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Abstract

This thesis aims to bring together the area of pragmatics in second language learning (SLL), and dynamic assessment (DA), and in doing so offer an alternative way of both assessing pragmatics and providing its instruction. DA aims to provide a detailed analysis of not only a learner’s current stage of development, but also their still developing abilities. Unifying instruction and assessment, the learner and a mediator co-construct a task, with the mediator providing assistance when necessary. By examining both the types of mediation practices and their frequency, insights can be gained as to the learner’s still maturing abilities, and future potential. DA also aims to uncover sources of learner difficulty, offering a diagnostic function as part of assessment.

Drawing on conversation analysis research, the work of Gal’Perin and DA methodology, this study carried out a DA of the speech act of requesting in spoken interaction, assessing the effectiveness with which the DA promoted development in the learners. Further, the ability of the DA to uncover specific locations of learner difficulty was examined, as well as the ways in which the interlocutors successfully negotiated the opening and closing of mediation sequences.

Six Japanese EFL learners in a university context co-constructed a number of role-play type language tasks with the researcher. In the first stage of the study, the researcher did not offer support to the learners, while in the following stage, mediation was provided when appropriate. The findings were used to inform the enrichment programme (EP) portion of the study, in which the learners met with the researcher for a period of four weeks, receiving tutoring. This was followed by further non-dynamic and dynamic assessments, to allow analysis of learner development.

The study’s findings indicate that DA methodology, when applied to the speech act of requesting, can be an effective way to both promote learner development and assess learners’ abilities. Compared with the pre-EP assessments, participants produced more complex interactions that frequently
showed evidence of taking the social context of the role-plays into account, as well as assuming greater responsibility for successfully completing the tasks. Participants were also more frequently able to verbally explain their language choices with reference to the target concepts of the assessments and EP. Further, overall, the opening and closing of mediation sequences were accomplished with more implicit negotiation practices, indicating increased interactive competence. The DA was also successful in locating specific locations of learner difficulty.
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Chapter One

Introduction

1. Introduction

This study aims to bring together two areas that are to date, while coming under increasing scrutiny, relatively under-researched in the field of second language learning- interactional competence and dynamic assessment (see section 1.2.4.3 for an overview of dynamic assessment, and Chapter Four, section 4.4 for a detailed discussion). The objectives therefore are to further our understanding of both of these increasingly important aspects of language learning and acquisition. Specifically, the current study investigates a dynamic assessment of the learner-participants' competence in relation to the speech act of requesting. Informed by conversation analysis research, participants took part in dynamic assessment sessions focusing on request-based sequences of talk, and participants' interactional competence (IC) in regards to such sequences. The central aim is to simultaneously promote and assess development of the learners' IC.

Dynamic assessment (DA) is a method of both assessing and promoting the development of a learner's ability or abilities. DA is grounded in a perspective of development that views learning as first occurring in social interaction with another, before being internalised, leading eventually to independent ability (Vygotsky, 1978). Unlike many tests or assessments, in which a learner's independent ability is assessed, with no help given from another person or tool, in DA a different approach is taken. In a dynamic assessment, a learner and a mediator work together on a task; when the learner struggles, the mediator can intervene, assisting the learner, and enabling the task to successfully proceed. By analysing the types and frequency of mediation in a DA session, the mediator can learn what the learner is capable of with assistance, and without. This provides insights into the current abilities of the learner, and their future potential.
In this study, DA is employed as a way of gaining insights into the interactional competence of the learner-participants, with regards to the speech act of requesting. The learners and myself (in the role of mediator) engaged in a number of DA sessions. In each session, the mediator and learners carried out the speech act of requesting in a variety of different scenarios, with the mediator responding to the particular needs of each learner, engaging in mediation when deemed necessary. An overview of the study and how DA was employed is provided in section 1.3, and a detailed discussion of the study's design and methodology given in Chapter Five.

By carrying out a dynamic assessment, the aim was to integrate learning with assessment in the language classroom, develop learner awareness of how requests are realised in authentic situations, and promote interactional competence. Further, the nature of the study and its sociocultural foundations provides insights into the developmental processes involved in the acquisition of the target concepts by learners. The diagnostic capabilities of a dynamic assessment in regards to interactional competence is also assessed (see Chapter Eight), diagnosis being a key function of testing according to Vygotsky (1978), and one missing from standardised, psychometric testing (Poehner, 2008a).

As part of the dynamic assessment methodology used in the study, learners also engaged in an enrichment programme (EP), an intervention sandwiched between pre-EP and post-EP dynamic and non-dynamic assessment stages (see section 1.3 for an overview of the study's structure; see Chapter Five, section 5.3.5 for details of the EP). The purpose of the EP in this study was to raise awareness of the requesting speech act in interaction through a concept-based approach to instruction, based on the work of Gal'Perin (1979). This pedagogical approach aims to develop a deep, conceptual understanding of the target skills, avoiding the oversimplification of key ideas. With the target concepts of this study being interactional competence in relation to requesting, findings from conversation analysis research of this speech act are used to provide the key concepts for instruction and assessment. The concepts of power, distance, and imposition are seen as being important contextual factors in making a request (Brown & Levinson, 1987) and are also incorporated into this study, with the learners being exposed to a variety of requesting contexts.
and encouraged to think about how these variables may affect language choices (see sections 2.2 and 3.2.4 for discussion of Brown & Levinson, 1987; see section 5.3.5 for details of how their work was incorporated into this study) for discussion. In this way, the study aims to address a number of issues in regards to both how pragmatics is typically taught in EFL classrooms, and also how it is assessed.

In this introduction chapter, section 1.1 presents an overview and discussion of the key concepts and terminologies used in this study - namely, the relationship between interactional competence and models of communicative and pragmatic competence. In section 1.2 a rationale for the study is provided, including a discussion of the practical importance of pragmatics, issues surrounding the way it is taught in EFL classrooms, and ways in which the study addresses these issues, including the dynamic assessment approach to assessment and development. Section 1.3 provides an overview of the study, including a brief description and the research questions. Finally, section 1.4 presents an outline of the thesis.

1.1 Pragmatics

In recent decades, it has become accepted that language is more than simply its grammatical and lexical components. The ability to use language appropriately, effectively communicating intended meaning, and also to interpret messages accurately, are also of fundamental importance. As Blum-Kulka (1997) puts forward, "words can mean something more- or something other-than what they say" (Blum-Kulka, 1997, p.38); how utterances are interpreted can depend upon the situation the interactants find themselves in, the culture, as well as paralinguistic features, such as intonation or gaze. Pragmatics then, "the societally necessary and consciously interactive dimension of the study of language" (Mey, 1993, p.315), can be seen as concerning the linguistic and communicative choices we make based on context, and also our ability to interpret the meaning of others’ talk.

In section 1.1.1 below I provide an overview of how pragmatics has been situated and described within models of communicative competence. I also
provide a detailed overview of interactional competence, which has been put forward by researchers in recent times as "qualitatively expand[ing] SLA's traditional learning object of grammar and even pragmatic competence" (Kasper, 2006, p.87).

1.1.1 Communicative competence, pragmatic competence and interactional competence

As the fields of second language teaching, assessment and pragmatics have developed in recent decades, so a number of key terminologies have come into common usage. As this study focuses on learner development of interactional competence, it is important to discuss the meaning of the term, and how it is used. In order to understand the meaning of interactional competence, it is necessary to also provide an overview of two related terms - communicative competence and pragmatic competence. A variety of researchers and perspectives offer related, though differing, definitions and descriptions of these terminologies and of the relationships between them. In the following section therefore, overviews of these key terms are given; different researchers' perspectives are discussed, and the ways in which they are used in the current study justified.

1.1.2. Pragmatic competence within models of communicative competence

The pragmatic element of communication is typically situated within more general models of communicative competence, along with other aspects of communicative ability, such as knowledge of grammar. It is therefore important to provide an overview of these models of communicative competence, the role of pragmatic competence within them, and how pragmatic competence is described.

Hymes' (1972) theory of communicative competence forms the foundation upon which a number of more recent models have been built. Hymes described communicative competence as consisting of "knowledge" of and the "ability for use," of language, with actual performance seen as being separate from competence. While "ability for use" includes factors that may affect a person's ability to communicate in a situation (such as motivation or personality), "knowledge" was further broken down into two sub-categories of grammatical
competence and sociolinguistic competence. Grammatical competence involves knowledge of the formal grammatical rules of a language, while sociolinguistic knowledge refers to knowledge of the relevant social or cultural norms of language use.

Hymes' model influenced Canale and Swain (1980; revised by Canale, 1983), who put forward a further model of communicative competence. This model has four key strands:

1. Grammatical competence, which incorporates lexis, phonology, syntax and other mechanical aspects of language;

2. Strategic competence, comprising of verbal or non-verbal strategies employed to address communication difficulties;

3. Sociolinguistic competence, described by Canale and Swain as the "sociocultural rules of use and rules of discourse" (Canale & Swain, 1980, p.30). These rules enable interactants to interpret their interlocutor's utterances, and are especially important when that meaning is not clear from the literal interpretation of the utterance.

4. Discourse competence, involving the ability to create different types of texts, such as oral presentations for example.

Canale and Swain's model has been influential in the second language field's efforts to describe communicative ability; it has however been criticised for being insufficiently specific for language assessment purposes (Schacter, 1990). This lack of specificity also means that it is unclear as to the role of actual language production and use, as opposed to simply "knowledge" of the various strands of communication (Ross & Kasper, 2013). In an attempt to address this, Bachman (1990; later revised by Bachman & Palmer, 1996) produced an additional model of communicative competence. Bachman (1990) describes communicative language ability as "consisting of both knowledge, or competence, and the capacity for implementing...that competence in appropriate...communicative language use" (Bachman, 1990, p.84). In the revised version of the model, communicative competence consists of three components- "organisational competence;" "strategic competence," and
"pragmatic competence." In turn, these are broken down into further sub-categories. Organisational competence consists of "grammatical competence," involving knowledge of the formal aspects of language, and "textual competence," which is similar to Canale's (1983) "discourse" strand. "Strategic competence" refers to a person's ability to achieve communicative goals (including setting goals and planning).

The third of Bachman and Palmer's (1996) communicative components is "pragmatic competence," which is sub-divided into "functional" and "sociolinguistic" competencies. While functional competence refers to the relationships between utterances and the communicative goals of the participant, sociolinguistic competence refers to knowledge of the relationship between an utterance and the context of the communication (the use of register or politeness for example).

Taguchi (2012), in an effort to synthesise elements of previous models, divides communicative competence into two elements- "language knowledge" and "processing," thus explicitly incorporating the production aspect within communicative competence. Following Bachman and Palmer (1996), Taguchi divides "language knowledge" into "organisational" and "pragmatic" knowledge categories. Organisational knowledge refers to knowledge of grammar, lexis and the formal aspects of language, while pragmatic knowledge refers to "language use in relation to language users and language use settings" (Taguchi, 2012, p.75). As with Bachman and Palmer (1996), in Taguchi's model there are two types of pragmatic knowledge- "functional" and "sociolinguistic," with similar meanings to Bachman and Palmer's (1996) similarly-named categories. Taguchi also puts forward that pragmatic knowledge "entails the ability to assess contextual information and to choose appropriate...means to perform functions according to context" (Taguchi, 2012, p.75).

Taguchi's model differs from Canale and Swain's (1980) and Bachman and Palmer's (1996) in terms of the additional "processing" aspect of communicative competence, which describes the efficiency with which language knowledge is put to use. For Taguchi, there are both cognitive (such as memory) and non-cognitive factors (such as age, or personality) that affect this efficiency. Taguchi's (2012) view then incorporates production of language within the
concept of communicative competence, as opposed to Hymes' (1972) model, in which "actual performance" was a separate category. It can be seen therefore as a step forward in viewing communicative competence as not only involving knowledge or comprehension, but also the production of appropriate utterances in "real-time" tasks. Other researchers however sought to place greater emphasis on interaction in communicative and pragmatic competence; this shift is discussed below.

1.1.3. Interactional Competence

Ross and Kasper (2013) put forward that the models discussed above fail to place sufficient emphasis on "interaction," which Ross and Kasper view as being of importance in a conception of communicative and pragmatic competence. They therefore advocate for the concept of communicative and pragmatic competence to be expanded upon further.

The concept which this study focuses on- interactional competence- in relation to the speech act of requesting, offers this expanded view of pragmatic competence, placing a greater emphasis on the interactive nature of talk, and the ways in which participants co-construct talk. In the following section, an overview is given of the term "interactional competence," different researchers' perspectives, and how it is specifically used in this current study.

It is only in relatively recent times that the importance of interaction in conceptions of pragmatic competence has been understood (Barraja-Rohan, 2011). Kramsch (1986) puts forward that second language teaching has tended to emphasise language accuracy over interactional competence, failing to adequately acknowledge the importance of the collaborative nature of talk. Kramsch advocated the incorporation of interactional competence into second language teaching, with language learners encouraged to reflect on how authentic discourse is constructed.

Oksaar (1983; 1990) put forward a model encompassing a number of factors that influence interactional competence, such as non-verbal behaviour or social and cultural norms, defining IC as:
"the ability of a person, in interactional situations to carry out and interpret verbal, paralinguistic, non-verbal and extraverbal communicative actions in two roles, that of the speaker and that of the hearer, according to the sociocultural and psychological rules of the group." (Oksaar, 1990, p.530)

This approach to communicative and pragmatic competence takes into account then, not only the role of the speaker, but also the listener; the ability to not only comprehend, but also produce appropriate utterances. This interactional approach sits in contrast to the earlier models of communicative competence, which placed more emphasis on a person's knowledge (Canale & Swain, 1980; Bachman, 1990; 1996). While Taguchi’s (2012) model did explicitly include "processing" as an element of communicative competence, there is still insufficient emphasis on interaction between interlocutors (Ross & Kasper, 2013).

Hall (1995), described "interactive practices-" talk that was repeated frequently in a community, had a communicative goal, and that played an important role in a community or society (such as the act of requesting for example). For Hall, because these practices occurred often, expectations as to how they would be carried out would arise in a community. For Hall, this shared cultural knowledge is expressed in the organisation of talk, in turn-taking conventions, and in other characteristics of talk-in-interaction. He and Young (1998), following Hall, labeled "practices" as "interactional competence." As with Hall, He and Young identified features of talk that form elements of IC, such as how talk is organised. He and Young also emphasised the collaborative, co-constructed nature of talk, and therefore of IC. Young (2011, p.428) elaborated on IC, describing it as "the pragmatic relationship between participants’ employment of linguistic and interactional resources and the contexts in which they are employed." As part of this definition therefore, IC can be seen as context-dependent, with different interactional competencies coming into effect in different contexts.

Kasper (2006), puts forward her view of IC, from a more explicitly CA perspective (see Chapter Three, section 3.3.1 for a detailed discussion of
Kasper's advocacy for a CA-based approach to talk-in-interaction and speech acts. Kasper defines IC as the ability:

- to understand and produce social actions in their sequential contexts;
- to take turns at talk in an organised fashion;
- to format actions and turns...by drawing on different types of semiotic resources (linguistic, nonverbal, nonvocal);
- to repair problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding;
- to co-construct social and discursive identities through sequence organisation, actions-in-interaction and semiotic resources;
- to recognise and produce boundaries between activities, including transitions from states of contact to absence of contact...and transitions between activities during continued contact. (Kasper, 2006, p.86)

Barraja-Rohan (2011), building on Kasper’s description of IC, puts forward a number of IC features she deems to be of importance to second language learners; which features are of particular importance would depend on the ability of the learner (Barraja-Rohan, 2011). Similarly to Kasper, Barraja-Rohan identifies the turn-taking system, organisation of talk, performance of speech acts, achieving common understanding, and repair of talk as being important features of IC. Summarising, Barraja-Rohan provides her definition of interactional competence as being able to:

1. engage in various interactional events to co-construct talk...and display pragmatic knowledge...

2. jointly manage the turn-taking system with co-participants adopting appropriate interactional roles. This entails an understanding and demonstration of how turns are designed and responding to turns in a coherent and sequential manner, displaying common understanding and repairing any threat to or breakdown in communication, showing engagement and empathy when relevant or intended...accomplishing
social actions befitting the interactional context... (Barraja-Rohan, 2011, p.482)

Kasper (2006) puts forward that IC can be seen as an alternative, or an addition to, previous models of pragmatic competence, arguing that "interactional competencies qualitatively expand SLA's traditional learning object of grammatical and even pragmatic competence" (Kasper, 2006, p.87). Kasper's (2006) and Barraja-Rohan's (2011) identification of specific aspects of IC, informed by findings from CA research, is useful, allowing IC to be operationalised for research. With Barraja-Rohan pointing out that, in a L2 learning context, different features of IC will be especially relevant to different learners, these definitions also allow features of IC to be identified and tracked over time, which is the focus of this current study (see Chapters Six, Seven, Eight and Nine for detailed analyses of participants' IC in relation to the speech act of requesting).

The concept of IC therefore, with its expanded view of pragmatic competence, taking into account the co-constructed, interactive nature of talk-in-interaction, fits well with this current study's focus on requesting in talk, and its use of conversation analysis concepts (such as how talk is organised) to promote learner development (see section 5.3.5 for further setting out of how I define IC for the purposes of this study). In this study, I analyse IC in two respects. In the first respect, the IC of the study's learner-participants is assessed in regards to the co-construction of the speech act of requesting, with interactions examined in detail. This is discussed in Chapter Six, which concerns the non-dynamic assessment of participants' IC; Chapter Eight, which discusses the diagnosis of particular challenges participants experienced with requesting, and Chapter Nine, which examines the development over time of participants' IC in relation to requesting.

The second respect in which the participants' IC is assessed in this study is in relation to a key characteristic of dynamic assessments- mediation sequences (see Chapter Four, section 4.4.5.3 for details). Van Compernolle (2013) employs the term "interactional competence" in order to examine in detail the ways in which a mediator and learner negotiate the boundaries between a mediation sequence in a dynamic assessment session, and a task sequence.
Van Compernolle puts forward that an interlocutor's competence in identifying and orienting to negotiating strategies and cues indicates developing IC. Van Compernolle's approach to dynamic assessment and IC is discussed in detail in Chapter Four, section 4.4.5.3. Analysis in this current study of the ways in which mediation sequences are negotiated is presented in Chapter Seven.

1.2 A Rationale for the current study

In this section, I discuss the rationale for this study. I begin by discussing the practical importance of interactional competence and requesting; I then discuss the issues facing the teaching of pragmatics in the EFL classroom, and of pragmatics research. I follow this with an overview of the ways in which this study contributes to the body of knowledge, both in terms of classroom pragmatics instruction and the fields of second language learning and acquisition research.

1.2.1 The practical costs and benefits of interactional competence

Models of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980; Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Taguchi, 2012) recognise that language is more than syntax and lexis, and also involves making context-based choices. It is clear therefore that knowledge of second language (L2) pragmatics, and the ability to incorporate it into L2 production, is of considerable importance to those who wish to learn a second language. Failing to accurately interpret or communicate intended meaning can have negative consequences, such as being ostracised within the target language community, with LoCastro arguing that pragmatic failure by L2 learners can be attributed to personality defects or L1 cultural norms. This in turn may lead to negative stereotyping of all members of the learner's L1 cultural community. This concern about the negative social effects of pragmatic failure are echoed by Kasper (1990), who puts forward that non-native speakers “...suffer the perennial risk of inadvertently violating politeness norms, thereby forfeiting their claims to being treated as social equals” (Kasper, 1990, p.193). As well as the dangers of negative stereotyping, an inability to successfully navigate the pragmatic requirements of challenging situations such as job interviews may lead to L2 learners struggling to advance in the L2 society.
(Brown & Levinson, 1987), with failure to understand an interviewer's intended meaning in a job interview possibly leading to a person not being offered a job (Roberts et al, 1992).

When two people talk with each other, there is the potential for cross-cultural misunderstandings in relation to directness or indirectness. In the following example, a Japanese secretary greets a visiting professor from the USA:

   Secretary: oh, you look like you're ready to go to the beach (LoCastro, 2012, p.88)

In this situation, the professor was unsure as to whether the secretary was giving a compliment, or making a criticism. The utterance’s intended meaning was difficult to interpret for the professor for a number of reasons, including possible differences in how conversations in this social status context unfold in American and Japanese society (LoCastro, 2012).

On the other hand, for LoCastro (2012), there are a number of benefits to acquiring pragmatic competence in the L2, such as allowing learners to enter the L2 community and participate in various occasions requiring communicative competence. LoCastro also puts forward the important role that pragmatic proficiency plays in addressing negative stereotypes that can become attached to language learners and their L1 cultures.

1.2.2 The importance of requesting

Roever (2005, p.12) defines a request as “the linguistic realisations of the speaker’s desire that the hearer perform a specified action, which the hearer would not otherwise perform from his own volition.” As this speech act requires action on the part of the hearer therefore, it is considered by Brown and Levinson (1987) to be inherently face-threatening, and thus a suitable speech act for the study of politeness and the three social variables of power, social distance, and imposition, that Brown and Levinson argue are central to the sociopragmatic decision-making process (see section 2.2 and 3.2.4 for discussions of Brown & Levinson, 1987). Conversation analysts also consider requesting to be a particularly important action due to “its modes of performance carry[ing] heavy social implications...[seeming] to be ruled by
universal principles of cooperation and politeness” (Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006, p.2).

The potential for a request to lead to a loss of face therefore has made it the subject of considerable research in the field of second language learning (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka et al, 1989; Fukushima, 2000; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). It has also been the focus of much conversation analysis research, which makes available a significant body of knowledge that can be utilised in the current study. The speech action of requesting is the central focus of this study, due to its importance in everyday talk, and the challenge it often represents to learners. In the experience of the author, requesting has been found to be of considerable difficulty to learners of English as a foreign language. This experience is supported by a number of studies that have found non-target like request performance by language learners (Hill, 1997; Fukushima, 2000). The requesting speech act, and the ways in which CA research has described it, is discussed in Chapter Five, section 5.3.3.

1.2.3 Challenges in the classroom

Despite the importance of pragmatics for L2 learners, it appears to be relatively neglected in the EFL context in comparison with the more traditional areas of language learning, such as grammar and vocabulary (McConarchy & Hata, 2013). Lorscher & Schulze (1988) put forward that the range of pragmatic strategies, particularly in relation to the issue of politeness, taught in German EFL classrooms was narrow, with opportunities to practice pragmatic skills restricted. Other studies argue that often materials concerning pragmatics given to learners are insufficient (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Alcon Soler & Safont, 2001; Salazar & Uso, 2001; Crandall & Basturkmen, 2004). Vellenga (2004) analysed eight ESL and EFL textbooks for the amount of pragmatic instruction contained therein, and also the type of instruction. It was found that there was generally a lack of explicit metapragmatic information, as well as authentic examples of pragmatics in the real world. Further, Jiang (2006), investigating the speech act of suggesting, compared the language found in ESL textbooks with that found in authentic discourse, and found the two to often be at odds with each other,
suggesting that textbook authors may be relying on intuition rather than real world discourse for their pragmatic examples.

According to Negueruela (2008) an issue regarding language instruction in general and including that of pragmatics and speech acts, is the tendency to rely on "rules of thumb." This approach to instruction provides learners with a simplified, reductionist view of language and communication, failing to address its complexities and areas of nuance. Negueruela puts forward that learner problems often have their roots in this approach to instruction "[depicting] a constrained view of language as a sedimented entity that seems to have a life of its own, independent of human users" (Negueruela, 2008, p.210).

This evolutionary approach to the language classroom is evident in how speech acts are incorporated into teaching. McConarchy and Hata (2013) found a number of issues in this regard, including only a narrow range of speech acts being introduced to learners. Further, speech acts are often presented to learners in the form of lists of set expressions or phrases, rather than in the context of an interaction between interlocutors. When example interactions are presented to learners, the interactions are typically based on the textbook author's intuition, rather than on authentic discourse from conversation analysis research (echoing the findings of Jiang, 2006). Furthermore, when metapragmatic information is provided in the classroom, it often takes the form of prescriptive rules ("if this, do that"), failing to account for the "largely fluid and context-dependent" nature of pragmatic norms (McConarchy & Hata, 2013, p.296).

An additional issue regarding speech acts in the classroom is their presentation as isolated adjacency pairs, with the act in question realised over two turns:

A: Can you pass me that pen please?

B: Sure, here you are

This view of speech acts is based on Speech Act Theory (Austin, 1962). LoCastro (2012) criticises this approach to presenting speech acts as being of limited value to learners, oversimplifying the concept, and failing to situate speech acts in multiple turns of talk-in-interaction.
A broader discussion of the teachability of pragmatics in the classroom is given in Chapter Four, section 4.3.

1.2.4 Addressing the issues with pragmatic instruction

1.2.4.1 From individual utterances to talk-in-interaction

Speech act theory’s (SAT) focus on speech act realisations as individual utterances in isolation from the surrounding talk has led to criticism of artificiality (Arundale, 1999; Kasper, 2004; 2006b; see Chapter Three for an overview of SAT). Recently however, conversation analysis (CA) has been proposed as being a more effective approach to analysing pragmatic and interactional competence (Kasper, 2004, 2006a, 2006b), situating speech act realisations within sequences of talk, with the interaction between participants being of central importance. This study utilises the CA approach to both inform speech act instruction and analyse development, and will be discussed at length in Chapter Five.

1.2.4.2 Concept-based instruction

Further, addressing the issues with pragmatic instruction raised by Negueruela (2008), and in sympathy with research carried out by van Compernolle and Henery (2014), the enrichment programme stage of the study follows the pedagogical methodology of Gal'Perin’s (1979) concept-based instruction (CBI) (see section 1.3.1 for an overview of the stages of the study; see Chapter Five, section 5.3.1 for a discussion of concept-based instruction). Rather than rely on oversimplified rules of thumb, the aim is to promote in learners a deep, conceptual understanding of how the requesting speech act is realised in authentic L2 talk-in-interaction. Concept-based instruction puts forward a pedagogy in which the target concepts are taught to learners without oversimplifying them, and providing them with the ability to apply their knowledge to novel situations. Gal'Perin and Negueruela both put forward the key techniques of materialisation, in which charts or diagrams are employed as mediational tools, and verbalisation, in which learners verbalise their understanding of the concepts. Both of these techniques therefore are incorporated into this current study.
This study brings together the CA research findings in relation to the speech act of requesting, and the concept-based instructional pedagogy put forward by Gal’perin in order to raise learner awareness and understanding of requesting (see section 5.3.5 for details). With CA findings providing the target concepts, and CBI a methodology that allows them to be presented without oversimplification, in a manner that promotes deep, conceptual level knowledge, this study therefore addresses the key issues of oversimplification and lack of context raised by McConarchy and Hata (2013), Negueruela (2008), and other researchers discussed above.

1.2.4.3 Assessments of pragmatics, Dynamic Assessment, and unifying instruction and assessment

It has only been in relatively recent times that testers have focused their attention on the pragmatic aspect of communication (see section 1.2 for definitions of pragmatics; see Chapter Four, section 4.1 for a detailed discussion of pragmatics assessments). Hudson et al (1992, 1995) developed a battery of tests, designing instruments such as discourse completion tasks (DCTs) and learner self-assessments in order to elicit data on the speech acts of apologising, refusing, and requesting. More recently, Roever (2005) and Liu (2007) developed their own tests using DCTs, assessing conversational implicature and speech acts respectively. Ishihara (2009) embedded a number of assessment tools into classroom instruction, such as role-plays and teacher field notes. However, while the work of Ishihara has made steps towards a more integrated approach to pragmatics assessment and learning, the majority of tests to date have assessed independent performance, assessing current ability, and indirectly, eliciting answers in writing. The tests do not assess future potential, which Vygotsky (1978) views as being of considerable significance, and also fail to diagnose the causes of pragmatic failure.

Dynamic Assessment (discussed in detail in Chapter Four, section 4.4) is based on the sociocultural theory developed by Vygotsky (1978) in the early part of the twentieth century and Feuerstein et al (1979; 1988), and aims to provide a rich, detailed analysis of not only a learner’s current stage of development, but also their still developing abilities. While dynamic assessment (henceforth referred to as DA) has been used for a number of years in various forms in the field of
general education, only relatively recently has it been applied to second language learning (Poehner, 2005; Ableeva, 2010).

Unlike in a standard, psychometric test, in which the learner is assessed based on their independent performance in isolation from their environment and others, DA aims to unify instruction and assessment. To this end, the learner and a mediator engage in co-constructing a task, with the mediator providing assistance when deemed necessary. While this mediation aims to promote learning, it also serves to enable an assessment of learner abilities. By examining both the types of mediation given and their frequency, insights can be gained into a learner's still maturing abilities, and thus their future potential development. DA also aims to uncover the sources of learner difficulties, providing a diagnostic function not typically present in psychometric testing.

Addressing the issues regarding pragmatics assessments discussed above, this study carries out a dynamic assessment of learners' interactional competence in regards to the speech act of requesting (see section 1.3.1 for specific details of how DA was employed in this study). By combining the CA-informed, concept-based instruction of Gal'Perin with a dynamic assessment, the study both promotes learner development in relation to the target concepts, and also assesses their developing abilities. See Chapter Five, section 5.3.1 for a discussion of concept-based instruction, section 5.3.2 for conversation analysis-informed instruction, and section 5.3.5 for details of how the two were combined for the purposes of this study.

In examining the mediation sequences in dynamic assessment sessions, analysis is informed by van Compernolle (2013), who calls for a move beyond seeing mediation as a uni-directional process, and towards a conception of it as a co-constructed, negotiated interaction between participants (see section 4.4.5.3 for discussion of van Compernolle's perspective on mediation in DA). Van Compernolle argues that conversation analysis allows for this shift in emphasis, analysing mediation through the interactional cues and strategies that take place between the DA participants. For van Compernolle, analysing these microinteractional strategies can further our knowledge of how ZPDs are constructed, and can thus be of use to educators. As well as benefitting teachers, he also argues it would be beneficial for researchers, allowing insights
to be gained into learner development within DA interactions. In carrying out the dynamic assessment therefore, van Compernolle's argument for viewing mediation as being co-constructed is taken into account, analysing the data for micro-interactional processes, both linguistic and paralinguistic. Van Compernolle's perspective on DA mediation sequences is followed in this study's data analysis, which can be seen in Chapters Six, Seven, Eight and Nine.

1.2.5 Contributions to second language learning and acquisition fields

It is put forward that this study contributes to the field of second language learning and acquisition on three levels. Firstly, by analysing the learners' development through the theoretical lens of Vygotskian sociocultural theory (see Chapter Four, section 4.4.1 for a detailed overview of Vygotsky), it provides a theoretical, principled perspective on pragmatic development, one needed in pragmatic research (Kasper & Rose, 2002). While interlanguage and cross-cultural pragmatic research has been gaining in popularity, Kasper and Rose (2002) identify a continuing lack of research on pragmatic development.

Similarly, Roever (2005) also identifies a need for more longitudinal research in this area, which would allow for greater understandings of how pragmatic competence develops in second language learners. While there have been a number of developmental studies since Kasper and Rose's observation (Achiba, 2003; Schauer, 2009; Bella, 2012), they are still relatively few in number. While the study of pragmatic use is of undoubted importance and usefulness, a lack of research into the developmental processes involved in the acquisition of pragmatic and interactional competence is problematic.

A further issue according to Kasper & Rose (2002), and an issue that remains today, is that of a lack of theoretical grounding in much of the developmental research that has been carried out, with research typically "descriptive, rather than motivated or guided by any particular theoretical orientation" (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p.13). While descriptions may help us to understand certain aspects of pragmatic learning, Kasper and Rose put forward that a more theoretical approach is required in order to understand development.

Investigating learner development in relation to interactional competence and
requesting makes an important contribution to the field, providing new insights into participants’ maturing abilities over time.

Further, in implementing a dynamic assessment (see section 1.2.4.3 for a brief overview of DA, and section 4.4 for a detailed discussion), the study unifies instruction and assessment. This dynamic assessment approach to assessing and teaching has only recently begun to be investigated in regards to second language learning. Little research has been undertaken that investigates DA in relation to interactional competence of second language learners, and to this researcher’s knowledge this is the first study to investigate DA’s applicability and effectiveness in regards to the important area of speech acts in talk.

As well as assessing and tracking learner future potential development, dynamic assessment also provides insights into learner difficulties that psychometric, standardised testing does not provide. The distinctive characteristic of DA is the interaction and collaboration between the researcher and the participants in the DA sessions. These mediation interactions allow the researcher to draw out a learner’s understanding of a target concept, and the causes or locations of difficulties in ways that more typical assessments of independent learner performance cannot. The insights these interactions provide in the current offer a unique contribution to the field, informing us as to aspects of requesting-in-talk that the Japanese learners of EFL struggled with.

Further, the study developed and carried out an innovative methodology for speech act instruction, and assesses its effectiveness (see Chapter Five, section 5.3.5). In doing so, it addresses a number of issues in regards to pragmatic instruction in the language classroom, such as the use of "rules of thumb" (Negueruela, 2008), the lack of authentic data-informed materials, and the presentation of speech acts in isolation from surrounding talk (McConarchy & Hata, 2013; LoCastro, 2012).

1.3 Overview of the study

This thesis reports on a dynamic assessment of interactional competence among Japanese EFL learners in a higher education setting. Specifically, the
study focuses on the speech act of requesting as the target concept. The central purposes of the study is to understand the effects of the dynamic assessment on the learner-participants' interactional competence in relation to requesting in the L2 (see Chapters Six, Seven and Nine) the diagnosis of learner difficulties (see Chapter Eight), and to develop a method of instruction in requesting, incorporating findings from conversation analysis and concept-based instruction (see Chapter Five). The research questions are as follows:

1. How are mediation sequences established and accomplished by the Japanese learners of EFL and mediator during the DA sessions,

2. During DA sessions, is there change in the type and frequency of microinteractional strategies over time?

3. Is there evidence of increased interactional competence regarding mediation sequences, demonstrated by efficient awareness and negotiating of opening and closing boundaries?

4. Is there evidence of increased interactional competence regarding mediation sequences, demonstrated by identifying and resolving the objects of mediation?

5. As a result of mediation and the enrichment programme, is there evidence of change in learners' actual level of development, shown in their pre and post-treatment non-dynamic assessments?

6. Is the DA able to diagnose the locations of learner pragmatic failure regarding the performance of the requesting speech act among the Japanese EFL participants?

