

A Comparative Study of L2 Interactional Competence at a Japanese University

David Shimamoto¹

Akita International University

ABSTRACT

Interactional competence (IC) is not only predicated on grammar and vocabulary knowledge, but also necessitates a pragmatic understanding of when and why such resources should be employed. Norms for turn-taking, negotiation, repair, and speech acts, such as agreeing and disagreeing are prevalent in any interaction. What differentiates classroom talk from other types of discourse is the power teachers possess to control verbal exchange. This study investigates the talk-in-interaction of a Japanese EFL university classroom in an attempt to demonstrate (1) how students navigate within the institutionalized parameters of teacher-fronted talk and (2) how the sequential organization of interaction changes during student-student group discussions. Conversation analysis was used to examine the interactional practices performed in these two common classroom settings. The results indicate that while the IC displayed during teacher-fronted discussion revolved around the ubiquitous initiation-response-feedback (IRF) sequence, learners demonstrated dissimilar IC while engaged in group discussion. Participation rights and discourse identities are discussed to elucidate the differences found between the two interactional environments. The findings presented in this paper evidence the need for teachers to consider how the underlying conditions of interactional contexts can ultimately lead to the development of equally important but inherently different interactional skills.

INTRODUCTION

Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory states that one's cognitive development is an outgrowth of the social interaction that the individual is involved in. Based on this understanding of learning, classroom interaction has garnered considerable research attention. Especially in a foreign language setting such as Japan, the structure of interaction and style of language that learners encounter in the classroom can have a profound influence on the language they use in the real world. Classrooms, like other institutional settings, are governed by pre-established rules and goals that drive verbal behavior. One aspect that differentiates language used in classrooms from natural conversation is the power that teachers possess to structure and control interaction (Seedhouse, 2009). Teacher-fronted talk can, therefore, be a double edged sword—at times facilitating learner involvement while also obstructing healthy communication (Walsh, 2002). Consequently, group work can be a highly effective departure from the “lockstep” mode of conventional teacher-led interaction, as it brings forward a number of benefits, including

¹ David Shimamoto is a graduate student in the English Language Teaching Practices program at Akita International University, Japan. Correspondence should be sent to David Shimamoto. E-mail: davidrshimamoto@gmail.com.

improved quality of student talk and increased student motivation (Long & Porter, 1985). Because both of the aforementioned settings have their advantages and disadvantages, it behooves teachers to not only carefully consider the balance of each, but also to organize interaction that synthesizes the best of both.

In order to capture the nuances of turn-taking, sequencing, repair and other interactional practices, conversation analysis (CA) has been a preeminent tool. CA methodology prescribes that researchers collect naturally-occurring data through “unmotivated looking”, which entails examining data without holding any predetermined hypotheses or theoretical assumptions (Wong & Waring, 2010). Since its entrance into the field of second language acquisition and teaching, CA has brought forth important implications in regards to how classroom interaction can be refined to enhance learning opportunities. The purpose of this paper is to use CA to demonstrate a clear juxtaposition of interaction between a teacher-fronted setting and student-student group discussions at a Japanese university.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Based on the concept of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972; Canale & Swain, 1980), emerged an expanded type of competence called interactional competence (IC). Although IC has been used with slightly different interpretations, Young (2008) attempts to clarify its meaning by outlining three important resources that participants bring to interaction. The first are identity resources, or the participation framework that is observed during interaction. This framework is constructed and transforms based on the footings or identities taken on by individuals. The second are linguistic resources, including pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary, and the ways participants construct interpersonal, experiential, and textual meaning. Last are interactional resources, which include speech acts, turn-taking, repair, and boundaries exchanges. Young (2001) makes clear that one fundamental distinction between communicative competence and IC is that “IC is not what a person knows, it is what a person does together with others” (p. 430). Similarly, Hall et al. (2011) state that IC “implies the ability to mutually coordinate our actions” (p. 2). It is apparent from these explications that IC is not simply an individual possession but is co-constructed by all involved participants.

