AJAL

Oiling the epistemic engine in intercultural L2 talk with short tokens of surprise

Sajjad Pouromid
Graduate School of Human Sciences, Osaka University, Japan

The construct of interactional competence has expanded our understanding of competence in an L2 beyond grammatical accuracy prioritizing appropriateness in language use over accuracy. In order to contribute to the existing knowledge around this construct, this study deals with the way L2 learners, without complete mastery over the linguistic system of their second language, may be able to maintain the flow of their intercultural talk through managing their epistemic stance dynamically. Building upon data collected from online video and audio interactions among Japanese and Taiwanese learners of English as a foreign language, the study shows how the utterance of short tokens and expressions of surprise alters a speakers' epistemic stance towards an emerging intercultural topic, hence allowing the conversation to continue smoothly. The findings also suggest that the participants would determine their epistemic stance on a moment-by-moment basis and without orienting to pre-existing categories such as their nationalities. This study makes use of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis as its framework to unravel how the management of epistemic stance contributes to the maintenance of the flow of talk, subsequently indicating L2 speakers' interactional competence.

Keywords: Interactional competence; epistemic stance; conversation analysis; EFL; Japanese learners of English; Taiwanese learners of English

Introduction

Linguistic competence was once conceived of as a language user's knowledge of syntax, morphology and phonology. This view, which stemmed from the innatist accounts of language learning underlining the role of human cognition in learning a language (Chomsky, 1959), came under criticism from Hymes (1971). Central to Hymes' contention was the argument that any theory of language disregarding the social aspects of its use lacks comprehensiveness. As a reaction against this theoretical inadequacy, Hymes introduced the concept of communicative competence (CC) as the knowledge of using language appropriately in various social contexts. Clearly enough, CC regarded language use as inherently social (Hall, 2018), but its subsequent application to language teaching (Canale & Swain, 1980) and testing (Bachman, 1990) models rendered it a static and individualistic ability (Hall & Pekarek Doehler, 2011). That is to say, rather than considering the ability to use language appropriately socially co-constructed by the interactants in a given interaction, CC was more concerned with a language user's individual proficiency. In the late 1980s and during the 1990s, however, along with developments in conversation analytic (CA) research, the more dynamic and socially grounded construct of interactional competence (IC) was introduced to address this perceived shortcoming in CC.

Interactional competence and epistemics

IC was first introduced to second language acquisition (SLA) research by Kramsch (1986) and deals with the way L2 learners manage to communicate in a second language without much difficulty despite being not yet fully competent in it. Kramsch's argument was that SLA research was too narrowly concentrated on accuracy and its aim was finding ways to help L2 learners master the grammatical system of the second language. She claimed this results in overlooking the dynamic process of human interaction, which is often characterized with collaboration, negotiation and accommodation prioritizing content and communication over form and accuracy. Consequently, she proposed an "interactionally-oriented curriculum" (1986, p. 369), which considered the development of IC necessary for the acquisition of a second language. This curriculum was designed to critically evaluate language use rather than language as a system of abstract rules. The construct of IC was explored by other scholars in the field, most of whom opted for an ethnomethodological and CA study of the construct (Seedhouse, 2011; Sert, 2019; Walsh, 2006). One of the many aspects CA studies have covered is how L2 speakers manage their epistemic stance to maintain intersubjectivity or mutual understanding (as an attempt to maintain the flow of talk) despite gaps in their L2 linguistic repertoire (Rusk, Pörn, & Sahlström, 2016).

In broad terms, epistemics in CA research concerns the knowledge claims that speakers in a sequence of interaction make and defend on a turn-by-turn basis. It is a common understanding in the fields of sociology, social psychology and linguistics that parties in an interaction are constantly seeking joint understanding or intersubjectivity partly through recognizing who knows what about the world and then organizing the structure of their interaction based on that recognition (Heritage, 2012). Having access to particular knowledge gives a speaker epistemic rights in the interaction. The right endowed to a speaker and recognized by other speakers in an interaction may reflect the social distribution of knowledge in predefined epistemic communities (Holzner, 1968). An example for this can be found in a doctor-patient interaction where epistemic rights over medical knowledge has to be given to the doctor to avoid communication problems. This concept is referred to as *epistemic status* (Heritage, 2013).