The first, second and third research questions are related, and are addressed in Chapter Seven of the thesis, while the fourth question is the focus of Chapter Nine. Research question five is examined in Chapter Six, and the sixth and final question is addressed in Chapter Eight.

1.3.1 A description of the current study
The study was carried out in a Japanese higher education institution with six Japanese EFL learners as participants. Over an eight-week period, the participants engaged in a short course focusing on the *requesting* speech act-in-interaction. The course was composed of three key stages- a pre-treatment assessment stage, a treatment stage, and a post-treatment assessment stage (see Chapter Five for a detailed discussion of this study's methodology and design). The pre-treatment stage of the study consisted firstly of a non-dynamic assessment, in which the researcher and learners participated in individual sessions, co-constructing a number of strategic interaction type role-plays (see sections 5.3.5.4 and 5.4 for details of strategic interactions; the non-dynamic assessment sessions are analysed in Chapter Six). Following this, a dynamic assessment stage was carried out, in which the author and learners again participated in a number of strategic interactions. Unlike the non-dynamic sessions however, in the dynamic assessment stage, the researcher engaged in mediation sequences with the learners when necessary, addressing and resolving difficulties that arose during the task performances. Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine present an analysis of the DA sessions.

Following these assessments, the researcher and learners engaged in the enrichment programme portion of the study (see Chapter Five, section 5.3.5 for a detailed discussion of the enrichment programme). This was a four-week programme in which the learners met with the researcher twice per week. During these group sessions, the target umbrella concepts of *requesting* and *interactional competence* (IC) were introduced, as well as their sub-concepts. Based on Gal'Perin's (1979) concept-based instruction pedagogical methodology, the enrichment programme's purpose was to raise the learners' awareness and develop their understanding of how the requesting speech act is typically realised in authentic L2 discourse.

After the enrichment programme was concluded, the learners and researcher again engaged in both non-dynamic and dynamic assessments (see Chapter Six for analysis of non-DA sessions, and Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine for analysis of DA sessions). At this point, an additional *transfer assessment* was carried out, in which the learners' ability to apply their understanding to novel contexts was examined. In this way, by comparing the pre-enrichment programme data with the post-enrichment programme data, an analysis of
learner development in regards to control of the target concepts could be carried out.

In examining the data elicited from the strategic interaction role-plays, a microgenetic analytic approach was taken towards the transcript data, in which the interactions between the interlocutors was analysed in detail for evidence of learner development. The data were also coded to allow a basic quantitative analysis to be undertaken, providing further insights into changes in participants' interactions over time.

Analysis of the non-dynamic assessment data (presented in Chapter Six, and discussed in Chapter Ten) found evidence of increased learner control of the requesting speech-in-action, with request-based interactions increasing in complexity in the post-enrichment programme stages. Further, learners took on a more proactive approach, initiating some stages of request talk to a greater extent. Evidence was also found of an overall increase in learner understanding of social context and its relationship with language choices.

Analysis of the dynamic assessment stage data focused on three key areas - the ways in which the openings and closings of mediation sequences were negotiated (See Chapter Seven); diagnosis of learner difficulties (see Chapter Eight), and assessing learner development by examining the efficiency with which they oriented to and resolved the objects of mediation (see Chapter Nine). In terms of the openings and closings, a variety of strategies used by both the mediator and learners in initiating and closing sequences was found and examined. Opening and closing moves were also categorised in terms of explicitness. A comparison of moves produced in the pre and post-enrichment programme stages found implicit moves to become more frequent over time. This indicates that the participants became more efficient in orienting to the initiation and closing of mediation sequences, and thus showed increased interactional competence in this regard.

Analysis of the mediation sequences also uncovered a number of frequent learner problems regarding the requesting speech act, which are analysed in detail in Chapter Eight of the thesis. Furthermore, by analysing the efficiency with which participants oriented to the objects of mediation and were able to
resolve them, further evidence was found of learner development (see Chapter Nine for detailed analysis).

### 1.4 Outline of the thesis

Chapter Two presents an overview of this study's context. The review of the literature will focus on two key areas related to the current study. Chapter Three focuses on speech act theory and theories of politeness. Chapter Four is concerned with pragmatics assessments, the teachability of pragmatics, and dynamic assessment. The sociocultural foundations of DA will be reviewed, along with its aims and methodologies, the work of prominent DA advocates in educational psychology, and its recent implementation in the field of second language learning. Chapter Five presents a detailed overview of the study's methodology. Chapters Six to Nine examine the data, discussing the findings in detail. Chapter Ten presents a discussion of the research findings, while Chapter Eleven provides a conclusion, discussing implications for research, pedagogy and pragmatics assessment, as well as a brief discussion of future directions for L2 DA pragmatics research.
Chapter Two- Context

An important focus of this study concerns the Japanese EFL learner-participants' interactional competence in regards to the speech act of making a request in the English L2. In carrying out this task, the participants must take into account the pragmatic element of communication, in which language choices are influenced by the social context. The concepts of politeness and formality for example, play important roles in the co-construction of speech acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Hudson et al, 1995). As this study was carried out in Japan, it is informative then to provide an overview of the various contextual factors that may play a role in communication in Japanese society (for details of the specific setting of the study, see Chapter Five, section 5.2). In this way, the social and cultural norms that may potentially inform and shape the participants' communicative practices can be understood.

In this chapter then, I begin by discussing research that has been carried out on social and cultural practices relevant to Japan in relation to politeness and formality; communicative styles, and also provide an overview of other factors that can influence the pragmatic aspect of communication. Following this, I then discuss what Ochs (1979) describes as the "behavioural environment" aspect of context- non-verbal behaviour, and the research that has been conducted on this in Japan. I finally examine two contextual factors more specific to this study- the English language education system in Japan, and Japanese EFL learners' attitudes towards learning English.

2.1 Social, cultural practices and language

In this section I provide an overview of the social and cultural practices that may inform communication in Japanese society.

In interpreting each other's turns and thus dynamically co-creating interactions, participants typically rely on their shared cultural and social norms (Garfinkel and
Sacks, 1970; Cicourel, 1964). For Cicourel and Garfinkel and Sacks, for participants to engage in a shared activity with each other, they should both understand the type of activity they’re engaged in and how to carry out that activity.

This question of common understanding becomes more complex in this current study, in which the participants (myself and the learner-participants) do not necessarily share the same norms. This is relevant in two respects. Firstly, the context of participating in a dynamic assessment (see section 4.4 for details of dynamic assessment) was novel to the participants, and thus they engaged in a learning process throughout the study, as they became more competent in negotiating the boundaries between task and mediation sequences (see Chapter Seven for details). It is also relevant in terms of task performance, co-constructing the speech act of requesting in the L2. The cultural and pragmatic norms embedded within this L2 speech act posed a challenge to the learner-participants. A key goal of this study therefore was to promote the development of competence in this regard, and their ability to successfully negotiate mediation sequences between the mediator and themselves.

In relation to this aspect of context, the following sections discuss the wider contextual elements such as cultural and social norms and practices in relation to Japan, the country in which the study took place. These contextual elements are related to the concepts of politeness and formality, and how these concepts influence communication in Japan; they also relate to communication styles, and the role of context in talk.

2.1.1 Cultural differences

Hofstede (1991), on behalf of a large multinational company, carried out a study of employees’ attitudes towards their work environment, employing surveys to collect data. He then analysed the data to uncover important aspects of variation between cultural groups. Based on this, he makes the distinction between societies that place an emphasis on the individual, and those that emphasise the collective. For Hofstede, cultures with individualist leanings tend towards looser connections between individuals, with society members expected to primarily look after their
own interests, or those of their close families. Collectivist-leaning cultural groups on
the other hand may emphasise closely connected "in-groups" of individuals, in
which members of a group are expected to consider the well being of the group as
a whole. This distinction is supported by Brislin (1994), who characterises
individualism as prioritising "self-reliance," while collectivism places an emphasis
on the needs and goals of the group. This categorisation of cultures has its critics;
Triandis (1994) for example argues that the two categories create a false
dichotomy, with most societies in fact comprising a combination of individualistic
and collectivistic tendencies. For Triandis then, cultures may lean towards one or
the other end of an individualist-collectivist continuum; simply labeling a society as
being "individualistic" or "collectivistic" however, can be an oversimplification. With
this proviso in mind, Japan has been described as a relatively collectivistic culture
(Hofstede, 1991; Fukushima, 2000).

According to Hofstede (1991) and Triandis (1994), collectivist-leaning cultures tend
to be more sensitive to the context within which communication takes place, with
an emphasis on in-group harmony. For Hofstede, cultures with collectivist
tendencies typically emphasise "high-context" communication, in which the
information is primarily in the situation and environment, rather than in the
utterances of the interlocutors (see section 2.1.3 for an overview of "high-context"
and "low-context" cultures). Fukushima (2000) identifies a number of
characteristics of communication in collectivist societies. One such characteristic is
that members often distinguish between discourse between those who belong to
the same "group", and those who do not. Further, more attention is paid to context,
with typically less explicit verbal communication. Fukushima also puts forward that
members tend to infer meaning to a greater extent than those who belong to more
individualistic-leaning societies. Okabe (1983) supports this assertion, putting
forward that high-context cultures place more emphasis on the unspoken rather
than verbal utterances. A number of studies focusing on Japanese culture
specifically have found Japanese people to generally be sensitive to context, and
in particular the social status of the interlocutor (Beebe et al, 1990; Hashimoto et
2.1.2 Criticism of Hofstede

Hofstede's work has been both influential in the field of cross-cultural differences, and also controversial. While his research "launched a rapidly expanding body of cultural and cross-cultural research in the ensuing 20 years" (Oyserman et al, 2002, p.3), it has also been criticised in two general respects, related to methodology and reductionism.

A number of researchers have drawn attention to issues with the methodology employed by Hofstede in collecting data. Matsumoto (1999), surveying research comparing North American and Japanese cultural differences, found a number of studies that did not support Hofstede's, raising uncertainty therefore as to the validity of Hofstede's methods of measuring the constructs of "individualism" and "collectivism" (Takano & Osaka, 1999).

Further, Voronov and Singer (2002) put forward that Hofstede's study participants were not representative of their countries as a whole, with data collected solely from employees for a large multinational company. Criticism has also been raised regarding the survey questions and the way in which they were mapped to the individualism and collectivism constructs, with some questions not clearly related (Voronov & Singer, 2002).

Researchers have also called into question the predictive power of Hofstede's work, arguing that, while his quantitative methods found cultural differences, these findings could not be used to predict the behaviour of individuals (Shaules, 2007; Shaules, 2014; Oyserman et al, 2002). Shaules provides an example:

"...knowing that Americans drink less tea on average than Indians doesn't allow you to accurately predict whether a particular Indian or American will choose coffee or tea in a Cafe in Aleppo." (Shaules, 2014, p.168)

Further, using a limited number of questions and eliciting data from a narrow subset of a population, in order to make general assertions about cultures can be seen as being reductionist- reducing individuals to one large group, and making assertions about that group (Shaules, 2014; Oyserman et al, 2002; Voronov &
Singer, 2002). There is a risk that this reductionism may feed into cultural stereotypes:

"When a whole culture or society is pigeonholed in dichotomous categories...subtle differences and qualitative nuances that are more characteristic of that social entity may be glossed over." (Voronov & Singer, 2002, p.461)

Voronov and Singer (2002) also point out that Hofstede's findings do not account for differences found within a country. Ho and Chiu (1994) for example found there to be considerable variability within the country of China in terms of collectivistic and individualistic tendencies.

It should be noted that Hofstede himself was clear on his research's limitations, stating that it should not be used to predict individual behaviour, and that a country's cultural tendencies should not be seen as being static; rather there is a continual process of change in all cultures (Oyserman et al, 2002).

While acknowledging the criticisms of Hofstede, Shaules (2014) puts forward that individualism and collectivism should be viewed as constructs to describe a "group level phenomenon" (Shaules, 2014, p.173), and are not supposed to be predictive on an individual level:

"...the mark of shared cultural knowledge is not the degree to which our behavior is typical or non-typical; it is the degree to which we are capable of successfully interpreting behavior in accordance with community standards." (Shaules, 2014, p.175)

For Shaules then, cultural differences described by the work of Hofstede should not be seen as stereotyping, but as indicating a shared cultural knowledge that allows a person to make predictions about how another person may view their behaviour. As Shaules puts forward, "if I break a convention, I do so knowingly...as an expression of my intentions" (Shaules, 2014, p.175). This shared knowledge regarding how interactions typically unfold in particular situations is important to the
pragmatic element of communication—knowing how language is influenced by social context.

It is clear then, that we should be careful in drawing firm conclusions regarding cultural differences based on Hofstede's findings, and should also avoid seeing them as being predictive of individual behaviour. Nonetheless, the constructs of individualism and collectivism, when viewed as indicating shared cultural knowledge, are useful ones that provide context for the current study.

2.1.3 Cultural groups, language use and the importance of context

Hall (1976) put forward the concepts of high-context and low-context cultures as a way of understanding differences in communicative styles among different cultural communities. In Hall's conceptualisation, high-context cultures can be described as placing importance on close relationships, an emphasis on social hierarchy, and strong behavioural conventions (Kim et al, 1998). For Hall, in a high-context culture, meaning is often understood through an understanding of the context of an utterance, and through shared cultural knowledge, with less reliance on the verbal utterance itself. In contrast, in a low-context cultural group, meanings are typically explicitly realised in utterances, with less reliance on the context, or shared cultural knowledge. Hall and Hall (1990) categorise Japan as having high-context cultural tendencies. Richardson and Smith (2007) also found Japanese study participants to score more highly on the low-high context scale than American participants.

2.1.4 Criticism of Hall

As with the work of Hofstede, the work of Hall is useful, as it allowed cultural groups to be compared, helping to understand common communicative problems between people of different cultural backgrounds (Shaules, 2007); it has also been criticised however. Researchers have argued that communication, being highly contextual, means it is problematic to assert that culture has such an influence on communication styles. Kramsch (2005, p.15) points out that

"to assume that 'German culture' speaks through the discourse of a speaker of standard German is an inappropriate assumption in our days of hybrid,
Kramsch (2005) then, views the modern, globalised world as being incompatible with views of culturally-influenced communication styles. Further, as with the criticism of Hofstede, it is important to avoid overgeneralising with regards to cultural groups, and recognise the variation between groups in a society, and also between individuals. Nonetheless, Hall's concept of high and low-context cultures does provide an interesting perspective on possible cultural influences on participants' ways of communicating, and "recast our understanding of the relationship between culture and behaviour" (Shaules, 2007, p.39).

2.2 Social status relationships, language choices, and Brown and Levinson (1987)

Brown and Levinson (1987), in their study of politeness (see section 3.2.4 for further discussion), put forward that people, regardless of culture (and therefore including Japan's), assess three key contextual factors when deciding an appropriate level of politeness in communication- the "social distance" between the interlocutors; the "power" relationship (or social status), and the degree of imposition imposed on the hearer by the speaker's utterance. However, the universality of these factors put forward by Brown and Levinson has been challenged by a number of researchers, citing a Western bias. Ide (1989) puts forward that Brown & Levinson's concept of a rational agent, making choices of politeness strategies based on assessments of contextual variables, is Western-centric and not applicable to cultures such as Japan's. For Ide, politeness in Japan is dependent on “discernment”- the tendency to follow the rules of a group or society, with the needs of the individual of less importance than those of the collective. “Volition,” or free will, is less significant in Japanese culture therefore, than in American society, or other Western cultures. Kita and Ide (2007), studying the use of "aizuchi" (head-nodding as active listener behaviour), propose that this is an example of a socioculturally motivated politeness strategy, stating that “Japanese conversation puts emphasis on mutual cooperation and social
bonds…[and is] consistent with the view that the Japanese concept of self is socially defined…” (Kita & Ide, 2007, p.1252).

Matsumoto (1988) provides the Japanese honorific system as an example of socially bound rules of politeness, supporting Ide’s view that Japanese people have less freedom in choosing strategies than Brown and Levinson’s theory would suggest. The plain honorific “da” for example, cannot be used with someone of a higher social position than the speaker, but “desu” can be. Because this example doesn’t involve a "face-threatening act" (an act that has the potential to cause social discomfort for the hearer and/or the speaker) it cannot be explained by face-theory, Matsumoto argues. Rather than redressive action to appeal to the hearer’s negative face, they serve the purpose of showing status.

Countering Matsumoto’s (1988) conclusion, Fukada & Asato (2004) argue that the honorific may in fact be compatible with Brown & Levinson’s theory, by incorporating the concept of Japanese society’s vertical hierarchy. They propose that, in Japanese society, when an addressee has a higher social status, social distance and power relationships are perceived to be greater. Because of this, any act, whether intrinsically “face-threatening” or not, will be considered face-threatening under Brown & Levinson’s model when addressing those with higher social status.

Okamoto (2011) also disagrees with the notion that the Japanese use of honorifics is socially grounded and lacking in volition. Analysing audio recordings of talk, Okamoto found a wide range of uses of honorifics, both between people and also by the same person. Not all of these uses, it is argued, can be accounted for by the mere application of social rules linked to context. Okamoto puts forward that the speaker is not bound by the context, but is able to decide whether, or how, to employ honorifics in a way that reflects their view of the situation. Okamoto concludes that "conforming to canonical rule...is a choice, and not a robotic observance of the rule" (Okamoto, 2011, p.3686). For Okamoto, Japanese speakers make their language choices strategically, with their aims in mind.
Cook (2006) and Shibamoto-Smith and Cook (2011) also found evidence of more flexibility in Japanese politeness strategies than put forward by Ide (1989), arguing that, while social conditioning may well play a part in determining the politeness strategies used by Japanese people, social rules do not absolutely determine the outcome of decision-making. Rather, the individual brings their own particular reasoning to the situation, which influences choices made.

Addressing the criticism of Western bias in their theory, Brown & Levinson argue that, while cross-cultural misunderstanding may well occur, and frequently does, this illustrates how linguistic variety can cause “mismatches in perceived politeness” (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.33). For them however, it does not undermine the underlying principle of a rational being assessing contextual variables when selecting politeness strategies:

While all this work has focused on cultural differences, and has clearly demonstrated that even minor differences in interpretive strategies carried over from a first to a second language...can lead to misunderstandings and cross-group stereotyping of interactional style, there is...no inherent contradiction between this...and our own insistence on underlying universal...properties of the linguistic construction of utterances, which we see as deriving from universal constraints on human interaction. (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.36)

Further discussion of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) work is given in Chapter Three, section 3.2.4; specifically, section 3.2.4 discusses further criticism of the rationalist model underpinning their theory of politeness.

2.2.1 Cross-cultural analysis of Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness

Fukushima (1996; 2000) investigated variations between British and Japanese participants in their assessments of Brown and Levinson's power, social distance and degree of imposition contextual factors, and whether there was a correlation between their assessment of context and their choice of strategies.
Using questionnaire data, Fukushima found a number of differences in the ways the participants assessed these three contextual factors in various contexts. In terms of the factor of power, Fukushima found the Japanese participants to perceive a larger difference than the British in certain contexts (a professor-student relationship for instance). Age difference also appeared to be of greater significance for the Japanese participants than for the British. In certain situations, social distance was also perceived to be larger by the Japanese. Further, in some contexts, the degree of imposition was also perceived to be greater, such as when a student asks a tutor in an educational institution for a reference letter.

In the use of requesting strategies, there were differences in approximately half of the situations presented to the study participants, with the Japanese choosing more direct politeness strategies than the British; this is at odds with Brown and Levinson's (1987) categorisation of Japan's tendency towards "negative politeness," in which indirect and off-record strategies in requests are often employed. Fukushima argues that this discrepancy may be due to a number of factors, such as the Japanese participants assessing the power, social distance and degree of imposition factors differently (assessing the degree of imposition as being smaller for example).

Fukushima also argues that, in situations in which the status is equal and the Japanese participants employed more direct strategies, this may have been due to the in-group-out-group nature of the Japanese cultural norms, with Japanese people tending to be more direct with in-group members. Fukushima also challenges Brown and Levinson's assumption that indirect strategies are always more polite than direct ones, arguing it varies according to cultural groups; in some contexts, directness may indicate "in-group membership and solidarity" (Fukushima, 2000, p.190).

In general, Fukushima found there to be fewer differences between the ways in which British and Japanese participants tended to assess power, social distance and the degree of imposition, as well as requesting strategies, than between Japanese and American participants, lending some support to Brown and Levinson's (1987) grouping of British and Japanese cultures in the same "negative
politeness” category. Fukushima modifies Brown and Levinson’s categorisation however, dividing Japanese cultural norms regarding politeness into two categories- direct and indirect (Fukushima, 2000, p.195; see Figure 2-1), based on the findings of her research.

**Figure 2-1:** Fukushima’s findings in regards to requesting strategies among Japanese study participants (Fukushima, 2000, p.195)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Requesting strategies</th>
<th>Payoffs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese (1)</td>
<td>High D,P relations dominate in public encounters</td>
<td>Negative politeness strategies, i.e., conventionally indirect requests; Off-record strategies, i.e., off-record requests</td>
<td>To pay respect to H in return for the FTA, leaving H unimpeded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese (2)</td>
<td>Low P relations prevail in close relationship</td>
<td>Bald-on-record strategies, i.e., direct requests</td>
<td>To claim that the act is not an FTA; to show/strengthen solidarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: D= social distance  P= Power  H= Hearer  FTA= Face-threatening act*

In Fukushima’s first category (indirect), in situations where there is a large social distance or unequal power relations in public situations, the Japanese participants typically employed indirect politeness strategies. However, in situations in which the social distance is close, and relations are relatively equal (category 2), the requesting strategies tended to be direct.

Fukushima did find that the factors of power, social distance and degree of imposition did influence the Japanese participants' choice of request strategies however, lending support to Brown and Levinson’s argument of the universality of these three contextual factors.
While Fukushima’s study provides a number of interesting findings that inform our view of this current study’s context, there are two important provisos to be kept in mind. Fukushima refers to Hofstede's constructs of individualism and collectivism in her study. As discussed in section 2.1.2, the use of individualism and collectivism as constructs can be useful; however, we should be careful to avoid using them to predict individual behaviour. Further, the limited size of her study means, while informative, her findings should not be seen as being definitive. It is important to avoid overgeneralising any finding in relation to communicative or pragmatic styles or norms, or using them to predict the behaviour of individuals.

2.2.2 Variables in communicative practices

While looking at culture and language use can provide useful insights into communication, there are a number of important factors that must be kept in mind that can lead to variations in language use.

2.2.2.1 Gender

In this current study, four out of the six participants are female (for details of how the participants were selected, see Chapter Five). While gender is only one of a number of factors possibly affecting communication, and therefore should not be overgeneralised in its importance, gender and language use in Japan has been the subject of a number of studies. In Japanese society, "female language" has traditionally been associated with being indirect, polite and non-aggressive, while "male language" is typically associated with being relatively assertive, direct and less polite (Saito, 2010; Ide, 1990; Ide & Yoshida, 1999; Okamoto, 2004). In terms of how these supposed traits are realised in language use, studies have found evidence of Japanese women using honorifics (parts of language signifying respect) to a greater extent in the Japanese L1 than men (Hori, 1986; Endo, 1999), and employing more politeness strategies (Ide, 1990). Further, women’s utterances include end of sentence particles that soften an utterance (Ide, 1982; Honda, 2001). Kanemaru (1993) and Ozaki (2001) also found women to employ different first person pronouns than men (in the Japanese language, there are a number of pronouns for "I;" "watashi," "atashi," and "boku" being examples). In other studies
however, this marked difference in language choices between genders is not as clear, as shown in some of the studies discussed in section 2.2.3.2 below (Okamoto & Sato, 1992; Okamoto, 1995).

2.2.2.2 Age

A further factor to be taken into account is age. All of the participants in this study are young adults between the ages of 19 and 21 years (see Chapter Five, section 5.2 for details of the participants). This leads to the question of how age may affect language choices in Japanese society. Okamoto and Sato (1992) investigated the talk of Japanese females in three different age groups- 18-23 years; 27-34 years, and 45-57 years of age. Okamoto and Smith found the oldest age group to make greater use of end of sentence grammatical forms traditionally associated with "female language," while the youngest age group used the fewest. The youngest age group also tended to use more "masculine" end of sentence forms.

Okamoto (1995) further investigated speech styles among young Japanese females, with the aim of understanding the degree to which their language use conformed to feminine language stereotypes. Okamoto found young females generally not conform to "female language" conventions, with "neutral" end of sentence forms being the most commonly used, and "masculine" types used more than feminine forms among the majority of the participants. In explaining this divergence of younger females' language choices from traditional feminine language conventions, she argues that the traditional notion of what constitutes "female language" in Japan is based on the communication style of relatively wealthy Japanese women living in the Tokyo area (Okamoto, 1995). Others put forward that increasing numbers of women entering the workplace has encouraged them to use increasingly "assertive" language forms (Reynolds, 1990).

In light of the above discussion regarding gender and age variation, it is clear that it is important to avoid reducing Japanese communicative and pragmatic practises to stereotypes. Rather, it is more worthwhile to undergo a "reexamination of stereotypical linguistic preferences...[and instead focus on] situational diversity and appropriateness" (Matsumoto and Okamoto, 2003, p.34).
2.2.2.3 Individual differences

A further factor to be taken into account is individual differences with regards to language use. In studying the use of honorifics and end of sentence forms in Japanese L1 talk for example, it has been found that language choices are often made based on multiple factors, such as the local context of the interaction (in a school or office for instance), and the individual's attitude and beliefs regarding the language (Okamoto, 1997). Okamoto (2011) also found a diverse range of ways in which honorifics were employed by the study participants, leading her to question the legitimacy of traditional views regarding their usage. Okamoto (2011, p.3686) puts forward that "ultimately it is the speaker and not the context" that is responsible for language choices related to honorifics, with a person's beliefs playing an important role. Saito (2010), in examining talk in business contexts also found participants to employ politeness and formality strategies in "fluid" ways that may reflect the personal attributes of the speaker as much as the status relationship of the interaction (such as a manager-employee relationship); these strategies are chosen then in a flexible manner, not necessarily dictated by convention.

2.3 Non-verbal behaviour

In the following section, I move from discussing broad contextual factors to another aspect of context that can influence communication- non-verbal behaviour (or the "behavioural environment," Ochs, 1979). Non-verbal behaviour forms an important layer of analysis in this current study, and is examined in detail in Chapter Seven.

For Ochs (1979), non-verbal behaviour is an important element of context, helping to frame talk, and can include not only gestures, but also eye contact, which is "relevant to language...it is a piece of its context" (Ochs, 1979, p.3). Ochs uses the example of a speaker changing their vocal pitch or volume for instance, if they notice their interlocutor's gaze is not towards them.
Van Compernolle (2013) also examines the use of non-verbal strategies by participants in a dynamic assessment, as the participants transition form mediation sequences to task sequences of talk (see section 4.4.5.3 for a discussion of van Compernolle's approach to DA). Parts of this study's data analysis, following van Compernolle, also look at non-verbal behaviour by the participants, as they negotiate these boundaries between mediation and task sequences (see Chapter Seven for an analysis of how the study participants carried out these negotiations), and achieve common understanding. This aspect of context therefore is an important element of this study, playing a role in gaining insights into the data.

2.3.1 Eye contact

One important aspect of non-verbal behaviour is eye contact, or gaze. In the following section, I provide an overview of studies investigating the use of gaze in Japanese society (see sections 7.3.3 and 7.4.3 for specific analysis of gaze in this study's data).

Akechi et al (2013) found that the amount and length of eye contact can vary between cultural groups. Argyle et al (1986), in a study of British, Italian and Japanese participants, found that participants from the UK and Italy rated making eye contact in a conversation as being of greater importance than did the Japanese participants. Other studies have found Japanese participants to make less eye contact in business contexts (Hawrysh & Zaichkowsky, 1991), and when responding to questions (McCarthy et al, 2006). Further, Akechi et al (2013) found evidence that, using heart-rate monitoring technology, Japanese participants may find faces making direct eye contact to be "angrier and more unapproachable" than did the European participants.

Based on the above research therefore, it would be reasonable to expect some of the learners to infrequently use eye contact as a resource. In this study however, data analysis found the participants to often draw upon eye contact as a resource during mediation sequences, and is discussed in Chapter Seven section 7.3.3, 7.4.3.
2.3.2 Silence and other non-verbal behaviour

In this current study, non-verbal behaviours, such as pausing, nodding and smiling form an important part of the ways in which the participants both carry out the task of co-constructing a request in talk, and also in the successful completion of mediation sequences (see Chapter Seven for analysis of these behaviours).

A number of studies on Japanese learners have found differences in terms of silence, or reluctance to talk, in the classroom, when compared with other cultural groups. Japanese learners have sometimes been found to produce fewer turns at talk in a classroom setting than non-Asian learners (Sato, 1982; Nakane, 2006). In explaining Japanese learners seeming tendency to produce fewer utterances, a number of ideas have been put forward by researchers, such as shyness (Doyon, 2000), insufficient knowledge of L2 norms (Korst, 1997; Jones, 1999), and the adverse affect of the Japanese university entrance examinations, which do not directly test speaking ability (Brown & Yamashita, 1995). King (2013) argues that the silence observed in Japanese EFL classrooms may be due to multiple factors, such as boredom, the prevalence of teacher-centred lessons, the learners feeling confused or uncertain as to how to proceed with language tasks, and feelings of embarrassment.

This leads to a more general question of how silence is used in Japanese society, in Japanese L1 conversations. Kogure (2007) investigated the non-verbal behaviour of Japanese study participants, in Japanese L1 conversation. Kogure calls into question the assumption that silence is tolerated to a greater extent in Japanese L1 talk. Rather than being "interactionally vacuous," a number of non-verbal behaviours were employed by participants during these pauses in talk. In particular, when negotiating who should take the next turn in a conversation, the participants drew upon a variety of non-verbal behaviours, such as nodding and smiling. Nodding has been found to play an important role in Japanese L1 conversation, helping to develop social relationships through talk-in-interaction (Kita, 1996), and to enable participants to negotiate turn-taking collaboratively (Hayashi, 1996).
From this overview then, it can be seen that the use of gaze and other non-verbal behaviours form an important part of the behavioural environment when Japanese people communicate face-to-face. Some of the research suggests interesting variations in how these resources are employed, with Japanese speakers seemingly making less direct eye contact in some situations than speakers from other cultural groups. Further, while some studies have found Japanese speakers to make fewer verbal utterances in talk, it is also clear that silence in talk among Japanese people can indicate other non-verbal strategies taking place, such as nodding or smiling. Chapter Seven's analysis of the ways in which this study's participants negotiated opening and closing mediation and task sequences of talk shows that the participants frequently drew upon these non-verbal resources in achieving common understanding. Gaze for example, was sometimes used to indicate that a mediation sequence had been successfully completed, while nodding was frequently employed in negotiating the beginning of a mediation sequence (see sections 7.2.7 and 7.3.3).

2.4 The Japanese education system and English language teaching

All of the learner-participants in this study received compulsory education through the Japanese education system. As part of this system, all Japanese students participate in English language learning. As this study focuses on the participants' English language learning and development, it is therefore useful to provide an overview of the role of English in Japanese education generally.

According to the Japanese Ministry for Education (MEXT), the English language education component in Japanese public schools aims to "enable Japanese people to communicate in international settings" (Gottlieb, 2012, p.65). With this goal in mind, the Japanese government has invested resources in a number of programmes designed to improve learners' English L2 standards in schools, such as the Japanese Exchange and Teaching (JET) programme, which places English L1 speakers in Japanese public school language classrooms as teaching assistants. Since 2003, a degree of emphasis has been placed on spoken English
ability in schools, through the Strategic Plan to Cultivate Japanese with English Abilities programme (2002). Further, since 2011, English education has been introduced to Japanese primary schools, leading to learners encountering English from the age of seven years (this does not apply to this study's participants however, who had all left the primary school stage of education before 2011). Before 2011, English classes began from the age of thirteen, when students entered into the junior high school stage of compulsory education.

However, while the above programmes aimed to improve learners' English communicative abilities, this approach has faced challenges in the Japanese language classroom, due to large class sizes and teaching methods (Nishino, 2008). Further, the entrance examinations students take upon leaving the high school stage of their education careers does not include a spoken English component; rather, the test focuses on formal knowledge of the English language in the form of grammar and vocabulary, and also on reading comprehension. The effect of this has been to discourage speaking and listening practice in school classrooms, and instead teach the aspects of language featuring in the test (Taguchi, 2005). According to Gorsuch (1998) and Myers (2003), teaching still focuses on grammar and vocabulary primarily, taught out of the context of surrounding talk or the social context.

Because of this, Japanese learners who enter university after high school at the age of eighteen are often described as sometimes being "false beginners," in the sense that they typically have some knowledge of lexis and syntax, but are beginners in terms of putting the English L2 to use in communicative contexts (Richards, 2011).

2.4.1 Japanese EFL learners' attitudes towards the English L2

In my study, the six learner-participants have a variety of personalities and goals for their learning (see Chapter Five, section 5.2 for descriptions of the individual participants). It would stand to reason therefore for there to be individual differences in how their attitudes towards the L2 affect communication when engaging in DA sessions with myself. This view is supported by LoCastro (2001),
who investigated the attitudes of Japanese EFL learners towards English L2 communicative practices. As with my study, LoCastro's participants were all Japanese undergraduate students at a Japanese university, and all were studying the English language. Examining the learners' self-reports on attitudes towards English, reactions to English L2 communicative practices, and motivation, LoCastro found that some of the learners showed a degree of "resistance" to incorporating L2 pragmatic norms in their L2 use:

"Individual differences, specifically attitudes, motivation, and learner self-identity, may influence and constrain the willingness to adopt... [native speaker] standards for linguistic action" (LoCastro, 2011, p.83)

In my study therefore, it makes sense for there to be individual differences among the participants in terms of the incorporation of the requesting speech act L2 norms in their talk-in-interaction. This is borne out in the analysis of the data in Chapters Six, Seven, Eight and Nine. This may also reflect individual differences among the learners in regards to their beliefs and attitudes towards their Japanese L1 as well (see section 2.2.3.3).

2.5 Conclusion
In this chapter, I discussed the various aspects of context in relation to this study. I described the setting of the study, discussing various aspects of the context in relation to pragmatics and communicative practices, including non-verbal behaviour, the possible influence of culture, and a number of factors that may affect pragmatic choices.