Like all social interaction, the sequential organization of classroom talk is regulated by a speech exchange system. Markee (2000) establishes that “speech exchange systems differ from one another in terms of whether members have equal rights to participate and talk” (p. 68). In unequal power speech exchange systems, teachers often maintain control of the content by reserving the right to ask questions, thereby obligating students to answer. Moreover, these question-answer adjacency pairs tend to be followed by an explicit positive assessment (EPA), such as “good job” or “excellent”. While it has been demonstrated that this third turn evaluation helps guide and correct learner errors along with manage the class’ attention (Lee, 2007), research has also indicated that EPAs can be sequence-closing acts, as they restrict possibilities for students to give alternate interpretations, discuss comprehension problems, and initiate repair (Waring, 2008). Nonetheless, acquiring subject-matter knowledge arguably depends on students and teachers having shared knowledge about how this triadic initiation-response-feedback (IRF) sequence is constituted (Gardner, 2013).

In contrast to what can become routinized teacher talk, learner-learner interaction is more likely to lead to an equal power speech exchange system (Markee, 2000). Here, individuals have

equal participation rights, and the sequential development of dialogue is not limited by a pre-established structure. Individuals are free to engage in a wider range of behavior, such as initiating question-answer sequences and nominating topics. Removing the pressure that comes with teacher evaluation can also lead to exploratory talk, where backpedalling, hesitation, change of direction, and uncertainty are seen as desirable as learners experiment with new ways of thinking and understanding (Barnes, 1992). Taking into account how participation rights can directly influence learner involvement, it can be expected that different interactional environments—be they learner-led group work or teacher-fronted talk—are likely to result in dissimilar displays of learner IC. Consequently, as Johnson (1995) emphasizes, “if teachers wish to promote communication in second language classrooms, they need to allow for greater variability in the patterns of communication so as to maximize students’ linguistic and interactional competencies” (p. 145).

Along with the observed speech exchange system, discourse identity is also closely tied to situational variation in a learners’ IC. Zimmerman (1998) states that discourse identities reflect an individual’s respective role within a given interaction. To illustrate this, he uses an example of a call to an emergency dispatch center. The receiver of the call initially begins as a questioner to gather information about a reported robbery. The caller begins as an answer, providing the essential background information about the crime. As the conversation moves along, the caller becomes a storyteller of the emergency incident, and the call receiver becomes a recipient of the story. This example shows that discourse identities are dynamic in that they shift and become layered as interaction evolves. Along the same lines, Goffman (1981) uses the term “footing” to describe one’s alignment in accordance with the other individuals during an exchange. Shifts in footing and discourse identity are a staple of natural talk and are interpreted through the contextual and linguistic cues produced by interactants. Furthermore, although learners have a situated identity of “student”, which binds them to such institutionalized roles as “answerer” of teacher questions (Wong & Waring, 2010), their opportunities for new roles may appear as the presence of the teacher fades away. Long and Porter (1985) assert that group work enables students to take on roles that may otherwise be occupied by the teacher. This gives learners opportunities to practice using language functions and speech acts associated with those roles.

As has been discussed, there are numerous factors below the surface that influence the ways in which learners interact with each other and their teacher. The present study attempts to unpack some of these layers to determine how and why classroom interaction unfolds. Understanding these small but integral details of classroom talk are vital in designing activities that enable students to perform and develop their IC.

METHOD

Context and Participants

The present study was conducted at a Japanese university. Data was collected during an online undergraduate writing course, which was composed of sixteen first and second year students, all of whom came from a Japanese L1 background. The participants were considered to be advanced-level students, as entrance into the university required them to have a minimum TOEFL iBT score of 61. Students met for biweekly 75-minute sessions. During this particular

lesson, students were asked to discuss various topics pertaining to racism in Japan. These topics were taken from a news article that students were required to read prior to class. The lesson was organized in the following manner: First, important themes from the news article were explained to students. Students were then shown pictures and/or videos that possibly depicted these themes and were asked to share their opinions on the presented media as a whole class discussion. After this, students were assigned to one of four Zoom breakout rooms to have a group discussion on a closely related issue. This pattern was repeated twice during the session.

Data Collection

Audio and video data of classroom interaction was collected using Zoom’s built-in recording function. Two segments of teacher-fronted talk (Appendix 2 & 3) and one segment of group discussion (Appendix 4) were transcribed following CA methodology. Student names were anonymized in the transcriptions. Following the conventions of CA, the researcher did not approach data analysis with any preconceptions but, rather, let the salient features of the data speak for themselves.

RESULTS

This first excerpt comes from the beginning of the class when students were shown a series of pictures and asked to describe them within the context of racism. The following short teacher-learner exchange is in reference to a picture of Jewish prisoners at a Nazi concentration camp.

