manager, or teacher-like figure, coinciding with the chronological time order. Sora enjoyed being the dominant figure in the mundane talk-in-interaction, regardless of the asymmetries of L2 expertise, which clearly differs from the common CfL dynamics reported in earlier studies (Kasper, 2004; Kasper & Kim, 2015). Sometimes she acted as an instructor on a certain topic in which she had expertise, which is clear evidence of the fluidity of identity. More in-depth research on the variables that affect novice child L2 speakers' participation in the CfL interaction would offer very useful guidance to educators and researchers by giving insights into the developmental features of L2 IC.

The role of the story recipient should also be explored more deeply, which the current study has not attempted due to limitations of space. The responses of the story recipient can shape and project the following contingent actions of the storyteller. Kim (2016) has revealed L2 learners' improved recipiency along the longitudinal time period of conversation interactions. The teacher's responses in the classroom setting have also been explored using the conversational analytic method (Seedhouse, 2004a); however, sequential analysis of recipiency in the storytelling in CfL sessions has not yet been examined. As the interaction between mothers and children have mostly been chosen to examine the effects of the mothers' recipiency on the children's language development, the stances and responses of the storytelling recipient in dyadic L2 interactions are expected to provide the basis for guidelines that could help the L2 speaker engage more actively in the interaction.

The diversification of linguistic patterns and vocabulary development could also be excellent topics for future direction with novice L2 learners participating in CfL sessions. The data set of the current study has some new emerging linguistic patterns in the repair work under the context of social interactions. In addition, the turn design and sequence organization are affected by the use of L2 vocabularies in the dyadic interaction. This study has omitted analysis of these topics, leaving them as appropriate directions for future research.

Another issue that concerns the researcher is whether the novice L2 speaker's use of

diversified methods is valid empirical evidence for the development of L2 IC. What criteria can measure categories of IC development, or a single phenomenon in this specific contingency? Waring (2022) pointed out in her study comparing the different storytelling practices at ages 3 and 8 that observation can simply entail different responses, but not necessarily convey more competence. The term "development" itself suggests some sort of improvement from the prior time period. However, it is necessary to consider the different contingencies that novice L2 child speakers manage at different ages and proficiency levels. This issue has not been answered in the current study but requires more empirically based research.

Lastly, the practical issue of pedagogically applying CfL in the institutional setting requires future research to allow more L2 learners to experience interactions that can allow them to create initiatives from their interactional and linguistic resources. This research has shown the future possibility of practically placing the peer-to-peer groups' constellation for CfL in both institutional and non-institutional settings. The novice L2 learner did not depend heavily on the other party in either the linguistic or interactional context, but figured out how to move forward in the interaction herself by deploying various methods and practices that she gathered from her mentor in that contingency. As far as I know, a longitudinal-based study with a novice child L2 speaker has not been previously explored in the classroom setting or in the wide world. Young (1999) has proposed more studies of novice L2 speakers' interactional features, and the current study is a small contribution to this. This researcher hopes to carry out further studies of CfL among novice L2 speakers and to reveal the delicate nature of IC and its development. This will contribute considerably to the body of work on L2 IC, L2 interaction, L2 learning, and CA-for-SLA.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action*. Cambridge University Press.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.

Bae, E. Y., & Oh, S. Y. (2013). Native speaker and nonnative speaker identities in repair practices of English conversation. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *36*(1), 20-51.

Balaman, U. (2016). *A conversation analytic study on the development of interactional competence in English in an online task-oriented environment.* Unpublished PhD Thesis. Hacettepe University.

Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (2015). "I told you": Storytelling development of a Japanese learning English as a Second Language. In T. Cadiemo & S.W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 271-304). De Gruyter Mouton.

Bateman, A., & Danby, S. (2013). Recovering from the earthquake: Early childhood teachers and children collaboratively telling stories about their experiences. *Disaster Management and Prevention Journal*, *22*(5), 467–479.

Bateman, A. (2020). Young children's affective stance through embodied displays of emotion during tellings. *Text & Talk*, *40*(5), 643–668.

Bateman, A., Danby, S., & Howard, J. (2013). Everyday preschool talk about Christchurch earthquakes. *Australian Journal of Communication*, *40*(1), 103–122.

Bateman, A., Danby, S., & Howard, J. (2015). Using conversation analysis for understanding children's talk about traumatic events. In M. O'Reilly & J. Lester (Eds.), *Handbook of child mental health*: *Discourse and conversation studies* (pp. 402–421). Palgrave.

Beach, W. A. (1993). Transitional regularities for 'casual' "Okay" usages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *19*(4), 325-352.

Bell, N. D. (2011). Humor scholarship and TESOL: Applying findings and establishing a research agenda. *TESOL Quarterly*, *45*(1), 134-159.

Bell, N., & Pomerantz, A. (2019). Humor in L2 pragmatics research. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics* (pp. 63-77). Routledge.

Berger, E., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2018). Tracking change over time in storytelling practices: A longitudinal study of second language talk-in-interaction. In *Longitudinal studies on the organization of social interaction* (pp. 67-102). Palgrave Macmillan.

Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Boblett, N. R. (2020). *Working on understanding in the adult ESL classroom: A collaborative endeavor*. Teachers College, Columbia University.