Epistemic status can be decided, agreed upon and oriented to even before an interaction starts. The interactants' status is defined on a continuum ranging from more knowledgeable (K+) to less knowledgeable (K-) (Heritage & Raymond, 2012). The status of the interactants may vary between the extremes of absolute inequality to absolute equality, with degrees of relative equality between them. The entitlement to a particular epistemic status does not merely concern professional knowledge, and individuals may be deemed more knowledgeable on topics related to their own thoughts, feelings, relatives and family among others (Raymond & Heritage, 2006). To sum up, epistemic status concerns what is known by whom as well as the possessor's rights and responsibilities regarding the knowledge.

While epistemic *status* is a result of social relationships and dynamics, epistemic *stance* (Heritage, 2013) deals with the moment-by-moment position takings of individuals in a sequence of interaction. It is therefore closer to the essence of CA studies that highlight the accomplishment of social actions on a moment-by-moment basis. Rather than orienting to predefined social categories to determine individuals' epistemic status, parties in an interaction may use a range of resources to organize their epistemic stance. One approach is alternation in grammatical structure which Heritage (2013, p. 377) explains through the following examples sentences:

1. "Are you married?"
2. "You're married, aren't you?"
3. "You're married."

The propositional content of the three sentences is the same. However, while sentence 1 upgrades the recipient's stance to K+ and downgrades the speakers' stance to K-, sentences 2 and 3 put the speaker in a more knowledgeable stance. These epistemic stances bear interactional consequences as well. While sentence 1 invites the recipient to expand the sequence and elaborate on the information; sentence 3 has a case closing function. Adhering to the responsibilities these positions assign to parties is also crucial for establishing and maintaining intersubjectivity. While a K- speaker is expected to use hedging, ask questions, etc., a K+ party has the right to make assertions. Heritage (2012) uses the metaphor of an engine to discuss the role of epistemic stance in a conversation. The proper functioning of this epistemic engine produces enough energy for the interaction to continue. But the epistemic engine also needs oiling which is achieved in a number of ways. The above example shows how grammar alternation can oil the epistemic engine but there are many other ways, including the use of expressions of surprise, which is the focus of the present paper.

Expressions of surprise are common features of human spoken interactions. A wide range of utterances can count as expressions of surprise from phrases such as "my gosh!" to short tokens like "oh!" The literature shows that such expressions have been well-documented and studied largely in the fields of ethnomethodology and discursive psychology. Research in these fields often uses CA approaches to understand how people organize their interactions in context-specific manners. There seem to be a consensus among these studies that expressions of surprise are interactionally organized performances that build up to a particular interactional achievement (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006). A number of studies have focused on how the utterance of the short token of surprise *oh* can determine the structure of the turns coming after it. Particularly when uttered at the beginning of turns, *oh* is found to have an important role establishing a relationship between the turns preceding it and those coming afterwards (Heritage, 2002). In question-answer sequences, for example, an *oh*-prefaced response problematizes the question that is posed prior to it, challenging its relevance or appropriateness (Heritage, 1998). Expressions of surprise can also function as a state changing token through establishing, maintaining or disrupting what Stivers (2008) calls alignment between a speaker's and a listener's state of knowledge. Short tokens and expressions of surprise are so obvious and omnipresent in spoken interactions that their interactional significance can easily be underrated. However, they are used by speakers in an interaction to perform a variety of actions including the fluid management of epistemic stance resulting in maintaining the flow of interaction.

In relation to IC, it is not only the ability of L2 speakers in producing grammatical utterances that account for their communication success. Their ability to handle the emerging interactional issues can predict their competence in the use of language. No matter how accurate communicators' speech might be, they might sound incompetent if they fail to appreciate the epistemics in the interaction and orient to them accordingly.

Methodology
The present study focuses on the maintenance of intersubjectivity through uttering short tokens of surprise. It examines, from a CA perspective, how L2 learners from different cultural backgrounds manage to align their talk according to the epistemic requirements

of the interactions. The participants in this study were Japanese (JL) and Taiwanese (TL) EFL learners engaged in intercultural discussions as a part of an online cultural exchange programme at their universities. As a part of this programme, students were required to discuss cultural topics, assigned to them by their teachers, in small mixed nationality groups outside their classes. The data for this study comprised recording of these interactions which took place on Skype or other teleconferencing applications. The interactions were recorded by the participants and submitted to their teachers. Informed consent to use this interaction data anonymously was granted by participants. The medium of discussions in the data was English since the two groups of learners did not share a first language. This is often the case with online intercultural exchanges where participants are from different countries and hence have to speak a shared foreign language. There were 16 students registered for the Japanese class and 18 students for the Taiwanese class, all of whom had English proficiency levels of pre-intermediate or intermediate (roughly equivalent to A2 and B1, respectively, in the common European framework of reference for language guideline) according to their school placement tests. In line with the tenets of data collection in CA research, no demographic information except English proficiency level and nationality was collected from the participants. The participants' turn-by-turn participation in the interactions is the focus in CA and it is accessed via the emic perspective of participants (Clift, 2016).