EXCERPT 1

First excerpt of teacher-fronted talk

038	Teacher	Ok. Can you tell me why it’s considered a form of racism.
039	Arisa	Because during World War II Germany discriminated Jewish because-
041		about their races. Based on the definition of racism uhm (1.0) they-
042		Uh they- I mean the Germany discriminated <u>Jewish people</u> because
043		their races so it is racism.
044	Teacher	Ok very good. Yes. So they were discriminated based on their race
045		and their religion. Excellent. ↑Let’s take a look at the second picture
046		here ((shows picture)) can someone tell me uhm what you see in this
047		picture (3.0)

Excerpt 1 shows one instance of an initiation-response-feedback (IRF) sequence. The teacher’s question at line 38 initiates the sequence. Here, Arisa is asked to explain why the picture the class is looking at might be considered racism. In response, Arisa provides her explanation from lines 39-43, and the sequence closes at line 44 with the teacher’s EPA, “Ok very good”. In this same turn, another IRF sequence begins, as the students are asked to give

their thoughts on the next picture in the series. Teacher-fronted talk from Segment 1 was a string of IRF sequences similar to Excerpt 1. Deviation from this status quo did not arrive until much later, as illustrated in Excerpt 2 below. Prior to this exchange, students were shown a video of a Japanese comedian with black face paint impersonating Louis Armstrong. Students were asked to discuss how (if at all) this video related to the concept of cultural appropriation.

EXCERPT 2
Second excerpt of teacher-fronted talk

012	Teacher	Ok. Excellent. >>Yes you have a good point here.<< So maybe it
013		creates some tension between different racial groups. Very good.
014		Anyone else? Another opinion?
015	Rina	Can I ask a question to Arisa and Kei?
016	Teacher	Yes go ahead. Sure.
017	Rina	nn:: yeah I think this:: Yamadera-san is like the kind of cultural
018		appropriation. He imitate the actor of not the all black people but
019		the person- <<Louis Armstrong>>. So I wonder where is the
020		distinguishing line between the imitation and the cultural
021		appropriation? So could you tell me how do you think?

Lines 12-14 in Excerpt 2 show the end of one IRF sequence and the initiation of another. Before the next IRF sequence gets underway, Rina unexpectedly intervenes at line 15. Here, we see an instance of cross-discussion (Lemke, 1985), as Rina wishes to directly address another student in the class but not before first seeking consent from the teacher. She does this by utilizing what Schegloff (2007) defines as “preliminaries to preliminaries” (“pre-pre”), which can be stated in a way, such as “Can I X?” or “Let me X” (p.44). This allows a speaker to introduce some preliminary information before actually performing the main intended action (in this case asking a question). Hence, Rina’s pre-pre, “Can I ask a question to Arisa and Kei?” at line 15 seems to accomplish two separate goals. First, because her desire to ask a question veers from the previously observed teacher-fronted interactional structure, she requests the teacher’s permission. Second, her “pre-pre” grants her the floor to supplement background information (lines 17-19) before performing the question itself (lines 19-21).

While the direction of teacher-learner exchange tended to be dominated by the constructs of IRF sequences, when students were put into groups, the flow of conversation was immediately distinguishable from its more rigidly constructed counterpart. The following excerpt is taken from a breakout room discussion, where students were talking about how personal experience shapes one’s perception of racism.

EXCERPT 3
First excerpt of student-student group discussion

001	Miho	So we don’t know the- how is it like to discriminated. (1.0) [We] don’t have the
-----	------	--

002	Rina	[Yeah]
003	Miho	experience about being discriminat;ing being discriminated so it's one of the
004		>>experiential perception which is<< which- (1.0) m:: fro- m:: (1.0) ((circular
005		motion with hands)) prevent us from (1.0) uh:: the:: thinking about the
006		discrimination. (2.0) °yeah°
007	Rina	Yeah most of Japanese schools like the majority of Japanese schools are
008		Japanese people so yeah I agree with that yeah (2.0) some Japanese people are
009		not used to like (1.0) have such experiences.
010	Miho	Right. (1.0)
011	Yuna	And also they're <<not many people>> who would point it out in Japanese
012		society. If- when I was in- uh when I was abroad like many people said like “oh
013		this is racism. This is like [not appropriate (1.0) and everything like- uh
014	Miho	[oh yeah] ((nodding))
015	Yuna	<<people don't really>> say that. And the- people are not really aware of the
016		fact that it could be seen as a form of cultural appropriation or racism so >>yeah
017		that's also<< like the lack of experience [in finding racism.
018	Miho	[mhm]