Braine, G. (2010). *Nonnative speaker English teachers: Research, pedagogy, and professional growth*. Routledge.

Brouwer, C. E., & Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of applied linguistics, 1*(1), 29- 47.

Butler, C., & Weatherall, A. (2006). "No, we're not playing families": Membership categorizationin children's play. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *39*(4), 441–470.

Button, G., & Casey, N. (1984). Generating topic: The use of topic initial elicitors. In M. Atkinson (Ed), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp.167-190). Cambridge University Press.

Cabrero, M. T. (2013). *Developing interactional competence through video-based computer-mediated conversations: Beginning learners of Spanish*. The University of Iowa.

Canale, M. (1983). On some dimensions of language proficiency. In J. W. Oller (Ed.) *Issues in Language Testing Research* (pp. 333–42). Rowley.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied linguistics*, *1*(1), 1-47.

Carroll, D. (2000). Precision timing in novice-to-novice L2 conversations. Issues in Applied Linguistics, *11*(1), 67-110.

Carroll, D. (2005) Vowel marking as an interactional resource in Japanese novice EFL conversation, in K. Richards and P. Seedhouse (Eds.), In *Applying Conversation Analysis* (pp.214-234). Palgrave Macmillan.

Cekaite, A. (2007). A child's development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*(1), 45-62.

Cekaite, A. (2017). What makes a child a good language learner? interactional competence, identity, and immersion in a Swedish classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *37*, 45-61.

Cekaite, A., & Aronsson, K. (2005). Language play: a collaborative resource in children's L2 learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *26*, 169–191.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *6*(2), 5-35.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. Jossy-Base Inc.

Clark, H. H., & Tree, J. E. F. (2002). Using uh and um in spontaneous speaking. *Cognition*, *84*(1), 73-111.

Clayman, S. (2013). Agency in response: The role of prefatory address terms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *57*, 290–302.

Cook, G. (1997). Language play, language learning. *ELT Journal*, *51*, 224-231.

Cook, G. (2000). *Language play, language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DaSilva Iddings, A., & Jang, E. (2008). The mediational role of classroom practices during the silent period: A new-immigrant student learning the English language in a mainstream classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *42*, 567–589.

Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality* (Vol. 38). Multilingual Matters.

De Jong, K. (2016, July). Evolutionary computation: a unified approach. In *Proceedings of the 2016 on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion* (pp. 185-199).

Deppermann, A., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2021). Longitudinal conversation analysis-introduction to the special issue. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *54*(2), 127-141.

Dewaele, J. M. (2018). Why the dichotomy 'L1 versus LX user' is better than 'native versus non-native speaker'. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(2), 236-240.

Dewaele, J. M., Bak, T. H., & Ortega, L. (2021). Why the mythical "native speaker" has mud on its face. In V. Slavkov, S. Melo-Pfeifer, & N. Kerschhofer-Puhalo (Eds), *Changing Face of the "Native Speaker": Perspectives from multilingualism and globalization*, 23-43. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Dewey, J. (1916). Nationalizing education. *Journal of Education*, *84*(16), 425-428.

Dings, A. (2014). Interactional competence and the development of alignment activity. *The Modern Language Journal, 98(*3), 742-756.

Duff, P. A. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *30*, 169-192.

Edwards-Groves, C., & Davidson, C. (2017). *Becoming a meaning maker: Talk and interaction in the dialogic classroom*. Primary English Teaching Association Australia.

Emirbayer, M., & Mische, A. (1998). What is agency?. *American Journal of Sociology*, *103*(4), 962-1023.

Eskildsen, S. W. (2012). L2 negation constructions at work. *Language Learning*, *62*(2), 335–372.

Eskildsen, S. W. (2018). Building a semiotic repertoire for social action: interactional competence as biographical discovery. *Classroom Discourse*, *9*(1), 68-76.

Eskildsen, S. W. (2019). Learning behaviors in the wild: How people achieve L2 learning outside of class. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, S. Pekarek Doehler., & A. P. Piirainen-Marsh, *Conversation Analytic Research on Learning-in-Action,* (pp. 105-129). Springer, Cham.

Eskildsen, S. W., & Theodórsdóttir, G. (2017). Constructing L2 learning spaces: Ways to achieve learning inside and outside the classroom. *Applied linguistics, 38*(2), 143-164.

Farina, C., Pochon-Berger, E., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2012). Le développement de la compétence d'interaction:une étude sur le travail lexical. *Travaux neuchâtelois de linguistique*, *57*, 101-119.

Filipi, A., Ta, B. T., & Theobald, M. (2022a). Storytelling Practices in the Home Between Speakers of Different Languages: Section Introduction. In A. Filipi, B.T. Ta, & M. Theobald (Eds.), *Storytelling Practices in Home and Educational Contexts* (pp. 337-341). Springer Nature.

Filipi, A., Ta, B. T., & Theobald, M. (Eds.). (2022b). *Storytelling Practices in Home and Educational Contexts: Perspectives from Conversation Analysis*. Springer Nature.

Firth, A. (2009). Doing not being a foreign language learner: English as a lingua franca in the workplace and (some) implications for SLA. *IRAL. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 47*(1), 127-156.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, *81*(3), 285-300.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*, 800-819.

Forrester, M. A. (2008). The emergence of self-repair: A case study of one child during the early preschool years. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *41*(1), 99–128.