This paper analyses the participants' use of short tokens and expressions of surprise to manage their epistemic stance using for illustration excerpts from the dataset which comprised over 10 hours of interaction. The excerpts selected for analysis feature Jeffersonian transcription to grasp all verbal and non-verbal intricacies of the talk (Jefferson, 1984, see the appendix for a guide).

Results and discussion

One way the participants determined their epistemic stance was by uttering short tokens and expressions of surprise such us *"oh!"* The results show that this feature is particularly used when a speaker assumes a K- position and wants to assign a K+ role to the other speaker in the interaction. In their intercultural discussions participants they had to swiftly shift between K- and K+ roles depending on the propositional content of the interactions. As the following excerpts illustrate, they did not rely on the predefined categories of their nationalities to achieve the social action of claiming a K+ or falling into a K- epistemic stance.

In Excerpt 1, four Taiwanese learners and one Japanese learner are discussing their favourite sweet foods in Taiwan and Japan. More specifically, the Taiwanese learners, only two of whom take turns here, are telling the Japanese learner about desserts in Taiwan.

Excerpt 1. Managing epistemic stance by short tokens and expressions of surprise

```
1    TL3: So maybe we can talk (1.0) tell you some dessert in Taiwan=
2  JL11:=ok=
3    TL3:=in our school nearby our school↓ (1.0)
4  JL11: ok (2.0)
5    TL3: do you like dessert? ((holding her smart phone screen with the
          photo of a dessert closer to the camera to let JL11 can see
          it))
6  JL11: yeah (.) ((bringing herself closer to the camera/screen to see
          the photo shown by TL3)) [what]
7    TL3:                          [blue]berry [cake]
8    TL5:                                 [blueberry] [cake]
```

```
   9 JL11: [cheese]cake?
  10  TL3: [yes]blueberry cheesecake
  11  TL5: [yes]
  12 JL11: ye:::s wo:::w ((raises her eyebrows))
  13  TL3: ((laughs))
→14 JL11: yeah I like cakes so: >it is< blueberry↑
  15  TL3: yeah blueberry
→16 JL11: cheesecake?
  17  TL3: yes (.) ehm=
  18 JL11: oh I like tha:t
  19  TL3: ((chuckles)) you can [come]
  20 JL11:                      [yea::h]↓
  21  TL3: to Taiwan next time and eat this
→22 JL11: oh↓
  23  TL5: in Ilan ((a city in Taiwan))
→24 JL11: what?
  25  TL5: Ilan in Ilan
  26  TL3: yes
→27 JL11: o:::h↓
  28  TL3: ILAN (.) it's next to Taipei (2.0)
  30 JL11: a:::h (1.0) so::
  31  TL3: ((shows JL11 another photo of a dessert on her phone))
  32 JL11: a:::h↑matcha? ((a special green tea in Japan))
  33  TL3: [yes]
  34  TL5: [yes]
  35  TL3: I love mota-matcha ((repeats trying to pronounce it better))
  36 JL11: a:::h↑ yeah yeah↓
  37  TL3: ((laughs))
→38 JL11: so in Kyoto:↓ so many=
  39  TL3: =uh=
  40 JL11: =matcha dessert (.) in Kyoto
→41  TL3: really↑
  42 JL11: ((nods))
→43  TLs: o::h
  44 JL11: yeah↑
  45  TLs: ((talking to each other in Chinese))
  46 JL11: Kyoto in Chinese how do you say Kyoto in Chinese?
  47  TL3: huh↑
  48 JL11: Jingdu↑ ((Chinese for Kyoto)) Jingdu is Kyoto↑
→50  TL3: yes
  51 JL11: o:::h↑Jingdu↓ in Jingdu you can lot of matcha desserts↓
  52  TL3: o:::h
  53  TLs: o:::h
  54 JL11: yeah
  55  TL3: uh so this is there↓
  56 JL11: yeah↓ (1.0)
```