Excerpt 3 begins with Miho's assertion at lines 1-6 that Japanese people do not have experience being discriminated, which may prevent them from acknowledging discrimination within Japan. Rina builds on Miho's statement at lines 7-10 by suggesting that this issue may be caused in part by a lack of diversity at school. Yuna expands on this topic (lines 11-17) by bringing in her own experience of studying abroad. In this group dialogue, it was clearly noticeable that because students were not responding to questions posed by the teacher, they were able to freely steer the conversation by nominating topics and self-selecting at appropriate transition-relevance places. Additionally, there were a noticeable number of backchannels (lines 2, 10, 14, and 18), which were, by and large, absent during teacher-fronted talk.

As the same conversation progressed, the hospitable nature of discussion gave way to a minor dispute between two students. One student, Hana, argued that because Japan is an island country without a large foreigner population, Japanese people do not have the necessary experience to fully comprehend discrimination. The following excerpt shows how Hana's point of view led to an instance of disagreement.

EXCERPT 4

Second excerpt of student-student group discussion

033	Ayaka	I actually wanted to make a point on it like (1.0) uhm so you- ok like I'm- I'm
034		not attacking you or anything but you said uhm like Japan is an island country

035		<<and don't have many>> like is homogeneous but I don't actually feel like it
036		nowadays. like I feel we are just ignoring the fact that there are many foreign
037		people or like mixed people in Japan and then pretending well >>we don't- we
038		don't have them in Japan ((throwing hands in air)) so we don't have experience
039		in it.>> Like I wonder what this like >>ok it was <u>true</u> << a decade ago that there
040		were not so many like foreign people or mixed people in Japan >>but like<<
041		nowadays you see like at least one or two people in your class for example [like-=
042	Hana	[Yes]
043	Ayaka	=I live in a rural area but like [I have-
044	Hana	[That's true so I- I say that (2.0) uhm
045		>>discrimination is experiential because<< (1.0) <u>our</u> experience is still from
046		uhm some decades ago [so I mean the discrimination is experience- experiential
047	Ayaka	[mm mm mm]
048	Hana	from <u>that</u> experience in some decades ago so uhm yes=
049	Ayaka	=Yeah so we are not really adapting to like new reality [((inaudible speech))]
050	Hana	[yeah so that old
051		experience [has] big influence on our- (1.0) on our experience now.
052	Ayaka	[°mm mm mm°

Ayaka instigates the confrontation at line 33 with her disagreement preface, “I’m not attacking you or anything but”. This strategy is an attempt to delay her disagreement further back within the same turn, thereby mitigating a potential face threat to the previous speaker, Hana. Because her point is being challenged by Ayaka, Hana uses two noteworthy strategies to procure and protect her right to the floor. At lines 44 and 50, Hana is able to anticipate what Ayaka will say and, as a result, uses recognitional overlaps to take the floor away from Ayaka. At lines 44-45, Hana uses a rush-through by speeding up her speech then briefly pausing after the word “because”, a point of maximal grammatical control. This strategy enables Hana to clearly state her counter-argument and defend against any potential overlaps by Ayaka. At the same time, we can see that Ayaka backs down from her aggressive stance with backchannels (lines 47 and 52) and an acknowledgement of Hana’s point (lines 50-51). Although an aggravated face-threatening situation was averted, nimble maneuvering was required on the part of both students.

DISCUSSION

One unmistakable feature of the teacher fronted-talk exemplified through this data is the recurrence of the IRF structure. Upon closer inspection, it is apparent that the displays of IC

during this setting were an attempt to act within the confines of this type of teacher-learner exchange. The teacher had the power to nominate topics, ask questions, and select students, whereas students had much more limited participation rights. They could only speak up during their designated “response” space of the IRF sequence, and the types of responses they could give were limited based on the topics nominated by the teacher. As was demonstrated in Excerpt 2, there was an instance of divergence from this structure. However, even when a student attempted to nominate her own topic and other-select classmates, she did so in a way that acknowledged the existing structure of interaction. Her desire to gain permission before straying from this structure was further evidence that there were institutionalized “rules” that students were abiding by. This finding highlights the underlying presence of a community of practice (Hellerman, 2008; Wenger, 1998) in that interactional practices between teacher and students are mutually recognized, not through overt instruction, but through a socialized understanding of how individuals work together to reach a common goal.