In the next chapter (Chapter Three), Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness will be discussed in more detail, alongside theories of speech acts, and criticism of the rational model underlying the work of speech act theorists and Brown and Levinson.
Chapter Three
Speech Act Theory and Politeness Theory

The purpose of this chapter is to provide context as to why speech acts are considered an important aspect of communication, and thus why a speech act was chosen as the pedagogical focus of this study. Further, this chapter will outline the rationale for this study adopting a conversation-analytic (CA) conception of speech acts, rather than that of the traditional speech act theory (SAT) set out in the work of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). The work of Austin and Searle will therefore be briefly outlined, followed by an overview of criticisms of the theory. CA’s perspective on speech acts will then be discussed, and the reasons why this more recent approach addresses some of the issues with SAT. Further, the concept of politeness, an important focus of this study will be discussed.

3.1 Speech Act Theory

Austin’s (1962) initial “performative hypothesis,” put forward that some kinds of utterances that use performative verbs are not merely statements, but carry out actions. Austin classed utterances into constatives (statements) that can be verified as true or false (“London is the capital city of the United Kingdom”), and “performatives” that cannot be judged to be true or false, but instead perform an action (“I invite you to a party”). Performative utterances, according to Austin, are characterised by certain features, such as the ability to insert “hereby” before the verb, and the ability to use the present tense form. For example, the utterance "I hereby invite you to a party" is appropriate, indicating the performative nature of the verb; "I hereby am British" however is not, and therefore cannot be performative. Rather, in Austin’s terms, it is a constative.

To process an utterance, the addressee must interpret the illocutionary force, or intended meaning. In order to do that, certain felicity conditions must be present before or during the speech act, known as felicity conditions, or “conditions of
appropriateness” (LoCastro, 2012, p.63). For Austin then, in order for speech acts to be realised, they must be in compliance with the felicity conditions; in other words, the speaker, hearer and the context should adhere to the norms of the speech act in order for it to be successful.

Austin (1962) later revised his theory concerning the notion of performative and constative utterances, acknowledging that statements can perform acts also. Instead, the hypothesis was adapted to form a theory of speech acts, in which not only performative type utterances, but also constatives could perform acts of speech as well. In this revision, Austin categorised three different features of speech acts:

1. **Locutionary act** - the literal meaning of the proposition;

2. **Illocutionary act** - the intended meaning of the proposition;

3. **Perlocutionary act** - the effect the act has on the addressee. This may or may not be different to the illocutionary act of the speaker. For example, while the speaker’s utterance “it’s chilly in here, isn’t it?” may have an intended meaning of “please turn on the heating,” this may or may not be picked up by the hearer, who may simply think the speaker is making an ice-breaking conversational gambit.

This evolution of the theory addressed some of the issues with the original hypothesis, and laid the groundwork for the work of Searle (1969).

3.1.1 Searle’s development of speech act theory

Searle, continuing the work of Austin, gave prominence to the notion of rule-based speech act behaviour, detailing a number of felicity conditions for various speech acts. Searle categorised the rules into varying types, namely propositional content conditions, preparatory conditions, sincerity conditions, and essential conditions. Searle (adapted from 1969, p.67) provides the felicity conditions, or rules, for the act of thanking for example:

   Propositional content condition: past act A done by the hearer (H);
Preparatory condition: A benefits the speaker (S) and S believes A benefits S;

Sincerity condition: S feels grateful or appreciative for A;

Essential condition: counts as an expression of gratitude or appreciation.

In the above example, the propositional content condition refers to an action by H that must have been carried out at some point in the past. The preparatory condition sets out that the act must have been something that has benefitted the speaker, and thus something for which he or she is genuinely grateful (the sincerity condition). The final “essential” condition is that the utterance “counts” as showing gratitude. Further, in an effort to organise speech acts to a degree, Searle (1976) proposed a number of categories under which pragmatically similar speech acts may be grouped, such as representative speech acts (such as complaining or boasting) and directives (such as commands or orders).

3.1.2 Criticism of Speech Act Theory

Thomas (1995) criticises Searle’s rules regarding speech acts as failing to account for some speech act realisations, which despite not meeting every condition set by Searle, are nonetheless valid. Further, Thomas puts forward that, if all speech acts were to be described in such a rule-based manner, the result would be extremely complex sets of conditions.

A further criticism of speech act theory, concerns its view of acts as consisting of isolated utterances, ignoring the sociolinguistic context of speech (LoCastro, 2012). Walters (2009) argues that Austin’s and Searle’s theories focus on the speaker of an utterance, to the exclusion of the hearer. For Walters, the hearer is equally important, as an act of speech requires an interlocutor in order to be successfully carried out. Mey (2001) puts forward that it is an oversimplification to describe speech acts in terms of single utterances. A more authentic description must instead include sequences of talk, showing how speech acts develop through interaction with another.

In accordance with the views of the above critics of traditional speech act theory, Thomas (1995, p.198), in stating that “almost all speech acts are
collaborative,” puts forward that “it is almost always the case that “the hearer has a contribution to make in determining the successfulness...of a speech act” (Thomas, 1995, p.198). Observing that illocutionary force is often negotiated between the speaker and the hearer in an interaction, Thomas provides two examples, shown in Figure 3-1.

**Figure 3-1:** Examples of co-constructed illocutionary force (Thomas, 1995, p.198)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 1: At breakfast in a hotel during a staff conference. The tea and coffee pots are on the table beside David</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David: Tea or coffee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny: Coffee, please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 2: Same setting as in the previous example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David: Tea of coffee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis: Yes, please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David: Coffee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis: Thank you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first example, Jenny interpreted David’s utterance as an offer, while in the second, Francis responded as if it were a question. For Thomas therefore, David’s utterance had the potential to be either speech act, depending on the response of the interlocutor.

Thomas further argues for the context and discourse surrounding an utterance to be examined carefully when analysing speech act realisations, with a request act for example often being realised over a number of turns, rather than just a single utterance.

### 3.2 Theories of politeness
An important focus of the current study is the pragmatic concept of politeness, and how it is realised in requesting and talk-in-interaction. The most prominent theory of politeness (Brown and Levinson, 1987) uses speech act theory as a foundation upon which they build a coherent and detailed account of the rational decision-making processes involved in choosing politeness strategies. In this section, the concept of politeness will be defined, before discussing the theories, with an emphasis on Brown and Levinson's work.

3.2 Definitions of politeness

Kasper (1994, p.3206) makes the distinction between the folk meaning of the word “politeness” and the linguistic definition. For Kasper, politeness in the non-academic sense “refers to proper social conduct and tactful consideration of others.” Politeness from a linguistic point of view however

“...refers to a broader... concept. Since the object of pragmatic inquiry is linguistic action, `politeness` as a pragmatic notion refers to the ways in which linguistic action is carried out- more specifically, ways in which the relational function in linguistic action is expressed.” (Kasper, 1994, p.3206)

For Kasper therefore, the academic concept of politeness refers to the ways in which linguistic choices reflect the relationship context between interlocutors.

Fukushima (2000, p.27) provides her own interpretation of the term, incorporating the concept of “face,” a term that will be discussed later in the chapter. According to Fukushima, politeness refers to strategies employed to "maintain mutual face" in relationships between interlocutors, with displays of "appropriate behaviour" necessary for politeness.

3.2.2 The importance of politeness

For second language learners, appropriate use and understanding of politeness strategies is an important part of adapting to life in a target language community. Failure to adapt to second language pragmatic norms concerning politeness may lead to negative consequences. While the process for developing second language politeness may be time-consuming and complex, it is a necessary element of language learning. LoCastro (2012) argues that
becoming proficient in grammar and lexical knowledge in a second language is not sufficient; in addition, learners must develop pragmatic competence in order to avoid being the victim of negative stereotyping in the second language community. For LoCastro therefore, pragmatic instruction should form an important part of learning a language.

3.2.3 Early work on politeness

Early studies in this area of pragmatics focused on linguistics and levels of linguistic politeness. Walters (1979a; 1979b) and Fraser (1978) investigated perceptions of politeness between native speakers and non-native speakers of English and Spanish, in order to establish such a hierarchy (of modal verbs for example). There was found to be a high level of agreement between the participants, with more grammatically complex utterances generally perceived to be more polite than simple ones. While these studies offered useful insights into perceptions of linguistic politeness, they suffered from failing to account for how differing social situations may affect the realisation of politeness. Thomas (1995) puts forward a further criticism, arguing that there is not always necessarily a connection between linguistic form and function. A linguistic form usually considered to be “polite” may be used in an impolite manner, depending on the situation the speaker and hearer find themselves in. In a social situation between two close friends for example, an excessive use of polite terms may lead to the hearer feeling that the speaker is creating unnecessary distance between them. Thomas concludes therefore that, in addition to the linguistic form of an utterance, the context within which it is uttered, and the relationship between the interlocutors should also be taken into account.

3.2.4 Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory of politeness

Brown & Levinson (1987) addressed the problems of earlier studies, placing context in a position of central importance in their extensive theory of politeness. Brown & Levinson advance their theory as having universal application, possessing equal explanatory power regardless of the country or culture.

Observing similarities between cultures and their expressions of polite behaviour, their theory seeks to explain the reasoning behind people’s choice of
politeness strategies. The theory rests on two key assumptions. Firstly, it is held that humans are rational beings, motivated to act for the mutual benefit of both themselves and the other participant in the interaction. Further, it is argued that “face” is of key significance in interactions between people. This concept was first put forward by Goffman (1967, p.5), who defined face as

“...The positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes- albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself.”

The concept of face is central to Brown & Levinson’s theory of politeness, as it is assumed that interlocutors behave in such a way as to address the needs and wants of the other participant’s “face,” while at the same time expecting their face needs to be attended to in a suitable manner. This subtle and complex negotiation of face occurs in a wide variety of contexts, and is key to understanding the motives and reasoning behind the use of politeness strategies.

3.2.4.1 Theory of face

Brown & Levinson put forward a number of key assertions that summarise their theory of preserving face. The first is that a “model person” has both a positive and a negative face that he or she wishes to be attended to. A person’s positive face is described as “the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others” (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.62). Negative face however, is defined as “the want of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others” (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.62). As these wants can only be met by another person in an interaction however, it is in the best interests of both parties to actively attempt to maintain each other’s face needs. Further, Brown & Levinson theorise that some acts, by their very nature, threaten the face of the hearer (and perhaps the speaker), such as a request for example. In situations where such acts are necessary, the speaker will attempt to reduce the threat through various politeness strategies, unless there is a more pressing need to be efficient in carrying out the act (such as in an emergency, when the
The more threatening the act, the higher degree of politeness will be necessary to mitigate it. The theory also provides an important proviso in that it is assumed that all parties to an interaction will be aware of these “rules” of behaviour. Therefore, while it may seem logical to always choose the most polite strategy in order to minimise the risk of a party losing face, being overly polite may in fact arouse suspicion in the hearer, who may believe the act to be more threatening than it actually is.

Brown & Levinson (1987) list a number of acts that inherently threaten an interlocutor’s negative face, including ones that pressurise the hearer into doing or not doing something, such as orders or requests. A second type is acts relating to an action that the speaker will carry out, such as an offer or promise. This puts pressure on the hearer to either accept or refuse the speaker’s act. A further type involves the speaker displaying a liking for the hearer’s possessions. A compliment for example, may fit this type of inherently face-threatening act. In addition, Brown and Levinson put forward two types of act that inherently threaten the hearer’s positive face. The first type relates to the speaker disapproving of H’s positive face, and can include criticism for example, or disagreeing. The second type relates to showing a lack of caring for the hearer’s positive face, such as interrupting.

According to Brown and Levinson, the speaker has four choices when faced with carrying out a face-threatening act (FTA):

1. They may “go on record, without redress,” in which the speaker communicates in the most efficient and direct manner possible, in sympathy with Grice’s (1975) maxims. According to Brown and Levinson, this strategy is typically chosen when the speaker wishes to carry out the FTA quickly, and when this wish is deemed more important than the face wants of the hearer. Giving orders in emergency situations would be an example of this.

2. They may go on record, with redress. Here, as with the previous option above, the meaning of the speaker’s utterances will be clear and unambiguous to the hearer. However, redressive action will involve attempting to mitigate the effects of the FTA in some way, softening the threat. Such action may take the form of positive politeness, in which the speaker appeals to the positive face
wants of the hearer, or negative politeness, in which the speaker appeals to the hearer's wish to be independent and left alone. FTAs

"...are redressed with apologies for interfering...with linguistic deference, with hedges on the illocutionary force of the act, with impersonalising mechanisms...and with softening mechanisms that give the addressee an 'out,' a face-saving line of escape, permitting him to feel that his response is not coerced." (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.70)

According to Brown & Levinson, opting to appeal to H's positive face wants may carry higher risks than choosing negative politeness strategies. For Brown and Levinson, appealing to the hearer's positive face entails assuming he belongs to the same "group" as the hearer, which is an assumption the hearer may not share, and could thus reject. Appealing to the hearer's negative face wants on the other hand, involves addressing the hearer's desire to be free to act as they please, a strategy that does not require any assumptions on the part of the speaker. When applying positive politeness strategies then, the speaker is accepting a certain degree of risk. Positive politeness implies that the speaker is friendly with the hearer, or is a member of the same group. If the hearer does not see the speaker as part of this group, he may feel that the speaker is being presumptuous. An example of this may be seen in a low ranking employee employing positive politeness strategies with his employer. The employer may feel such an approach to be overly familiar.

3. A speaker may also go off-record with their utterance, introducing a degree of ambiguity into the FTA. This allows the speaker to not commit to the act, in case of a negative reaction from the hearer. Brown & Levinson also identify the use of “conventionalised indirectness,” a way of going off-record that has become standardised to such an extent that it is no longer ambiguous in meaning, effectively making the act on-record. Phrases such as “could you pass the salt?” for example, while indirect, have become an established way of requesting in English. These conventionalised indirect utterances serve the function of solving the tension between wishing to avoid a FTA, and needing to carry it out.

4. A final option available to the speaker is to avoid the FTA altogether, deciding that the risk to face is too large to be worthwhile.
Brown & Levinson put forward that there are a number of advantages to each option. On record FTAs have the benefit of being clear and easily understood, while adding a form of redress serves to satisfy the face wants of the hearer in some way. Going off-record with the FTA however may reduce the face-threat to a greater extent, and may help the speaker to avoid responsibility for the act.

3.2.4.2 Social distance, power and rank of imposition

When calculating appropriate politeness strategies in a given situation, according to Brown & Levinson, three factors are of central importance— the social distance between the speaker and the hearer; the power relationship between the parties, and the ranking of the imposition in the parties’ particular culture. While social distance refers to the degree of familiarity between the speaker and hearer and the power relationship the relative status levels (employer and employee for example), the ranking of the imposition concerns the size of the favour being asked, and how much effort is required to carry it out. The measurement of these variables is very much context-dependent, varying significantly in differing situations. Brown & Levinson use the example of a bank manager with high social status, who would normally address a person in a certain manner. If H were to hold a gun to the bank manager’s head however, the power relationship would be altered, and the choice of politeness strategies would follow suit. In any situation, the speaker will assess the costs and benefits of the strategies available, making a language choice perceived to appropriate for the context.

3.2.4.3 FTA strategies and their realisation

Brown & Levinson provide in detail the various politeness strategies that fall under the four above-mentioned choices the speaker faces when needing to perform a FTA. According to their theory, more than one strategy may be employed by the speaker as, in general, the more effort he or she expends the more polite his or her utterance is perceived to be. Further, the same strategy may address more than one face need. Examples given of negative politeness strategies include apologising, being pessimistic, and hedging. Positive politeness strategies on the other hand include using in-group identity markers, joking, and being optimistic.
3.3 Criticism of the rationalist model underpinning speech act theory and Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory

Arundale (1999) argues for a move away from the Western rationalist model of communication, in which individuals act in isolation from each other, with intention and meaning bound up in the cognition of the individual. The rationalist model forms the foundations of both SAT and Brown and Levinson’s theory of politeness, both highly influential in the field of pragmatic research. However, even Brown and Levinson, when putting forward their explanation of politeness, acknowledged the inherent weaknesses in their theoretical positioning regarding the social nature of communication, ceding that their theory is ill-equipped to explain social interaction's "emergent properties" (Brown & Levinson, p.48).

According to Arundale (1999, p.122), Brown and Levinson's theory (and also the work of Austin and Searle) is based on the "encoding/decoding" model of communication. According to this model, the speaker formulates his or her goals and intentions, encodes them in language, and then “transmits” the message to the receiver (hearer) who then decodes the message. This model is described by Arundale as wholly inadequate for explaining the interactional, emergent nature of real-life communication. Arundale advocates a view of communication that is ontologically antithetical to the individualistic, cognitive view underpinning SAT and politeness theory, instead seeing interaction as “the meshing of two individuals’ separate cognitive plans or schemas" (Arundale, 1999, p.126). For Arundale, speech acts are co-constructed by the interlocutors, with the turns in talk dependent on the previous turns and the potential turns to come; the illocutionary force are also seen as co-constructed, rather than "decoded" by the individual.

3.3.1 Towards a contextualised, discourse-focused analysis of speech acts

Similarly to Arundale, Kasper (2004; 2006b) puts forward a proposal for a "discursive approach to pragmatics," in which conversation analysis (CA) is applied to the investigation of speech acts, replacing the dominant rationalist approach exemplified in the work of Searle and Brown and Levinson.
Kasper (2006b) criticises the traditional rationalist approach to speech acts on three levels: action, meaning, and context. SAT, and Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory, are both based on the theoretical notion of the rational person, who makes purposeful choices regarding actions based on their goals and cost/benefit analyses. Grounded in an individual’s psychology, a person performs speech acts with the aim of carrying out their intended goal. For Kasper, a key weakness of SAT is its need to make assumptions as to the intentions of the speaker, assumptions that cannot be proved, as we cannot possibly know a person’s thoughts unless we ask them. An utterance, for example, may be interpreted as being one of a number of speech acts, based on the guesswork of the researcher (it may be alternatively a request or suggestion for instance). According to Kasper, conversation analysis (CA) addresses this weakness by purposefully avoiding making any assumptions about the speaker’s intentions, instead searching for evidence in talk. By “analysing the participant’s turns-at-talk in their sequential location [CA] enables the analyst to examine what actions the participants accomplish jointly, how such actions reflexively define the activity, without making assumptions about the actions-as-intended.” (Kasper, 2006, p.291). The uncertainty as to which speech act an utterance may be can be seen as a weakness of the speech act framework of analysis therefore, rather than any inherent ambiguity in the data. For Kasper, CA then does not assume the motivations or intentions of interlocutors, but instead discusses evidence in the talk indicating what their intentions may be.

Kasper (2006b) also puts forward a need to reexamine how we conceive of “meaning.” A rationalist approach conceives of utterances as containers holding messages from the speaker, with the speaker’s intention determining the meaning of the utterance. Arundale (1999) describes this model of meaning as one of “encoding/decoding.” In this highly individualistic model of meaning-making, the speaker decides what message they wish to convey, encodes it in linguistic form, and “sends” it to the hearer, who then must decode the message in order to understand the meaning within.

An extension of the encoding/decoding model of intended meaning is that of conventionalised forms used to convey the message of the speaker, and is exemplified in the taxonomies of conventionalised speech act realisations in
Brown and Levinson (1987) and Blum-Kulka et al (1989). Kasper argues that the fixed, unchanging nature of these taxonomies can sometimes fail to accurately capture meaning in interaction, putting forward that all utterances should be analysed in light of their position in the sequence of talk, fully taking into account the preceding turns, and those that come after. Rather than assuming that a conventionalised expression represents a particular action therefore, CA adopts a “why that now?” approach (Scheglof and Sacks, 1973). Kasper (2004) illustrates this point with an example, shown in Figure 3-2.

**Figure 3-2:** Example talk-in-interaction sequence (Kasper, 2004, p.126)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I: Mm. Can you tell me about—what— you did over Golden Week?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>C: Pardon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I: Tell me what you did for Golden Week, over Golden Week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>C: Yah, I (. ) worked as a (. ) assistant of ca-, cameraman, and uh one day I (. ) met, =I’ve met my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>(. ) parents,=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I: =Mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>C: in Okayama.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Figure 3-2, “I” repeats the same question twice, in line 1, then again in line 3. While the illocutionary force (intended meaning) of both utterances are the same however, the pragmalinguistic form has changed, from a conventionally indirect request (Blum-Kulka et al, 1989) to a direct one. From a speech act perspective analysing these realisations in isolation, it is difficult to satisfactorily explain the reason why the request form changes here, as the social context has remained the same. CA however, placing the utterances back into their talk-in-interaction context, can provide answers. The repeating of the question in line 3 can be seen to be a response to the repair initiator of “C” in line 2 ("pardon?"). That C has initiated repair indicates that C is having difficulty understanding the initial utterance of I, and so I produces a simplified, more direct reformulation of the original request. While an analysis using speech act frameworks therefore
may have led to a misunderstanding of the directness of the repeated question in line 3 therefore, the introduction of CA allows I’s utterance to be understood in context.

For Kasper then, rationalist approaches to meaning fail to accurately reflect real talk, ignoring the social context of interaction. She also offers a further criticism, arguing that SAT fails to account for nonverbal actions, such as delays or pauses in speech, which can have significant effects on the CA notion of preference organisation. Kasper puts forward that the propositional content and linguistic form are not the only important characteristics of an act, as the “temporal structuring” of a turn (a pause or hesitation for example) can also be influential. Kasper uses the example of an apology as a first turn. According to CA, an apology requires a response, some of which may be “preferred” (comfortable for the speaker) or “dispreferred” (uncomfortable). A delay in responding may be interpreted by the speaker as a dispreferred response, requiring further action in order to elicit a more favourable response from the hearer. Kasper argues therefore, that while grammatical and lexical elements are certainly important in terms of pragmatic meaning, it is also important to take into account other features of interaction. Particular attention should be paid to the placement of turns in sequences of interaction, and also the “temporal organisation” (Kasper, 2006b, p.301) of turns, including pausing and the delaying of utterances.

Kasper (2006b) also calls for a reconceptualisation of context, away from a discourse-external notion of power, distance, and imposition operating on the interaction independently of the interlocutors. While some studies to date have indeed taken into account participants’ subjective assessments of these factors as being relevant to speech act realisation strategies, Kasper argues that this too is unsatisfactory, arguing for a view instead in which “context is endogenous to the interaction” (Kasper, 2006b, p.304). For CA, analysts must show in the data where these variables become relevant to the participants through their talk. CA then reframes context as being discourse-internal, displayed via the “sequential environment” and “publicly displayed orientations to social structure” (Kasper, 2006b, p.305). The factors of power, distance, and rank of imposition must be shown to be relevant to the participants through their
interaction therefore; it should not simply be assumed that these factors are relevant.

3.6 Conclusion

In this chapter speech act theory, through the work of Austin and Searle, has been critically discussed, alongside Brown and Levinson’s theory of politeness. Both theories have proved influential in the field of pragmatics, providing frameworks for analysis of talk. It has also been shown, in the work of Arundale (1999), Kasper (2004; 2006) among others, that the individual-in-isolation view of communication that underpins both of these theories is inadequate for explaining talk in interaction. Clearly a different conception of communication is required, one that can encapsulate speech acts as they arise in authentic talk. Kasper points the way in this regard, arguing for the use of conversation analysis as an analytical framework capable of capturing action in discourse. The current study takes advantage of this shift in the way speech acts are viewed and described, using the body of knowledge built up by CA to develop a dynamic assessment of requesting in talk. By raising awareness of how requests are co-constructed in interaction, without resort to simplified or intuition-based prescriptive rules, the aim is to promote learner development in this area of interactional competence.

In the next chapter, pragmatics assessments that have been developed to date will be discussed, as well as common assessment item types. An overview of research into the teachability of pragmatics is provided, before a detailed discussion of dynamic assessment and its applicability to second language acquisition.
In this chapter, a chronological overview will be given of the main pragmatics assessments developed to date, along with a critical assessment of the tests from a sociocultural, dynamic assessment perspective. The chapter will then discuss the instruments commonly used to elicit pragmatic data, their strengths, and their weaknesses. Pragmatics instruction and its effectiveness will be examined, with the final section of the chapter providing a detailed overview of dynamic assessment in both the general education field, and also in specific relation to second language learning.

### 4.1 Pragmatics assessments

#### 4.1.1 Hudson et al (1992; 1995)

Hudson et al (1992; 1995), in the first comprehensive investigation into testing second language pragmatic competence, systematically developed a test for Japanese learners of English, focusing on three speech acts—requesting, refusing, and apologies. Three main types of instruments were developed for assessing pragmatic ability—DCTs (discourse completion tasks; open-ended and multiple-choice); “oral-aural” instruments, in which learners listened to a situation and responded orally, or alternatively took part in semi-structured interviews; and self-assessment (see Figure 4-1).

The test design was grounded in Brown & Levinson’s theory of politeness, with the three variables of power, distance, and imposition used as a framework for item design. Figure 4-2 shows Hudson et al’s definitions for these three key factors.
**Figure 4-1:** Test methods developed by Hudson et al (1995, p.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cued Response</th>
<th>Free Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper and pencil indirect measures</td>
<td>Multiple choice or cued items following situation description DCT</td>
<td>Open-ended response following situation description DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral semi-direct measures</td>
<td>Listening laboratory tape response to descriptions of situations</td>
<td>Structured oral interview and response to video-taped scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment measures</td>
<td>Self-assessment of performance on situation description</td>
<td>Direct observation and evaluation of the video-taped role play and interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-2:** Hudson et al's (1995, p.4-5) definitions of Power (P), Distance (D), and Ranking of imposition (R)

**Relative power (P)**

The power of the speaker with respect to the hearer. In effect, this is the degree to which the speaker can impose his or her will on the hearer due to a higher rank within an organisation, professional status, or the hearer’s need to have a particular duty or job performed.

+P= Speaker has a higher rank, title or social position, or is in control of the assets in the situation. Examples would be a supervisor, manager, president, or customer.

-P= Speaker has a lower/lesser rank, title or social position, or is not in control of the assets in the situation. Examples would be a worker of lesser status, member of an organisation with lesser status, or salesperson serving a customer.

**Social distance (D)**
The distance between the speaker and the hearer. In effect, the degree of familiarity and solidarity they share as represented through in-group or out-group membership.

+D= Speaker and hearer do not know or identify with each other. They are strangers interacting due to social/life circumstances. Examples would be customer to service person or law enforcement officer to citizen.

-D= Speaker and hearer know and or identify with each other. There is an affiliation between the speaker and the hearer; they share solidarity in the sense that they could be described as working toward a common goal or interest. Examples would be co-workers or people who belong to the same social or professional organisation or club.

Absolute ranking of imposition (R)

The imposition in the culture, in terms of the expenditure of goods and/or services by the hearer, or the obligation of the speaker to perform the act. This will vary depending upon whether the speech act is a request, a refusal, or an apology.

Requests

+R= Great expenditure of goods, services, or energy required by hearer to carry out the request.

-R= Small expenditure of goods, services, or energy required by hearer to carry out the request.

In order to assign appropriate speech act situations during the development of the DCTs, pilot items were drawn up and rated by native speakers in terms of which speech acts were evoked, and the power (P), distance (D), and rank of imposition (R) relationship. After revising the items, frameworks for the contexts and relationships were constructed, as shown in Figures 4-3 and 4-4.
**Figure 4-3:** Framework for power and distance relationship (Hudson et al, 1995, p.10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>←</th>
<th>+ Power</th>
<th>- Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Distance</td>
<td>loan officer</td>
<td>renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>customs officer</td>
<td>traveler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loan officer</td>
<td>loan applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manager</td>
<td>job applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>customer</td>
<td>salesperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>customer</td>
<td>shop worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>customer</td>
<td>restaurant staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>customer</td>
<td>bank teller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Distance</td>
<td>supervisor</td>
<td>worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>department head</td>
<td>department worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project leader</td>
<td>project head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lead teacher</td>
<td>teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lease-holder</td>
<td>house-mate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>club president</td>
<td>club member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 4-4**: Framework for imposition of requests and refusals (Hudson, 1995, p.11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+ Imposition</th>
<th>- Imposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>do extra work</td>
<td>deliver a message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do work faster</td>
<td>give change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make a decision faster</td>
<td>talk for a few minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give more time to finish work</td>
<td>watch a short video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reschedule an important meeting</td>
<td>move out of someone’s path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay late at work</td>
<td>get/give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reschedule with a busy person</td>
<td>napkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay home all morning waiting for a repair person</td>
<td>application form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go on a tour</td>
<td>menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move furniture in the house</td>
<td>item from display case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allow a party in your house</td>
<td>information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>location of item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phone number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borrow/lend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accept:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bubble gum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coupon book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DCT items were piloted with both native (NS) and non-native (NNS) English speakers, with the responses analysed using the CCSARP.
Cultural Study of Speech Act Realisation Patterns) coding scheme developed by Blum-Kulka et al (1989b), and examined for differences between the two groups. NS responses were then used in the final versions of the DCTs as the “correct” responses, with NNS responses used for the distractors in the multiple-choice items. For the aural-oral instruments, the same DCTs were employed, with the participants required to communicate their answers orally, rather than in the written mode. For the role-plays, eight scenarios were developed, with each situation requiring the three speech acts that were the focus of the assessment. Finally, for the self-assessments, two types were developed, with one requiring test takers to evaluate how well they think they would succeed in a situation, and the other requiring the participant to rate their own actual performance in role-play.

For both the DCTs and the oral-aural instruments, NS raters were trained to rate the NNS answers, using a 5 point scale of “appropriate” to “inappropriate,” based on six aspects of pragmatic competence- the ability to use the speech act; formulaic expressions; the amount of speech used and information given; and formality, directness, and politeness.

Hudson (2001) assessed a group of Japanese ESL learners studying at an American university, basing the test on the instruments developed by Hudson et al (1992; 1995)- open-ended DCTs, oral language laboratory DCTs, and role-plays. As with Hudson et al (1995), the three variables of P, D and R formed the basis of the test, as “they...[were] identified as the three independent and culturally sensitive variables that subsume all other variables and play a principled role in speech-act behaviour” (Hudson, 2001, p.284). Based on the piloting carried out in Hudson et al (1995), in order to focus on the three key variables of P, D, and R, a number of constraints were placed on the situations used for the assessments (Hudson, 2001, p.286-87):

1. The roles should not be gender specific;
2. The situation must be face-to-face;
3. For requests, the phrases “you want,” or “you need” must be in the prompt;
4. The situation should be “context-internal,” meaning, for example, that a situation involving a student and a professor should be university study related;
5. Money should not be explicitly involved;

6. Contexts for apologies should not be due to being physically harmed or injured in some way;

7. No “socially stigmatised” roles should be involved, such as a rich pop music singer for example;

8. Situational routines should be avoided;

9. No relationships between family members or close friends should be involved;

10. The situations should be familiar to the participants

For the design of the role-play instruments, the DCT scenarios were converted to the role-play format. Hudson identifies a number of measures taken to enhance the reliability of the role-plays, including efforts not to overburden the participants with cognitive processing, limiting the amount of acting involved, using props when useful, and ensuring the emphasis was on language rather than action.

Using the same criteria to assess the DCTs as in Hudson et al (1995), and a holistic rating method for the role-plays, it was found that the role-play instrument elicited slightly higher rated performances than the DCTs and language laboratory instruments, indicating a degree of method effect. It was further found that the pragmalinguistic components of performance were rated lower than the sociopragmatic ones. The data also showed the degree of imposition to have an effect on performance, with performance levels decreasing as the degree of imposition increased, implying that high ranked impositions place a more significant cognitive load on second language learners.

4.1.2 Roever (2005)

Roever (2005) designed a web-based test of the pragmalinguistic, “offline” knowledge (in which the knowledge of the learners is assessed, rather than an assessment of actual performance in the L2) of ESL or EFL learners, including implicature, routines, and speech acts. While acknowledging that sociopragmatic knowledge would inevitably have an impact upon performance, for the purposes of the test, it was not part of the construct. Three main sections
of the test were given to 316 young adult learners. The first section, assessing knowledge of implicature, consisted of eight items testing a mixture of “idiosyncratic” (general conversational) implicature, and formulaic implicature (such as the “Pope Q,” in which the learner is asked “is the Pope Catholic?”). Section two tested a mixture of situational and functional routines, while the final part of the test focused on the speech acts apologies, refusal, and requests, with four items for each act. As the test construct was one of pragmalinguistic, rather than sociopragmatic, knowledge, the only contextual variable altered was the size of the imposition, from low to high. Power and distance variables were kept constant, based on Hudson et al’s (1995) study. Unlike Hudson et al’s assessment however, rejoinders were used in the items, with some items requiring one rejoinder and one required response, and some with two rejoinders and two required responses.

4.1.3 Liu (2007)

Building on the work of Hudson et al (1995) and Roever (2005), Liu (2007) developed a multiple-choice test (MDCT) for the speech act of apologies, choosing this instrument type due to it being the main test method in China, and also in order to test the validity and reliability of the MDCT methodology.

The development of the test items underwent a number of stages before being administered to participants. Based on the assertion that authentic situations are of importance in a pragmatics test, Liu administered a questionnaire to Chinese students in order to generate scenarios relevant to the lives of the target learners. A further questionnaire was given asking for the situations to be rated based on the likelihood of them occurring in the learners’ daily lives. A metapragmatic assessment of the situations was then undertaken, in order to ensure that the sociopragmatic variables of P, D, and R were evaluated in a similar fashion by both NS of the L2, and NNS. A pilot study was also carried out to ensure the target speech act was elicited.

Liu found the MDCT items to be a statistically reliable (in terms of their ability to produce consistent responses, and to elicit the intended speech act) method of eliciting pragmatic data, more so than found in studies by Yamashita (1996) or Yoshitake (1997), both of which used Hudson et al’s (1995) instruments. This
may be due to Liu's development of the MDCT scenarios, which were generated by Chinese EFL learners. Hudson’s, on the other hand, were generated by the test designers. This may mean that Liu’s situations demonstrated a greater degree of relevance and authenticity than Hudson et al’s due to the participants' greater familiarity with them, and thus elicited more reliable data.