The excerpt starts with TL3's regulatory comment telling JL11 what they are doing from this point on. After a brief introduction, TL3 shows JL11 a photo of a dessert on her phone (turn 5). It turns out that the dessert is a blueberry cheesecake. TL3 and TL5 refer to the dessert as "blueberry cake" in turns 7 and 8 and it is JL11 who for the first time refers to it as a cheesecake framed in a question-like utterance. What follows this is TL3's confirmation in turn 10, and in turn 11 TL5 also confirms JL11's proposition. JL11's prolonged "yes wow" indicates that she has understood her Taiwanese peers since she does not ask for further clarifications at this point. However, it is important to notice how JL11 asks "it is blueberry?" again in turn 14. An interactional interpretation for this is that JL11 opts for a K- stance regarding the topic at hand. Although from the previous turns it is evident that all participants in this interaction already know that the photo features a blueberry cheesecake, not asking this question and a subsequent one in turn 16

puts JL11 in a K+ stance and requires her to expand the sequence. Another important point is that in turn 4 a two-second pause occurs after a completed utterance without TL3 or TL5 self-selecting as the next speaker. Silence can become awkward in the absence of next speakers taking turns (Enfield, 2017) hence potentially imposing pressure on the current speaker (JL11) if she does not wish to continue. JL11's questions, which downgrade her stance, lead to the initiation of a new sequence by TLs going on until turn 21 where TL3 tells JL11 that she could try the dessert in question in a city called Ilan in Taiwan. Once again, the short tokens in turns 22, 24 and 27 (*oh* and *what?*) uttered by JL11 downgrade her stance and hence absolve her of the responsibility to expand the sequence.

In turn 31, TL3 shows JL11 a photo of another dessert on her phone and from here on the epistemic stances of the participants change. As the subsequent turns reveal, the photo features a matcha (a special Japanese green tea) dessert. JL11's response to this is yet another short token but this time with a prolonged vowel and a rising intonation. Although this is also an expression of surprise, it is different from the previous short tokens, such as the one in turn 27, which were uttered with a falling intonation. This rising intonation, as the following turns indicate (turn 38), is an upgrade for JL11 to the K+ stance. In turn 38, JL11 explicitly claims epistemic superiority over the other speakers by initiating a new sequence saying that Kyoto (a city in Japan) has different kinds of matcha desserts. Now, TL3 quickly aligns herself with JL11's new stance by expressing her surprise word "really?" in turn 41, which is followed by other TLs' short token *oh* in turn 43. Switching between epistemic stances occurs frequently even in this very short excerpt, another example can be found in the turns following turn 46. In this turn, JL11 tries to use the Chinese name for the city Kyoto. For some reason she already knows the name of the city in Chinese but frames it first in the question-like utterance "Jingdu?" with a rising intonation and then the more explicit question "Jingdu is Kyoto?" in order to keep a lower epistemic stance. Once she receives a confirmation from the allegedly more knowledgeable (regarding the Chinese language) speaker in turn 50, she quickly upgrades her stance in turn 51 by saying "Jingdu" with a falling intonation and then completing her sentence at a TRP. Here, once again, TL3, as well as other TLs in the interaction, downgrade their stance to K- by saying *oh* as an expression of surprise with prolonged vowels.

Another example of how learners manage to maintain intersubjectivity and the flow of interaction by positioning themselves dynamically in different epistemic stances is provided in Excerpt 2. In this excerpt, which is taken from the same sequence of interaction as the one presented above, JL11 initiates the sequence by positioning herself in the K+ epistemic stance about a topic which is generally accepted to reside closer to the epistemic domain of the Taiwanese students rather than her. What follows shows that she has been to Taiwan before and this puts her in the position to claim for a K+ stance. However, at one point, later in the sequence, JL11 retreats from this position and switches to a K- stance.