When comparing group discussion to teacher-fronted talk, a number of differences stood out. When the teacher was not present to direct the flow of interaction, students had equal participation rights, leading to an equal power speech exchange system. Students could self-select as they pleased and had the freedom to bring in new topics. This in itself necessitated calculated movement, as students no longer took cues from the teacher about when to speak but instead had to self-manage transitions from one speaker to the next. For the group discussion found in Excerpt 3, students did this by anticipating the end of a classmate’s turn. This was often followed by some utterance of agreement with the previous comment and then an expansion on a related but slightly different point of view. This propensity to seek agreement and thereby avoid disagreement aligns with the preference structure of ordinary conversation (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Lerner, 1996; Pomerantz, 1984). When a student attempted to disrupt this preference structure by showing disagreement with another student, the desire to avoid loss of face was readily noticeable. The student performing the face threat initially attempted to avert a potential face threatening situation by softening the illocutionary force of her speech act through the use of a preface. This ultimately proved unsuccessful and led to both students jockeying for turns in order to maintain face.

Stemming from having equal participation rights, another reason why learners’ IC during group interaction was distinct from teacher-fronted talk was unrestricted opportunities to shift their discourse identities. Outside of the rare instance that a student wanted to ask a question to others, during teacher-fronted talk, students remained positioned in the “answerer” role of class interaction. However, during group discussions, students took on various roles, including becoming agreeers, disagreeers, and defenders of ideas. These roles ultimately dictated the types of interactional practices students performed. To summarize, when comparing the two settings discussed in this paper, although IC was apparent in both settings, a distinctly different array of interactional skills were found during group discussion.

These findings have numerous pedagogical implications on how classroom interaction can be managed to improve language learning. In accordance with Seedhouse’s (2015) assessment of ordinary conversation as having unrestricted turn-taking and participation rights, shared responsibility by all participants for managing and monitoring discourse, and joint negotiation of topics, group interaction seems to be a closer fit to this characterization. Because communicative language teaching strives to provide learners with opportunities to engage in more natural-like conversation, prioritizing student-to-student talk stands to be a fruitful goal. Although IRF sequences have been portrayed as the defining pattern of classroom discourse

(Cazden, 2001; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), this is not to suggest that modifications to teacher-fronted talk cannot be made. Hale et al. (2018) demonstrates that by withholding the third-turn teacher evaluation, students were able to autonomously negotiate and co-construct meaning. Walsh (2002) is critical of teacher echoing and “filling in the gaps”, as they facilitate a smooth-flowing exchange but simultaneously reduce opportunities for interactional adjustments. Waring (2014) analyzes the ways in which embedding informal personal conversation into the framework of institutional talk enables teachers to step down from a position of authority and signal co-membership with students. Although the prevalent structures of classroom interaction have received much attention in terms of sequential organization, less is known about how such structures can be adjusted and integrated to optimize learners’ IC. Moving forward, this aspect of communicative language teaching warrants further examination.

CONCLUSION

The data presented in this paper attempts to show how speech exchange systems directly influence the types of interaction that manifest in second and foreign language classrooms. By analyzing two ubiquitous settings, it can be suggested that expanded participation rights can have a rippling effect on the discourse identities learners take on, and thus, the interactional practices they engage in. As an extension of this, the power teachers wield in the classroom can hinder precious opportunities for student-centered learning. Although teacher control is a tacit condition of classroom talk, deciding when to implement and when to restrain this control requires careful foresight. Nevertheless, IC can be witnessed in any classroom environment regardless of whether or not the teacher is present. Developing a fuller repertoire of interactional skills is dependent on students being exposed to and learning how to interact in a multitude of classroom situations. For any teacher, the challenge is knowing the limitations of each and providing a robust balance of all.

REFERENCES

- Barnes, D. (1992) *From communication to curriculum*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook-Heinemann.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Cazden, C.B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann
- Gardner, R. (2013). Conversation analysis in the classroom. In T. Stivers & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *The Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 593-611). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Oxford: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hale, C.C., Nani, A., Hooper, D. (2018). Conversation analysis in language teacher education: An approach for reflection through action research. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 30, 54-71.