Freed, B. F. (Ed.). (1995). *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (Vol. 9). John Benjamins Publishing.

Freese, J. & Maynard, D. W. (1998). Prosodic features of bad news and good news in conversation. *Language in Society*, *27*(2), 195–219.

Galaczi, E. D., & Taylor, L. B. (2020). Measuring Interactional Competence. In P. Winke, & B. Brunfaut (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition and Language Testing* (pp. 338-348). Routledge.

Galloway, N. (2008). Native Speaking English Teachers in Japan: From the Perspective of an Insider. *Journal of English as an International Language*, *3*, 127–188.

Gardner, R. & Wagner, J. (2004). *Second Language Conversations.* A&C Black.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Prentice-Hall.

Garland, J. (2010). 'I am under cool': Humorous mock-translation as a claim to expertise in an Irish language class. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, *4*(1), 27-44.

Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (2008). Second language acquisition (3rd edition). Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1963). Embarrassment and Social Organization. In N. J. Smelser & W. T. Smelser (Eds.), *Personality and social systems* (pp. 541–548). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goodwin, M. H. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children*. Indiana University Press.

Goodwin, M. H., & Goodwin, C. (1Hall986) Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica*, *62*(1/2), 51-75.

Goodwin, M. H., & Kyratzis, A. (2011). Peer language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B.B. Schiefflein (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 365–390). Blackwell.

Greer, T. (2016). Learner initiative in action: Post-expansion sequences in a novice ESL survey interview task. *Linguistics and Education, 35*, 78–87.

Greer, T. (2019). Initiating and delivering news of the day: Interactional competence as joint-development. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *146*, 150-164.

Greer, T., Ishida, M., & Tateyama, Y., (2017). Interactional competence in Japanese as an additional language: an overview. In: Greer, T., Ishida, M., Tateyama, Y. (Eds.), *Interactional Competence in Japanese as an Additional Language* (pp. 1-15). National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Griffiths, R. (1991). Pausological Research in an L2 Context: A Rationale, and Review of Selected Studies. *Applied Linguistics*, *12*(4), 345-64.

Hall, J. K. (1999). A prosaics of interaction: The development of interactional competence in another language. In E. Hinkel(Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 137-151). Cambridge University Press.

Hall, J. K. (2004). Language learning as an interactional achievement. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 607-612.

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., Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.). (2011). *L2 interactional competence and development*. Multilingual Matters.

Hall, J. K., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). L2 Interactional Competence and Development (Chapter 1). In JK Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 1-15). Multilingual Matters.

Hauser, E. (2003). *'Corrective recasts' and other-correction of language form in interaction among native and non-native speakers of English: The application of conversation analysis to second language acquisition*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Hauser, E. (2005) Footing and identity in interaction at a conversation club. In B. Preisler, A. Fabricius, H. Haberland, S. Kjaerbeck, and K. Risager (Eds.), *Consequences of Mobility* (pp.28-44). University of Roskilde, Denmark, Department of Language and Culture.

Hauser, E. (2008) Nonformal institutional interaction in a conversation club: Conversation partners' questions. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *5*, 275–295.

Hauser, E. (2017). Avoiding initiation of repair in L2 conversations-for-learning. *Pragmatics*, *27*(2), 235–255.

He, A. W., & Young, R. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency*, *14*, 1-24.

Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Multilingual Matters.

Hellermann, J. (2009). Looking for evidence of language learning in practices for repair: A case study of self-initiated self-repair by an adult learner of English. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *53*(2), 113-132.

Hellermann, J. (2011). Members' methods, members' competencies: Looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated repair. In JK Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development*, 147-172.

Hellermann, J. (2018). Languaging as competencing: Considering language learning as enactment. *Classroom Discourse*, *9*(1), 40—56.

Heritage, J. (1984a). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J.(1984b). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Polity Press.

Horasan, S. (2014). Code-switching in EFL classrooms and the perceptions of the students and teachers . *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *10* (1), 31-45.

Hosoda, Y. (2006). Repair and relevance of differential language expertise in second language conversations. Applied Linguistics, *27*, 25-50.

Housen, A., & Kuiken, F. (2009). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language acquisition. *Applied linguistics*, *30*(4), 461-473.

Hymes, D. (1974): *Foundations in Sociolinguistics. An Ethnographic Approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

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). University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

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). Natl Foreign Lg Resource Ctr.

Jacoby, S., & Gonzales, P. (1991). The constitution of expert-novice in scientific discourse. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *2*(2), 149-181.

Jacoby, S., & Ochs, E. (1995). Co-construction: An introduction. *Research on language and social interaction, 28*(3), 171-183.

Jefferson, G. (1978). Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J. Schenkein, (Ed), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*, 219-248. Academic Press.

Jefferson, G. (1988). On the sequential organization of troubles-talk in ordinary conversation. *Social Problems*, *35*(4), 418–441.

Jin, Y., Kim, Y. H., & Chen, M. H. (2022). Alignment, Affiliation, and Engagement: Mothers' Wow in Parent-Child Interactions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *55*(3), 279-298.

Kahng, J. (2012). How long should a pause be? Effects of cut-off points of pause length on analyzing L2 utterance fluency. In *Poster presented at Fluent Speech Workshop, Utrecht, The Netherlands*.