Excerpt 2. Moving outside and inside one's epistemic domain

```
→1  JL11: and Taiwan is famous for (.) broken ICE↓ (2.0)
 2   TL3: broken ice↓
 3  JL11: yeah↓ mango: o::r=
 4   TL3: =[yes]
 5   TL5:  [yes]
 6  JL11: so broken ice (2.0) I ate (1.0) uh ice broken [ice]
```

```
  7  TL3:                                              [cha bing]
            ((礤冰 Chinese for ice))
  8  JL11: like you know?
  9  TL3: oh↑ I know I know↓ ehm (.) it's (.) it has a
            ((incomprehensible)) (2.0) cha bing it's (1.0) in Taiwan (1.0)
            say (.) cha bing↓
→10  JL11: u:::h↑
 11  TLs: ((talking to each other in Chinese, incomprehensible))
 12  JL11: wait wait wa-wa-wa-wa-wa- (1.0) wait a second ((sending a photo
            to TLs on the Skype application on her smart phone))
 13  TL3: ok↓ (3.0)
 14  JL11: yeah (.) I take >I took< a picture in Taiwan
→15  TL3: o:h↑
 16  JL11: yeah yeas so I ate (.) I ate THIS ((sends the photo)) (2.0) I
            ate THIS
 17  TLs: ((talking to each other in Chinese while coming closer to the
            camera/screen to see the photo))
 18  JL11: I took this
 19  TL3: ok
 20  JL11: send a picture (.) can you the picture? Can you see the
            picture?
 21  TLs: yea::h
 22  JL11: yeah I ate this
→23  TLs: o::::h ((laughs and raises her eyebrows))
 24  JL11: yeah it is very it was very delicious↓
 25  TL3: yes
 26  JL11: and so::: (.) yeah
 27  TL3: I seldom eat this in Taiwan (.) it's a little expensive
 28  TL5: yeah↓
 29  JL11: yeah↓ [u::h]
 30  TL3:      [mango] is a little [expensive]
 31  JL11:                         [((nods quickly))]
 32  TL3: and it only (.) u::h eat in summer ((incomprehensible, to other
            TLs in Chinese))=
 33  JL11: =u::h↓ yeah yeah yeah yeah↓ so in Japanese oh >no no no no< ehm
            Japan has the same broken ice
 34  TL3: yeah↓=
 35  JL11: =but not fluffy (3.0)
 35  TL3: hum↑
 36  JL11: not FLUFFY↓
 37  TL3: not profit↓
 38  JL11: yeah↓
 39  TL3: what's what's
 40  TL5: prof=
 41  TL3: =profit (5.0)
 42  JL11: yeah ((searching for an appropriate English word))
 43  TLs: ((in Chinese, incomprehensible))
 44  TL3: not profit ((in Chinese, incomprehensible))
 45  JL11: UH ok↓ >ok ok ok ok ok< shaved ice (2.0) shaved ice
 46  TL5: shaved ice↑
 47  TL3: shaking ice↑
→48  JL11: yes (3.0) ((TLs look confused)) so Taiwan is famous for mango?
→49  TL3: uh yes [it's]
 50  JL11:        [o:::h] ((looks surprised))
 51  TL3: trip (.) uh trap- ((talks to other TLs in Chinese))
 52  TL5: TROPICAL
 53  TL3: yes it's tropical fruit (3.0)
→54  JL11: yea::h↑ nigh- when I went to:: Taiwan I went to night market
 55  TLs: o::h
 56  JL11: yes and I saw a lot of [tropical]
 57  TL3:                        [which one?]
 58  TL5: do you know which one?
 59  TL3: do you know which one? Night [market]
```

```
   60 JL11:                               [Shilin] ((name of the night
            market in Taiwan))
   61  TL3: yeah↑ ((laughs))
→62 JL11: so big night market the most big night market in Taiwan?
   63  TL3: oh no↑ it's Feng Chia ((another night market in Taichung in
            Taiwan)) night market yes yes I'm from  [Taichung]
   64 JL11:                                         [o:::h]
   65  TL3: ((laughs))
   66 JL11: hu:::h (.) yeah↓ and and there I ate a lot food (1.0)
   67  TL3: f food?
   68 JL11: I had a lot dinner in Shilin night market
   69  TL3: u:::h
   70 JL11: yes it is very cheap=
   71  TL3:=YES
   72 JL11: yeah and very tasty so (.) yeah I ate a lot of food↓
```