- Hall, J.K., Hellerman, J. & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). *L2 interactional competence and development*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hellerman, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-285). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Y. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 180-206.
- Lemke, J. L. (1985). *Using language in the classroom*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Lerner, G. (1996). Finding "face" in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59(4), 303-321.
- Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 207.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Pomerantz, A., (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shape. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge University Press
- Seedhouse, P. (2009). The interactional architecture of the language classroom. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 1(1), 1-13.
- Seedhouse, P. (2015). L2 classroom interaction as a complex adaptive system. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp.373-389). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, J. M. & R. M. Coulthard (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), pp. 3-23.
- Waring, H.Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, 577-594.
- Waring, H.Z. (2014). Managing control and connection in an adult ESL classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 49(1), 52-74.
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- 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* (pp. 426-443). New York: Routledge.
- Young, R. F. (2008). *Language and interaction: An advanced resource book*. London and New York: Routledge
- Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). *Identity, context and interaction*. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 87-106). Sage Publications Ltd.

APPENDIX 1

CA transcription symbols

.	(period) Falling intonation.
?	(question mark) Rising intonation.
,	(comma) Continuing intonation.
-	(hyphen) Marks an abrupt cut-off.
::	(colon(s)) Prolonging of sound.
<u>w</u> :rd	(colon after underlined letter) Falling intonation on word.
w:rd	(underlined colon) Rising intonation on word.
<u>word</u>	(underlining)
<u>word</u>	The more underlying, the greater the stress.
WORD	(all caps) Loud speech.
°word°	(degree symbols) Quiet speech.
↑word	(upward arrow) raised pitch.
↓word	(downward arrow) lowered pitch
>>word<<	(more than and less than) Quicker speech.
<<word>>	(less than & more than) Slowed speech.
<	(less than) Talk is jump-started—starting with a rush.
hh	(series of h's) Aspiration or laughter.
.hh	(h's preceded by dot) Inhalation.
[]	(brackets) simultaneous or overlapping speech.
[]	
=	(equal sign) Latch or contiguous utterances of the same speaker.
(2.4)	(number in parentheses) Length of a silence in 10ths of a second
(.)	(period in parentheses) Micro-pause, 0.2 second or less.
()	(empty parentheses) Non-transcribable segment of talk.
((gazing toward the ceiling))	(double parentheses) Description of non-speech activity.
(try 1)/(try 2)	(two parentheses separated by a slash) Alternative hearings.
\$word\$	(dollar signs) Smiley voice.
#word#	(number signs) Squeaky voice.

APPENDIX 2

Data Segment 1

Line	Speaker	Talk
001	Teacher	Ok. Can anyone share their thoughts about racism? (5.0) Any ideas?
002		(3.0) I can't see your names right now so it's hard for me to call on
003		anyone. uh::::m
004	Miho	Can I- Can I say something?
005	Teacher	Sure go ahead.
006	Miho	Uhm I think the racism is hating the other ethnicity without uhm
007		mm (2.0) without good reason based on the uh:: (1.0) prejudice
008	Teacher	[Ok]
009	Miho	[yeah] that's all. Thank you.
010	Teacher	Thank you very much for your ideas. So you said ethnicity and
011		prejudice. These are two good words to use when talking about
012		racism. Does anybody have any other ideas? (5.0) Anyone else?
013	Kento	Can I say?
014	Teacher	Yes go ahead. Please
015	Kento	It is ((inaudible word)) with Miho's idea but maybe racism is to
016		discriminate <<a particular group>> or you know <<a particular
017		hu:mans>> based on their- you know ideas. Just- just like that.
018	Teacher	(2.0) Ok thank you very much for your thoughts. You used the word
019		<u>discrimination</u> uhm which again this is another important idea and
020		is something that we'll talk about a little bit later in the lesson. (1.0)
021		↑Ok so next what I would like to do is:: I'm going to show you <u>four</u>
022		pictures and <<for each picture I want you to tell me>> first of all
023		uhm what is happening in the picture. What do you see in the picture.
024		And second of all <u>is this picture</u> ra:cism does it it relate to racism?
025		Uhm so if you think it does try to explain why and if you think it
026		doesn't then also try to explain why not. So let's uh take a look at the