Kahng, J. (2014). Exploring utterance and cognitive fluency of L1 and L2 English speakers: Temporal measures and stimulated recall. *Language Learning*, *64*(4), 809-854.

Kanagy, R. (1999). Interactional routines as a mechanism for L2 acquisition and socialization in an immersion context. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*(11), 1467-1492.

Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Interlanguage studies bulletin (Utrecht)*, *8*(3), 203-231.

Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 551-567.

Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view? *International Review of Applied Linguistics* , *47*, 11-36.

Kasper, G., & Kim, Y. (2015). Conversation-for-learning: in institutional talk beyond classroom. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 390-408). Wiley Blackwell.

Kasper, G., & Monfaredi, E. (2021). Storytelling as instructional practice in Persian language classrooms. In J. Wong & H.Z. Waring (Eds.), *Storytelling in multilingual interaction* (pp. 119-161). Routledge.

Kasper, G., & Prior, M. T. (2015). Analyzing storytelling in TESOL interview research. *TESOL Quarterly, 49*(2), 226-255.

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). A conversation-analytic approach to second language acquisition. *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*, 117-142.

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2014). Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *34*, 171-212.

Kidwell, M. (2005). Gaze as social control: How very young children differentiate "the look" from a "mere look" by the adult caregivers. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *38*(4), 417–449.

Kidwell, M., & Zimmerman, D. H. (2006). "Observability" in the interactions of very young children. *Communication Monographs*, *73*(1), 1–28.

Kim, D. R. (2019). Emergence of proactive self-initiated self-repair as an indicator of L2 IC development. *Applied Linguistics*, *41*(6), 901-921.

Kim, D. R. (2020). Exploring searching as evidence of development in interactional competence. *Language Research*, *56*, 73-95.

Kim, S. (2019). "We Limit Ten Under Twenty Centu Charge Okay?": Routinization of an Idiosyncratic Multi-word Expression. In *Conversation Analytic Research on Learning-in-Action* (pp. 25-49). Springer.

Kim, Y. (2016). Development of L2 interactional competence: Being a story recipient in L2 English conversation. *Discourse and Cognition*, *23*(1), 1-28.

Kim, Y. (2017). Topic initiation in conversation-for-learning: Developmental and pedagogical perspectives. *English Teaching*, *72*(1), 73-103.

Kim, Y. (2019). 'What is Stoyr-Steruh Type?' Knowledge Asymmetry, Intersubjectivity, and Learning Opportunities in Conversation-for-Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *40*(2), 307-328.

Kim, Y., & Carlin, A. P. (2021). "How was your day?" Development of Interactional Competence located in Today Narrative sequences. *Pragmatics*, *32*(2), 246-273.

Kim, Y., & Carlin, A. P. (2022). Story appreciation in conversations-for-learning: Stories and gestalt-contextures. In A. Filipi, B.T. Ta, & M. Theobald (Eds.), *Storytelling Practices in Home and Educational Contexts* (pp. 201-223). Springer.

Kim, Y., & Petraki, E. (2009). Students' and teachers' use of and attitudes to L1 in the EFL classroom. *Asian EFL Journal*, 11(4), 58-89.

Kivik, P. K. (2012). *Conversation-for-learning in Estonian coffee hour: An interactional linguistics perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Ko, H. (2013). Overuse of the Discourse Filler, So in Micro-teaching Talks by Koreans. *Language Research, 25*(4), 25-44.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The modern language journal*, *70*(4), 366-372.

Kunitz, S., & Jansson, G. (2021). Story recipiency in a language café: Integration work at the micro-level of interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *173*, 28-47.

Kunitz, S., & Yeh, M. (2019). Instructed L2 interactional competence. In M.R. Salaberry, & S, Kunitz (Eds.), *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence* (pp. 228-259). Routledge.

Kurhila, S. (2006). *Second Language Interaction*. John Benjamins.

Kurniawati, K., & Rizki, D. (2018). Native vs. non-native EFL teachers: Who are better?. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *5*(1), 137-147.

Lee, Y.–A., & Hellermann, J. (2014). Tracing developmental changes through conversation analysis: Cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*,*48*, 763–788.

Lehtimaja, I. (2011). Teacher-oriented address terms in students' reproach turns. *Linguistics and Education*, *22*(4), 348-363.

Lennon, P. (1990). Investigating fluency in EFL: A quantitative approach. *Language Learning*, *40* (3), 387-417.

Lerner, G. H. (1992). Assisted storytelling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter. *Qualitative Sociology*, *15*(3), 247–271.

Li, W. (2002). "What do you want me to say?" On the conversation analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society*, *31*(2), 159–180.

Liddicoat, A. (1997). Interaction, social structure, and second language use: A response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal*, *81*(3), 313-317.

Lucarevschi, C. R. (2016). The role of storytelling on language learning: A literature review. *Working Papers of the Linguistics Circle of the University of Victoria*, *26*(1), 24–44.

Mandelbaum, J. (1989). Interpersonal activities in conversational storytelling. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, *53*(2), 114–126.

Mandelbaum, J. (2012). Storytelling in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 492–508). Cambridge University Press.