4.1.4 Ishihara (2009)

Ishihara (2009) addressed what she considered to be an imbalance in current pragmatic assessments, which place an emphasis on assessment in isolation from other learners (or teachers), rather than in a classroom setting, putting forward that classroom-based assessments are “less prominently discussed, even though assessment is an integral part of instruction” (Ishihara, 2009, p.446). In her study, Japanese higher education learners of EFL were taught pragmatics over a period of sixteen weeks, with approximately 50% of that time devoted to pragmatic instruction. The primary goals were to raise awareness of the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic appropriateness of requests. Deliberate effort was made to avoid the imposition of L2 cultural norms on the learners. L2 norms were taught, but for the assessment, Ishihara avoided judging learner pragmatic production based on L2 norms. In this way, she argues that learners are empowered to make their own pragmatic choices in L2 community situations, without having L2 norms imposed on them as being “correct.”

A variety of classroom-based assessments were carried out, including written DCTs, learner reflections on language use, learner analysis, teacher observations and field notes, and role-plays (see Figure 4-5).
**Figure 4-5: Instruction/Assessment methods (Ishihara, 2009, p.452)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction/assessment</th>
<th>Brief description &amp; purpose of the instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Initial reactions to language use in context</td>
<td>Learners’ observation of the use of Hong Kong English based on Rose’s (1999) episode. Assessment of learners’ awareness of pragmatic variation and possibility of negative pragmatic transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Production of written request discourses</td>
<td>Written dialogues elicited from learners through multiple- rejoinder DCT. Assessment of learners’ pragmatic production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Learners’ data collection in authentic L1/L2 discourse</td>
<td>Assignment for learners to collect naturally occurring request dialogues in L1 Japanese or L2 English. Facilitation of learners’ noticing (Schmidt, 2001) of the language of request in the given context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Learners’ reflections on language use in context</td>
<td>In-class instruction on request mitigators (adapted from Yates, 2003) and learners’ written reflections on learning pragmatics. Assessment of learners’ pragmatic awareness about the context–language relationship and awareness of speaker’s intention and listener’s interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/assessment</td>
<td>Brief description &amp; purpose of the instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Learners’ analysis of context–language relationship</td>
<td>Learners’ analysis of the relationship between contextual factors and the language of request based on the learner-collected data (c). Assessment of learners’ noticing and understanding of the context–language relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Pragmalinguistic development and assessment</td>
<td>In-class instruction and quiz on request strategies (supportive moves) and key expressions. Assessment of learners’ pragmalinguistic control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Learners’ self-revising, role-playing, and refining request discourses</td>
<td>Self-improvement of the previously completed multiple-rejoinder DCT dialogues (b), and scaffolded and unscaffolded role-plays using the same scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Learners’ self-evaluation of written request discourse</td>
<td>Learners’ self-reflection on their own language production (g) with guiding prompts. Assessment of learners’ pragmatic (1) awareness of directness, politeness, and formality in context; and (2) awareness of speaker’s intention and listener’s interpretation; and (3) pragmatic productive skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Teacher’s assessment of written request discourses</td>
<td>Teacher’s assessment of learner’s written dialogues produced without scaffolding (g). Assessment of (1) directness, politeness, and formality in context; (2) choice and use of supportive moves; and (3) overall pragmatics-focused comprehensibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learners were primarily assessed indirectly in the written mode, due to the low proficiency level of the participants, and the classroom context, which placed a limit on the amount of time available. Further, regular interaction between the teacher and the learners was carried out through written interaction in journals and in the classroom. The assessments were designed to be embedded in the syllabus, and diagnostic in nature, with Ishihara describing the instruction and assessment as a “cyclic process...inseparable from each other in facilitating development” (Ishihara, 2009, p.449). While this seems to bear similarities with the approach of dynamic assessment (see Chapter 6 for further discussion), this process perhaps is closer in nature to formative assessment, in which “predetermined guidance or spontaneous feedback [is] provided to learners based on observation of their competence” (Ishihara, 2009, p.449). Ishihara does state that mediation given to learners was grounded in the sociocultural principle of the ZPD, though it is not clear how this was carried out in practice, as frameworks for mediation are not provided. Ishihara found evidence of development in some of the learners, although a lack of development was also noted in a few participants, who displayed little interest, or a lack of motivation.

### 4.2 Common item types used in pragmatics assessments

#### 4.2.1 Discourse completion tasks (DCTs)
DCTs typically consist of a situation prompt, with the participant required to produce a response. They may also contain the beginning of the conversational sequence, and a rejoinder at the end (a scripted response to the learner’s turn, which the learner needs to take into account when evaluating the appropriateness of their turn). Roever (2005, p.18) provides an example of a DCT, shown in Figure 4-6:

**Figure 4-6**: A discourse completion task (DCT) type assessment item (Roever, 2005, p.18)

“You are about to leave the house for an important appointment when your housemate Jack asks you if you could help him paint your room.

You say:

____________________________________________________

An example of a DCT with a rejoinder is also provided (Roever, 2005, p.19):

“You are about to leave the house for an important appointment when your housemate Jack comes up to you and says:

“Hey, would you have a little time? I’m painting my room and I could use some help.”

You say:

____________________________________________________

Jack: “That’s okay. I’ll ask Jane if she can help me.”

The restricted nature of the DCT is designed to specifically elicit a particular speech act (in Figure 4-6, a refusal), and allows researchers to carefully control the variables affecting pragmatic choices. Roever (2005) puts forward a further advantage of DCTs, in that unlike oral elicitation item types, there is no need to transcribe the data, an additional stage of analysis that can lead to errors being made. In addition, the standardised nature of the DCT, and especially of the written DCT, allows for collection of large amounts of data in a short space of time.
Numerous studies have investigated the validity of DCTs in terms of their ability to predict “online” interactional performance. Beebe and Cummings (1996) found significant differences between refusals elicited by DCT and refusals found in authentic discourse, in terms of both the length of utterances and the semantic formulae used. Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig (1992) compared DCT rejections and authentic discourse rejections in both NS of the L2, and NNS also, finding DCT responses to be generally shorter and displaying a narrower range of strategies. This is supported by Turnbull (2001), whose study also found refusals elicited by DCTs to be shorter in length and more limited in variety than those found in natural data or in role-plays. Further, Golato (2003) transcribed compliment responses in German L1 situations based on recorded interaction, then compared the data with that elicited by DCTs. Golato found significant differences in the two data sets. For example, while in the DCT-elicited data the textbook response “danke” appeared 12.4% of the time, in the natural data it did not occur at all. Conversely, responses involving agreement with the complimenter occurred in 12% of the natural data, but in only 0.5% of the DCT data.

Walters (2009) also criticises the DCT method as a way of eliciting data, arguing the format is artificial, often leading to unnatural responses from participants, such as overly lengthy responses (Faerch and Kasper, 1989; Brown, 2001). Further, Walters argues that DCTs do not elicit sequences of talk, which according to conversation analysis (CA) are more authentic data for analysing pragmatic competence.

In terms of DCTs in which the participant response is written and DCTs in which the response is communicated orally, Rintell and Mitchell (1989) found the data to be similar, whether collected orally, or in writing, with the only difference being an increase in the response length of NNS in the written mode. As Johnston et al (1998) point out however, this similarity may be due to the nature of the DCT in which only a single response was provided, limiting the types of possible answers, rather than the mode of production.

Some DCTs include, as mentioned above, one or more rejoinders, in an attempt to improve the authenticity of the instrument and more accurately mirror the interaction of a conversation. Blum-Kulka et al (1989) incorporated them into
DCTs, as did Rose (1992), who included a hearer’s turn after the participant’s response. However, including rejoinders did not lead to any significant differences in participant responses. Hudson et al. (1995) however, after initially using rejoinders in test trials, removed them from the final version of the items, as they “appeared to frequently interfere with appropriate and realistic test taker generated responses” (Hudson et al., 1995, p.23). Further, Johnston et al. (1998) found rejoinders to have significant effects on responses, with different speech acts being affected in different ways. According to Johnston et al., rejoinders make DCTs less authentic rather than more so, by removing the uncertainty inherent in natural conversation sequences. Kuha (1999), however, reported more authentic conversation sequences when including rejoinders in their computer-based DCTs.

It appears that DCTs report what learners believe they would say in a given situation, rather than what they actually would say in an authentic conversation context. According to Roever (2005) therefore, DCTs may be more useful for assessing pragmatic knowledge, rather than performance. Roever stresses the importance therefore, of being selective in the use of the item type, putting forward that DCTs may be unsuitable for testing learners' performances in "online," authentic situations.

Similarly, Kasper and Rose (2002) also support the use of DCTs for certain types of research, with the deciding factor being what it is the researcher wishes to assess. Kasper and Rose argue that, if the goal is to assess pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic knowledge, then a DCT may be an effective way of providing insights into that. Conversely, they put forward that this type of assessment item may be inappropriate for assessing performance in interactions.

4.2.2 Role-plays

Eckard and Kearny (1981) define a role-play as

“a type of skit in which learners assume the identity of individual characters in a given situation and engage in a conversation that reflects the personalities, needs, and desires of the characteristics they are asked to portray...The emphasis is on the verbal interchanges rather than on the actions.”
Similarly, Crookall and Saunders (1989, p.15) see role-plays as a ‘social or human activity in which participants 'take on' or 'act out' specified 'roles,' often within a predefined social framework or situational blueprint.” Kasper and Dahl (1991) make the distinction between “closed” role-plays, in which learners respond to a standardised, scripted conversation opening, with “open” role-plays, in which, while the situation and roles are defined, the interaction is not scripted and can be carried out in a large number of ways over multiple turns. According to Kasper and Rose (2002), open role-plays have the advantage of allowing researchers to observe interaction management strategies, such as turn-taking, but also design the role-plays to elicit specific speech acts. Further, the social variables can be controlled to assess the effects of varying the degrees of power, social distance, and imposition on learner performance.

However, Kasper and Rose caution against the assumption that such open role-plays accurately recreate authentic situations, arguing “there is no guarantee” (2002, p.88) that role-plays are valid substitutes for authentic interaction situations.

Eisenstein and Bodman (1993) compared data elicited by DCTs, role-plays and field notes regarding the showing of gratitude. While all three instruments elicited similar words and phrases, the responses differed in length and complexity. While the DCT data was relatively short and simplified, the natural data was more complex and varied. The role-play data was found to bear some similarities to the authentic data, displaying more variety than the DCTs, but was still less complex and wide ranging than the gratitude shown in natural settings. Sasaki (1998), investigating the requests and refusals of Japanese EFL learners, also found role-plays to elicit longer utterances and a wider variety of strategies than the responses in DCT items. Further, Margalef-Boada (1993) also compared DCT data with that of role-plays, and found role-plays to generally elicit “richer and more complex” (Margalef-Boada, 1993, p.153) responses than DCTs. Both types however, were deemed to be less polite than the authentic data, leading to the possible conclusion that the role-plays failed to recreate the social conditions and pressures present in real-life situations.

While role-plays may therefore be able to provide data closer to authentic performance than DCTs, Kasper & Rose (2002) put forward that such data may not accurately represent a learner’s pragmatic abilities, with the strain involved
in imagining the situation alongside the production of the L2 providing a considerable cognitive load on the participant:

“Constructing and interpreting communicative intent can easily overstretch learners' social imagination and memory and thus reduce their capacity for online input processing and utterance planning. It is therefore possible that most types of role-play under-represent learner's pragmatic ability.” (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p.89)

4.3 Pragmatics and Instruction

The issue of pragmatics and the extent to which it can be taught in the classroom is discussed. A key aspect of the dynamic assessment process is not only the assessment of target skills or abilities, but also instruction, with the aim being to unify the two. Further, the enrichment programme, a period of instruction in which the learners develop their skills based on the findings of the initial dynamic assessment, is an important portion of the study. Therefore, in order to understand the extent to which pragmatics will be a suitable focus for DA, this section examines three core issues. Firstly, the extent to which second language pragmatics is “teachable” will be discussed. The effectiveness of instruction compared with mere exposure to L2 input will be explored, as well as the potential benefits of explicit instruction versus non-explicit instruction.

4.3.1 Can pragmatics be taught?

A number of studies have investigated the effects of instruction on learners' pragmatic performance, with mixed findings. Olshtain and Cohen (1990), using one group of learners as study participants, provided instruction in apologising in the L2, using softeners and intensifiers in a variety of contexts. Learners were given three 20 minute sessions of instruction, followed by an assessment using a number of DCTs. Results were mixed, with no increase in the frequency of taught phrases being used by learners, although participants did show a wider range of strategies in the post-test compared with the pre-test. Perceptions of the appropriateness of various apology strategies did not become more target-like however.
LoCastro (1997) investigated the instruction of politeness strategies with Japanese EFL learners. Instruction was given over a nine-week period, with assessment carried out via an observation of group interaction. The post-test found no significant improvement compared with performance before the treatment period. Liddicoat & Crozet (2001) also carried out a study on the effects of instruction on pragmatic performance. Participants were native English-speaking learners of French who were instructed for a total of one hour on pragmatic responses to the question “did you have a good weekend?” The assessment was carried out through the use of role-plays. The initial post-test found instruction had an impact on appropriate content of the learner responses, but less so on “interactional devices.” Although some evidence was found of the use of feedback for example, there was little overlapping or repetition found in the data. A delayed post-test twelve months later showed that, while improvements in content remained, of the interactional devices taught, only feedback was still evident.

Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga (2012) investigated the teachability of conventional expressions used in conversation. Pre and post-tests consisted of a self-assessment of the participant’s familiarity with the expressions, and DCTs. Instruction involved input in the form of dialogues from episodes of a television comedy and awareness-raising metapragmatic activities. It was found that the combination of providing examples in context with consciousness-raising tasks did promote the use of target expressions. However, while there were gains in performance when comparing the pre and post-test results, they were not large.

It can be seen therefore, that the results from the above studies fail to provide a clear picture of the benefits of instruction in pragmatics. While the findings have been mixed however, this may be at least partly due to weaknesses in the designs of the studies. Kasper & Rose (2002) for example, put forward that the one hour of total instruction in Olshtain and Cohen's (1990) study may have been insufficient for promoting development. Further, while LoCastro failed to find any improvement after nine weeks of instruction, Kasper & Rose argue this may be attributable to the quality of the post-test assessment, which relied on a single observation of one group. Kasper & Rose put forward that examining multiple discussions would have given greater insights into participants’ development, and a written questionnaire would have been more effective in
assessing comprehension. Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga (2012), in discussing their inconclusive results, state that, like Olshtain and Cohen’s study, there may have been insufficient instructional input (three hours in total), a lack of target language production practice, and the written mode of the input (rather than oral dialogues) may have contributed to the mixed findings.

While the above studies provided mixed results concerning the benefits of teaching pragmatics, Kubota (1995) did find clear evidence of the effectiveness of instruction. 45 Japanese learners of English were assessed on polite requests, following instruction using a combination of DCTs, a role-play, and assessments regarding their judgment of the acceptability of various request types in different contexts. The results of the post-tests found that the experimental instructed groups out-performed the control group, which did not receive any teaching.

4.3.2 Instruction versus exposure

A number of studies have investigated the effect of instruction versus the effect of exposure only on pragmatic competence. Implicatures for example, in which the hearer must infer meaning based on the context in which the utterance was produced, can often be a source of difficulty for learners. While an utterance may seem non-sensical on the surface level (for example, responding to the question “are you hungry?” with “I had breakfast an hour ago”), the hearer can assume the utterance is relevant to the situation, and can infer the intended meaning. Bouton (1994) investigated the ability of university level learners of ESL to interpret such implicatures in American English. As no pragmatic instruction was given to the study participants, the central aim was to investigate the effects of exposure to the L2 over an extended period of time. Two groups were assessed, one over a period of 4 years, and one over a 17 month period.

The group assessed over 4 years showed significant development, being able to interpret implicatures to a NS-like level. The 17-month group however still found certain implicature types difficult, such as indirect criticism, not showing significant progress compared with the pre-treatment assessment results. Bouton concludes that, while learners can acquire understanding of implicatures
over long periods of time, progress appears to be slow. This is seen in the 17-month group, who still struggled with some implicature types. While the groups were assessed at only two points, with development not regularly tracked over time, the study nevertheless shows the limitations of mere exposure to L2 input, without instruction.

Lyster (1994) carried out a study comparing a control group, in which no instruction was given, with experimental groups in which teaching was provided on the appropriate use of the tu/vous forms in French. A total of 12 hours of instruction was given over a 5 week period, with an immediate post-test, and a further delayed post-test one month later. Significant differences were found between the experimental groups’ post-test performance and the control group’s. According to Lyster, the participants’ performances showed improvement in three key areas. The learners were firstly able to accurately produce orally the "vous" form in formal scenarios. Further, improvement was seen in their ability to appropriately use the "vous" form in formal written French; a final improvement was observed in learner's awareness of the relationship between context and language choices.

Following the studies by Bouton (1994) and Lyster (1994), Yoshimi (2001) investigated the effects of explicit instruction on the topic of discourse markers in Japanese as L2. 30% of the total 80 hours of instruction were dedicated to pragmatics instruction, with the explicit instruction consisting of explanatory handouts, NS modelling, communicative practice, and feedback from the teacher. The explicit instruction was found to have an overall “beneficial effect” on learners' use of markers in storytelling.

Halenko & Jones (2011), investigating the realisation of requests among Chinese learners of English, gave 6 hours of explicit instruction to an experimental group, and no instruction to a control group. As with the studies mentioned above, learners benefited from explicit instruction and awareness-raising activities, with significant improvements noted between pre and post-test scores. However, the effects decreased in the delayed post-test.

A further study was carried out by Li (2012) who investigated three types of treatment on participants in relation to the requesting speech act. The first
"incidental" group carried out input-output activities only, with no instruction; the second group received implicit instruction in the form of visually enhanced input, while the third "explicit" group received metapragmatic information. Results showed that only the incidental group improved in all aspects of the target ability, while the implicit group outperformed the explicit one in the post-treatment test.

It can be seen from the findings of the above studies therefore, that there is evidence of the benefits of providing instruction in L2 pragmatics over merely being exposed to the second language by living in the target community. While such exposure can indeed lead to pragmatic development in learners, the process seems gradual, taking a considerable period of time. Providing instruction, and thus raising learner awareness of various pragmatic features of the L2 may speed up this process.

4.3.3 Explicit versus non-explicit instruction

While the above studies compared the effects of instruction versus only being exposed to the target language community, other studies have compared the affects of different types of pragmatic instruction in the classroom. House (1996) compared two groups of learners, one that received explicit instruction on routines such as discourse transitions and topic initiations, and one that did not, relying only on classroom input and opportunities to practice their L2 English. Both groups showed signs of improvement over the 14 week duration of the course, but the explicit group was able to demonstrate a wider range of routines and strategies than the non-explicit group. Based on the findings, House puts forward that providing learners with explicit metapragmatic information can promote improvement in their repertoire of pragmatically appropriate linguistic realisations, and counter negative L1 pragmatic transfer.

House comments however, that explicit instruction did not seem to result in marked improvements in the responding behaviour of participants, which remained a challenge for both groups. Overall, while there were mixed results for the explicitly taught group, evidence was found that explicit metapragmatic instruction can be a useful way of raising learner awareness of pragmatic elements, which may lead to increased pragmatic fluency. As House (House,
1996, p.250) states, “...there is some indication that with respect to developing pragmatic fluency, it is better to know what one is doing than simply to be doing what one is doing.”

Koike and Pearson (2005) investigated the effectiveness of explicit instruction and implicit instruction in the teaching of Spanish speech acts to native English speakers, with a control group that received neither. It was found that the explicit group performed better than the implicit one on the multiple-choice section of the test, while the implicit group performed better on the open-ended dialogues. However, while both experimental groups showed gains over the control group in the post-test, these gains were not sustained in the delayed post-test, four weeks after the initial post-test. This may be partly due to the short length of the treatment, which consisted of only three 20 minute sessions of instruction. Koike and Pearson conclude that, while explicit instruction may help to raise learners’ awareness of pragmatic norms, implicit instruction may be beneficial in terms of producing pragmatically appropriate utterances. Koike and Pearson suggest this may be due to learners, upon receiving implicit feedback from an instructor, being able to adapt their utterances and notice alternative language options.

Alcon Soler (2005) investigated request strategies, and the effect of both explicit and implicit instruction on pragmatic development of Spanish learners of English L2. The explicit group was presented with excerpts from a television programme, were given written transcripts, explicit awareness-raising tasks, and DCTs. Appropriate answers to the DCTS were then given with metapragmatic explanations. For the implicit group however, excerpts were presented, scripts were given with sociopragmatic factors highlighted, implicit awareness-raising tasks were provided, and DCTs given. A range of possible answers was given for learner self-correction, but no metapragmatic explanations were provided.

It was found that awareness of strategies increased between pre and post-tests for both groups, with few significant differences between them. However, a significant difference between the two groups was found regarding request realisation production, with gains being higher for the explicitly taught group. Soler argues this may be due to the metapragmatic explanations given during
the explicit instruction, supporting the findings of Rose and Ng (2001), who found that explicit metapragmatic explanations had a positive effect on learners’ sociopragmatic competence. Soler observed however that both groups struggled with non-conventional indirect requests to a greater degree than conventional and direct requests. Adopting a language-processing perspective, she argues this may be due to constraints on processing, with non-conventional indirect requests requiring learners to process more information, including contextual information and its relationship with language choices. When the illocutionary force of the request is not immediately apparent on a surface level, this can cause difficulties for L2 language learners.

Martinez-Flor & Fukuya (2005) compared learners receiving explicit instruction of English L2 suggestions, with those receiving implicit instruction. Three groups participated in the study- a control group, which did not receive instruction, an explicit group taught metapragmatic information on the relevant speech act, and an implicit group, taught pragmalinguistic “input enhancement and recast activities” (Martinez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005, p.463). It was found that both the explicit and implicit groups showed gains in the post-test, in terms of their production of pragmatically appropriate suggestions. Martinez-Flor & Fukuya therefore argue that pragmatic instruction should necessarily include both metapragmatic instruction and recasts, a mix of explicit and implicit instruction, in order to maximise potential for learner development.

Takimoto (2006) investigated the effects of explicit feedback when teaching pragmatics to language learners. Takimoto compared two types of instruction-consciousness-raising with explicit feedback, and consciousness-raising without feedback. It was found that consciousness-raising tasks were effective in promoting development, which Takimoto argues may be due to the deeper processing required by the learners. However, no significant differences between the two groups were found, suggesting that giving explicit feedback was not essential to the learners’ performance.

A further study was carried out by Nguyen et al (2012), which investigated the effects of implicit and explicit instruction on performance of the speech act constructive criticism to Vietnamese learners of English. While the explicit group received metapragmatic information and explicit error correction, the implicit
group received targeted input and error correction in the form of recasts. Testing pre and post-treatment performance using discourse completion tasks (DCTs) and role-plays, it was found that both groups showed improvement. The explicit group however, outperformed the implicit one.

To conclude therefore, while not all studies have shown unambiguous evidence of the positive effects of instruction in pragmatics for learners, the overall body of evidence suggests that pragmatics can be effectively taught, and that it is more effective in promoting development than mere exposure to the target language. As Kasper and Rose (2002) conclude, the evidence suggests that pragmatic instruction offers "at least an important facilitative role, which is especially good news for learners in foreign language contexts" (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p.269). Further, a number of studies find that explicit instruction in pragmatics can be of benefit to learners. It has also been found however, that a combination of both explicit metapragmatic instruction and more implicit techniques such as recasting can be an effective method in the classroom (Rose & Ng, 2001; Koike & Pearson, 2005; Martinez-Flor & Fukuya, 2005; Takimoto, 2006).

4.4 Dynamic Assessment

Dynamic Assessment (DA) is a form of assessment that emphasises the importance of interaction in examining the abilities of a learner. Grounded in Vygotskian theory that promotes the social basis of learning, DA aims to both assess the future potential of a learner, while at the same time promoting their development. In this way it acts as a counterbalance to more traditional forms of assessment, which aim to isolate the individual performance as much as possible, and also has the potential to be effective in the instruction of pragmatics. This section will discuss the sociocultural foundations of DA, its aims and methodologies, the work of prominent DA advocates in educational psychology, and its recent implementation in the field of second language learning.

4.4.1 The foundations of dynamic assessment: Vygotsky and sociocultural theory
Dynamic assessment is based on Vygotsky’s (1978, 1998) sociocultural theory of learning. Vygotsky’s research led him to propose that learners develop skills at first with the help of others, until at a certain point the skill becomes internalized and the learner is able to perform independently. Learning therefore begins with social interaction. The movement towards internalization is described by Lantolf and Appel (1994, p.11) as “the shift from the intermental to the intramental,” and is the umbrella under which other important sociocultural ideas, such as the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), operate.

Vygotsky (1978, p.85) defines the ZPD as:

“...the difference between the child’s developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the higher level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers.”

For Vygotsky, the social nature of learning was of crucial importance in creating this space, with development taking place when the child "is interacting with people in his environment and in collaboration with his peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p.90). Kozulin and Garb (2002) echo this principle, putting forward that development of cognitive functions and skills appears first in interaction with others, before being internalised by the child.

Vygotsky (1986) provides an illustration of what is meant by the ZPD:

“Having found that the mental age of two children was, let us say, eight, we gave each of them harder problems than he could manage on his own and provided some slight assistance: the first step in a solution, a leading question, or some form of other help. We discovered that one child could, with cooperation, solve problems intended for nine year olds. The discrepancy between a child’s actual mental age and the level he reaches in solving problems with assistance indicates the zone of his proximal development.” (Vygotsky, 1986, p.187)

It was this potential, not yet fully matured development in the learner that particularly interested Vygotsky. While current independent performance informs us of a learner’s past development, assisted performance indicates what may
be achieved independently in the future. The concept of the ZPD therefore, was Vygotsky’s attempt to move beyond a focus on current unassisted performance. By incorporating assisted performance into his model, a learner’s potential could be observed.

The concept of the ZPD is critical, as according to Vygotsky, collaboration between two people will only lead to development if the assistance given falls within the range of this zone. Should the assistance fall outside of this space, the help would probably not be effective. Within the ZPD therefore, assistance, or “scaffolding” (Wood, Bruner and Ross, 1976) from others, is seen as critical in helping the learner appropriate a given skill or ability.

An important point worth noting at this stage is the variety of interpretations of the ZPD and of the mediation within it. Definitions range from narrow interpretations of the concept as a pedagogical tool to be used in aid of the completion of a particular task, to broader interpretations in which the learner and the interlocutor participate in a co-construction of knowledge, with both participants in joint control of the interaction (Lave and Wenger, 1991). It is this latter view of Vygotsky’s ZPD that is more in tune with the type of DA applied in second language learning (L2) research (Poehner, 2005; Ableeva, 2010), as will be discussed below.

4.4.2 Towards dynamic assessment

Dynamic assessment can be seen as a movement away from assessing the individual in isolation from his or her environment and other people, and towards a form of assessment that takes into account Vygotsky’s emphasis on the social nature of learning and the ZPD.

Proponents of Vygotsky’s approach Leontiev et al (1968) were critical of the psychometric testing predominantly used in education assessment at the time as ill equipped to understand the causes of learner performance issues, and providing only a partial view of a learner’s development. They argued instead for the use of intervention in assessment, allowing the causes of learner problems or challenges to be uncovered through interaction. Leontiev et al’s (1968) argument for intervention in assessment is grounded in the work of
Vygotsky, who emphasised the importance of attending to maturing functions, not just matured ones:

“Like a gardener who in appraising species for yield would proceed incorrectly if he considered only the ripe fruit in the orchard and did not know how to evaluate the condition of the trees that had not yet produced mature fruit, the psychologist who is limited to ascertaining what has matured, leaving what is maturing aside, will never be able to obtain any kind of true and complete representation of the internal state of the whole development.” (Vygotsky, 1998, p.200)

For Vygotsky therefore, unassisted performance “not only does not cover the whole picture of development, but very frequently encompasses only an insignificant part of it.” (Vygotsky, 1998, p.200)

4.4.3 Dynamic Assessment

4.4.3.1 Definitions

DA is seen as a method of uncovering and observing these still maturing cognitive functions, in which assessment is embedded in social interaction. In such an assessment, typically a learner interacts with, and is assessed by, an expert or more competent peer, with both working towards the completion of a task. The assessor-mediator (henceforth referred to as mediator) intervenes, or mediates, based on the needs of the learner in the session.

Lidz (1991) provides the defining characteristics of DA in the field of general education. According to Lidz, the first characteristic is a “static” (psychometric, non-dynamic) pre-test followed by a session in which interventions take place to alter the learner’s performance, with a further static post-test to assess development. A second characteristic is attendance to the learner’s “modifiability,” or ability to change their performance through intervention by the expert. A third aspect of DA is that it should provide the mediator with information concerning effective or ineffective interventions that can inform future interactions between the learner and assessors or teachers.
Lidz and Gindis (2003) elaborate on the nature of DA, putting forward founding principles upon which the above DA characteristics are based. The first of these is that cognitive "processes" are *modifiable*, and the goal of DA is to uncover the extent of this modifiability in a learner. Further, DA includes learning as well as assessment, with insights gained into development through a learner's assisted performance. A final principle for Lidz and Gindis is that a primary aim of DA is to put forward suggestions for ways in which a learner can be further instructed, to encourage development. For Lidz and Gindis, cognitive abilities are not static or innate, but the result of a learner interacting with others and their culture; the key to assessment then is to examine this development, rather than their current unassisted performance at tasks.

The belief in the modifiability of cognitive processes is central to dynamic assessment, and is based on both Vygotskian theory and the extensive work of Feuerstein (2003), whose Structural Cognitive Modifiability Theory and theory of “mediated learning experiences” is discussed below.

While Lidz’ (1991) and Lidz and Gindis’ (2003) definitions seem to place primary importance on the assessment aspect of DA, Poehner (2007) provides a more open interpretation that places greater emphasis on the development of the learner, defining DA as “…providing mediation in order to reveal the depth of learners’ abilities and simultaneously act as a catalyst for their further development” (Poehner, 2007, p.325). For Poehner, as will be discussed below, DA is development-oriented, with the dual roles of assessment and instruction indistinguishable. Although advocates of DA may have differing opinions concerning the extent to which the goal should be assessment or development, what is not in dispute is the idea that social interaction is crucial in providing a full picture of a learner’s potential, with Poehner and Lantolf (2005) arguing that a complete view of a learner’s capabilities can only be seen through interaction with another; isolated performance, reveals only an incomplete picture.

*4.4.3.2 Dynamic Assessment and Formative Assessment*

Formative assessment, in which learners are regularly assessed with the purpose of monitoring and informing instruction, bears some commonalities with dynamic assessment. According to Poehner and Lantolf (2005), while dynamic
assessment and formative assessment share some of the same goals, such as improving the effectiveness of instruction by assessing the learner’s development, there are key differences, with DA’s grounding in theory being the most significant. Poehner and Lantolf put forward that, while DA is based upon Vygotsky’s theory and sociocultural foundations, formative assessment (FA) has a tendency to be unsystematic, based on the intuition of the teacher. According to Poehner and Lantolf, DA is systematic due to its focus on the learner’s ZPD, and mediating within that “space.” As FA is not grounded in Vygotskian theory, or usually in a theory of any kind, it lacks this focus. Further, it is this concentration on the learner’s ZPD that promotes development, with each intervention appropriate to the learner’s needs. Although development may take place in FA, it is not the goal and thus will be incidental if it occurs at all. Finally, while the aim of FA is to inform future teaching, there is still a bifurcation of assessment and instruction that is not present in Poehner and Lantolf’s interactionist DA.

4.4.4 Dynamic assessment methodologies: Interventionist and interactionist DA

Dynamic assessment has been used in the field of general education for a number of decades, from the work of Luria (1961), through Budoff’s (1968; 1987) and Feuerstein’s (1979; 1988) differing approaches to DA, and Lidz (1991). The following section will discuss both interactionist and interventionist types of DA (as defined by Lantolf and Poehner, 2004). Further, the potential advantages of DA over FA in the classroom, the influential work of Feuerstein, and also of Poehner, who has been a leading figure in the application of interactionist DA to the L2 field, will be discussed.

4.4.4.1 Interventionist and interactionist dynamic assessment

Lantolf and Poehner (2004) make the distinction between interventionist and interactionist DA. According to Lantolf and Poehner, and Poehner (2008a), interventionist DA is a form of dynamic assessment closer to NDA in the sense that interventions in DA sessions are standardised, typically ranging from implicit to explicit, depending on learner responses. This methodology has the advantage of increasing reliability and the potential to generalise results, but
sacrifices the promotion of development to an extent, as standardised mediation will inevitably be less attuned to a learner’s individual ZPD.

Interactionist DA on the other hand, is more closely aligned with Vygotskian theory (Poehner, 2008a). Mediator interventions are not pre-determined, but are rather developed in reaction to the response moves of the learner in a DA session. The mediation given is appropriate to each learner’s needs, with emphasis placed on development, rather than psychometric reliability.

Poehner (2008b) further discusses the differences between interventionist and interactionist DA, putting forward that, while interventionist DA places an emphasis upon assessing potential development, interactionist DA emphasises helping learners to realise that potential. Poehner criticises the Graduated Prompt Approach, an interventionist approach to DA, as inadequate in its ability to accurately assess learner’s potential in two ways. Firstly, the standardised prompts may not be suitable for the particular needs of a given learner; further, it does not enable the mediator to look into the causes of learner difficulties in the same way as a more flexible, interactionist approach does.

Interventionist DA then, shares some of the characteristics of psychometric testing, in which the learner’s performance is still, albeit to a lesser extent, seen in isolation. Rather than being a cooperative, creative process, in which both the learner and the mediator work towards completion of the task, primary responsibility lies with the learner. In an interactionist approach to DA however, the performance is jointly constructed,

“[belonging] neither to the mediator nor to the learner but comprises the interplay between them as they raise questions, debate ideas, brainstorm alternatives, offer explanations, and jointly work out solutions to assessment tasks.” (Poehner, 2008b, p.38)

This is in tune with wider conceptions of Vygotsky’s ZPD espoused by researchers such as Wertsch (1984) and Engestrom (1987), and it may be said that interactionist DA is more closely aligned with Vygotsky’s approach to interaction. Poehner advises against the “medical view” (Poehner, 2008b, p.52) of interactions, in which appropriate mediation is administered by the assessor in a one-directional way, ignoring learner reciprocity. For Poehner, “a more
useful analogy ...is to understand DA as a dance in which performance results from the active participation and cooperation of both mediator and learner” (Poehner, 2008b, p.53).