027		first picture <u>here</u> . ((shows picture)) (2.0) So take a look at it. Can
028		anyone tell me what they see in the picture. Maybe some of you
029		recognize this picture.
030	Arisa	They're in the concentration ca ₂ mp
031	Teacher	>>They're in a concentration camp.<< Ok very good. Can you tell us
032		Uh who is they?
033	Arisa	Jew ₂ ish
034	Teacher	Ok so Jewish people are in a concentration camp. Very good. Does
035		anyone else have any other ideas? (6.0) No ₂ ok you summed it up
036		pretty well. <u>Is this racism?</u>
037	Arisa	Yes.
038	Teacher	Ok. Can you tell me why it's considered a form of racism.
039	Arisa	Because during World War II Germany discriminated Jewish because-
041		about their races. Based on the definition of racism uhm (1.0) they-
042		Uh they- I mean the Germany discriminated <u>Jewish people</u> because
043		their races so it is racism.
044	Teacher	Ok very good. Yes. So they were discriminated based on their race
045		and their religion. Excellent. ↑Let's take a look at the second picture
046		here ((shows picture)) can someone tell me uhm what you see in this
047		picture (3.0)
048	Naoto	I think this is kind of symbol of apar ₂ theid [in the South Africa.]
049	Teacher	[ok.]
050		Ok.
051	Naoto	And I think this- yeah kind of racism because they separate the uh:::
052		people based on the- uh::: whether they are white or uh black. And so
053		this is- uh <<yeah this is>> separating people by just their race so it's
054		racism.
055	Teacher	Right.

APPENDIX 3

Data Segment 2

Line	Speaker	Talk
001	Teacher	Ok. Excellent. Very good. Thank you for your opinion. Uh does
002		anyone else want to share their ideas about this?
003	Kei	Yes. I also think it's form of <<cultural appropriation>> in the sense
004		that it creates di:vide uh:: between- like among many racial- <u>aces</u>
005		u::hm so like- >>as as Arisa just said<< painting his face black
006		<u>does</u> mean or like implies u::h some fortun- << <u>some forms of</u> >>
007		prejudices or like biases against black people so uh:: even though
008		Japanese audiences or people like sitting in the studio wouldn't
009		consider as uh a form of <<cultural approp _r iation>> some people-
010		maybe those like black people who:: watch this video online would
011		consider >>as a form of it so like<< it can create a huge divide.
012	Teacher	Ok. Excellent. >>Yes you have a good point here.<< So maybe it
013		creates some tension between different racial groups. Very good.
014		Anyone else? Another opinion?
015	Rina	Can I ask a question to Arisa and Kei?
016	Teacher	Yes go ahead. Sure.
017	Rina	nn:: yeah I think this:: Yamadera-san is like the kind of cultural
018		appropriation. He imitate the actor of not the all black people but
019		the person- <<Louis Armstrong>>. So I wonder where is the
020		distinguishing line between the imitation and the cultural
021		appropriation? So could you tell me how do you think?
022	Kei	Well yes for [me] he could probably like imitate <<how Louis
023	Rina	[mhm]
024	Ayaka	Armstrong would sing>> but he didn't have to paint his face
025		black. [That] and he didn't have to make that kind of like facial
026	Rina	[hm] ((sits back in seat and nods))

027	Ayaka	expression that could be considered making fun of the uh person.
028		I think that's the line. (2.0) °for me°
029	Rina	Thank you.
030	Miho	Sorry. Can I ask one more question about Ayaka's opinion?
031	Teacher	[Sure go ahead.]
032	Miho	[Why do-] In the uh:: variety when people imitate other artists or
033		famous people they tend to:: uh:: dress like them and some wear- do
034		makeup like the::actual person and (1.0) but (1.0) is it different from
035		uh <<painting their face black?>>
036	Ayaka	Well I think that's the point of it because <u>in Japan</u> people don't see
037		it as racism or like <<cultural appropriation>> but <u>in the U.S.</u> or
038		uhm let's say in many parts of the world consider it as cultural
039		appropriation like for- like what I mean is that in Japan >>not like-
040		maybe- it's the same<< as any other people imitating uhm other
041		people but u::h in like many other parts of the world it's considered
042		as it [so::]
043	Miho	[mh] Right. So we have to be careful about the international ro:le=
044	Ayaka	=Yee- [yeah] especially in the like age of globalization people can
045	Miho	[yeah]
046	Ayaka	easily watch these videos and be offended so:: <<we might be->>
047		we should probably like (1.0) yeah [be aware of that.]
048	Miho	[yeah]
049		Thank you for answering. (3.0)
050	Teacher	Ok. Thank you for your discussion. I think you guys brought up a
051		good point here that maybe within Japan <<it may not be>>
052		considered racism but you have to be careful about how it's
053		portrayed outside of Japan. That's a good point. Ok. Any any
054		other thoughts about this? (5.0) Everyone's ok? (3.0) Alright so I'm
055		going to:: show another video now. The next video is a little bit more
056		subtle. And it's going to go by kind of quickly so you have to pay
057		attention a little bit more carefully to this on:e but uh same with the