Markee, N. (1994). Toward an ethnomethodological respecification of second language acquisition studies. In E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Research methodology in second-language acquisition* (pp. 88–116). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Markee, N. (1995). Teachers' answers to students' questions: Problematizing the issue of making meaning. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *6*, 62–92.

Markee, N. (2000). Conversation analysis. Routledge.

Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(3), 404-427.

Markee, N. (2011). Doing, and justifying doing, avoidance. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(2), 602-615.Pek

Markee, N. (2015). *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction*. John Wiley & Sons.

Markee, N. (2018). Dealing with late students. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Conversation Analysis (ICCA). University of Loughborough, Loughborough, UK.

Markee, N. (2019). Some theoretical reflections on the construct of interactional competence. In M.R. Salaberry, & S. Kunitz (Eds.), *Teaching and Testing L2 Interactional Competence* (pp. 60-76). Routledge.

Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*, 491-500.

Markee, N., & Kunitz, S. (2015). CA-for-SLA studies of classroom interaction: Quo vadis. In N. Markee (Ed), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 425-439). Wiley.

Markee, N., & Seo, M. S. (2009). Learning talk analysis. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *47*, 37–63.

Martin, C., & Sahlström, F. (2010). Learning as longitudinal interactional change: From other-repair to self-repair in physiotherapy treatment. *Discourse Processes*, *47*(8), 668-697.

Masuda, K. 2011. "Acquiring Interactional Competence in a Study Abroad Context: Japanese Language Learners' Use of the Interactional Particle Ne." *The Modern Language Journal 95*(4), 519–540.

Maynard, D. W. (1997). The news delivery sequence: Bad news and good news in conversational interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *30*(2), 93–130.

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more?. *ELT Journal*, *46*(3), 340-349.

Monfaredi, E. (2022). Exiting a storytelling sequence in Persian language classrooms. A. Filipi, B.T. Ta, & M. Theobald, (Eds.), *Storytelling Practices in Home and Educational Contexts* (pp. 261-282). Springer.

Mori, J. (2003). The construction of interculturality: A study of initial encounters between Japanese and American students. *Research on language and social interaction*, *36*(2), 143-184.

Mori, J. (2007). Border crossings? Exploring the intersection of second language acquisition, conversation analysis, and foreign language pedagogy. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*, 849-862.

Mori, J. (2021). Between researchers and practitioners: Possibilities and challenges for applied conversation analysis. *Classroom-based Conversation Analytic Research*, 407-415.

Nao, M. (2010). The preallocation of student topic nomination and negotiated compliance in conversation-for-learning. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice*, *7*(3), 251-272.

Nao, M. (2015). 'So You Are from England': Categorization and Cultural Reduction in First-time Conversation Lounge Encounters between Foreign Teachers and Japanese Students of EFL. *Applied Linguistics*, *36*(2), 194-214.

Nguyen, H. (2011a). A longitudinal microanalysis of a second language learner's participation. In G. Pallotti, & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 17–44). University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Nguyen, H. (2011b). Achieving recipient design longitudinally: Evidence from a pharmacy intern in patient consultations. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 173–205). Multilingual Matters.

Nieminen, J. H., Tai, J., Boud, D., & Henderson, M. (2021). Student agency in feedback: beyond the individual. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *47*(1), 1-14.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge university press.

Ochs, E., & Taylor, C. (1992). Family narrative as political activity. *Discourse and Society*, *3*(3), 301–340.

Ortega, L., & Iberri-Shea, G. (2005). Longitudinal research in second language acquisition: Recent trends and future directions. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *25*, 26-45.

Palloti, G. (2001). External appropriations as a strategy for participating in intercultural multi-party conversations. In Di Luzio, A., S. Guenthner, & F. Orletti (Eds.), *Culture in communication* (pp. 295-334). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Pallotti, G., & Wagner, J. (Eds.). (2011). *L2 Learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives*. Natl Foreign Lg Resource Ctr.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: On language and learning from a conversation analytic perspective on SLA. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, & C. Jenks (Eds.), *Conceptualising 'learning' in applied linguistics* (pp. 105–126). Palgrave Macmillan.

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. (2019). On the nature and the development of L2 interactional competence: State of the art and implications for Praxis. In M.R. Salaberry, & S. Kunitz (Eds), *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence*, (pp. 25-59). Routledge.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2020). Conversation Analysis and Second Language Acquisition: CA-SLA. In C.A. Chapelle (Ed), *The concise encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp.287-295). Wiley.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2021a). How grammar grows out of social interaction: From multi-unit to single-unit question. *Open Linguistics*, *7*(1), 837-864.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2021b). L2 Interaction competence and L2 education. In S. Kunitz, N. Markee, N. & O. Sert (Eds.), *Classroom-based Conversation analytic Research* (pp.417-424). Springer.

Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2016). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(4), 555-578.

Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2019). On the reflexive relation between developing L2 interactional competence and evolving social relationships: A longitudinal study of word-searches in the 'wild'. *In Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action* (pp. 51-75). Springer.

Pekarek Doehler, S., & Lauzon, V. F. (2015). Documenting change across time: Longitudinal and cross-sectional CA studies of classroom interaction. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp.409-424). Wiley Blackwell.

Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: Evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization and repair organization and preference organization. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-Based Perspectives on Second Language Learning* (pp. 233–268). Mouton de Gruyter.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics*. Lawrence Erlbaum

Peters, A., & Boggs, S. T. (1986). Interactional Routines as Cultural Influences upon language acquisition. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language Socialization Across Cultures*, (pp. 80-96). Cambridge University Press.