Minick (1987), on the advantages and disadvantages of the two approaches to DA, argues that interventionist methods allow for results to be more easily quantified and generalised, while interactionist DA is more attuned to learner development. Minick further puts forward that inflexible interventionist dynamic assessments, in which the focus is on the comparison between pre-intervention test scores and post-intervention ones, risks ignoring the rich information that might be available from close analysis of interactions. According to Minick, the ZPD should instead be viewed as a window that allows the mediator to view what a learner may be capable in the near future, and the types of mediation that would best promote their development.

For Poehner, while interventionist DA often focuses on the assessment of the learner, interactionist DA places a renewed focus on development, “providing mediation in order to reveal the depth of learner’s abilities and simultaneously act as a catalyst for their further development” (Poehner, 2007, p.325). This unity of the two sides of DA should be such that, according to Poehner, they should be largely indistinguishable, with an observer “[unable] to discern whether they are witnessing an assessment or an instructional lesson because they are one and the same” (Poehner, 2007, p.325).

Further, Poehner and Lantolf (2010) argue that a dialectical unity of instruction and assessment is of central importance to the concept of the ZPD. Poehner and Lantolf argue that the ZPD consists of interaction in which development is promoted by instruction. However, for instruction to be effective, there must be assessment in order to ascertain the capabilities of the learner. Concurrently, Poehner and Lantolf put forward, assessment requires instruction, with "higher mental development...[finding] its source in sociocultural activity rather than in the recesses of the brain" (Poehner & Lantolf, 2010, p.316). It can be argued therefore, that the unification of assessment and development- an idea in opposition to the traditional psychometric assessment that form the consensus in the field of testing- is in agreement with sociocultural theory. Further, it is a key aspect of the interactionist DA proposed by Feuerstein’s Structural
Cognitive Modifiability Theory, in which interventions in the form of MLE are designed to both assess the ability of the learner to change, and also to promote cognitive development.

Interventionist and interactionist DA therefore, have somewhat differing goals. While the interventionist approach places emphasis on the assessment element of DA, with efforts made to bring assessment sessions closer to psychometric models of testing, interactionist methodologies place greater emphasis on the development of the learner. Inevitably therefore, if interactionist DA practitioners are to effectively promote such learner development, a more flexible approach to mediation is required, tailored to each learner’s needs.

4.4.4.2 Interactionist DA and Feuerstein

A prominent researcher and practitioner in the interactionist DA tradition is Feuerstein (1979; 1988), who has carried out a large body of research on children with learning difficulties. Feuerstein’s work has been influential in promoting the interactionist approach, both in the field of general education and also in the field of L2 learning.

Feuerstein’s concept of a “mediated learning experience” (MLE), “…an explanatory principle accounting for the diversity of human learning abilities” (Kozulin, 2002a, p.5), is based on the assumption that it is possible to intervene in a learner’s development and thus change its course. Feuerstein specifically uses the term “retarded performer” rather than “retarded person” (Sternberg and Grigorenko, 2002) to emphasise his position that learning difficulties are not innate, but are a result of a learner receiving a lack of quality mediation between him or herself and the environment.

For Feuerstein, there are two kinds of learning experience. A direct experience involves a learner being exposed to "environmental stimuli" that have a lasting effect on them. Here, there is no intermediary mediator, or mediating tool- the environment has a direct effect on the person (Kozulin, 2002b). A mediated learning experience on the other hand, involves a more experienced other interjected between the environment and the learner. Feuerstein (1979, p.71) defines this mediated learning experience in more detail:
“...the interactional processes between the developing human organism and an experienced, intentioned adult who, by interposing himself between the child and external sources of stimulation, “mediates” the world to the child by framing, selecting, focusing, and feeding back environmental experiences in such a way as to produce in him appropriate learning sets and habits.”

In sympathy with Feuerstein's definition, Kozulin (2002a) similarly describes a MLE as an interaction between a learner and a mediator who acts as an intermediary between the learner and the material or object the learner is interacting with.

Feuerstein argues that learning difficulties arise due to the learner not receiving sufficient MLE, which are crucial in pushing the development of cognitive abilities. For Feuerstein (1978), MLEs allow a child to learn more efficiently and become "modified." Without such mediation, the learner passively receives information from the environment, and is thus limited in his or her ability to develop.

Feuerstein asserts that through MLEs learners’ development can be altered or “modified,” producing “a noticeable departure from the normal developmental course of the individual as determined by his genetic and/or neurophysiological and/or experiential background” (Feuerstein, 1978, p.197). This assumption, that an individual’s course of development is not fixed, but may be changed via intervention, is of central importance within both interventionist and interactionist DA, but Feuerstein's MLE places particular emphasis on interventions sensitive to each learner's specific needs. For Feuerstein therefore, MLE are essential in both assessing the cognitive modifiability of a learner and thus their potential for development, and also in assisting that development.

It can be seen therefore that there are a number of parallels between Vygotsky's theory and the work of Feuerstein, with both placing considerable importance on the role of social interaction and mediation. Sternberg and Grigorenko (2002) point out the similarities between Feuerstein's MLE and Vygotsky's concept of internalisation. While Vygotsky focused on socialising in a wider sense, and Feuerstein more on one-to-one interactions between a learner
and more experienced other, "the difference, however, is one of degree rather
than one of kind" (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2002, p.50).

While Feuerstein strongly argues for the use of MLE in both assessing and
promoting development, its practical applicability requires a detailed description
of what qualifies as MLE. To this end, Feuerstein lists eleven attributes of a
mediated learning experience (see Figure 4-7) that help to bring about cognitive
modification.

**Figure 4-7**: Mediated Learning Experience attributes (Feuerstein et al, 1988:61-62)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intentionality and reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transcendence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mediation of meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mediation of feelings of competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mediation of regulation and control of behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mediated sharing behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mediation of individuation and psychological differentiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8 | Mediation of goal seeking, goal setting, goal planning, and achieving
   behaviour |
| 9 | Mediation of challenge: The search for novelty and complexity |
| 10 | Mediation of an awareness of the human being as a changing entity |
| 11 | Mediation of an optimistic alternative |

This list of attributes is described by Lidz (2002) as “proximal causes of
development, in contrast to the more distal factors of socioeconomic status,
physical condition, health, disabilities etc” (Lidz, 2002, p.70) and is “both broad
and specific, as well as flexible in its applications” (Lidz, 2002, p.69). Of these
eleven attributes, the first three- intentionality and reciprocity, transcendence,
and mediation of meaning, were considered to be of primary importance by
Feuerstein, as they “transcend not only culture but even the modality of
mediation” (Kozulin, 2002b, p.24). By this, it is meant that the attributes are not
specific to any particular mode of learning, such as speaking or reading, but are
relevant in all contexts.

4.4.4.3 *Intentionality*
Intentionality refers to the mediator’s “deliberate efforts to mediate the world, an object in it, or an activity for the child” (Poehner, 2008a, p.57). This is the opposite of the random nature of much interaction, where the learner may or may not receive effective help. In an MLE, the mediator intentionally assists the learner as and when it is necessary, in a structured attempt to influence the developmental trajectory of the learner.

4.4.4.4 Reciprocity

This stresses the point that an MLE requires the learner to play an active part in collaborating with the mediator, not merely passively receiving knowledge. Attending to the reciprocating moves of the learner by the mediator is also of prime importance, as this allows the mediator to accurately assess the learner’s ZPD, and offer appropriate interventions within that development space. It is this reciprocity that for Poehner (as mentioned above), leads to a collaborative “dance” between the mediator and learner. Reciprocity will be further discussed below.

4.4.4.5 Transcendence

In an MLE, it is necessary to promote development by challenging the learner, promoting the extension of their ability beyond the immediate task at hand, and encouraging them to transfer it to other tasks, in different contexts. According to Feuerstein (1979, p.92), development “transcends any specific task and manifests itself in a variety of ways under a multitude of differing conditions.”

4.4.4.6 Mediation of Meaning

Related to the attribute of transcendence, mediation of meaning involves the mediator promoting understanding of the concepts behind the successful completion of a task, so that the learner may transcend the immediate task at hand and apply the ability or abilities to other activities. For Poehner (2008), this is the key aim of interactionist DA, with the mediator responsible for providing optimal conditions for development through mediation tailored to the learner’s individual ZPD.
The influence of Feuerstein’s work in the field of L2 learning and how his concept of MLE has been adapted for application in the second language classroom will be discussed below.

4.4.5 Dynamic Assessment, "static testing" and criticism

Although the terms “static” and “dynamic” assessment were first used by Feuerstein et al (1979), and are used in much of the literature (Lidz, 1991; Sternberg and Grigorenko, 2002), Poehner (2008a) uses the more neutral terms “dynamic” and “non-dynamic” assessment. This study will follow Poehner’s convention.

Criticisms of DA have typically fallen under one of two types- criticism from the perspective of traditional NDA-type testing, with its focus on reliability and validity, and also criticism with regards to DA’s perceived lack of efficiency in assessing learners. Each type of criticism is discussed below.

As discussed in section 4.4.4, there is not one, but a number of DA methodologies, falling within two main types- interventionist and interactionist DA. While interventionist DA approaches have attempted to incorporate elements of standardised NDA-type testing in their methodologies (Guthke, 1995 for example), interactionist DA places emphasis on the needs of the individual learner, and thus is not readily compatible with standardisation. While interactionist DA, with its focus on the learner's particular needs and bringing together instruction and assessment makes it particularly effective in classroom contexts (Poehner, 2008), this lack of adherence to NDA testing principles has drawn criticism.

Glutting and McDermott (1990) view DA's approach to assessment as incompatible with the NDA testing principle of reliability- in which a test score is seen as being reliable, as if is "free from errors of measurement" (Bachman, 1990, p.24). For Glutting and McDermott (1990, p.300), a mediator promoting development during an assessment undermines "internal consistency reliability" (in other words, the object of assessment should ideally remain constant during the assessment). In a DA then, the goal of promoting development entails bringing about change in a learner's development; this is seen as being problematic from a NDA perspective. Glutting and McDermott also criticise the
learner interacting with a mediator in a DA as undermining reliability in another sense- that different mediators may provide different types or amounts of mediation to a learner in different DA sessions. This question of inter-rater reliability is seen as a problem from a NDA point of view; if different mediators or observers respond to learners' performances in varying ways, the DA results may be unreliable, "reflect[ing] more of the observer's than the child's characteristics" (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1998, p.84).

Poehner (2007) and Poehner and Lantolf (2010) argue that the difference between dynamic (DA) and non-dynamic (NDA) assessment lies in their opposing ontological and epistemological views of learning and development. The emphasis that non-dynamic assessments place on individual performance and what that tells us about a learner's abilities is not shared by the dynamic approach. While traditional psychometric forms of assessment are based on the belief that current independent performance levels of an individual are indicative of future proficiency, Vygotskian theory puts forward that a person's developmental trajectory can be altered through social interaction, and is thus dynamic. Therefore, while NDA aims to capture the performance of an individual in isolation, with as little interference from external factors as is reasonably possible, DA asserts that it is only through interacting with others that an individual's potential development can be fully assessed. DA studies do typically include a non-dynamic stage as part of the overall assessment, in order to gauge a learner's zone of actual development (ZAD); however, without an accompanying dynamic assessment, it offers only an incomplete view of a learner's abilities and potential.

DA has also been criticised for a lack of reliability, failing to control the interference of outside contextual factors on the assessment (such as the giving of feedback from a mediator, or the use of tools to aid learner understanding). From a NDA perspective, context is seen as a set of variables to be controlled, in order to accurately measure these abilities with as little interference as possible (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1998; Haywood & Tzuriel, 2002)).

In sociocultural theory however, the context, or environment, is seen as crucial in cognitive development, and therefore “the unit of analysis for the study of development is not the individual acting alone, but the interpersonal functional
system formed by people and cultural artifacts acting jointly to bring about development.” (Poehner & Lantolf, 2010, p.238). Poehner and Lantolf assert that DA does not share the concerns of NDA in terms of minimising the effects of the environment upon the individual’s performance. In fact, from a sociocultural point of view, the learner and the environment are indistinguishable, forming a “dialectical unity that cannot be understood if the unity is broken” (Poehner & Lantolf, 2010, p.239). McNamara (1997) and van Lier (2004) also both criticise non-dynamic forms of assessment. According to them, in focusing on reliability and generalisability, NDA methodology fails to adequately take into account the social contexts of learning and development.

Poehner (2007) puts forward that NDA captures individual, unassisted performance, which according to Vygotskian theory shows us the past development of the learner, or their zone of actual performance (Giest and Lompscher, 2003). DA however, uncovers potential future development through mediating within the learner’s ZPD. Poehner also points to another key difference however- that of “ecological generalisability.” It is argued that by placing the assessment in a social context, the session is more attuned to the way individuals learn in common practice, and also carry out most general activities. This is in opposition to the more artificial methodology of NDA, in which learners perform without assistance from others. As Poehner (2007) states:

“Whereas NDA views performance as the provenance of the individual and context as a backdrop to that performance, DA understands performance to emerge from the interplay between individuals, the activities in which they engage, and the culturally constructed artifacts they employ.” (Poehner, 2007, p.334)

From a NDA perspective, DA also has problems in terms of validity, “the extent to which the inferences or decisions we make on the basis of test scores are meaningful, appropriate, and useful (Bachman, 1990, p.25). In traditional NDA testing, there are a number of different types of validity, such as content validity (showing that a test is relevant to the content being tested), and criterion validity (showing a relationship between the test scores and another criterion also believed to indicate the ability being tested; Bachman, 1990). Criterion validity is
typically established through statistical methods (Cronbach, 1990; Bachman, 1990), comparing two separate measurements for correlations. Beckman (2006) argues that DA proponents have not yet put forward sufficient empirical evidence for the validity of their methods. This approach to validity is not easily applicable to DA, as DA’s emphasis on development means the goal is for learners’ performances to change from assessment to assessment. From a NDA point of view therefore, this calls into question DA’s validity as an assessment.

A further type of validity is construct validity (what is being measured?), which should be precisely identified and defined (Bachman, 1990). Poehner (2008), addressing the overall issue of validity in regards to DA, acknowledges that, as with NDA, DA needs to clearly define the construct (object) being assessed. In DA however, there is the additional object of development, as DA is designed to uncover and assess development through interaction; this means then “the validity of a DA procedure is best understood as the extent to which it promotes development” (Poehner, 2008, p.76).

Buchel and Scharnhorst (1993), while recognising the pedagogical benefits of DA methodology, argue that the developmental effects of interaction with a mediator compromise the usefulness of it as an assessment of cognitive abilities: "If assessment is to be a scientific enterprise...then we must accept a compromise between the educational and the diagnostic function" (Buchel & Scharnhorst, 1993, p.100) In addressing this concern, Poehner (2005; 2007; 2008) advocates framing DA as being a "development-referenced" assessment, with its usefulness measured by its effectiveness in promoting development, rather than as a measure of underlying cognitive abilities:

"DA...should not be judged according to psychometric standards because these are incommensurable with Vygotsky's theory of mind. Instead, DA procedures are legitimate to the extant that they achieve their primary goal of understanding and promoting learner development." (Poehner, 2008, p.87)

The second category of criticism with regards to DA relates to efficiency. Karpov and Tzuriel (2009) highlight two related issues that have been raised by critics
of DA. The first is that DA is time-intensive, and thus inefficient, and secondly that it the use of skilled mediators in these time-intensive sessions is expensive. These are undoubtedly valid concerns, both within the field of second language learning, and in the field of educational psychology more generally. DA has traditionally involved one-on-one meetings with learners; the complexity of some objects of assessment also necessarily involve the need for assessors to be highly skilled. In response to these concerns, research has in recent times been carried out in incorporating technology into the DA approach (see Chapter Eleven, section 11.7.2 for details), thus increasing the efficiency with which it can be administered. A small number of studies are also beginning to explore the potential for DA to be administered to more than one participant at the same time, which could reduce both the time and cost factors for this form of assessment (see Chapter Eleven, section 11.7.1 for details).

The limitations of DA in terms of when it may be appropriate, and when it may not be suitable, should also be acknowledged. If the purpose of an assessment is to allocate school department resources, select or stream students, or assess the accountability of an education programme, DA's lack of suitability for "systematic comparison" may make it inappropriate for such contexts (Elliott, 2003, p.18); in these "high stakes" situations in which large numbers of individual learners may be systematically compared with others, more standardised testing may be suitable (Gipps, 1999).

4.4.6 Poehner’s application of interactionist dynamic assessment to second language learning

4.4.6.1 Towards a unity of instruction and assessment

Poehner (2009) argues for an interactionist approach to DA that is simultaneously both assessment and instruction. Although combining both assessment and instruction is a central characteristic of DA, in the field of education, according to Poehner, the relationship between instruction and assessment has “[typically] been defined by embedding intervention in a testing procedure in order to monitor learner responsiveness to mediation” (Poehner, 2009, p.253). For Poehner however, the unity between the two can be more strongly emphasised, and used in the classroom.
On DA in the general education field, Poehner puts forward that most research has been concerned with using DA as a method of placing students, or identifying learners with special educational needs, and has largely not addressed the classroom. For the most part, the DA is administered by school psychologists, with the aim of providing reports to teachers. In these cases, the divide between assessment and instruction has not been addressed. Even in curriculum-based DA, in which a DA session leads to a personalised learning plan for a learner, assessment and instruction are divided, although connected. In applying Vygotskian principles to the field of L2, Poehner emphasises a unity between instruction and assessment, what he calls a “dialectical approach.”

In contrast, Poehner puts forward that most DA research in the field of L2 learning has focused to a greater extent on the development of the learner, rather than assessing their potential. While in general education, research has tended to focus on cognitive abilities or intelligence, in the L2 field researchers have focused on development in relation to course content and curriculum (for example Poehner, 2005; Ableeva, 2010). This movement of the focus of DA towards the classroom is supported by Kozulin (2009). According to Kozulin, DA is traditionally concerned with assessing cognitive functions, not rooted in curriculum. Formative Assessment, in which “higher mental processes” in relation to domains such as mathematics or languages are assessed, offers a way of expanding DA’s scope. While there are differences between FA and DA (see above), Poehner’s suggested form of DA for L2 does share commonalities with formative assessment. The interactionist DA put forward by Poehner, like FA, is embedded in curriculum; DA however, uses principles of the ZPD and mediation to ground the assessment in theory, enabling a more systematic assessment.

### 4.4.6.2 Principles in applying interactionist DA to second language learning

Using Feuerstein’s MLE attributes as a foundation, Poehner (2008a) sets out three guiding principles to be used when applying interactionist DA to the second language classroom- intentionality and reciprocity, coherence and object. Each will be discussed in turn.

#### 4.4.6.2.1 Intentionality and reciprocity
Intentionality, as discussed above in relation to Feuerstein’s proposed criteria for a mediated learning experience, is a necessary characteristic of effective mediation. While it is possible that an interaction not focused on development might lead to incidental learning, the effects will be inconsistent and unreliable. In order for mediation within a DA session to be effective, the intention of the mediator must be to promote learner development whenever possible through their mediating moves, and should therefore fall within the learner’s zone of proximal development. For Poehner and Lantolf (2010) this entails encouraging the learner to assume as much responsibility for the task as possible. Mediation therefore, should be guided by the learner’s ZPD, offering the appropriate degree of explicitness or implicitness to promote what Feuerstein describes as cognitive modification (Feuerstein, 1979; 1988). Without intentionality on the part of the mediator however, interventions may not effectively encourage development, falling randomly within or outside the ZPD.

Aljaafreh and Lantolf’s (1994) study, while not strictly dynamic assessment, offers valuable insights into the kinds of intentional mediating moves by an expert or more competent peer that will promote development in the learner. According to Aljaafreh and Lantolf, in order for assistance within an interaction to be effective, it should be both contingent upon the needs of the learner, and graded, with interventions varying in their degree of explicitness depending on the learner’s ZPD. After analysing the interactions between the mediator and the study participants, twelve types of assistance were found in the data, organised on a scale from most implicit to most explicit (see Figure 4-8).

**Figure 4-8:** Regulatory scale from implicit to explicit (Aljaafreh and Lantolf, 1994:471)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Tutor asks the learner to read, find the errors, and correct them independently, prior to the tutorial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Construction of a “collaborative frame” prompted by the presence of the tutor as a potential dialogic partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Prompted or focused reading of the sentence that contains the error by the learner or the tutor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Tutor indicates that something may be wrong in a segment (e.g., sentence, clause, line)- “is there anything wrong in this sentence?”

5. Tutor rejects unsuccessful attempts at recognising the error.

6. Tutor narrows down the location of the error (e.g., tutor repeats or points to the specific segment which contains the error).

7. Tutor indicates the nature of the error, but does not identify the error (e.g., “There is something with the tense marking here.”).

8. Tutor identifies the error (“You can’t use an auxiliary here”).

9. Tutor rejects learner’s unsuccessful attempts at correcting error.

10. Tutor provides clues to help the learner arrive at the correct form (e.g., “It is not really past but something that is still going on”).

11. Tutor provides the correct form.

12. Tutor provides some explanation for use of the correct form.

13. Tutor provides examples of the correct pattern when other forms of help fail to produce an appropriate responsive action.

In order for mediators to be able to provide intentional, appropriate interventions while interacting with a learner however, it is necessary to uncover and evaluate the learner’s ZPD. It is therefore of considerable importance to attend closely to the reciprocating moves of the learner while participating in DA (“learner reciprocity,” Lidz, 1991). Poehner (2008b) argues that often in L2 DA research mediating moves have been studied at the expense of learners’ reciprocating moves, and that this is something that needs to be addressed. Paying close attention to the responses of learners is of central importance in an interactionist approach to dynamic assessment, as it both informs the mediator of the level of potential development, and provides the information necessary to give appropriate, developmentally sensitive assistance. Poehner’s emphasis on the importance of not only the mediator’s interventions being examined, but also the responses/reciprocations of the learner also, are in tune with the work of Wertsch (1984) and Engestrom (1987) mentioned above, who criticise narrow definitions of the ZPD. Such narrow interpretations, in which the mediator is seen as providing scaffolding in a one way process are described as inaccurate, and a result of taking the concept out of its original context (Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory). Instead, the ZPD should be seen as a two way process, in which the mediator and learner co-construct new knowledge.
While attendance to learner reciprocity is a key aspect of development-focused DA, Poehner (2008b) is careful to point out that developing a “definitive” list of learner reciprocating moves in order to analyse interactions would be inadvisable, as each interaction is unique, and must be placed in its own context. Any attempt to adhere to such a list would be to simplify the interactive process, which would inevitably lead to missing important information about a learner’s development. With this proviso in mind, Poehner provides an illustration of the reciprocating moves found while carrying out a French L2 DA programme for undergraduates at a North American university (see Figure 4-9).

Figure 4-9: Learner reciprocating move types found in a French L2 DA programme (Poehner, 2008b, p.42-52)

1. Negotiating mediation, in which the learner responds to the mediation offered.
2. Use of mediator as a resource - learners request help from the mediator, showing a degree of agency and self-regulation.
3. Creating opportunities to develop - the learner takes the opportunity to challenge themselves or take the interaction in a different direction.
4. Seeking mediator approval - the learner may have difficulties in planning or controlling their use of the L2.
5. Rejecting mediation - the learner may not accept the mediation offered, perhaps because they believe they can perform independently.

4.4.6.2.2 Coherence

Relating to Feuerstein’s concept of transcendence, Poehner posits that DA sessions should be coherent, in that sessions should offer related tasks of increasing difficulty as the learner’s ZPD shifts due to internalisation of skills. Assessment should not be a fixed activity, but rather instruction and assessment need to constantly evolve with the learner in order to promote development. Coherence (transcendence) then allows for tasks to move along with the movement of the learner’s ZPD, challenging the learner to constantly move beyond the immediate task at hand and apply their abilities in new contexts.

4.4.6.2.3 Object
Relating to Feuerstein’s “mediation of meaning” MLE attribute, Poehner’s third principle asserts the importance of developing a learner’s conceptual understanding, allowing them to progress beyond a particular task and apply their knowledge to a range of related but different activities (transcendence).

An important distinction should be made between scaffolding that enables learners to complete a given task, and mediation that promotes development. It is argued by Poehner (2007; 2008a) that with sufficient scaffolding, most learners will be able to complete a task. That does not necessarily mean however, that linguistic development has taken place. Poehner argues that, for development to take place, mediation should be sensitive to the learner’s needs, with the learner assuming greater responsibility, and the mediator providing less assistance over time. In other words, mediation should be responsive to the learner’s ZPD, with appropriate levels of implicitness or explicitness. Also, mediation should involve helping learners to understand the reasoning behind why the task should be completed in a particular way, allowing them to apply that knowledge to new situations. Without promoting conceptual understanding, learners may be able to complete the immediate task at hand, but will not be able to transcend the task. For Feuerstein, it is this transcendence that shows development.

For Poehner therefore, scaffolding is focused on task completion, and is of limited use in pushing forward learner development. Valsiner and Van der Veer (1993) support this argument, putting forward that scaffolding (in Poehner’s sense of the word) is not grounded in a theory of development, and so is not development oriented. Chaiklin (2003) also argues against narrowly defining the ZPD as a pedagogical tool for the completion of tasks, asserting instead the importance of a focus on development. Further, Karpov (2005) also argues that theoretical, conceptual learning promotes development that allows learners to transcend the immediate task in front of them and apply their knowledge in new areas. Negueruela also (2008) calls for conceptual learning in a “revolutionary pedagogy” based on Vygotskian theory, in which learning leads development rather than vice versa. He argues for this to be done by the teaching of concepts which act as psychological tools, mediating learning for participants.
There have been a number of studies concerning the implementation of concept-based learning in the field of L2. Ferreira and Lantolf (2008) implemented a concept-based programme of instruction for teaching genre in writing within an ESL course, based on the work of Davydov (1999) and his “MAC pedagogy” (“Movement from the Abstract to the Concrete”).

Students, over a sixteen week period were presented with theoretical concepts of three genres of writing (public announcement, cover letter, and argumentative text), and were encouraged to move from a purely empirical understanding of how to write them (rule-based) to a conceptual understanding, with the aim of allowing them to adapt their writing to different contexts, increasing their flexibility and creativity. Learner development was evaluated based on their ability to understand texts conceptually, and improved writing performance. It was found that the learners increased their conceptual understanding throughout the course, while some of them improved their writing performance. The authors put forward however that this lack of improvement in performance in some students, despite their improved conceptual understanding, is not at odds with Vygotskian theory, as Vygotsky conceived of development as non-linear, with development unpredictable. Ferriera and Lantolf conclude that it is probable however that these learners, over time, would see performance improvements.

Serrano-Lopez and Poehner (2008) carried out a study concerning the learning of Spanish as a second language. Based on Gal’Perin’s (1979) Concept-Based Instruction (CBI) and The Davis Method of 3-D clay modelling (Davis, 1997), participants were required to use clay modelling to help further their understanding of the concept of “space” in relation to Spanish prepositions. Comparing pre and post-treatment test scores, it was found that the concept-based instruction had led to participants having increased control over their use of the target language.

Although not directly related to mediation of meaning and transcendence, Lapkin, Swain and Knouzi’s (2008) study investigated the effect that learners’ self-explanation (private speech) of a grammatical concept had on their development of their understanding of the concept. A short programme consisting of two sessions was designed, based on the learning of the concept
of “voice” in French. The concept was explained to the learners, who were then asked to explain the concept of voice aloud. Numerous examples were found of the verbalisation leading to increased understanding of the concept.

Recently, work has begun on applying CBI pedagogy to pragmatics instruction by van Compernolle (2014) and van Compernolle and Henery (2014). Van Compernolle (2014) and van Compernolle and Henery (2014) report a study in consisting of a 6-week enrichment programme aiming to promote learners’ conceptual understanding of the French tu and vous forms, and how they are influenced by sociopragmatic factors. The study focused on three central factors- self-presentation (how a learner wishes to present themselves in a given context), social distance, and power. To this end, learners were presented with instructional materials such as diagrams (following Gal’Perin’s (1979) and Negueruela’s (2008) concept-based approach) and questionnaires asking learners to judge the appropriateness of language in varying contexts. They also carried out role-plays with the researcher, in which they attempted to put into practical use their developing knowledge. As with Negueruela (2008), the learners were also encouraged to verbalise their understanding of the tu/vous forms' usage. It was found that, over time, the learners showed improvements in their ability to access their sociopragmatic knowledge when producing linguistic realisations.

4.4.6.3 Mediation as being co-constructed

Van Compernolle (2013) puts forward that Poehner’s view of mediation in DA, while a significant step forward in terms of viewing L2 development as social and emergent in interaction, still ultimately views mediation as one-directional, flowing from the mediator to the learner. Using conversation analysis (CA) as both a method of analysing talk occurring during the carrying out of role-plays and as a theoretical grounding, van Compernolle puts forward the concept of interactional competence (IC) as being of key importance in pragmatic DA sessions. Van Compernolle argues that L2 DA work to date has focused primarily on the moves of the mediator. While the work of Poehner has also investigated the reciprocating moves of the learner, and has produced lists of both successful mediating moves and reciprocating ones, van Compernolle
argues that this still reinforces the notion that mediation is something applied to the learner, rather than being co-constructed.

Van Compernolle describes interactional competence as the ability to understand various types of interaction between interlocutors and recognise how such interactions typically unfold, understanding the illocutionary force behind an interlocutor's turns. For van Compernolle, IC is not only social in nature, but also psychological, as the individuals attune to their interlocutor's intended meanings. Importantly, this not only involves an awareness of interactional practices, but also of the object of the mediation. There are two key aspects to IC in this context therefore - the ability to recognise and negotiate the opening and closing of mediation sequences, and secondly to identify and work on the object of the mediation itself.

Using CA techniques to examine evidence of how mediation is co-constructed by the DA participants, rather than applied by the mediator in a one-directional flow, van Compernolle video recorded a number of “strategic interaction scenarios” (Di Pietro, 1987), carried out by a mediator and learners of French as a second language. The aim of these role-plays was to develop pragmatic knowledge and performance through interactions between the two participants. DA principles were used throughout the scenarios, meaning that the mediator not only carried out their role in the situation, but also pedagogically assisted the learner whenever pragmatic failure occurred.

Rather than Poehner’s mediation move and reciprocating move conception of DA mediation, van Compernolle conceives of it as a mediation insertion sequence, inserted within the language task, in which the task sequence is paused in order to resolve a problem or difficulty that has been identified. Of particular interest from this perspective are the ways in which mediation insertion sequences are begun (often, though not necessarily, by the mediator), and finished - the “boundaries” between task-directed talk and the mediation sequences, in which the mediator takes on an instructor’s role. It is the proficiency of the learner in recognising and negotiating these boundaries that demonstrates interactional competence. Van Compernolle puts forward that DA should therefore take into account these negotiations in assessing learners.
Further, Van Compernolle argues that, once mediation is defined as an insertion sequence, with an opening and closing, and interactional competence is defined as the participants’ competence in identifying microinteractional cues or strategies, and orienting themselves to the object of the mediation, it becomes clear that interactional competence and pragmatic performance are closely interconnected. In order for the learner to gain increased control over the object of mediation, and thus develop, they must first identify the object, a central aspect of IC. Development is therefore linked to how successful the mediation sequences are, and the success of the mediation sequences are in turn affected by the degree of interactional competence of the participants. For van Compernolle therefore, viewing DA sessions through a conversation analysis and interactional competence framework allows for a fresh perspective on mediation, one in which the co-constructed nature of successful mediation events can be better captured by the framework of analysis. This, it is argued, is a view of DA interaction that is more closely aligned with Vygotsky's view of the ZPD as something constructed through interaction.

4.4.7 Second language dynamic assessment studies to date

DA and second language learning is still a young field, and as such, only a relatively small number of studies have been carried out. In the following section, a survey of DA L2 studies to date is carried out, with a discussion of their varying approaches to DA methodology. The studies are discussed in chronological order, with later studies offering more detail on methodological practices and learner development.

Schneider and Ganschow (2000) provide an early study in DA in the L2. However, their study is light on detail, in terms of what is meant by “DA” for the purposes of their research. They identify the need to introduce DA into second language learning, and provide a number of strategies that can be used in sessions to help the learner. However, in talking of an “assessment/teaching cycle,” they appear to bifurcate the two aspects of DA, while the goal of interactionist dynamic assessment is to unify the two (Poehner, 2005; 2008a). Further, they fail to ground their strategies in theory (Feuerstein’s MLE for example) and fail to give examples of interactions between mediators and learners.
While not implementing dynamic assessment among L2 learners as such, Erben et al (2008) introduced DA in an ESOL certificate course at an American university. Replacing a traditional multiple-choice examination, participants instead were given an examination paper in which they first answered the questions individually. This was followed by answering the same questions in pairs, then in groups, with the teacher finishing the session with a whole class discussion of the answers. The study found a positive reaction to the DA from the students, with many reporting that they felt they had learnt from the session.

Anton (2009) implemented interactionist DA for writing and speaking in an advanced Spanish language programme at the higher education level, with a NDA followed by a mediation session, but with no post-intervention test. The writing and speaking DAs were given as part of an entrance examination for third grade students.

For the writing DA, students were asked to write a passage, and were then allowed to revise it based on checking dictionaries, grammar texts or asking the assessor. For the speaking DA, oral interviews were followed by a picture description. Students first described the picture without assistance, and then were asked to narrate once more with help from the mediator. In a following section, students were requested to perform a monologue, with assistance if or when needed. Students were assessed and given a numerical score, based on their assisted performance, and also a qualitative assessment report.

Detailed descriptions of the procedures are given by Anton, as well as examples of mediator-learner interactions and the qualitative reports given as part of the assessment. While Anton’s study provides useful examples of interaction between learners and mediators, it is based on a once-only DA session, as part of an entrance examination. Anton is therefore unable to report on learner development over time that a longitudinal study would allow. Also, it appears that while attempts are made to incorporate Aljaafreh and Lantolf’s (1994) implicit-explicit assistance scale into mediations, insufficient information is provided concerning incorporation of Feuerstein’s MLE attributes. Further, by administering a DA once only, as part of an examination, a bifurcation of assessment and instruction is introduced, a characteristic of static testing that interactionist DA is designed to remedy.
Poehner (2005) carried out the first extensive, longitudinal study of DA in the L2 classroom. The interactionist DA study, in which the participants were learners of French (L2), involved a non-dynamic and dynamic pre-test, a L2 enrichment programme, followed by a NDA and DA post-test (the sandwich technique, Sternberg and Grigorenko, 2002). During the initial pre-test sessions, participants were shown a film clip in their first language, and were asked to then narrate it in French (L2). The pre-test performances were analysed for insights into the developmental levels of the participants that would inform the following sessions. The concept of verbal aspect, a particularly challenging area for many learners of French, was chosen as an area of focus for the enrichment programme section of the study, with the aim being to help the learners develop a conceptual understanding of the area (Feuerstein’s mediation of meaning). For the following six weeks the mediators and participants engaged in one-to-one learning sessions in a weekly programme of narrating clips from a romantic comedy film. Each week the mediator and learner jointly worked towards creating a narrative of a new clip. The interventions were not pre-planned, but were given in response to the learner’s reciprocating moves and the mediator’s assessment of the learner’s personal ZPD.