At the beginning of the sequence, JL11 displays her knowledge in a domain, which could be outside her epistemic domain: although she is Japanese, she is stating a fact about Taiwan at this moment. In fact, she argues that Taiwan is famous for what she calls now "broken ice" but later on refers to as "shaved ice." TLs do not challenge JL11's epistemic stance since as the interaction unfolds it is known that JL11 has prior first-hand experience about Taiwan and is hence legitimate to claim a K+ stance. The term *broken ice* however seems to be a source of difficulty earlier in the sequence. That is why TL3 in turn 7 says what the term could possibly mean in their own native language so that other TLs can follow what JL11 is talking about. It is important to notice how JL11's short token and expression of surprise (turn 10) temporarily position her as K-. This is temporary since, as the following turns show, JL11 still possesses a K+ role regarding the topic and it is only her lack of knowledge about the Chinese equivalent for *broken ice* that makes her fall into a K- role for a while. After that, and to clarify further what she is talking about, JL11 sends a photo (turn 12) of the object in question to TLs, and in turn 14 ascertains that she took the photo in Taiwan, which solidifies her K+ claimed before. TL3's "*oh*" (turn 15) with a rising intonation verifies JL11's K+ role once again. This continues until the photo is sent and TLs have access to it and utter their surprise with a prolonged "*oh*" in turn 23. Although this short token positions them as K- here, it does not mean that they do not have epistemic control over the topic. This "*oh*" is rather a state changer downgrading TLs epistemic stance merely regarding the photo sent by JL11.

In turn 33 JL11 starts a sub-topic about the so-called *broken ice* in Japan, which is clearly a topic outside TLs' domain and well within her own domain. Following this, however, TLs do not readily display a sign of downgrading their stance, and as turns 35, 37, 39, 41 reveal the reason is that they do not understand the word (*fluffy*) used by JL11 to describe Japanese broken ice. After a few exchanges, JL11 comes up with a better word (turn 45) to describe the object in the photo offering the term *shaved ice* as a replacement for *broken ice*. Clarification requests by TL5 and TL3 in turns 46 and 47, however, prove this futile and a long pause occurs in turn 48 as JL11 refrains from providing further explanations. As a result, a very noticeable shift of epistemic stance occurs again by JL11 at this point. While JL11 had positioned herself earlier in this sequence in turns 1 and 3 as K+ regarding Taiwan's being famous for "mango broken ice," in turn 48 she retreats from that position and claims a K- one. Playing a K+ role makes the speaker accountable for explanations and clarifications. After a long pause in turn 48, however, it is seen that JL11 does not provide further explanations. Instead, she asks a question "so Taiwan is famous for mango?" the answer to which clearly resides within the TLs' domain. After this question and with the expression of surprise in turn 50, JL11's K- position becomes an acceptable one and TLs take on the K+ role once again. Such shifts often occur

frequently in line with the interactional demands of the moment and can be seen in turn 54 too, where JL11 reverts to a K+ role this time about night markets in Taiwan. Her claim about the size of the market in turn 62 however is repaired by TL3 and in the rest of the sequence both JL11 and TL3 hold relatively equal stances about the topic.

The two excerpts elaborated upon here indicate how shifting epistemic stance can be a tool for avoiding breakdowns in interaction and maintaining the flow of talk. It is in part realized through the production of short tokens and expressions of surprise regardless of the interlocutors' predictable epistemic domains, which in this case are their nationalities. Speakers make use of interactional devices to expose their desirable epistemic stance to their interlocutors. Once this implicit message is received by the interlocutors and oriented to, intersubjectivity is achieved and the flow of talk is maintained.

Conclusion

This single-case analysis study, with a CA methodology, investigated the role of expressions and short tokens of surprise in maintaining the flow of interaction in intercultural L2 talk. The findings of this study corroborate what prior research in this area had offered while also suggesting that alternations between K- and K+ epistemic stances would enable L2 learners to keep the flow of their interactions while talking with peers from a different culture. Interestingly, this happened among learners who did not have mastery over the linguistic system of the L2 they were using. Thus, it seems safe to argue that from an IC point of view, the participants in this study showed clear signs of competence in the appropriate management of their L2 conversation in the context of the task they were engaged in. However, things would probably have been very different had they taken a speaking test primarily concerned with measuring accuracy. Maintaining the flow of talk in this study was an enterprise undertaken by all the participants rather than any single one of them. Assessing the ability of learners to have context-sensitive conduct (Pekarek Doehler & Berger, 2018) may well entail evaluating their interlocutors' ability to do so. As research in IC has shown, language use is, by nature, situated and co-constructed. Concerns with testing and evaluation aside, there are also issues regarding how L2 learners' IC is developed in the language classroom.