Pham, J. (2021). The fallacy of native-speakerism in English language education. In R. T. Torres, K. Leung, & V. Soepriatna (Eds.), *Outside and In-Between: Theorizing Asian-Canadian Exclusion and the Challenges of Identity Formation* (pp. 177-186). Brill.

Pomerantz, A. M. & Mandelbaum, J. (2005). A conversation analytic approach to relationships.pdf. In K.L. Fitch, & R.E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction* (pp. 149–171). Psychology Press.

Reddington, E., & Waring, H. Z. (2015). Understanding the sequential resources for doing humor in the language classroom. *Humor*, *28*(1), 1-23.

Riazantseva, A. (2001). Second language proficiency and pausing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *23*, 297-526.

Richards, K., & Seedhouse, P. (Eds.). (2005). *Applying conversation analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Rieger, C. L. (2003). Repetition as self-repair strategies in English and German conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *35*(1), 47-69.

Riggenbach, H. (1991). Towards an understanding of fluency: A microanalysis of nonnative speaker conversation. *Discourse Processes*, *14,* 423-441.

Rine, E. F., & Hall, J. K. (2011). Becoming the teacher: Changing participant frameworks in international teaching assistant discourse. In JK Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 Interactional Competence and Development* (pp. 244-274). Multilingual Matters.

Roever, C., & Kasper, G. (2018). Speaking in turns and sequences: Interactional competence as a target construct in testing speaking. *Language Testing*, *35*(3), 331-355.

Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (pp. 337–353). Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1984). Doing "being ordinary." In J. M. Atkinson & J. C. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 413–429). Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation* (Vols. 1 & 2, G. Jeferson, Ed.). Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, *50*(4), 696-735.

Salaberry, M. R., & Kunitz, S. (Eds.). (2019). *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice*. Routledge.

Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication: An* introduction (3rd ed.). Blackwell.

Scarcella, R. (1988). Conversational analysis in L2 acquisition and teaching. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *9*, 72–91.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, *70*(6), 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics 12: Discourse and syntax* (pp. 261-286). Academic Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk*, *71*, 71-93.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. *Talk and social organization*, *1*(1), 70-85.

Schegloff, E. A. (1988). On an actual virtual servo-mechanism for guessing bad news: A single case conjecture. *Social Problems*, *35*(4), 442–457.

Schegloff, E. A. (1989). Reflections on language, development, and the interactional character of talk-in-interaction. In M. H. Bornstein & J. S. Bruner (Eds.), *Interaction in human development* (pp. 139–153). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991) Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. Resnick, J. Levine, and S. Teasley (Eds). *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition* (pp. 150-171). American Psychological Association.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997a). Third turn repair. In G. R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Toward a social science of language: Papers in honour of William Labov*, *Volume 2* (pp. 31–40). John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997b). "Narrative Analysis" Thirty Years Later. *Journal of narrative and life history*, *7*(1-4), 97-106.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). 'On granularity'. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 715–720.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I* (Vol. 1). Cambridge university press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2013). Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair. In M. Hayashi, G. Raymond, & J. Sidnell (Eds), *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding* (pp.41-70). Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53*(2), 361-382.

Schegloff, E., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S., & Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *22*, 3-31.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, *7*, 289–327.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. E. (1986). *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1977). Opening encounters. *American sociological review*, *42*(5), 679-691.

Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Wiley.

Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, *38*, 165-187.

Seedhouse, P. (2012). What kind of interaction receives high and low ratings in oral proficiency interviews? *English Profile Journal*, *3*, 1–24.

Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh University Press.

Sert, O. (2017). Creating opportunities for L2 learning in a prediction activity. *System*, *70*, 14–25.

Sert, O. (2019). Classroom interaction and language teacher education. In S. Walsh & S. Mann. (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English language teacher education* (pp. 216-238). Routledge.

Sert, O., & Balaman, U. (2018). Orientations to negotiated language and task rules in online L2 interaction. *ReCALL*, *30*(3), 355-374.

Sert, O., & Walsh, S. (2013). The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education*, *27*(6), 542–565.

Shea, D. P. (1994). Perspective and production: Structuring conversational participation across cultural borders. *Pragmatics*, *4*(3), 357-389.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, *17*, 38-62.

Skogmyr Marian, K., & Balaman, U. (2018). Second language interactional competence and its development: An overview of conversation analytic research on interactional change over time. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *12*(8), 1-16.

Stivers, T. (2008). Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *41*(1), 31–57.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting?, *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(4), 760-770.

Svennevig, J. (2000). Getting acquainted in conversation. *Getting Acquainted in Conversation*, 1-393. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2001). *Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects*. Longman, Pearson Education.

Taguchi, N. (2014). Development of interactional competence in Japanese as a second language: Use of incomplete sentences as interactional resources. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*(2), 518-535.

Taguchi, N., & Roever, C. (2017). *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Tarone, E. (1977). 'Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report' in Brown, H.D. and R. Crymes (eds.): *On TESOL*' 77: Teaching and Learning ESL. Washington, DC: TESOL.