The final element of the study included two “transfer tasks” in which the learners were challenged to transcend the previous activity by applying their conceptual knowledge to related but different tasks. In the first transfer task, participants were required to narrate a clip from a film of a different, more challenging genre. The second transfer task required narration of a section of text from Voltaire’s Candide. Poehner tracked learner development over the period of eight weeks, with the data providing evidence of development. Although the development was found to be non-linear with some participants, Poehner argues that this is in line with the Vygotskian idea of learning often being “revolutionary” rather than “evolutionary,” (Vygotsky, 1998) with learners often seemingly regressing before moving forward.

Ableeva (2010), in a similar approach to Poehner’s above, carried out a longitudinal study of listening comprehension in the French L2 classroom, with the aim of investigating the effects of DA on both assessing and promoting the development of listening comprehension among the study participants. Seven learners participated in individualised interactionist DA sessions over a period of
two months, with the NDA-DA pre-test, development programme, NDA-DA post-test “sandwich” methodology used. The procedural framework for mediation within the DA sessions was based on both Aljaafreh and Lantolf’s (1994) implicit-explicit scale of assistance and Poehner’s (2005) inventory of mediation types.

While Poehner administered two transfer tasks after the post-tests in his study, Ableeva administered four, in order to better analyse the extent to which the mediation given to the learners had been internalised. This “multiple transfers” approach is based on the work of Brown and Ferrara (1985) and Campione et al (1984), who employed multiple transfer tasks in a non-second language learning context. In her analysis of the data, Ableeva provided an inventory of both effective mediation moves and response moves by the learners. Evidence was found of learner development throughout the concept-based enrichment programme, with Ableeva also arguing that the DA allowed for effective diagnosis of the learners’ problem areas related to listening comprehension.

Lantolf and Poehner (2011) reported on an implementation of DA procedures in an elementary school setting. Following an interventionist approach using scripted interventions ranging from most implicit to most explicit, the teacher gave daily DA sessions to 8-11 year old learners of Spanish (L2). Students’ performances were recorded, with the type and number of interventions required, along with teacher comments. Changes in learner performance were tracked over a period of four months in order to observe any development, and the sessions were video recorded in order to allow microgenetic analysis of the mediator-learner interactions.

Lantolf and Poehner emphasise the fact that the teacher administered her own interpretation of DA, choosing to create her own set of scripted interventions and tasks tailored to the teaching context. Lantolf and Poehner argue that this is in keeping with the views of Vygotsky, who supported a two-way relationship between theory and practice, with both informing the other (Vygotsky, 1997).

The study yielded important insights into the learners’ development. While two of the students for example struggled with the noun-adjective agreements that were a focus of the sessions, one of them was able to self-correct with less
explicit help than the other learner, pointing towards a more maturing ability to self-regulate (Aljaafreh and Lantolf, 1994). One of the participants developed in a short space of time from requiring explicit help to relatively implicit assistance. From a sociocultural point of view, this is possible evidence of microgenetic development, with the learner developing within a short space of time (possibly within one learning session).

While the majority of L2 DA studies to date have taken place in adult settings, this study shows the value of DA procedures in other settings also. The interactions between the teacher and the students appear to encourage development in the participants, and the process yielded important insights into the learners’ matured and still maturing cognitive abilities. The interventionist approach to the DA sessions however, while allowing for a highly systematic approach to mediation, inevitably leads to less sensitivity to learners’ individual ZPDs. Further, the short time span of the DA sessions (15 minutes) means that delving more deeply into the participants’ ZPDs was problematic.

Van Compernolle (2014), as part of his study of concept-based instruction of the French tu/vous forms and sociopragmatic knowledge, incorporated dynamically administered strategic interactions as part of the enrichment programme. Reporting on the learners in the study, he found evidence of development in terms of the speed with which they were able to access their sociopragmatic knowledge during the role-play performances.

The above review of DA L2 studies to date demonstrates that the body of knowledge is still very much in a period of expansion. Early studies do not typically provide detailed descriptions of methodological practices in carrying out DA, or do not provide detailed assessments of DA interactions. Later studies by Poehner (2005) and Ableeva (2010) address these issues, and also provide an assessment of learner development over a longer period of time. However, while Poehner (2005) focuses on grammar, Ableeva (2010) on listening comprehension and van Compernolle (2014) on the use of French pronouns, the effectiveness of DA in relation to interactional competence and speech acts has yet to be explored in detail. This current study’s purpose is to address this particular aspect of communicative competence. In addition, the study provides a detailed account of the methodology developed and used in order to assess
the learners. Further, by incorporating van Compernolle’s conception of mediation as being co-constructed in an insertion sequence, this study aims to provide fresh insights into learner-mediator interactions.

4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, a brief overview was provided of the main pragmatics assessments developed to date, with the important work of Hudson et al (1992; 1995), Liu (2007) and Roever (2005) discussed. In the latter part of the chapter, the common item types used in assessments, such as discourse completion tasks and role-plays were examined and evaluated. The issue of the teachability of pragmatics was also examined. Studies comparing learners merely exposed to the L2 with those provided with instruction were discussed, as well as studies comparing groups of learners who received different types of instruction. A survey of studies concluded that there was evidence overall of pragmatic instruction being effective in promoting the development of pragmatic competence in some respects, although results were somewhat mixed.

In the final section of the chapter, an overview of dynamic assessment was given, ranging from its theoretical foundation in Vygotskian sociocultural theory and Feuerstein’s work regarding Cognitive Modifiability Theory, to its more recent application in the L2 field. The pioneering work of Poehner (2008a; 2008b) in this area is deemed to be of particular importance, paving the way for the current study's employment of DA to the requesting speech act. Van Compernolle’s view of mediation as consisting of mediation insertion sequences was also discussed.

In the next chapter, this study's research design and methodology is presented in detail.
Chapter Five
Methodology

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the methods undertaken to investigate the research questions put forward in Chapter One. The context of the study will be presented, including details regarding the participants of the study, their learning environment, and how they were recruited. The enrichment programme stage of the study will also be discussed in detail, as well as the assessment stages. The final section of the chapter will put forward the ways in which the data collected were analysed.

The current study is influenced by a social constructivist worldview, in which the researcher collects data and interprets its meaning. The meaning of the data is interpreted through the theoretical lenses of Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory (1978), and also of Feuerstein’s Cognitive Modifiability theory (1986) (see Chapter Four for detailed discussions of these perspectives on learning). These theoretical lenses led to the employment of the microgenetic-analytic methodology as the primary framework for analysis, (discussed in section 5.5.1) with a longitudinal research design that allowed learners’ development to be assessed over time.

5.2 The Context of the study

The aim of the current study was to investigate the interactional competence regarding the requesting speech act of intermediate Japanese EFL learners in a higher education context (see Chapter Two for discussion of this study's context). The general area of pragmatics was chosen as the pragmatic component of communicative competence is of considerable importance, and yet is still relatively under-researched (Kasper & Rose, 2002), and under taught (McConarchy & Hata, 2013). The speech act of requesting was chosen as the study's focus as it is one of the more frequently required speech acts, and has
also been the subject of considerable research from both a conversation analysis viewpoint, and also that of politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Liddicoat, 2011; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). There is therefore, a significant body of work that can inform mediation and the study's enrichment programme (EP). Research has also found requesting to be a challenging speech act for some learners of English L2 (Fukushima, 2000).

5.2.1 The setting and course

The study took place in a higher education institution in Japan. The learners were all members of the International Communication department. During the first year of their programme, learners are required to take three English language courses- English for International Communication (EIC1), Basic Reading, and Basic Writing. In total, they receive eight lessons of instruction per week, with four for EIC1, two for reading skills, and two for writing. The EIC1 course is designed to practice the four main language skills of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and aims to develop their ability to critically self-assess their language abilities, and also to learn autonomously. As a part of this course, learners are briefly introduced to basic pragmatic issues, such as intended meaning, and the importance of social context. In their second year, students study two English language courses- English for International Communication II, and Media English. The focus shifts to a large extent towards content in this second year, with contentious global issues studied at length.

Outside of their university studies, learners have access to a self-access learning centre (SALC), where they can use a variety of materials and equipment to aid their language learning. Off-campus however, opportunities for English language use are limited, with a small number of native English-speaking people living in the country. The International Communication department does not stream learners, meaning that all classes are of mixed proficiency levels.

5.2.2 Recruiting participants

All six of the participants were aged between 19-21 years and in their second year of the university programme. In order to enter the second year of their course, it was necessary for the learners to have successfully passed all of their
first year courses, indicating they had reached a certain level of proficiency. Within the context of the institution therefore, these learners were classed as being at an intermediate level. Intermediate learners were chosen for this study in the anticipation that they would have sufficient syntactic and lexical range to be able to carry out the required tasks, but not be at such an advanced level where the tasks would not pose a challenge.

The researcher was given permission to enter three of the English for International Communication II classes by the course instructors. The author described the study as involving the tutoring of learners in oral communication in a short intensive course, in both group format and individually. The author emphasised the voluntary nature of the study, the option to leave the study at any point in time, and that participation would not entail earning any credits as part of their programme. The author also described the study as an opportunity for the learners to practise and improve their communication abilities. The students were then given the information once more in written form, with the e-mail contact details of the author provided for those learners interested in participating. The students were also made aware that the participants would be chosen on a "first come, first served" basis.

In total eight students contacted the author to express an interest in participating, with two later withdrawing their interest due to time commitments. The six remaining students met the author in a group meeting, in which they were again given an explanation of the short tutoring course, and what they would be asked to do. The students were all given a written description of the study and how their data would be handled in both their L1 and L2. They were then given a participant consent form to read and sign, agreeing to participate. The consent form explicitly stated that participation in the study was voluntary, and the participants could freely withdraw from the study at any point. Further, no information that could personally identify the participants would be published, and the data would be treated in the strictest confidence by the researcher. The form also stated that the participants could contact the researcher at any point with questions regarding the study (see Appendix B for the participant consent form). The participants were also asked to complete a brief questionnaire providing information regarding their educational and language learning
backgrounds. All six participants have been given pseudonyms to protect their anonymity.

Data collection involved audio-video recording all sessions involving the researcher and participants. The recordings were then transcribed by the researcher for analysis. Hard copies of the transcripts and signed consent forms were securely stored in a locked filing cabinet. The video data was downloaded from the video recording equipment as soon as the sessions were finished, and were immediately deleted from the devices. The video data files were password-protected, and stored in a password-protected folder, on a password-protected computer. The data was not stored on any memory sticks or cards, and a list of participants’ names was stored separately from all other data, and on a separate hard drive (see Appendix A for the Certificate of Ethics Research Approval document).

The following are brief descriptions of each participant.

5.2.1.1 Akiko

Akiko was a 19-year-old female student. As with all of the participants (with the exception of Hanako), she had studied English formally since entering junior high school at the age of 13. Her motivation for participating in the short tutoring course was to improve her speaking ability and to have the opportunity to speak English, which she enjoyed. She had never lived abroad for an extended period of time, but had visited Australia for one week when she was younger.

5.2.1.2 Ema

Ema was a quiet 19-year-old female student who decided to participate in order to improve her speaking skills. Before entering higher education she had only studied English in a formal context. She did have experience however of living abroad, having stayed in the United Kingdom for one year, and the USA for one month. She had visited the USA on two other occasions, both for one week.

5.2.1.3 Hanako

Hanako was a 19-year-old female student who decided to participate to practise her speaking skills. She had studied English in a formal setting from the fourth
grade of primary school, but had never lived abroad for an extended time. She had however traveled to Singapore for four days on vacation.

5.2.1.4 Mayumi

Mayumi was a 20-year old female student. She decided to join the short course as she was concerned about her speaking ability worsening due to a lack of practice opportunities. By participating, she hoped to improve her confidence in speaking English. Her experience of foreign travel was limited to a one month stay in the USA at a younger age.

5.2.1.5 Ryota

Ryota was a 19-year old male student who joined the course in order to improve his speaking ability, which he was concerned about. As with the other participants, he had formally studied English since the age of 13, but had never lived in, or visited a foreign country. He expressed however a wish to use English as part of his future work after graduating.

5.2.1.6 Hikaru

A confident, talkative 21-year old male student, Hikaru saw the tutoring course as an opportunity to improve his English skills. He had studied English formally since entering junior high school, but pointed out that this was primarily focused on reading and writing skills. After leaving high school, he studied English informally, concentrating on speaking and listening in particular. His foreign travel experience was limited to a one-week stay in Vietnam at a younger age.

5.3 The enrichment programme

After the NDA1 and DA1 stages of the study, the author and participants engaged in an enrichment programme (EP), designed to promote the development of the participants' interactional competence in regards to request-based talk-in-interaction. During the EP, the participants met twice a week for a period of four weeks with the author, in a group context. These EP group meetings typically lasted for approximately 90 minutes per session.
During the NDA1 and DA1 stages, it became evident that the learners found the co-construction of complex, multi-staged talk challenging, with issues formulating pre-requests and pre-closings for example. Further, *politeness* and *formality* proved to be concepts with which the participants struggled to control. Those insights therefore, were used to inform the EP, in terms of which aspects of IC to focus on in particular.

That the participants struggled with the co-construction of requesting-in-talk is unsurprising when taking into account the ways in which speech acts are often treated in instructional materials. Pragmatics in general, including speech acts, are typically underrepresented in textbooks, compared to other aspects of language, such as grammar or syntax (McConarchy & Hata, 2013).

When speech acts are incorporated into textbooks, there are a number of problems that arise. According to McConarchy and Hata (2013), often only a narrow range of acts is included, and frequently they are presented as isolated adjacency pairs, stripped of socio-cultural context. Furthermore, when speech act-based conversations are present in materials, they are often based on the author's intuition, rather than on findings from research (McConarchy & Hata, 2013). In addition, when metapragmatic information is included, it is typically in the form of prescriptive rules that do not attend to the "largely fluid and context-dependent nature of pragmatic norms" (McConarchy & Hata, 2013, p.296).

5.3.1 Concept-based instruction

Negueruela (2008) warns against this use of reductionist "rules of thumb," that oversimplifies the complex nature of talk-in-interaction. According to Negueruela, these rules of thumb often lead to learner difficulties, "[depicting] a constrained view of language as a sedimented entity that seems to have a life of its own, independent of human users" (Negueruela, 2008, p.210). In an effort to address this issue therefore, the EP follows the concept-based instruction methodology, based on the work of Gal'Perin and Negueruela.

The work of Gal'Perin (1979), Davydov (1999), and Negueruela (2008) show the benefits of concept-based instruction, a crucial element of DA, satisfying Feuerstein's criterion of "mediation of meaning,"- i.e. that instruction should not simply teach to the immediate task at hand, but should promote learners’
conceptual understanding of the target language. This enables them to apply their knowledge to a wide range of situations in the future.

Gal’Perin (1979) developed his “systemic-theoretical instruction” pedagogy as a way of relating the work of Vygotsky to classroom instruction. Building on Vygotsky’s emphasis on the importance of concepts as tools for mediation, Gal’Perin put forward a theory of concept-based instruction in which learners move through three key stages—orientation, execution, and control (Gal’Perin, 1979). The orientation stage, or planning stage, is where the learner orients to the task given to them, planning how they will carry it out successfully. The execution stage refers to the actual task performance, while the control stage evaluates the success of the task execution. For Gal’Perin, in order to successfully plan for the task execution, learners must develop a conceptual understanding of the target object. In order for this understanding to be effectively developed, suitable models of the concept must be presented to the learner. Verbal or written explanations are insufficient for this purpose, with Gal’Perin arguing for material objects to be used to help learners grasp the concept in question. A key indicator of the extent to which the concept has been internalised by the learner is verbalisation, in which the learner verbalises through private speech the taught concept. Being able to orally explain the concept then, indicates understanding.

Negueruela (2008) supports Gal’Perin’s assertion that concepts should be placed firmly at the centre of the classroom, in what he describes as a “revolutionary pedagogy,” arguing that classroom instruction should be "grounded in, and guided by, explicit conceptual understandings that are internalised" (Negueruela, 2008, p.204). Negueruela contrasts the conventional “evolutionary” approach to instruction, in which linguistic forms are taught first, with meaning developed through generalised “rules of thumb,” with Gal’Perin’s “revolutionary” approach, in which concepts are taught from the very beginning of instruction. A critical point here is that the concepts are taught with the specific aim of promoting understanding, and should be useful in guiding communication in language tasks. Concepts therefore, while abstract, must be functional and practical, concretely linked to authentic language use.
Like Gal’Perin, Negueruela recommends the “materialisation” of concepts through the use of objects, or in Negueruela’s case, diagrams. Further, encouraging the learner to verbalise their understanding of the target concept in classroom activities is seen as an important tool, promoting internalisation as well as demonstrating it. Negueruela provides the example of a classroom task in which learners were required to explain their choices of language during the execution stage based on the concept diagrams or charts used in the orientation stage of instruction, audio-recording their explanations for homework.

5.3.2 Conversation analysis-informed instruction

Conversation analysis (CA), defined by Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008, p.11) as “…the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction,” rests on the fundamental observation that talk is highly ordered and sequential. The central aim of CA therefore is “to discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus on how sequences of actions are generated.” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p.12).

In collecting and analysing authentic discourse, conversation analysts have identified a number of key features of talk-in-interaction that were introduced to the learner-participants in the EP stage of this current study. Further, while the methodology employed for data analysis in this study is not that of conversation analysis, the CA concepts outlined below were used to inform the microgenetic analysis of the data.

5.3.2.1 Adjacency pairs

A basic observation of CA is that pairs of utterances form an important part of talk sequences. Common adjacency pairs include, for example, question and answers and invitation and acceptances or rejections (Levinson, 1983). These pairs are ordered in such a way that, once a first turn part is uttered, a second part becomes “relevant,” or required.

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) describe the basic rule of their use, stating that once a “recognisable” first pair part of an adjacency pair is completed, the
speaker finishes his or her turn, and the co-participant should begin their turn, producing the second part of the pair. While the term adjacency is used, it is not necessarily the case that the relevant second turn will occur immediately after the first turn in a sequence of talk. It may be the case for instance, that an insertion sequence is placed between the turns (Levinson, 1983, p.304).

5.3.2.2 Preference organisation

A further feature of adjacency pairs concerns the way in which some first turns may trigger a preferred response (positive) or a dispreferred response (negative), labeled as such due to the different ways they are realised in talk. The labels do not refer to any psychological motives or feelings on the part of the participants, but rather refer to differences in production features (Heritage, 1984, in Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). While preferred responses tend to be relatively simple and immediate, dispreferred ones are often delayed, and feature mitigating characteristics, making the utterance longer and more complex. Davidson (1984) puts forward that the mitigating moves found in dispreferred turns serve the function of not only softening the negative utterance, but also offering the first turn speaker an opportunity to revise their turn, lessening the discomfort of the second turn speaker.

5.3.2.3 Turn-taking

Turn-taking consists of two key parts- turn construction units (TCUs), in which a turn takes place, and a “turn-distribution component” (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008) in which the transition of one turn to another is negotiated by participants. A key feature of a TCU is “projectability-” the ability of the hearer to anticipate the speaker’s turn, in terms of what kind of turn it is, and when it may end (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008). “Transition relevant places” refer to the ending of turns, when a transition to the next turn is expected, or possible.

A speaker may explicitly offer the floor to another participant in a number of ways, such as asking a question. Although linguistic resources are commonly drawn upon in these situations, non-verbal resources may also come into play. Kendon (1967) for example put forward that the speaker’s gaze may indicate they wish another person to begin their turn. By looking at another participant intently, this can signal that the speaker wishes to end their turn, and provide
the interlocutor with a chance to talk. It is important to note here, that the above rules are not imposed upon data by researchers, but are descriptive observations by Sacks et al (1974) concerning what tends to occur in talk-in-interaction.

5.3.2.4 Overlapping speech

A further important point to note is that participants also orient themselves to possible transition relevant places in talk, rather than actual concrete ones. Related to the aforementioned projectability of TCUs, the hearer anticipates what they believe may be the end of the speaker’s turn. This explains overlapping speech, in which the hearer begins their turn before the previous turn speaker has finished talking. In this situation, it may be that the hearer has projected (incorrectly) when the turn will actually end. Research indicates that rather than overlapping speech indicating hearer misunderstanding, in fact most overlaps occur within these potential transition places (Schegloff, 2000; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008).

5.3.2.5 Sequence organisation

While adjacency pairs can be considered as the basic building blocks of talk, conversation can be, and typically is, more complex, with interaction organised into lengthy sequences. Taking a simple adjacency pair as a starting point, talk may be expanded before the first part of the pair, an expansion may be placed between the pair parts, or after the second part. Figure 5-1 illustrates this type of sequence.

**Figure 5-1:** (Sidnell, 2010, p.94)
5.3.2.6 *Pre-expansions*

A pre-expansion occurs before the first part of a base adjacency pair, and prepares for the action of the base pair in some way. While some pre-expansions are general, others are specifically related to certain types of actions, such as invitations or requests, and usually check to ensure a felicity condition for an act is met (Sidnell, 2010). Sidnell (2010, p.96) provides an example of a pre-invitation expansion:

01 John: Judy?
02 Judy: Yeah,
03 John: John Smith
04 Judy: Hi John
05 John: How ya doin’=

=say what’r you doing.
06 Judy: Well, we’re going out. Why.
07 John: Oh, I was just gonna say come out and come over here an’ talk about this evening, but if you’re going out you can’t very well do that.

In turn five, John asks Judy about what she is doing, preparing for the invitation in line 7 by checking as to her availability- a felicity condition for an invitation being successful.

5.3.2.7 *Insert expansions*

An insert expansion is sandwiched between the first part of a base pair, and the second part. Such insert expansions are either oriented to the first part of the base pair, or the second (Schegloff (2007). A common example of an expansion orienting to the first part is a next turn repair initiator (NTRI), in which the insert aims to repair the talk by clarifying the meaning of an utterance for example:

01 Ann: Maybe Rebecca, maybe you can move it,
02 Rebecca: Move what.
03 Ann: Move that thing that (‘in the lock)/ (yo- in the door).
Rebecca: Okay.

(Sidnell, 2010, p.103)

In the example above, Rebecca initiates repair in line 2, in order to clarify what Ann means by “it.” Once Ann provides the information in line 3, the insert expansion is completed, and the second part of the base pair is provided in line 4.

Insert expansions oriented to the potential second pair part are usually concerned with preconditions for a preferred second pair part, as shown in the example below:

Customer: Do you have Marlboros?

Seller: Yeah, Hard or soft?

Customer: Soft please

Seller: Okay

(Sidnell, 2010, p.104)

It can be seen therefore, that insert sequences are linked to the base pair in some way, in order to deal with a related issue.

5.3.2.8 Post-expansion

According to Schegloff (2007), post-expansions may be one turn only (minimal), or more complex (non-minimal). Examples of minimal post-expansions include “oh” or “okay” turns, in which the speaker acknowledges receipt of information, or the doing of an action respectively (Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell, 2010). Non-minimal types may include commentaries on the second pair part of the base pair, or a repair (Sidnell, 2010). In an invitation adjacency pair, in which a dispreferred response is given for instance, person A may respond to the declining with an assessment type commentary, such as “oh, that's too bad, maybe next time.”

5.3.3 Conversation analysis and the act of requesting

Dispreferred turns are not always necessarily second pair parts (SPPs), such as refusals or disagreements, but can also be first pair parts (FPPs) as well. In the
case of *requesting*, an offer is seen as a preferred FPP, whilst a request places an imposition upon the hearer, and is thus dispreferred (Liddicoat, 2011). As mentioned above, dispreferred SPPs regularly demonstrate a number of characteristics that distinguish them from their preferred counterparts. While a preferred response is typically produced without delay, and is syntactically simple, a dispreferred SPP is often mitigated with pauses, delays, and greater syntactic complexity. In regards to dispreferred *first pair parts*, sequences are often extended, with the action delayed by the speaker as they prepare to lay the groundwork for the socially uncomfortable utterance (Liddicoat, 2011; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). According to Liddicoat (2011), request sequences are often marked with “accounts [and] mitigations, which occur before the request itself and which delay the request in its turn” (Liddicoat, 2011, p.156).

5.3.3.1 *Pre-requests*

Mitigating moves such as pre-requests can serve to promote preferred actions and minimise the chance of performing a dispreferred one. Goodwin and Heritage (1990) argue that pre-sequences for dispreferred first turns can serve to evaluate the chances of such an action being successful. For Taleghani-Nikazm (2006), pre-sequences serve to delay and minimise the risk of rejection, thus promoting "social solidarity" (Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006, p.5-6).

As a type of pre-sequence therefore, pre-requests serve to minimise the possibility of having to perform the request action; if the hearer orients to the pre-request, they may offer to perform the service, thus avoiding the need for a request turn (Levinson, 1983).

As mentioned above, a further motivation for a pre-request can be to minimise the possibility of a rejection, a dispreferred response. Providing the hearer orients to the pre-request, they can respond in one of three relevant ways. The respondent may encourage the inquirer to continue with the request; they may indicate that the request will be unsuccessful, or they may respond to the pre-request with an offer, avoiding the need for a dispreferred action (Schegloff, 1990), as shown in the previous example. In all three situations, the risk of producing a request is mitigated. In this way, we can see in the pre-request part of a sequence a type of “face work” occurring, in which the speaker and hearer
make efforts through their turns to mitigate FTAs and achieve social solidarity (Levinson, 1983; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006).

A common type of pre-request involves the speaker pre-empting the action by asking as to the availability of the wanted item or service. Levinson (1983) argues that the inquiry does not usually relate to just any pre-condition of a preferred response, but the one or ones most likely to be the reason for a refusal. Levinson suggests therefore, the reason why pre-requests inquiring as to the hearer’s ability are particularly common is because a lack of ability is usually the reason given for refusing a request. By checking with a pre-request therefore, a request can be aborted if the hearer lacks the requisite ability to carry out the task.

Liddicoat (2011) puts forward that a typical pre-request, inquiring as to the availability of an item, or the hearer’s ability to perform an action, can project the intended request to such an extent that the hearer treats the pre-sequence as if it were the request proper. At the time of the pre-request FPP, there is potential for the hearer to end the sequence by treating it as a request. However, the full sequence including the base pair request sequence may also be performed (Liddicoat, 2011).

It can be seen therefore, that pre-requests can be responded to in a number of ways. They can be treated by the hearer as an indirect request; they may respond to the pre-request with an offer; they may “block” the request by indicating it would be met with a dispreferred response, or they may hedge their SPP, allowing the requestor to go ahead with their action. Levinson (1983) argues for a hierarchy of preferred pre-request responses:

1. most preferred pre-request response to request
2. next preferred pre-request offer acceptance of offer
3. least preferred pre-request

go-ahead

request

compliance

(Liddicoat, 2011, p.169, from Levinson, 1983)

5.3.3.2 Pre-pre-sequences

Schegloff (1980) identifies the “preliminary to preliminaries” sequence in talk, in which the speaker projects the nature of his or her intended action. In the case of a request sequence, this may take the form of “can I ask a favour?” (Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). However, these preliminaries (pre-pre sequences) are different in nature to pre-sequences. While pre-sequences may lead to the hearer preventing the base adjacency pair action by letting it be known they will or cannot give a preferred response, pre-pre sequences do not usually lead to this kind of “heading off” of the base adjacency pair (Liddicoat, 2011). Rather than being treated as a type of pre-sequence, they tend to be followed by pre-sequences, and serve to orient the hearer to the type of talk that is to come.

5.3.3.3 Request FPPs

Should the speaker’s pre-request be met with a go ahead response from the hearer, the base request adjacency pair will be required in the request sequence. The pragmalinguistic form of the request turn will be dependent to a large extent on Brown and Levinson’s (1987) power, social distance, and rank of imposition variables, as well as the pragmatic norms of the target language culture. Goffman (1963) for example, describes requests for “free goods” such as the time of day as requests of low imposition that can be asked without need for explanation or complex linguistic forms. On the other hand, requests involving a significant imposition upon the recipient will require a different approach. Such requests may involve multiple clauses, pauses and other non-verbal behaviour. Liddicoat (2011) therefore proposes that requests, while
dispreferred actions, can be placed on a scale from “highly dispreferred” (high imposition) to “slightly dispreferred” (low imposition).

5.3.4 Incorporating CA concepts into language instruction

Huth and Taleghani-Nikazm (2006) used conversation analysis (CA) informed teaching to address pragmatic misunderstandings due to differences in sociopragmatic norms. Arguing that learners must be sufficiently exposed to authentic examples of target speech in order to raise awareness of L2 norms, Huth and Taleghani-Nikazm used CA findings to develop learners’ awareness, and therefore interactional competence. For Huth and Taleghani-Nikazm, CA-informed instruction affords a number of benefits to the language classroom. CA allows researchers to investigate the underlying patterns and sequences in interaction, as interlocutors co-construct verbal actions such as greeting or requesting. Further, unlike much speech act research in which native-like speech act realisations are generated based on native-speaker intuition, CA-based materials are derived from authentic, naturally-occurring talk. This authenticity allows exemplars to be shown that accurately demonstrate the multi-turn, sequential nature of speech acts in interaction.

Focusing on the sequence structures underlying authentic talk and relevant turns within the sequences, Huth and Taleghani put forward a general framework for instruction, including

1. General in-class reflection about conversational practices and their systematic nature;
2. A contrastive in-class analysis of sequences in the target language and the native language;
3. Presentation of the materials with authentic transcripts and audio and video materials (if available);
4. Practice of the target language sequences within a communicative context; reflection and evaluation of the cultural import of the practised structures.

(Huth & Taleghani, 2006, p.65-66)

Barraja-Rohan (2011) also used CA in pragmatics instruction, with the aim of promoting interactional competence in conversation among learners of English, finding evidence that it both raised awareness of target language norms, and
also led to more proficient conversational performance. A combination of tasks
was used in order to raise awareness of both "verbal resources" and "non-
verbal resources," such as eye contact and gestures, with CA-based examples
introduced to participants using a simplified transcription procedure, in which
only certain relevant features were highlighted.

5.3.5 Towards a concept-based, CA-informed method of instruction

The aim of the enrichment programme stage of the study therefore, was to
provide instruction both based on Vygotskian theory and the work of Gal'Perin,
and that is also informed by conversation analysis research. To implement this,
the target concepts were identified, with the umbrella concept of the requesting
speech act chosen. With CA research showing how speech acts are co-
constructed in talk, it was necessary to instruct learners in the concept of
interactional competence (IC). Barraja-Rohan (2011) breaks down IC into a
number of elements, including turn-taking, preference organisation, how talk is
typically organised, and the role of context (Barraja-Rohan, 2011, p.481-482).
By introducing learners to the concepts of IC and requesting, as well as their
sub-concepts, the aim was to promote learner understanding and ability to
control them.

In the data analysis chapters of this current study, the learners' interactional
competence is assessed in two specific respects- the first being the efficiency
with which participants orient to and identify the object of mediation in dynamic
assessment sessions (see the work of van Compernolle, discussed in Chapter
Four, section 4.7.3). Secondly, the participants’ proficiency with regards to
carrying out the speech act of requesting during the task sequence portions of
the data is assessed, analysing elements of talk such as turn-taking, preference
organisation and the role of context (described by Barraja-Rohan above as
elements of IC). This study is informed by the definitions of interactional
competence set out by Kasper (2006) and Barraja-Rohan (2011) when
analysing the carrying out of speech acts-in-interaction by the participants (see
Chapter One, section 1.1.3 for discussion of interactional competence).

The EP followed in principle Gal'Perin's (1979) three stages of concept-based
instruction- orientation, execution, and control, in which the participants were
firstly introduced to the target concepts, given opportunities to practise them, followed by reviews of their performances. In the orientation stage, the learners were introduced to the basic concepts of IC as identified by Barraja-Rohan (2011), such as the idea of speech-as-action, the organisation of talk, and adjacency pairs. In introducing the learner-participants to the fundamental concept of speech-as-action for example, the researcher first asked the learners to consider why people talk. After eliciting ideas, the researcher introduced the idea of speech as doing something. The learners then watched a series of short video clips, identifying the speech act being performed. Following this, working with a partner, the learners were given cards with specific speech acts written on them (inviting for example, or apologising); one partner would enact the speech act, while the other would attempt to identify it. At this point, the speech acts were in simple adjacency pair form, as the aim was to simply familiarise the learners with the concept of speech acts. As a final review, the learners verbalised their current understanding of speech-as-action to a partner and the researcher.

The participants were then introduced to the specific umbrella concept of requesting, and the CA findings used to describe it in authentic verbal interactions. In particular, the learners were introduced to the notion of requesting occurring over multiple turns of talk, with conversations organised in terms of openings, pre-requests, and other stages of typical request-based talk. The concept of preferred and dispreferred turns and how they relate to requesting (discussed in section 5.3.2.2) was also introduced, as was the inherently socially uncomfortable nature of making a request, and how this can influence the interactants. One aspect of the requesting speech act-in-interaction that demonstrates this socially uncomfortable characteristic is the pre-request stage of request-based talk. To raise the learners’ awareness of this stage of talk, the researcher firstly asked them to review the basic stages of talk that had already been introduced at an earlier point in the course of instruction (an opening, a central object of conversation, and a closing). The researcher then drew the learners’ attention to the space between the opening of a conversation, and the central object, and asked them to consider whether anything is sometimes uttered in this space. After eliciting ideas, the researcher then showed the learners a video clip of a request-based conversation, with the
learners asked to identify what was said after the opening, but before the central object. They were then asked to consider the possible reasons for this utterance (i.e. giving a reason for the upcoming request, or checking the listener’s availability or ability to carry out the request). At this point the researcher introduced the concept of the pre-request stage of talk, and potential reasons for its use. As a review, the learners produced diagrams or flow charts, visualising their current understanding of how request conversations are typically organised, and verbally explained them to a partner.