This study suggests that further research is needed on the extent to which language teaching textbooks and materials develop aspects of learners' IC and the extent to which language teachers allocate class time to raising their learners' awareness of interactional intricacies. The legitimate move away from an undue emphasis on grammaticality towards a balanced attention to accuracy and appropriateness currently seen in language learning and teaching theories should be reflected in the classroom.

About the author

Sajjad Pouromid is a specially appointed assistant professor at Kansai University, Japan. He has a Ph.D. in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) from Arak University, Iran, and a second Ph.D. in Transformative Education from Osaka University, Japan. Sajjad's current research interests include ethnomethodological and conversation analytic studies of social interaction with a focus on interactions taking place in technology-mediated learning environments.

References

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1-47.

Chomsky, N. (1959). A review of B.F. Skinner's verbal behaviour. *Language, 35,*, 26-58.

Clift, R. (2016). *Conversation analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Enfield, N. J. (2017). *How we talk: The inner workings of conversation*. New York: Basic Books.

Hall, J. K. (2018). From L2 interactional competence to L2 interactional repertoires: Reconceptualising the objects of L2 learning. *Classroom Discourse, 9*(1), 25-39.

Hall, J. K., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). L2 interactional competence and development. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellerman, & S. P. Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 1-15). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Heritage, J. (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society, 27*(3), 291–334.

Heritage, J. (2002). Oh-prefaced responses to assessments: A method of modifying agreement/disagreement. In C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence* (pp. 196-224). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heritage, J. (2012). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 45*(1), 30-52. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.646685

Heritage, J. (2013). Epistemics in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 370-394). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2012). Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions. In J.-P. de Ruiter (Ed.), *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives* (pp. 179-192). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holzner, B. (1968). *Reality construction in society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman.

Hymes, H. D. (1971). *On communicative competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jefferson, G. (1984). Transcript notation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. ix-xvi). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *Modern Language Journal, 70*(4), 366-372. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05291.x

Pekarek Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2018). L2 Interactional Competence as Increased Ability for Context-sensitive Conduct: A Longitudinal Study of Story-openings. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(4), 555–578.

Raymond, G., & Heritage, J. (2006). The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society, 35*(5), 677-705. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506060325

Rusk, F., Pörn, M., & Sahlström, F. (2016). The management of dynamic epistemic relationships regarding second language knowledge in second language education: Epistemic discrepancies and epistemic (im)balance. *Classroom Discourse, 7*(2), 184-205.

Seedhouse, P. (2011). Conversation analytic research into language teaching and learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 345-363). London: Routledge.

Sert, O. (2019). The interplay between collaborative turn sequences and active listenership: Implications for the development of L2 interactional competence. In M. R. Salaberry & S. Kunitz (Eds.), *Teaching and testing L2 interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 142-166): Milton: Routledge.

Stivers, T. (2008). Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 41*(1), 31–57.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routledge.

Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2006). Surprise as an interactional achievement: reaction tokens in conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 69*(2), 150–182.

Appendix A: Transcription Symbols (based on Jefferson, 1984)

Symbol	Name	Use
[text]	Brackets	Indicates the start and end points of overlapping speech.
=	Equal Sign	Indicates the break and subsequent continuation of a single interrupted utterance.
(# of seconds)	Timed Pause	A number in parentheses indicates the time, in seconds, of a pause in speech.
(.)	Micropause	A brief pause, usually less than 0.2 seconds.
. or ↓	Period or Down Arrow	Indicates falling pitch.
? or ↑	Question Mark or Up Arrow	Indicates rising pitch.
,	Comma	Indicates a temporary rise or fall in intonation.
-	Hyphen	Indicates an abrupt halt or interruption in utterance.
>text<	Greater than / Less than symbols	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more rapidly than usual for the speaker.
<text>	Less than / Greater than symbols	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more slowly than usual for the speaker.
°	Degree symbol	Indicates whisper or reduced volume speech.
ALL CAPS	Capitalized text	Indicates shouted or increased volume speech.
Underline	Underlined text	Indicates the speaker is emphasizing or stressing the speech.
:::	Colon(s)	Indicates prolongation of an utterance.
(hhh)		Audible exhalation
? or (.hhh)	High Dot	Audible inhalation
(text)	Parentheses	Speech which is unclear or in doubt in the transcript.
((italic text))	Double Parentheses	Annotation of non-verbal activity.