Tarone, E. (2000). Getting serious about language play: Language play, interlanguage variation and second language acquisition. In *Social and cognitive factors in second language acquisition: Selected proceedings of the 1999 Second Language Research Forum* (pp. 31-54). Cascadilla Press.

Tavakoli, P. (2011). Pausing patterns: Differences between L2 learners and native speakers. *ELT Journal*, *65*(1), 71-79.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). SAGE.

Theobald, M. (2019). Scaffolding storytelling and participation with a bilingual child in a culturally and linguistically diverse preschool in Australia. *Research on Children and Social Interaction*, *3*(1–2), 224–247.

Theodorsdottir, G. (2011). Second language interaction for business and learning. In J. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp.93-116). Multilingual Matters.

Theodórsdóttir, G. (2018). L2 teaching in the wild: A closer look at correction and explanation practices in everyday L2 interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *102*, 30–45.

Tomasello, M. (2003). The key is social cognition. *Language in mind: Advances in the Study of language and thought*, 47-57.

van Dam, J. (2002). Ritual, face, and play in a first English lesson. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 237-265). Continuum.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Wagner, J. (2004). The classroom and beyond. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 612–616.

Wagner, J. (2015). Designing for language learning in the wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning* (pp. 75-102). De Gruyter Mouton.

Wagner, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. & González-Martínez, E. (2018). Longitudinal research on the organization of social interaction: Current developments and methodological challenges. In J. Wagner, S. Pekarek Doehler, & E. González-Martínez (Eds), *Longitudinal studies on the organization of social interaction* (pp. 3-35). Palgrave Macmillan.

Waring, H. Z. (2011). Learner initiatives and learning opportunities in the language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, *2*(2), 201-218.

Waring, H. S. (2013). 'How was your weekend?': Developing the interactional competence in managing routine inquiries. *Language Awareness*, *22*(1), 1-16.

Waring, H. Z. (2019). Developing interactional competence with limited linguistic resources. In M. R. Salaberry, & S. Kunitz (Eds.), *Teaching and Testing L2 Interactional Competence* (pp. 215-227). Routledge.

Waring, H. Z. (2022). Participating in storytelling at ages 3 and 8. In A. Filipi, Ta. Thanh, B.T. Ta & M. Theobald (Eds.), *Storytelling Practices in Home and Educational Contexts* (pp. 47-71). Springer.

Watanabe, A. (2017). Developing L2 interactional competence: Increasing participation through self-selection in post-expansion sequences. *Classroom Discourse*, *8*(3), 271-293.

Wells, G. (1981). *Learning through interaction: The study of language development*. Cambridge University Press.

Weissglass, J. (2012). Listen first, then teach. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *93*(6), 29-33.

Willemsen, A., Gosen, M. N., Koole, T., & De Glopper, K. (2020). Teachers' pass-on practices in whole-class discussions: how teachers return the floor to their students. *Classroom Discourse*, *11*(4), 297-315.

Woolley, J. (2002, July). Second language classroom conversation and membership categorizations. *Paper presented at the British Association for Applied Linguistics (BAAL)*/Cambridge University Press (CUP) seminar "Conversation Analysis and Applied Linguistics. University of Newcastle Upon Tyne.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers.* Routledge.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (Eds.). (2021). *Storytelling in multilingual interaction: A conversation analysis perspective*. Routledge.

Wong, J., & Olsher, D. (2000). Reflections on conversation analysis and nonnative speaker talk: An interview with Emanuel A. Schegloff. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *11*(1), 111-127.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2017, March). Pause and preference in second language talk. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL), Portland, OR.

Wooton, A. J. (1997). *Interaction and the Development of Mind*. Cambridge University Press.

Youn, S. J. (2020). Managing proposal sequences in role-play assessment: Validity evidence of interactional competence across levels. *Language Testing*, *37*(1), 76-106.

Young, R. F. (1999). Sociolinguistic approaches to SLA. *Annual review of applied linguistics*,

19, 105-132.

Young, R. F. (2000) '*Interactional competence: challenges for validity*.' Paper presented at a joint symposium 'Interdisciplinary Interfaces with Language Testing' held at the annual meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics and the Language Testing Research Colloquium, 11 March 2000, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Young, R. F. (2007). Language learning and teaching as discursive practice. In Z. Hua, P. Seedhouse, L. Wei & V. Cook (Eds), *Language learning and teaching as social interaction* (pp. 251-271). Palgrave Macmillan.

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 volume II* (pp. 426-443). Routledge.

Young, R. F. (2019). Interactional competence and L2 pragmatics. In N. Taguchi (Ed), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics* (pp. 93-110). Routledge.

Young, R., & He, A. W. (Eds.). (1998). *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (Vol. 14). John Benjamins Publishing.

Young, R. F., & Miller, E. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 519-535.