Furthermore, the learners’ awareness of the important role of social context was raised, with specific reference to Brown and Levinson’s (1987) three key factors of social status, social distance, and rank of imposition. The learners were constantly encouraged to reflect on the ways in which these three factors can influence interactions when analysing video materials, performing role-plays, or verbalising their understanding of talk. For example, when analysing audio-video materials, the learners were asked to identify the relationship between the interlocutors, in terms of social status and the social distance between them. They were given three continuums representing Brown and Levinson’s three factors, and regularly assessed situations in which example interactions took place. They were then required to identify language in the interactions that showed the influence of these social factors (the use of indirect language for example when there is a gap in social status).

5.3.5.1 Use of audio/video examples

To aid the instructional process, audio and video materials were used to provide examples for learners to analyse. For this purpose, materials by Barraja-Rohan and Pritchard (1997) were used. These examples were of realistic situations, were unscripted, with the interlocutors participating as themselves, rather than as a "role." These example interactions were used to both illustrate key points, and as examples to be analysed by the learners, applying the concepts taught. Transcripts of the audio or video clips were also given to the learners to aid their analysis. In this way, the materials served as a "bridge" between the metapragmatic information introduced, and "online" performance in strategic interaction role-plays.
5.3.5.2 Verbalisation

In accordance with Negueruela (2008), the participants were regularly required to verbalise their understanding of concepts both to the author, and also at times to their peers. Verbalisation is seen as both promoting development and providing evidence of it, and is put forward as an important element of concept-based instruction by both Gal'Perin and Negueruela. Therefore, regular verbalisation tasks were incorporated into the EP programme, in which the learners were encouraged to verbally express their current level of understanding of the concepts taught (such as pre-requesting), and also when the participants created models of their understanding (see section 5.3.5.3, Materialisation).

5.3.5.3 Materialisation

Towards the end of each session, the learners were required to materialise their current level of understanding of the request speech-in-action, by drawing a flow chart or diagram on paper. Once completed, they then showed and explained their materialisations to a peer, therefore combining both materialisation and verbalisation techniques. Once this was completed, the mediator then presented his materialisation of the concepts introduced up to that point in the EP (see Appendix M for an example of a learner’s diagram, and Appendix L for an example of the researcher’s). As with verbalisation, materialisation is seen as an important aspect of concept-based instruction (CBI) (Negueruela, 2008).

The learners were required to create five diagrams in total, with one drawn at the end of a given learning session in the EP programme. As the participants were introduced to new concepts and their understanding of requesting-in-interaction became more complex, so their diagrams typically reflected this, becoming more detailed and complex. Appendices M and V show two learner-generated diagrams, one drawn near the beginning of the EP stage (Appendix V), and the other towards the end (Appendix M).

With this materialisation technique, the aim is to deepen the learners’ understanding, and help them to understand the relationships between the various concepts taught. This is in contrast with more typical treatments of
speech acts, in which prescriptive lists of phrases, or rules of thumb, are provided (McConarchy & Hata, 2013).

5.3.5.4 Strategic Interactions

Also towards the end of each EP session, the participants carried out a SI role-play in which a request was necessary (see section 5.4.1). The learners were firstly given a role card, and then planned their role with other learners who had been given the same role card. Because of the unpredictability of the strategic interactions, they needed to consider how to react to their interlocutor, with a variety of scenarios being possible. Following this, they then performed the SI with a partner. This fulfilled the "execution" stage of Gal'Perin's CBI, and allowed learners to apply their current understanding of the target concepts.

Following this, and as a part of the "control" stage of Gal'Perin's pedagogy, the learners would reflect on their SI performances in light of the concepts learnt. To enable this, learners’ SI performances were video recorded, then transcribed by the learners themselves, in pairs. They then analysed the transcripts, drawing on the knowledge of the concepts gained in the EP programme. While in the early stages, learners were able to analyse transcripts by identifying openings and closings for example, as the course progressed, their analyses became increasingly sophisticated. By the end of the course for example, the learners were able to identify pre-requests, post-requests, pre-closings, and also evaluate the appropriateness of their language choices in light of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) concepts of power, distance, and imposition.

5.4 Assessments

5.4.1 Strategic Interactions (SI)

For this study, strategic interactions were utilised (Di Pietro, 1987) to elicit data from the participants. Specifically, four SIs were carried out in the NDA1 stage. Following this, there were eight SIs in the DA1 stage (the four SIs used in the NDA1 sessions, with an additional four introduced for the dynamic assessment sessions). For the post-EP stages, four different SIs were carried out in the
NDA2 stage, and eight for the DA2 stage (the same four used in the NDA2 sessions, with an additional four introduced). The final transfer assessment (TA) stage consisted of three SIs (see Chapter Eleven for a more detailed explanation of the transfer assessment stage).

Di Pietro developed the strategic interaction as a pedagogical tool for the language classroom, emphasising the importance of “real-life happenings that entail the unexpected and require the use of language to resolve them” (Di Pietro, 1987, p.vii). A central foundation to the concept of strategic interactions is what Di Pietro describes as “participatory discourse,” as opposed to the teaching of grammatical forms and vocabulary in isolation from their interactional contexts. Emphasis is also placed on the need for instructional tools to be meaningful for students, having relevance to their lives.

Di Pietro defines a strategic interaction as “...a strategic interplay of roles functioning to fulfill personal agendas within a shared context” (Di Pietro, 1987, p.41). While SIs can be categorised as a type of role-play therefore, unlike traditional role-plays often used in L2 classroom settings, SIs are designed to be dynamic, incorporating “dramatic tension” into their structure by introducing uncertainty into the activity. This “dramatic tension” is brought about in a number of ways, including designing them to be unpredictable for the participants, with the interlocutors not necessarily sharing the same goals, and not knowing their interlocutor's goals. While SIs can be seen as a type of role-play therefore, they are distinct from typical role-plays in a number of important ways. Di Pietro (1987, p.67) summarises the differences between strategic interactions and standard role-plays in Figure 5.2.

In a similar fashion to Gal'Perin's CBI, Di Pietro suggests that tasks should consist of three main stages- a rehearsal stage, in which the learners plan their performance; a performance stage, in which the SI interaction is carried out, and a debriefing stage, in which the participants review and reflect upon their performances.

By using strategic interactions as a model for task design in the current study, the aim was to elicit richer, more authentic data that demonstrates talk-in-interaction. While sociocultural and conversation analytic research both state a
preference for authentic, naturally-occurring data, the EFL context of the study, in which opportunities for authentic discourse with native English speakers is strictly limited, and also time and budget limitations, render authentic data collection impractical. It is argued that the SI model allows for a reasonable approximation of authentic discourse, while still allowing the researcher to choose scenarios and control social variables to an extent.

Figure 5-2 A comparison of strategic interactions and standard role-plays (Di Pietro, 1987, p.67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role-play</th>
<th>Scenario role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student is given a &quot;part;&quot; student portrays someone other than self.</td>
<td>1. Student plays self within the framework of the role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student is often told what to do or think (e.g. you want to go to the movies but your partner doesn’t)</td>
<td>2. Student is given a situation but not told what to think or do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The target language is used to practice previously presented items, thereby reinforcing the syllabus.</td>
<td>3. Aspects of the target language are taken from the interaction and determine the linguistic syllabus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Usually all the players know what the others will say and do.</td>
<td>4. The interaction contains a greater element of uncertainty and dramatic tension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the SIs to be meaningful to the learners and to allow them to carry out the tasks as themselves (fulfilling one of Di Pietro’s (1987) criteria for a strategic interaction), the SI task scenarios were generated following the procedure set out by Liu (2007). Initially, the author identified a class of 22 students of the same population as the study participants, being in the second year of their degree programmes, and of similar ages and backgrounds. The class instructor allowed the author to enter the classroom and give the students an exemplar generation questionnaire, in which they were asked to think of six situations in their daily lives when they would make or receive a request. They were then asked to write the scenarios on handouts given to them by the author, providing information regarding the interlocutors, the setting, and the nature of the request. The questionnaires were then collected, and the request situations ranked by the author in terms of frequency.
The ranked request scenarios were then used to create a second questionnaire to assess *situation likelihood*; in other words, the likelihood with which the situations would occur in the daily lives of the target student population. This second questionnaire was then given to a second class of 30 students to complete. The results of this questionnaire were used to compile a list ranked in terms of the requesting situations most likely to occur in the daily lives of the target student population. These results were then used as templates for creating the SIs used in the current study. It should be noted however, that in addition to these results, an additional SI was created for the study, in which a learner-participant requests a teacher for an assignment deadline extension. While this scenario was not one of the most frequently occurring in the questionnaire data, it was included in the study in order to challenge the learners with a range of social contexts.

Based on the results of the situation likelihood questionnaire, a final questionnaire was created and given to 10 native English speakers. This questionnaire asked the NS to evaluate the requesting scenarios in terms of Brown and Levinson's (1987) *social distance, social status, and rank of imposition*. The purpose of this questionnaire was to provide the researcher with information regarding how other NS evaluate the social contexts of requesting situations, rather than relying solely on the researcher's intuition. This information was used by the author to inform the mediation given during the DA, TA and EP sessions with the study participants.

5.4.2 Procedure

For the NDA1, DA1, DA2 and TA stages, each participant met with the researcher individually. For the NDA stages there were four SIs in total, while the DA stages consisted of eight SIs. The eight DA stage SIs consisted of the same four situations used in the corresponding NDA stage, with an additional four SIs carried out also. The DA stages consisted of not only the four NDA SIs, but also four new ones, in order to provide ample opportunities for the interlocutors to engage in mediation sequences and thus provide rich data for analysis. The final TA stage consisted of one *near* transfer SI, a *medium* transfer SI, and a *far transfer* SI.
All study sessions were conducted in the L2, but with the written material in both the L1 and L2 for clarity. This written material consisted of a description in both the L1 and L2 of how the session would proceed, given to the learners at the beginning of each pre and post-EP stage. In the DA and TA sessions it was made clear to the participants that the researcher (mediator) would halt the SI at certain points to provide assistance as needed. Following this, the participant would be given a card with their "role" described on it, in the L1 and L2. After checking their understanding, and fielding any questions, the SI would begin. This procedure was repeated until all of the SIs were completed.

The dynamic assessment stages (DA1, DA2 and TA) followed the interactionist approach put forward by Feuerstein (1979; 1988) and Poehner (2008). In this approach, the author and learner-participants engaged in co-constructing the requesting speech act. The author's mediating moves were not pre-scripted, but emerged in response to the particular needs of each participant at that moment in time. In this way, mediation could be provided that was sensitive to each participant's ZPDs, tailored to the situation at hand.

5.4.3 Cognitive map

While DA has become the subject of increased attention in in the SLA field in recent years, its origins lie in educational psychology, and the work of Feuerstein. Feuerstein et al (1986, p1.4) describe a "cognitive map" as a "way to conceptualise the relationship between the characteristics of a task and its performance...a tool by which to locate specific problem areas and to produce changes..." While the cognitive map then has its roots in educational psychology rather than language learning specifically, the concept of a "map" used to assist the mediator in identifying "specific problem areas" is a useful one for DA sessions in the SLA field also. Adapting the idea of a cognitive map for the current study, the researcher created a document describing the target umbrella concepts and their sub-concepts in precise detail. The cognitive map therefore in this study is informed by conversation analysis research, listing the concepts used to describe requests in interaction (the pre-request stage for example), and also the socio-contextual factors of status, distance and imposition identified in Brown and Levinson (1987). This was then used as a reference tool by the author-mediator in DA sessions with the learners, to assist
in the identification and location of learner problems, which became objects of mediation. This document is provided in Appendix F.

5.4.4 The researcher’s role

Throughout the various stages of the study I actively participated in the various language tasks and activities with the learners. Creswell (2003) states that a qualitative researcher should reflect upon their "biases, values or interests," and so it is important to be clear about my role in the study. As an active participant in the strategic interaction-type role-plays and the dynamic assessment sessions as a whole, my utterances and mediation were shaped by my past experience as a teacher, and by my personal history as a British, English as L1-speaker, influenced by the social practices of my home community. This means the mediation I co-constructed with the learner-participants was unique to me; a different mediator may well have provided different assistance, or framed their mediation in differing ways. While the use of a cognitive map during the DA sessions (see section 5.4.3), the thorough researching of how requests are typically co-constructed in talk, and efforts to adhere to the principle of the ZPD in mediation sequences (the learner being given the least amount of help required to move on with the task, and only being assisted if needed) ensured I approached the DA sessions in a principled way, inevitably there was subjectivity to my role.

The study was carried out at the higher education institution in which I was teaching; I had not however taught the learner-participants prior to the current study. However, I did have several years of experience teaching Japanese learners of EFL in a higher education context. This experience gave me some insights into possible issues learners might have with the target concepts and abilities, and also the ways in which I could interact with them in a manner that would elicit useful data. I felt it important for example to ensure the learners felt comfortable and able to make mistakes without fear of receiving harsh criticism. In addition to this experience-based approach to study sessions with the learners, I also attempted to incorporate Feuerstein’s Mediated Learning Experience (MLE) attributes into my mediating style (see Chapter Four, Figure 4-7). A number of these attributes (for example, “mediating feelings of competence,” and mediation of challenge”) aim to address the affective factors
in a dynamic assessment session, and as mediator, my role involved realising these MLE attributes to the best of my ability. In terms of the attribute “mediation of feelings of competence” for example, I consistently provided positive feedback to learners when they successfully resolved an object of mediation in collaboration with myself, or when they verbalised their understanding of a target concept. A further example relates to the attribute of “mediation of challenge,” in which learners are encouraged towards new or more complex utterances. Through co-constructing mediation sequences, I regularly prompted learners to consider alternatives to linguistic realisations they had been relying on (such as opening turns), supporting their attempts to produce more complex utterances through questioning, positive feedback, or hinting as to possible alternatives.

5.5 Research Methodology

5.5.1 Microgenetic analysis

In this study, learner development was tracked and assessed over time, employing microgenetic analysis as an analytical framework. Grounded in the field of psychology, and in particular Vygotsky's perspective on development which calls for abilities or skills to be studied "in the process of change" (Vygotsky, 1978, p.65), microgenetic development has been defined as "the process of change in abilities, knowledge, and understanding during short time spans" (Grannott & Parziale, 2002, p.1). The meaning of "short time spans" has differed in different studies, from a matter of minutes (Goldin-Meadow, 1999; Thornton, 1999) to weeks (Siegler & Svetina, 2002), and depends on the length of each study.

Siegler and Crowley (1991) identify three defining characteristics of microgenetic analysis: analysis or observation should take place during the period of change, or development; there should be a "high density" of observations during this period of change; and the data should be subject to "intensive" analysis. In order for this to happen, the data should be "fine-grained" (Flynn et al, 2007). To this end, one common type of data used in research has been transcripts, allowing interactions to be closely analysed.
Flynn et al (2007) identify a further important feature of microgenetic analysis, arguing that it allows development to be viewed as it occurs. This may be "untidy," (Flynn et al, 2007, p.4) in the sense that it could be rapid or gradual, or there may be periods of seeming regression.

It has been put forward that microgenetic analysis may be describing learning, as opposed to development (in other words, change that may be temporary, rather than lasting), as it examines changes over short periods of time (Liben, 1987). In countering this however, Siegler and Crowley (1991) point out that learning and development "are so completely intertwined that usually no clear separation...is possible" (Siegler & Crowley, 1991, p.607), implying therefore that Liben's distinction between the two is not a clear-cut one. Further, while Liben might argue that observing change within the course of minutes or days may not by itself show development, when microgenetic analysis is coupled with a Vygotskian view of development in studies, Liben's point does not readily apply. This is because Vygotsky framed development as not simply being change in and of itself, but change within social interactions and within the theoretical concept of the ZPD. Vygotsky viewed development as being the movement in a learner from assisted to unassisted performance; further, this development could be captured and observed within a single session, or a number of sessions (Vygotsky, 1978; see Chapter Four, section 4.4.1 for a discussion of Vygotsky). In this current DA study then, microgenetic analysis is a tool used in service to uncovering the micro-developments in social interactions between the mediator and learners, systematically charting this movement within the learners' ZPDs, as they require less explicit mediation. A further characteristic of some DA studies is the carrying out of assessment stages over a period of time, which aim to examine the extent to which learners still demonstrate the development observed during earlier DA sessions. In this study for example, the learner-participants' performances are tracked over a period of eight weeks, using microgenetic analysis to closely examine development over various stages of the study (see Figure 5-3 for a breakdown of the study stages). DA therefore, including this study, is not looking at short-term learning, but rather development, through a Vygotskian lens.

A further issue that undoubtedly limits the widespread adoption of microgenetic analysis as a method of understanding change is its difficulty and the amount of
time needed to carry it out (Siegler & Crowley, 1991). This is a limitation of the approach that technology may have a part in overcoming in the future (see Chapter Eleven for a discussion of directions for future research); in the present however, microgenetic analysis remains a time-intensive approach to data analysis.

It is argued that microgenetic analysis is suitable for a study of dynamic assessment, as the methodology is grounded in Vygotsky's perspective of development, and allows for the extracting of rich, detailed information from the data. For Vygotsky, the development of a learner could be best assessed through dialogic interactions between a mediator and learner, leading to the statement that "we must not measure the child, we must interpret the child" (Vygotsky, 1998, p.204). This method has been employed in a number of studies both sociocultural in emphasis (Donato, 1994; Aljaafreh and Lantolf, 1994; Ohta, 2001), and also within dynamic assessment (Poehner, 2005; Ableeva, 2010) and aims to capture evidence of development within a relatively short space of time. Employing this method allows a detailed, fine-grained assessment of the study participants’ development by analysing the mediator-learner interactions for patterns and signs of increased control of the various target aspects of interactional competence. While the methodology is microgenetic analysis, concepts from conversation analysis (CA) research are used to enrich and enhance the analysis. This allowed the author to assess the requesting talk-in-interaction in precise detail.

A further aspect of microgenetic analysis is the examining of the verbalisations of the participants (see Chapter Nine for examples of verbalisations in the data, and Chapter Ten, section 10.3 for discussion). According to Gal'perin (1979) and Negueruela (2008), learners exhibiting increasing ability to verbalise their reasoning for producing utterances during task performance with reference to the concepts taught to them indicates increasing control. Increasing control and understanding of the concepts taught can be seen as evidence of development, as learners transition from object and other regulation to self-regulation. As part of the analysis of the data therefore, learners’ verbalisations was assessed for evidence of control.

5.5.2 A rubric-based tracking of development
As discussed in section 5.5.1, a microgenetic analytic approach is taken to the data, in which the dialogic interactions between the researcher and learners are closely analysed for evidence of development. In sociocultural terms, development here is defined as the movement within a learner's ZPD from dependent, assisted performance (other-regulation) to independent, unassisted performance. This movement therefore, from requiring explicit forms of mediation to more implicit ones, is seen as evidence of development.

While microgenetic analysis is the primary approach to assessing learner development, it is complemented in this study by the use of a rubric, or coding scheme, in which the learners' movement within their ZPDs is captured and quantified. This allows for a basic quantitative analysis in the form of frequency counts, distributions and calculations of central tendencies, and provides another angle on learner development. This approach to analysis is based on Aljaafreh and Lantolf's (1994) 5 stages of development (see Chapter Nine, section 9.1 for details), which in turn is based on the Vygotskian concepts of the ZPD and movement from other-regulation to self-regulation. Because Aljaafreh and Lantolf's stages of development are based on sociocultural theory and the ZPD, they fit well with this current study's sociocultural perspective on development, describing movement in the ZPD. Further, Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994), developing this typology through a grounded approach to data analysis, found it to be an effective way to assess learner development over time.

Previous studies of dynamic assessment in the second language-learning field have also adopted Aljaafreh and Lantolf's 5 stages of development, and found it to be effective in framing learner development. For example, Poehner's (2005) investigation into the effectiveness of DA in relation to grammatical aspect was influenced by the five stages identified by Aljaafreh and Lantolf; Ableeva's (2010) DA study of listening comprehension also relied on it. Both studies found the 5 stages useful and effective in aiding the tracking of development in DA sessions. By using a rubric informed by Aljaafreh and Lantolf's 5 stages of development, it also allows for greater comparibility between the findings of this study and previous ones. Therefore, because Aljaafreh and Lantolf's 5 stages shares this study's Vygotskian perspective on development, and because it has been found to be effective in other second language learning DA studies, this current study also uses it as a basis for a rubric. A detailed description of this
study’s adaptation and implementation of Aljaafreh and Lantolf’s 5 stages of development is provided in Chapter Nine, section 9.1.

5.6 Research Design

The current study employs a clinical-analytic, mixed methods approach to analysis of the data. While quantitative data in the form of basic descriptive statistics are shown therefore, a psychometric standardised testing approach is not taken. Rather, the quantitative data is used to complement microgenetic analysis, which examines the data in detail for evidence of learner development; by combining both approaches, a richer view of learner performance and development can be seen.

Based on Poehner (2008), a DA interactionist approach was adopted for the study, in which the mediator engages in flexible interactions that are not pre-determined, in order to better respond to the particular ZPD of a learner (see Chapter Six for a detailed discussion of interactionist DA). Based on the approach taken by DA in educational psychology, and also by Poehner (2005 and Ableeva (2010), the current study consists of a “sandwich” format pedagogical experiment, with a pre-intervention stage, an intervention (the enrichment programme), and a post-intervention stage (Sternberg and Grigorenko, 2002; Poehner, 2005; Ableeva, 2010). The study is designed to allow both the pre-experimental stage performance level to be assessed (NDA1), and potential development and causes of pragmatic failure to be evaluated (DA1) in the pre-test stage. The final section of the study allowed an assessment of the effectiveness of the mediation and EP stage in terms of tracking learner development over time.

The current study consisted of six core stages. In the first stage, a non-dynamic assessment was carried out (NDA1), in which the six learner-participants engaged in four strategic interaction role-plays (SIs) with the researcher. In these role-plays, the interlocutors co-constructed the requesting speech act in talk, with no mediating moves provided by the researcher. In this way, the actual level of development of the participants could be assessed. The second stage of the study involved a dynamic assessment of the participants' interactional
competence regarding the requesting speech act (DA1). In this stage, the interlocutors co-constructed the speech act in a set of eight SIs; the same four SIs as in the NDA1 stage, and also a further four SIs not encountered by the learners before. In this dynamic stage however, the researcher (or mediator) provided mediation when he deemed it appropriate to do so. By simultaneously providing instruction and promoting development in this manner, insights were gained into the potential level of development of the learners.

Following these two assessment stages was the enrichment programme portion of the study (EP). Informed by the findings of the DA1 sessions, the goal of the EP was to promote understanding and raise awareness of the various concepts related to interactional competence and requesting in talk. By combining concept-based instruction and conversation analysis research findings, the EP aimed to deepen the participants' conceptual knowledge of the target concepts.

Upon completion of the EP, three further assessment stages were carried out. The first was a non-dynamic assessment (NDA2) session, in which the researcher and learners co-constructed four SIs (different SIs to the NDA1 scenarios), without mediation. This was followed by a DA2 stage in which mediation was provided when necessary. This stage consisted of the four SIs from the NDA2 stage, and also four further new ones not yet encountered by the learners. Finally, a transfer assessment stage (TA) was carried out, in which the participants engaged in three further SIs designed to challenge the learners with situations types not encountered in the previous stages (being required to produce two differing requests in the same interaction for example, or co-constructing a request with an interlocutor with a very high social status).

**Figure 5-3:** The stages of the current study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Mediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-EP: NDA1</td>
<td>A strategic interaction role-play.</td>
<td>No mediation given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-EP: DA1</td>
<td>A strategic interaction role-play</td>
<td>Mediation given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment programme (EP)</td>
<td>A set of strategic interactions. During the planning stage of the interactions, concept-based instruction based on DA principles will be carried out.</td>
<td>Mediation given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-EP: NDA2</td>
<td>A strategic interaction role-play</td>
<td>No mediation given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-EP: DA2</td>
<td>A strategic interaction role-play</td>
<td>Mediation given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer task 1</td>
<td>A strategic interaction role-play</td>
<td>Mediation given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer task 2</td>
<td>A strategic interaction role-play</td>
<td>Mediation given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer task 3</td>
<td>A strategic interaction role-play</td>
<td>Mediation given.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7 Transcription conventions

The data was firstly audio-video recorded and then transcribed. As put forward by van Compernolle (2013), mediating moves can include non-verbal elements as well as verbal ones, and so by capturing these features during the transcribing process, insights into mediation can be gained. Transcription conventions were therefore employed that would allow features such as overlapping speech, and also paralinguistic features such as the length of a pause, body positioning and facial expressions to be captured. To this end, the conventions used in this study were adapted from those used by Poehner (2005) and Ableeva (2010)- studies that carried out microgenetic analyses of transcripts- and further conventions were borrowed from Jefferson (2004), which allow for the capturing of both verbal and non-verbal features of talk. It is important to note however, that the current study does not take a “pure” CA approach to data analysis; rather, a sociocultural, microgenetic analytic
approach is taken (see section 5.5.1). In this way, concepts and techniques used in CA are adopted by this study when they are useful for informing the microgenetic analysis (transcribing lengthy pauses for instance is important, as they may indicate a learner struggling); those that are not relevant to this study’s data analysis however, are not used (the transcribing conventions employed in this study are provided in Appendix O). The transcripts were then imported into NVivo, software that provides tools for qualitative analysis of data.

5.8 Coding

5.8.1 Inter-rater reliability check

Prior to coding the entire data set, an inter-rater reliability check was carried out, involving both the researcher as primary investigator (PI), and a second rater. This check had two purposes- to check the reliability of the primary investigator's coding, and also to develop a suitable and practical coding scheme that would allow learner development within the ZPD to be tracked. For this check, the methodology put forward by Campbell et al (2013) was chosen, as it is designed specifically for qualitative studies with transcript data, in which the second rater is not an “expert” in the field. Using this procedure therefore, the check was carried out in the following manner. A 10% sample of the total number of mediation sequences was chosen randomly among the participants and across both DA1 and DA2 sessions. The PI identified the mediation sequences, addressing the issue of which portion of the transcripts were to be coded.

Figure 5-4: “Five general levels of transition from intermental to intramental functioning” (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994: 470)

| Level 1: “The learner is not able to notice, or correct the error, even with intervention from the tutor.” |
| Level 2: “The learner is able to notice the error, but cannot correct it, even with intervention.” |
Level 3: “The learner is able to notice and correct an error, but only under other-regulation.”

Level 4: “The learner notices and corrects an error with minimal, or no obvious feedback from the tutor and begins to assume full responsibility for error correction.”

Level 5: The learner becomes more consistent in using the target structure correctly in all contexts.”

The second rater was given a detailed description of the study, and an explanation of the purpose of the coding, as well as the initial coding scheme created by the author, which was based on Aljaafreh and Lantolf’s 5 stages of development, see Chapter Nine, Figure 9-3). Phase one of the inter-rater reliability check involved both raters independently examining five mediation sequences, coding the object of mediation, before comparing their results. This was to ensure both raters were in agreement in terms of what the actual objects of mediation were. With inter-rater agreement sufficiently high in terms of identifying the objects, both raters then coded independently using the initial coding scheme for tracking development. Where there were discrepancies between the two sets of coding, the coders entered into a “negotiated agreement” (Campbell et al, 2013) phase, in which an attempt was made to reconcile. In each case, whether reconciliation was achieved, and which rater was deferred to, was recorded. Also at this stage, the coding scheme was refined by the coders, in order to clarify any ambiguities or areas of confusion. This process was then repeated until the entire portion of the data set was coded. At this point, the percentage of inter-rater agreement was calculated. This was done by dividing the number of instances in which the coders agreed by the total number of agreements and disagreements. In this way, it was calculated that there was an agreement of 71% between the raters before negotiated reconciliation, and 98% after. Although there is no consensus in the field as to what an appropriate level of agreement should be, Campbell puts forward a level between 80-90% as being acceptable.
Figure 5-5: Coding scheme used for tracking learner-participant development in DA1, DA2 and TA mediation sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifying the object</th>
<th>Resolving the object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unable to notice or identify the object without explicit assistance from M.</td>
<td>1. Unable to resolve the object without explicit assistance from M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Able to notice and identify the object with implicit assistance from M.</td>
<td>2. Able to resolve the object with implicit assistance from M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Able to notice and identify the object with no assistance required from M.</td>
<td>3. Able to resolve the object with no assistance required from M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The refined coding scheme is shown in Figure 5-5, which is the result of the inter-rater reliability check. During this check, whenever the raters came across disagreements or confusion in the coding, the coding scheme was refined, until both coders were satisfied that it was clear and practical to use. The final coding scheme settled upon by the raters is similar to Aljaafreh and Lantolf's (1994) regulatory scale, but there are also differences. While Aljaafreh and Lantolf's scale has five levels, this study's has three levels. However, the scheme has been separated into two categories, with one for identification of the object, and one for its resolution. The coding scheme used in the current study then, reflects the fact that this study is informed by the work of van Compernolle (2013), who argues that these two elements (object identification, and object resolution) are important elements of interactional competence. The coders found this to be a clearer scheme when coding, and one that also provides a more granular view of the learners' development, as it enables nine possible score combinations (a learner may score a 1 for "identifying the object" for example, but a 2 for "resolving the object").

When coding the data set, each mediation sequence was assigned two numbers- one relating to identifying the object of mediation, and another for its resolution. A coding of “2-1” for instance, would mean that the learner-participant was able to identify the object with only implicit assistance required, but the object could not be successfully resolved without explicit mediation. If disagreement arose between the raters regarding the explicitness of assistance,
the raters entered into a negotiation phase, following the procedure set out by Campbell et al (2013) for inter-rater reliability checking. The typologies of Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) and Poehner (2005) were used as reference documents during this period negotiating agreement proved to be challenging. Coding the data in this manner allowed the development of the learners to be tracked both within a given DA session, and across pre-treatment DA1 and post-treatment DA2 sessions.

5.8.2 Coding the data

With the inter-rater reliability check complete, the NDA1 and NDA2 transcripts were coded in terms of the typical elements of request-in-talk present, such as pre-requesting, or closing terminal sequences. At the same time, the transcripts were annotated with insights into the data. For the DA and TA stages, instances of the task sequence being interrupted by mediation sequences were coded as "mediation sequences," with the participant name and SI number recorded. Upon identifying the mediation sequences, opening and closing types were coded in terms of which interlocutor initiated the sequence, whether the initiation was explicit or implicit, verbal or non-verbal. Within these coding categories, sub-categories were coded, identifying the types of opening and closing moves. It is important to note that these types emerged from the data, rather than being prescribed. The objects of the mediation sequences were also identified and coded, with the categories again emerging from the data. The final stage of coding was undertaken in order to track learner development, with a prescribed coding scheme used to understand movement within learners' ZPDs, from other-regulation to self-regulation (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994) (see Figure 5-5). This coding scheme was developed through an inter-rater reliability check, carried out between the primary investigator (myself) and a second rater. Following the methodology set out by Campbell et al (2013), the final coding scheme was the outcome of the inter-rater reliability check process, and is an adaptation of the five stages of development put forward by Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994).

5.9 Conclusion
This chapter provides an overview of the methodology behind the current study, describing the theoretical lens of the author, the procedures in designing the study, and the methods employed to analyse the data collected. The outline of the study was discussed, in which non-dynamic and dynamic stages were carried out with the participants, before an enrichment programme and post-EP assessment stages. Details of the participants and the ways used to recruit them were presented. The task types and the rationale behind their design were put forward, the various stages described, and the methods of assessment discussed.

In the next chapter, the non-dynamic assessment stages of the study will be analysed for evidence of change in learner performance over time.
Chapter Six

An Analysis of Independent Performance: A Non-dynamic Assessment of NDA1 and NDA2 Stages

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the performances of the six participants during the NDA1 and NDA2 stages are analysed. As these assessments were carried out without mediation, the focus of analysis here is specifically on the independent performance of the participants, without assistance. Analysis therefore focuses on three areas of comparison: the frequency of instances of infelicitous pragmatic behaviour, and their types; the complexity of the interactions, in terms of their sequential organization; the range of linguistic realisations produced, and the level of directness of the realisations. Specifically, both the variety of lexis-grammar employed by the participants, and the relationship between the various social contexts and the lexis-grammar choices made are examined.

In analysing the learner-participants' request turn levels of directness, Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness is informative. As discussed in Chapter Two, the speech act of requesting is seen as a face-threatening act (FTA). The speaker therefore, is faced with a number of options in terms of how to proceed. The most direct realisation of the FTA is to be "bald, on record" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.94). This typically takes the form of an imperative. A less direct option is to "go on record" with "redressive action" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.91). This involves softening the FTA with positive or negative politeness strategies, with positive strategies appealing to the hearer's sense of belonging to the same group as the speaker, and thus wanting the same thing in some way; negative politeness strategies on the other hand appeal to the hearer's desire to not have their freedom impinged upon.

A third option is to "go off record" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.211). In doing so, the speaker introduces ambiguity into the FTA, in theory making it less clear what he would like the hearer to do. Such indirect strategies, such as "I was
wondering if..." or "could you..." have become so conventionalised, that in effect they have become "on record."

In addition to the above choices a speaker must make, Brown and Levinson (1987) put forward a general rule regarding the realisation of FTAs. They posit that the more effort the speaker puts into attending to the hearer's face wants, the more the speaker "communicates his sincere desire that...[the hearer's] face wants be satisfied" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.93). In other words, the more effort the speaker makes in terms of the FTA (in this current study, requesting), the more polite he appears to be. When softening a FTA with negative politeness strategies therefore, the more complex the grammar-syntax of the request turn, the more the speaker communicates his desire to be polite. The speaker may achieve this by, for example, inserting clauses or using conjunctions to increase the indirectness of his utterance. In terms of the current study therefore, the more complex the grammar-syntax of the request turn by the learners, the more this indicates they are demonstrating politeness in their linguistic realisations. By then looking at the social-contextual factors of each SI (the social statuses of the interlocutors, the social distance, and the level of imposition), the appropriateness of the learners' politeness levels can be assessed.

Each participant's performance is examined in turn, with performances in the two stages contrasted for evidence of development in regards to interactional competence. Common themes throughout the entire data set of all six participants are also discussed.