058		last video we just watched: as you're watching it think about
059		whether or not it's an example of cultural appropriation. >>Ok let's
060		take a look.<< ((video begins to play))

APPENDIX 4

Data Segment 3

Line	Speaker	Talk
001	Miho	So we don't know the- how is it like to discriminated. (1.0) [We] don't have the
002	Rina	[Yeah]
003	Miho	experience about being discriminat;ing being discriminated so it's one of the
004		>>experiential perception which is<< which- (1.0) m:: fro- m:: (1.0) ((circular
005		motion with hands)) prevent us from (1.0) uh:: the:: thinking about the
006		discrimination. (2.0) °yeah°
007	Rina	Yeah most of Japanese schools like the majority of Japanese schools are
008		Japanese people so yeah I agree with that yeah (2.0) some Japanese people are
009		not used to like (1.0) have such experiences.
010	Miho	Right. (1.0)
011	Yuna	And also they're <<not many people>> who would point it out in Japanese
012		society. If- when I was in- uh when I was abroad like many people said like "oh
013		this is racism. This is like [not appropriate (1.0) and everything like- uh
014	Miho	[oh yeah] ((nodding))
015	Yuna	<<people don't really>> say that. And the- people are not really aware of the
016		fact that it could be seen as a form of cultural appropriation or racism so >>yeah
017		that's also<< like the lack of experience [in finding racism.
018	Miho	[mhm]
019	Emi	I agree with it to Yuna's opinion. I think there's not much discussion about
020		cultures. Uhm:: when I was in- when I went to America American high school
021		students talked about like different language or cultures like daily basis but
022		in Japan we don't like have discussion about it. We don't really talk about
023		uhm how other cultures have like influence on our culture so maybe (1.0) if-

024		>yeah that's< I think that is one of the uhm examples of like lacking of
025		experiences (2.0)
026	Hana	I also think that lack of experience uhm:: with other (1.0) people or other foreign
027		people who have different racism- different race. It's because our discrimination
028		against foreigners in Japan because- uh because Japan is island country and they
029		don't have much foreign people or several uh (1.0) many kinds of race- rac <u>e</u> s
030		uhm (1.0) that becomes uh >>that- it- that is because of discrimination against
031		foreigners <<so we should have>> more experience uhm with living people who
032		have different races.
033	Ayaka	I actually wanted to make a point on it like (1.0) uhm so you- ok like I'm- I'm
034		not attacking you or anything but you said uhm like Japan is an island country
035		<<and don't have many>> like is homogeneous but I don't actually feel like it
036		nowadays. like I feel we are just ignoring the fact that there are many foreign
037		people or like mixed people in Japan and then pretending well >>we don't- we
038		don't have them in Japan ((throwing hands in air)) so we don't have experience
039		in it.>> Like I wonder what this like >>ok it was <u>true</u> << a decade ago that there
040		were not so many like foreign people or mixed people in Japan >>but like<<
041		nowadays you see like at least one or two people in your class for example
042		[like-=
043	Hana	[Yes]
044	Ayaka	=I live in a rural area but like [I have-
045	Hana	[That's true so I- I say that (2.0) uhm
046		>>discrimination is experiential because<< (1.0) <u>our</u> experience is still from
047		uhm some decades ago [so I mean the discrimination is experience- experiential
048	Ayaka	[mm mm mm]
049	Hana	from <u>that</u> experience in some decades ago so uhm yes=
050	Ayaka	=Yeah so we are not really adapting to like new reality [((inaudible speech))]
051	Hana	[yeah so that old
052		experience [has] big influence on our- (1.0) on our experience now.
053	Ayaka	[°mm mm mm°
054	Ayaka	mm mm mm that makes sense. Yeah °mm mm mm° (3.0)

Shimamoto, D. (2021). A comparative study of L2 interactional competence at a Japanese university. *Accents Asia*, 14(1), 11-27.