APPENDIX A: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

(adapted from Jefferson, 2004)

(.)	untimed perceptible pause within a turn (micropause, less then 0.3s)
(1.0)	pause (length of the pause in seconds, to one decimal place.)
<u>words</u>	stress
WORDS	very emphatic stress/high volume
↑	marked pitch increase
↓	marked pitch decrease low pitch on word
.	sentence-final falling intonation
?	yes/no question rising intonation
,	phrase-final intonation (more to come)
¿	up-down intonation, as in an open question, or weak rising intonation
_	flat intonation, neither rising nor falling
:	lengthened vowel sound (extra colons indicate greater lengthening)
=	latch (direct onset or no space between two unites)
→	highlights point of analysis
[words]	overlapped talk; to reflect the simultaneous beginning and ending of the overlapped talk, extra spacing is used
∘words∘	spoken softly/decreased volume
#words#	creaky voice
> <	increased speed
<>	decreased speed
<	the first part of the speech is accelerated, but the speed then normalises
( )	(empty parentheses) transcription impossible
(words)	uncertain transcription
.hhh	inbreath (more hs indicate a longer inbreath)
hhh	laughter (more hs indicate more laughter)
$words$	spoken in a smiley voice
(( ))	analyst's notes

APPENDIX B: ABBREVIATIONS

DM	Discourse marker
OBP	Objective particle
POL	Polite speech level suffix
PST	Past tense suffix
QUOT	Quotative particle
SUB	Subject marker

ABSTRACT IN KOREAN

본 연구는 초급 영어 학습자인 한국 9 세 아동이 한국 성인과 나누는 영어 학습을 위한 대화(Conversation-for-Learning)에서 상호 작용하는 양상을 대화 분석으로 살펴본 종단 사례 연구이다. 14 개월 동안 51 회에 걸쳐 약 28 시간 동안 진행된 영어 학습을 위한 대화는 본 연구에 참여한 한국 아동 학습자가 지닌 영어 상호 작용 능력의 장기적인 변화 과정상 특징들을 보여주고 있다. 새롭고 좋은 일 나누기 및 독서 후 활동으로 이루어진 대화는 회당 30 여 분간 진행하였고, 질문에 대한 응답 방식, 말 차례 구성 방식, 이야기 전개 방식에 초점을 두고 상세히 분석하였다. 장기적인 종단 연구 기간 동안 영어 학습을 위한 대화에 정기적으로 참여한 아동은 다양한 언어적 의사소통 자원을 배우고 활용하면서 한정된 제 2 언어 자원의 제약을 극복하고 제 2 언어 상호작용 측면에서 긍정적인 변화를 경험하였다.

대화 분석 결과 다음과 같은 특징이 발견되었다. 첫째, 아동 학습자는 스스로 먼저 말 차례를 정하여 대화에 참여하는 빈도가 증가하였고 점차 더 긴 말 차례 구성 성분(TCU)을 만들며 이야기 전개에 적극적으로 참여하였다. 이 과정에서 아동 학습자는 다양한 방법의 교정 실행(repair practice)과 다양한 모국어 자원을 활용하였고, 자신의 삶과 연계되는 영역으로 이야기를 확장시키기도 하였다. 연구 참여 9~14 개월 차에는 주체적인 참여자로서의 특징이 부각되었는데, 유머와 농담을 구사하고 신체적 행위나 실제 도구를 자원으로 이용하는 등 자신이 계획한 사회적 행위들을 이루고자 다양한 자원을 적절하게 활용하였다.

둘째, 아동 학습자와 성인 대화 상대자가 공통의 모국어를 공유하는 점은 아동 학습자가 성인 대화 상대자에게 도움을 요청하는 것과 상호 주체성의 유지에 기여하였다. 대화 참여자 간 언어적 능력의 차이는 의사소통의 어려움을 야기하기 보다는 상호 오해의 가능성을 낮추고 모국어 자원을 다양한 상호 작용 양상에 적용함으로써 대화상의 문제를 해결하는 데 기여하였다. 이는 초급 영어 학습자가 의사소통 능력에 결함이 있는 제 2 언어 화자가 아니라 다양한 자원을 바로 사용할 수 있는 능숙한 화자로 변할 수 있음을 보여주고 있다.

셋째, 영어 학습을 위한 대화는 제 2 언어 상호 작용 능력 발달에 기여하는

265

자원을 적절하게 제공할 수 있다. 자신의 이야기를 지지하는 모습을 보이는 청자에게 아동 학습자는 보다 정교하고 효율적이고 다양한 방법을 사용하여 이야기함으로써 자신이 수행하고자 하는 것을 성취하였다. 이러한 화자 관계 구조에서는 외국어로서 영어를 학습하는 아동에게 영어 학습을 위한 대화의 적용 가능성을 탐색해볼 수 있다.

넷째, 제 2 언어 초급 학습자의 상호 작용 능력은 시간이 지남에 따라 학습자의 능숙도 수준별로 단순한 대답부터 적극적인 참여까지 다르게 나타났으며, 대화 참여 의지가 강해지면서 휴지(pause) 장치와 말 메움(filler) 자원을 사용하는 교정 실행 능력이 향상되었다. 후기에는 사회적 실행 성취를 위해 모국어를 사용하는 새로운 방식의 변화가 나타났다.

본 연구는 제 2 언어습득을 위한 대화분석(CA-for-SLA) 연구의 대상을 제 2 언어 초급 학습자로 확장하면서 대화분석의 연구방법이 제 2 언어 초급 학습자의 상호작용 측면과 언어적 자원의 활용을 통한 제 2 언어 상호 작용 능력의 발달 연구에 적합한 것을 보여주었다. 대화분석으로 도출된 결과는 제 2 언어 능숙도가 인지적 영역과 사회적 영역에 공존하는 것을 보여준다.