### 6.2 Akiko

#### 6.2.1 Interactional factors

##### 6.2.1.1 Openings

Conversation analysis research on authentic discourse finds that openings frequently include small talk or "personal state inquiries" (Sidnell, 2010) before beginning the main topic of conversation. Throughout the NDA1 strategic
interactions (SIs) however, the openings with Akiko are typically simple, with an initial greeting adjacency pair followed immediately by the request sequence.

In Excerpt 6-1 below, Akiko initiates the greeting adjacency pair, but does not reciprocate the interlocutor’s *personal state inquiry*. Rather, she begins a pre-request explanation (*mention*), immediately beginning the main topic of conversation-the request.

**Excerpt 6-1 (NDA1-1)**

1. Akiko: Hi ((laughs))
2. M: Ah, hey Akiko(.) how's it going.
3. Akiko: Yeah not-it's really bad ((laughs))
5. Akiko: I: lost my wallet,(.) with my suica ((rail card)) or Pasmo: so I
6. cannot go (.). home. so I need (.). money ((laughs)) so

Similarly, in Excerpts 6-2 and 6-3, Akiko initiates the greeting, and then immediately begins the request sequence with pre-request mentions.

**Excerpt 6-2 (NDA1-2)**

1. M: Hello
2. Akiko: Hello: [I
3. M: [Ah Akiko
4. Akiko: Yeah (0.3) u:h I: finished my class ac- uh club activity: (.)
5. [and
6. M: [uhum
7. Akiko: It's seve:n and (.). look outside (.). ((laughs)) (1) the weather
8. is not
9. good [so::
10. M: [um (1) yea:h.

**Excerpt 6-3 (NDA1-3)**

1. Akiko: ((knocks))
2. M: He:lo come in
3. Akiko: (0.5) Hello:
4. M: Ah (.) Akiko
5. Akiko: Yeah
6. M: [hi
7. Akiko: [yeah Akiko] I'm taking your class, (.) [and
8. M: [ahum
9. Akiko: your (.) writing class

In contrast however, the openings in the NDA2 stage generally show a greater level of complexity. In excerpt 6-4, after the initial greeting adjacency pair, Akiko and the interlocutor engage in small talk, following the interlocutor’s personal state inquiry. Further, in excerpt 6-5, Akiko initiates a personal state inquiry in line 5, before engaging in a 4-turn sequence of small talk.

Excerpt 6-4 (NDA2-2)

1. Akiko: morning
2. M: oh hey (0.2) he- how's it going
3. Akiko: ((laughs)) (1.3) uh I was just kind of (.) a little sleepy (0.3)
4. still
5. M: a:h (0.4) yeah (0.4) you had a busy week,
6. Akiko: (1) kind of (0.2) yeah (.) yeah
7. M: h:m

Excerpt 6-5 (NDA2-3)

1. Akiko: ((knocks on table))
2. M: hello come in
3. Akiko: oh hello
4. M: oh Akiko (0.2) hi there
5. Akiko: hi ho- how are you
6. M: (0.4) uh (.) I'm (.) yeah I'm good thank you very much how are you today
7. Akiko: I'm (.) a little busy (.) today,
8. M: a:h ok I see I see you've got lots of (.) homework to do,
9. Akiko: yeah I- (.) yeah and- (0.3) also the: (0.5) the kind of other
6.2.1.2 Requesting

As with the openings of the SIs, the request sequences provide evidence of Akiko’s IC development, with an increase in both the complexity and variety of the interactions. In the NDA1 stage interactions there were no pre-pre requests (pre-pres) at all from Akiko.

In Excerpt 6-6, line 2, Akiko utters a pre-request mention after the personal state inquiry adjacency pair has been completed, without first attempting to orient the interlocutor to the upcoming request with a pre-pre. Again, in Excerpt 6-7, in line 4 Akiko begins a pre-request mention immediately after the interlocutor provides the greeting second part in line 3. In fact, no pre-pres are used at all by Akiko in any of the SIs in which she is the requestor. In the NDA2 stage however, as the requestor, Akiko employs pre-pres to orient her interlocutor to the upcoming request in all three of the interactions.

Excerpt 6-6 (NDA1-1)

2. Akiko: I: lost my wallet,(.) with my suica ((rail card)) or Pasmo: so I
cannot
3. go (. ) home. so I need (. ) like (. ) money ((laughs)) so
4. M: Aw no (2)
5. Akiko: If- (. ) if you are ok I: (. ) wa:nt- (. ) I’d like to: (. ) I'd like you to
6. (0.5) lend me money:: so can I borrow your- some money:
7. M: A::h

Excerpt 6-7 (NDA1-2)

1. M: Hello
2. Akiko: Hello: [I
3. M: [Ah Akiko
4. Akiko: Yeah (0.3) u:h I: finished my class ac- uh club activity: (. ) [and
5. M: [uhum
6. Akiko: It's seve:n and (. ) look outside (. ) ((laughs)) (1) the weather is not
In Excerpt 6-8, Akiko employs a pre-pre in line 7, then again in line 9, and once more in line 11, before uttering a pre-request mention from line 13. These pre-pres serve to project the request to the interlocutor, allowing the partner to orient to what is coming. Again in excerpt 6-9, in lines 14 and 16 Akiko utters two pre-pres in preparation for the future request. Further, in line 5, Akiko initiates a personal state inquiry, something that was absent from any of the SIs in the NDA1 stage.

Excerpt 6-8 (NDA2-1)

1. Akiko: ((knocks on door))
2. M: come in
3. Akiko: hi
5. Akiko: u:m.
7. Akiko: (0.5) I'm good- u:h (0.2) are you busy?
8. M: u:h just studying. (0.3) yeah
9. Akiko: do you have a- a little time (. ) for me, (0.8) like-[l]- I have=
10. M: [wh-]
11. Akiko: (0.8) may I ask you a favour?
13. Akiko: ((laughs)) (0.5) I'm study:ing (. ) now (. ) in English homework,
14. M: [hm
15. Akiko: [but] the (0.4) assignment is a kind of little (0.2) uh difficult (. ) so:
16. (1.5)

Excerpt 6-9 (NDA2-3)

1. Akiko: ((knocks on table))
2. M: hello come in
3. Akiko: oh hello
4. M: oh Akiko (0.2) hi there
5. Akiko: hi ho- how are you
6. M: (0.4) uh (. ) I'm (. ) yeah I'm good thank you very much how are you today
7. Akiko: I'm (. ) a little busy (. ) today,
8. M: a:h ok I see I see you've got lots of (. ) homework to do,
9. Akiko: yeah I- (. ) yeah and- (0.3) also the: (0.5) the kind of other stuffs.
10. M: [a:h
11. Akiko: [(inaudible)]
12. M: oh ok I see I see
13. Akiko: u:m (0.8) are you busy (. ) now?
15. Akiko: um may I ask you a favour?
16. M: ahum: yea:h (. ) ok (0.2) what

In the NDA1 SIs, Akiko frequently initiated pre-requests, with all NDA1 pre-requests being mentions, in which she explained the situation to her partner. There were no pre-request checks of availability or ability, common pre-request types in native English-speaking interactions. While pre-request mentions were also the most frequently employed pre-request throughout Akiko’s NDA2 SIs also (used in all three requestor SIs), she also uttered a pre-request check of availability in NDA2-1 (excerpt 6-8). In line 9 of Excerpt 6-8, Akiko asks if the interlocutor has time for her. This can be interpreted as both a pre-pre, but also as a pre-request check, as the request here involves asking for help with homework. While the partner explains that he is too busy to help at that particular time, Akiko was unaware of this at the time of asking.

6.2.1.3 Closing

The closing sequences of the pre and post-treatment stages also show evidence of change in regards to IC. Throughout the NDA1 SIs, Akiko does not initiate any terminal sequences, and in fact, in excerpt 6-10 there is no terminal sequence at all. In Excerpt 6-10 below, lines 1-3 show the turns becoming shorter, indicating that this is the pre-closing stage of the interaction. In line 4, the interlocutor initiates a closing implicature environment, summarizing the conversation, then pausing to see if Akiko will add anything. Nothing is added however, indicating that Akiko has signified the end of the interaction, without
any terminal sequence. In excerpt 6-11, the interlocutor initiates the terminal sequence in line 5, with Akiko providing the 2nd part in line 6. Similarly, in NDA1-3 and 1-4, Akiko provides the 2nd part of the terminal sequence, but does not initiate.

Excerpt 6-10 (NDA1-1)

1. Akiko: [thank you- thank you so much
2. M: Ok ok. no worr[ies
3. Akiko: [you saved me
4. M: Oh ok ((laughs)) (. ) I hope you find your wallet tomorrow (1)
5. alright (. )
6. cool. (0.3) thank you very much
7. Akiko: ((gives coin back to M, laughs))

Excerpt 6-11 (NDA1-2)

1. Akiko: I:'m in a: building four (1) [((laughs))
2. M: [hu:m
3. M: Ok alright I'll pick you up in about (. ) twenty five minutes
4. Akiko: Ok (. ) thankyou thankyou ve- ry much
5. M: Alright (. ) I'll see you soon
6. Akiko: [thankyou

One possible explanation for the absence of learners’ initiating opening turns and terminal sequences that should be borne in mind is the artificial nature of the SI instrument itself. While studies have shown role-play type instruments to generally be more effective in eliciting rich data that DCTs for example (Kasper & Rose, 2002; Margelef-Boada, 1993; Sasaki, 1998), a number of studies have also found role-plays to elicit less complex or varied data than that found in natural discourse (Eisenstein & Bodman, 1993). While considerable effort was made to mitigate for this, with SI scenarios purposefully chosen to reflect situations likely to occur in the learners’ daily lives, nevertheless, the possible effects of the SIs’ artificiality should be noted.

In terms of closing implicature environments, in which interactants provide opportunities for closing a conversation by making arrangements, or by
summarizing the conversation for example, Akiko provides these environments by expressing *appreciation*. An example of this is shown in excerpt 6-12 below, in line 3.

Excerpt 6-12 (NDA1-3)

1. M: Ok (.) so: yeah. come to my office by five o clock tomorrow and  
2. give me the homework.  
3. Akiko: Thank you  
4. M: Ok?  
5. Akiko: yeah  
6. M: Alright. I'll see you tomorrow  
7. Akiko: See you tomorrow ((laughs))  
8. M: Ok. ((laughs))

In the NDA2 SIs however, Akiko takes a more pro-active stance regarding the closing of conversations. In excerpt 6-13, Akiko initiates both a closing implicature environment (an arrangement) in lines 1 and 3, and also the terminal sequence first part in line 6.

Excerpt 6-13 (NDA2-1)

1. Akiko: thanks (. ) u:h (2) see ya, (0.4) later,  
2. M: ok  
3. Akiko: half an hour,  
4. M: half an hour, (. ) u:h ((looks at watch)) (. ) yeah alright (. ) ok (0.5)  
5. I'll see you later  
6. Akiko: see you.  
7. M: (1.5) alright ((laughs))

This proactive stance is further in evidence in excerpt 6-14. Here, Akiko offers appreciation in lines 1 and 3, and in line 6 offers a type of arrangement to her father, allowing him to return to watching the television programme. She then initiates the terminal sequence in line 8. It can be seen therefore, that the passive stance adopted in the NDA1 stages, in which closing implicature environments are restricted to showing appreciation only, and terminal sequences are not initiated is no longer evident in the NDA2 stage. Throughout
the NDA2 SIs, Akiko actively initiates a variety of closing implicature environments and initiates leave-taking.

Excerpt 6-14 (NDA2-2)

1. Akiko: thank you thanks
2. M: alright ok
3. Akiko: ((laughs)) (0.4) that'll be- (. ) thank you
4. M: m: ok (. ) alright (. ) ok (. ) no problem [well
5. Akiko: [ ((laughs))
6. Akiko: (1) go back to: (. ) TV [ ((laughs))
7. M: [oh-
8. Akiko: see you
9. M: alright (. ) ok. ((turns on imaginary TV))

6.2.2 Social factors

Tables 6-1 and 6-2 show Akiko's language choices regarding the various stages of the SIs in the NDA1 and NDA2 stages. By looking at the range of linguistic realisations employed, and the social contexts of the SIs, insights can be gained into Akiko's understanding of the key concepts of social distance, social status, and imposition.

The first observation to note is the way in which, in NDA1-1, Akiko struggles to formulate the request, pausing, hesitating and revising her language choices a number of times. This indicates uncertainty over the appropriate level of directness of her request turn. There is no such evidence of uncertainty in NDA2 request turns however. This may indicate Akiko's increased control over the lexis-grammatical aspect of producing requests, and also of an increased confidence in her assessment of the social contexts.

There is limited evidence of Akiko increasing her linguistic range in the NDA2 stage compared with the NDA1 session. While for example, she produces two greeting types in NDA1, she uses three in NDA2. However, while the lack of leave-taking adjacency pairs in the NDA1 stage makes it difficult to compare, in the NDA2 sessions, she uses the same leave-taking linguistic realisation in all four SIs. This may indicate that her range in terms of leave-taking realisations is
still limited; alternatively it may indicate that she is not taking social context into account when closing interactions.

In the NDA1 stage, the connection between the social contexts and the language choices in the request turns is unclear. However, distance seems to be an important factor in Akiko’s decision-making, with NDA1-3 (a "distant relationship") leading to the most indirect request turn. However, the effect of imposition is unclear- Akiko makes a number of attempts of differing levels of directness in NDA1-1, before settling on a relatively direct formulation. The language in NDA1-2 has a similar level of directness, despite the level of imposition being larger. Status may be influential here, as NDA1-2 involves a parent-daughter relationship.

Examining the requesting language choices in NDA2, Akiko seems to be taking distance into account again. The distance of the relationship in NDA2-3 appears to affect the language choice made, with Akiko using indirect lexis-grammar to formulate the request. This in contrast with the two “close relationship” SIs, in which Akiko uses more direct language. However, she also seems to have taken the level of imposition and/or status into account, as NDA2-2 (large imposition) uses more indirect language than NDA2-1 (medium). Overall, there is some evidence of Akiko taking the social contexts of the SIs into account to a greater degree than in the NDA1 stage.

**Table 6-1**: NDA1 stage linguistic realisations of request turns by Akiko

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akiko/ NDA1</th>
<th>NDA1-1</th>
<th>NDA1-2</th>
<th>NDA1-3</th>
<th>NDA1-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- distant</td>
<td>R- close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imp- medium</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Hi</td>
<td>Hello</td>
<td>Hello</td>
<td>Hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal state inquiry</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>How about you (reciprocating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-pre</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-request checks</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>If- (. ) if you</td>
<td>Could you: come pick me up to:: the school today?</td>
<td>I'm really sorry (0.2) so uh (0.3) I was wondering if you: (. ) can give me more (. ) another two days? [please. ]</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing implicature</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave-taking</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: R= relationship; S= status; Imp= degree of imposition*

**Table 6-2: NDA2 stage linguistic realisations of request turns by Akiko**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akiko/ NDA2</th>
<th>NDA2-1</th>
<th>NDA2-2</th>
<th>NDA2-3</th>
<th>NDA2-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- distant</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp- medium</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- low</td>
<td>Imp- high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opening**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greeting</th>
<th>Hi</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>a) Oh hello</th>
<th>Hi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Hi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal state inquiry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDA2-1</th>
<th>NDA2-2</th>
<th>NDA2-3</th>
<th>NDA2-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Requesting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-pre</th>
<th>a) Are you busy</th>
<th>Do you have time</th>
<th>a) Are you busy now?</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Do you have a little time for me</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) May I ask a favour?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-request checks</th>
<th>a) Are you busy</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Do you have a little time for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>can you- (0.2) \textbf{can you help me?}</td>
<td>could you (0.3) \textbf{could you come} (0.2) and pick me up, (.) yesterday?</td>
<td>so I:: was wondering if (.) you: (1) \textbf{could help me to translate} (0.8) Japanese and English in the flyer,</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing implicature</td>
<td>thanks (.) u:h (2) see ya, (0.4) later,...half an hour,</td>
<td>a) thank you thanks</td>
<td>see you tomorrow</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave-taking</td>
<td>See you</td>
<td>See you</td>
<td>See you (.) later?- uh ((laughs)) see you- ok ((laughs)) see you tomorrow</td>
<td>See you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.3 Akiko summary

Comparing independent performances in the NDA1 and NDA2 stages, Akiko shows significant development in a number of areas in terms of the complexity of the interactions, the consistency of her language choices, and also in terms of taking control of the interactions.

One significant area of change relates to the pre-request stage. While in the NDA1 strategic interactions Akiko made no use of pre-pres at all, she regularly employs them throughout the NDA2 SIs. Similarly to in NDA1, the NDA2 pre-requests consist primarily of mentions, although there is one checking of availability. In using the pre-pres therefore, she successfully projects the upcoming requests to the interlocutor.

Another significant area of change can be seen in the closing sequences. Whereas in the NDA1 SIs Akiko does not initiate any terminal sequences, she regularly does so throughout NDA2. Further, the variety of closing implicature environments is significantly greater in the NDA2 SIs. While she shows appreciation as a way of opening an environment for closing in the NDA1 stage, throughout NDA2 she employs a variety of strategies, including arrangements...
and summaries. In fact, in general, Akiko adopts a more pro-active stance in the NDA2 stage, initiating a personal state inquiry in one SI opening sequence, initiating closing implicature environments, and terminal sequences. This is in marked contrast to the NDA1 SIs, in which she frequently takes a more passive role, waiting for her interlocutor to take control of the interactions.

Regarding social factors, there is some evidence of Akiko taking the concepts of social distance, social status and imposition into account to a greater extent in her request turns in the post-EP NDA2 stage. However, this is less evident in other stages of the interactions, with Akiko using similar leave-taking turns for example, regardless of the varying social contexts of the SIs.

6.3 Ema

6.3.1 Interactional Factors

6.3.1.1 Openings

As the requestor, Ema initiates the greeting adjacency pair in all three of the NDA1 strategic interactions. Furthermore, she initiates personal state inquiries-albeit formulaic ones- in Excerpts 6-15 and 6-16. In Excerpt 6-15, Ema provides a formulaic “hello” as the first part of a greeting adjacency pair, followed by a personal state inquiry, to which her interlocutor responds with an appropriate 2nd part. When her partner reciprocates the personal state inquiry, Ema responds however with a pre-request mention. In Excerpt 6-16, the same “hello” greeting is used, followed by an announcement of her name (as this is a simulated telephone conversation). In line 5, she produces the same personal state inquiry as in the previous interaction, before uttering a pre-request mention in line 7.

Excerpt 6-15 (NDA1-1)

1. Ema: Hello.
3. Ema: how are you.
5. Ema: U:m. (0.3) I list- (. ) lost my (. ) wallet.

Excerpt 6-16 (NDA1-2)

1. Ema: hello
2. M: oh. hello
3. Ema: um. (1) it's Ema.
5. Ema: u:h how are you.
6. M: yeah yeah I'm ok thanks I'm ok. what's wrong.
7. Ema: u:h. (1) I just finished club (1.2) [a:nd
8. M: [uhum.

In Excerpt 6-17, the opening sequence is particularly brief, consisting of a greeting adjacency pair only in lines 3 and 4, followed by her interlocutor producing a question in line 6 regarding the purpose of Ema's visit:

Excerpt 6-17 (NDA1-3)

1. Ema: ((knocks on desk))
3. Ema: [ah- hi.
5. Ema: u:m.
7. Ema: u::h. (2.3) the- (3) ((laughs)) (0.8) I couldn't (. ) finish (0.8) u:h (0.5)
8. the project yet (0.2) so: (. ) u:m (1)

The pattern of brief opening sequences continues throughout the NDA2 stage also, with greeting adjacency pairs typically followed by the request sequence, as in the NDA1 stage. Indeed, while in two of the NDA1 SIs Ema initiated personal state inquiries, she does not do so at all in the NDA2 stage. In Excerpt 6-18 below however, the opening sequence is made more complex by Ema making small talk in lines 5-8, before beginning the request sequence:
Excerpt 6-18 (NDA2-1)

1. Ema: ((knocks on table))
2. M: hey
3. Ema: can I come in?
4. M: ah hey yeah yeah (. ) sure
5. Ema: uh (. ) do you ha- (. ) wha- (. ) what are you doing
6. M: a:h I'm just um (. ) just doing some (. ) work for u:h (. ) my (. ) kind of
7. u:h (. ) course for (. ) for M
8. Ema: (0.5) ((laughs)) a:h. (. ) u:h do you have time? (. ) now?

In the other SIs however, the openings are simple, such as in the excerpt below, in which the opening greeting adjacency is immediately followed by a pre-request turn.

Excerpt 6-19 (NDA2-2)

1. Ema: hey dad
2. M: ah: heya
3. Ema: uh (2.2) u:h (.) do you have time now?

6.3.1.2 Requesting

In the NDA1 stage, the request sequences are marked by the use of pre-request mentions (in all three SIs in which Ema makes a request). However no pre-pres are used at all; nor are there any pre-request checks of availability or ability. In Excerpt 6-20 for example, Ema produces a pre-request mention in line 2 without using a pre-pre beforehand to orient her partner to the upcoming request. The same occurs in Excerpt 6-21, with Ema producing a similar pre-request mention in line 2, after the opening sequence.

Excerpt 6-20 (NDA1-3)

1. M: how can I help.
2. Ema: u::h. (2.3) the- (3) ((laughs)) (0.8) I couldn't (. ) finish (0.8) u:h (0.5)
3. the project yet (0.2) so: (. ) u:m (1)
5. Ema: I'm sorry(.) but (1.8) um:. (0.3) could you wait (0.2) for () two days,
6. M: so the deadline is tomorrow.

Excerpt 6-21 (NDA1-2)

1. M: yeah yeah I'm ok thanks I'm ok. what's wrong.
2. Ema: u:h. (1) I just finished club (1.2) [a:nd
3. M: [uhum.
4. Ema: (0.7) it's very ba- very- u:m. (. ) very bad weather (. ) it's u:m (2.3)
5. M: [ri:ght
6. Ema: [windy (short laugh))
8. Ema: so: (0.3) I'd like to (0.3) um (1.5) I'd like you to pick up- pick me up
9. (0.3) at KUIS ((university name))
10.M: you on campus at the moment?

The request sequences in the NDA2 stage however, show increased complexity. In Excerpt 6-22 below, Ema produces a pre-pre in line 1, asking if her interlocutor has time to talk. That her partner successfully orients to this is shown by his question in line 2, giving her the go-ahead to continue with the request. In line 3 therefore, Ema utters a pre-request mention, explaining her problem.

Excerpt 6-22 (NDA2-1)

1. Ema: (0.5) ((laughs)) a:h. (. ) u:h do you have time? (. ) now?
2. M: yea- (. ) we'll (. ) yeah I guess why what's up
3. Ema: u:h (. ) I have- (. ) I'm doing (. ) homework
4. M: ahum
5. Ema: but (. ) uh. (0.3) it's (0.3) u:h (0.5) very difficult,
6. M: ahum
7. Ema: and uh (0.2) u:h (0.2) I know you're (. ) uh it's- (0.2) uh it is (. ) En-
In Excerpt 6-23 below, Ema produces the same pre-pre as before, in line 1. After being given the go-ahead to continue, she then utters a pre-request check of availability in line 3, followed by a typical pre-request mention from line 11.

Excerpt 6-23 (NDA2-2)

1. Ema: uh (2.2) u:h (.) do you have time now?
2. M: yea: yeah sure ((turns off imaginary TV)) (1) ok yeah
3. Ema: u:h (0.2) what are you doing (. ) tomorrow
4. M: tomorrow (. ) I was going to u:m (0.7) probably uh just (. ) finish
5. writing a report for work
6. Ema: ahu
7. M: and u:m (0.2) probably just spend some time with (. ) with your
8. mother
9. Ema: oh (. ) I see (. ) uh
10. M: how come
11. Ema: u:m (3.5) I- (. ) tomorrow I'm- (. ) uh (. ) I'm going to: (. ) con-
12. cert,

Whereas in the NDA1 stage therefore, Ema’s interactions did not feature any pre-pres, and only one type of pre-request, the NDA2 stage shows some significant change, with pre-pres used in NDA2-1, NDA2-2, and NDA2-3. Further, as with the NDA1 interactions, pre-request mentions are used in all three SIs in which Ema is the requestor. However, she also produces a pre-request check of availability in Excerpt 6-23, showing control over a greater variety of pre-request types than in the pre-treatment stage previously.

Post-request expansions are present in all of the interactions in the NDA1 stage, such as in Excerpt 6-24 below. Here, Ema’s partner grants the request to lend money in lines 1 and 3, which is followed by a minimal post-request expansion by Ema in line 5. Ema’s post-request expansions in all of the NDA1 SIs are similarly minimal.

Excerpt 6-24 (NDA1-1)

1. M: Ok. ok yeah I have the money here [so
2. Ema:                     [((laughs))}
3. M: I'll give it to you. (0.2) ok. three hundred yen ((places coin on
desk))
4. Ema: (1.3) thank you ((laughs))
5. M: a:h ok no worries and you'll give it back to me tomorrow?
6. Ema: yeah

Likewise, in the NDA2 stage, minimal post-request expansions are present in all
interactions. However, Ema does initiate one larger expansion in NDA2-3,
shown in Excerpt 6-25. In this excerpt, after the request has been granted in
line 1, rather than simply provide a typical “thank you” as appreciation, she
offers a larger post-request expansion, commenting on her partner’s granting of
the request by offering an assessment in line 3.

Excerpt 6-25 (NDA2-3)

1. M: [make] any changes or anything maybe?
2. Ema: [oh]
3. Ema: that's good
4. M: yeah is that ok?
5. Ema: oh yeah
6. M: ok yeah then I can do that (. ) that's fine.
7. Ema: a:h (. ) thank you
8. M: no worries

6.3.1.3 Closing

In the closing sequence shown in Excerpt 6-26 below, Ema initiates a closing
implicature environment in line 4, expressing appreciation. This allows her
interlocutor to produce the 1st part of the terminal sequence in line 5. During the
NDA1 stage however, this is an exception, rather than a typical closing
sequence, as Ema does not initiate any other closing implicature environments,
and also does not initiate any terminal sequences either.

Excerpt 6-26 (NDA1-1)

1. M: a:h ok no worries and you'll give it back to me tomorrow?
2. Ema: yeah
3. M: ok. [no worries
4. Ema: [thank you very much.
5. M: alright I'll see you tomorrow.
6. Ema: see you tomorrow

In the NDA2 stage however, Ema takes control of the closing sequences, initiating closing implicature environments in all three of the SIs in which she is the requestor, and also initiates three terminal sequences, as in Excerpt 6-27 below. In this excerpt, there is evidence of the pre-closing sequence beginning in line 4, as Ema's interlocutor's turn is brief, with a falling intonation. In line 5, Ema initiates a closing implicature environment, summarizing the arrangement that has been made earlier in the conversation. This provides the opportunity for the terminal sequence to begin in line 8, which Ema also initiates.

Excerpt 6-27 (NDA2-2)

1. M: [li]ke u:m (.) about an hour before the end, (.) and then I'll come
2. and uh pick you up
3. Ema: thank you
4. M: alright ok (0.3) no problem.
5. Ema: (1.3) so (.) um (1.5) I will (.) email you- (.) text you
6. M: ok [yeah yeah] about an hour before yeah (.) ok
7. Ema: [tomorrow]
8. Ema: so (0.5) see ya ((laughs))
9. M: alright see ya

6.3.2 Social factors

Examining Ema's greeting turns, she employs a wider range in the NDA2 stage than in the NDA1 session, using two types of greeting in NDA1 versus four different realisations in NDA2. There is not evidence of Ema taking context into account with her greeting turns in the NDA1 stage, with the same realisation produced in both a "close relationship" SI, and a "distant relationship" one. In the NDA2 stage however, she does employ a different greeting type for the distant relationship SI than in the "close relationship" interactions- an indication of taking context into account.
For the NDA1 stage, there is evidence of the social distance affecting the formulation of the request, with a more indirect formulation used for the distant relationship SI with a large imposition (NDA1-3), than the close relationship and large imposition (NDA1-2). For the NDA2 stage, distance and imposition seem to clearly affect language choices in the requesting turn, with the high imposition NDA2-2 and distant relationship NDA2-3 both using indirect lexis-grammar. In comparison, the close relationship, medium imposition NDA2-1 uses very direct language. Overall, Ema uses more indirect language in NDA2 than in NDA1 to formulate requests, indicating therefore that Ema is taking context into account to a greater extent.

**Table 6-3: NDA1 stage linguistic realisations of request turns by Ema**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ema/ NDA1</th>
<th>NDA1-1</th>
<th>NDA1-2</th>
<th>NDA1-3</th>
<th>NDA1-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- distant</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp- medium</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opening**

- Hello
- Hello
- Ah- hi
- Hi

**Greeting**

- How are you
- How are you
- n/a
- Great. You (reciprocating)

**Personal state inquiry**

- I’d like you to pick up pick me up (0.3) at KUIS ((university name))
- I’m sorry(.) but (1.8) um:. (0.3) could you wait (0.2) for (. ) two days,
- n/a

**Request**

- Thank you very much
- n/a
- n/a
- n/a

**Closing**

- Thank you tomorrow
- See you. Thank you
- See you
- See you later
### Table 6-4: NDA2 stage linguistic realisations of request turns by Ema

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ema/ NDA2</th>
<th>NDA2-1</th>
<th>NDA2-2</th>
<th>NDA2-3</th>
<th>NDA2-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- distant</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp- medium</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- low</td>
<td>Imp- high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opening**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greeting</th>
<th>Can I come in</th>
<th>Hey dad</th>
<th>a) Hello</th>
<th>Hi M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Hi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal state inquiry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Requesting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-pre</th>
<th>a) What are you doing</th>
<th>Do you have time now</th>
<th>Do you have time now</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Do you have time now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-request checks</td>
<td>Do you have time now</td>
<td>What are you doing tomorrow</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Request**

|          | I want to- (0.2) I want you to (.). help (1.8) the homework. | I (1.5) um (0.3) I was wondering (.). uh (.). if you (.). could (0.8) pick (.). me up, | I- (.). I was wondering if (.). uh (0.2) I ask- (0.3) if I could ask (.). you (0.2) to: (0.7) translate? | n/a |

**Closing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closing implicature</th>
<th>ok (1) so see you then</th>
<th>so (.). um (1.5) I will (.). email you- 8.) text you</th>
<th>thank you very much</th>
<th>yeah (.). I hope you will get better soon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave-taking</td>
<td>ok (1) so see you then</td>
<td>So (0.5) see ya</td>
<td>See you</td>
<td>See you later</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.3.3 Ema summary

Examining Ema’s performances in the NDA1 and NDA2 stages therefore, a number of changes can be identified. While in the NDA1 stage Ema adopts a passive-reactive stance throughout the interactions, ceding control of the conversations to her partner, the NDA2 SIs see Ema take a more proactive
approach. This is shown in the way she takes control of the closing sequences, regularly initiating both closing implicature environments and the terminal sequences.

A further significant area of development relates to the request sequences. While in the NDA1 conversations Ema made little attempt to orient her interlocutor to the upcoming requests with pre-pres, in the NDA2 stage, she regularly does so, with success. She also increases the range of pre-request types under her control, producing a pre-request check of availability in NDA2-2. This is in contrast to her performances in NDA1, in which only pre-request mentions were used. Increased complexity can also be identified in the post-request expansions. While all such expansions were minimal in NDA1, there was a larger expansion in NDA2-3, with Ema producing a comment on the previous turn.

In terms of closings, as noted above, Ema moves from a passive role in the NDA1 SIs, to a more active one in NDA2, providing first parts of the terminal sequences, and providing openings for the interactions to end via closing implicature environments.

One area in which Ema does not show significant change is in the opening sequences however. In both the NDA1 and NDA2 stages, openings are typically simple in both structure and choices of lexis-grammar.

In terms of social factors, Ema shows evidence of some development in taking the concepts of social distance, status and imposition into account, using indirect request language more frequently in the NDA2 stage than in the NDA1. She also employs a greater variety of greeting turns, with some evidence of having accounted for varying contextual factors.

6.4 Hanako

6.4.1 Interactional Factors

6.4.1.1 Openings
Throughout the NDA1 stage, Hanako’s opening sequences are brief and simple in structure. There is no small talk, and she does not initiate any personal state inquiries. She does however reciprocate one in NDA1-4, shown in Excerpt 28. In this opening, Hanako is the recipient of the request, rather than the requestor. Her partner provides the 1st part of the greeting pair, which Hanako completes, and also responds to his personal state inquiry by reciprocating in line 2.

Excerpt 6-28 (NDA1-4)

1. M: hey Hanako how’s it going.
2. Hanako: o:h. hey. (.) yeah good. (.) how about you ((laughs))
3. M: yeah yeah not bad thanks (0.2) I’ve got a favour to- are you busy at
4. the moment?
5. ((puts hand together in prayer like manner))
6. Hanako: ah no no no.

Hanako initiates greetings in the first three NDA1 SIs, with the possible exception of NDA1-1 in Excerpt 6-29.

Excerpt 6-29 (NDA1-1)

1. Hanako  Hi. (.) ok. (. ) u:m. (0.7) uh- can I start, uuhuh
3. Hanako: oh ok. (0.5) I (0.3) uh. (1.7) I- I’m (0.2) I- (1) can- uh ((wincses)) I
4. want to (1.5) do my favour. (0.4) and (0.2) I- (0.3) I lost my (. ) wallet and
5. (1) I lost-5. I lost my wallet and (2.3) I re- I re- I really need money from
6. (0.3) u:h to: (0.4) go back my home (. ) and I don’t- (. ) I don’t have (. ) yeah
7. money (0.2) any- (0.3) anymore
8. M: [o:h.

In line 1 of excerpt 6-29, Hanako provides the 1st part of a greeting, before hesitating and engaging in meta-talk with her interlocutor, unsure of whether to begin. In line 3, she begins again, but without a greeting. Instead, she immediately begins a pre-request mention. It is unclear as to whether this is down to confusion, or a lack of pragmatic awareness.
In the NDA2 stage however, Hanako clearly initiates greetings in the first three SIs, such as below, in Excerpt 6-30, in which she produces a greeting first part in line 1.

Excerpt 6-30 (NDA2-2)

1. Hanako: oh hi dad
2. M: oh hey (.) morning
3. Hanako: are you free now,

Hanako also engages in more complex opening sequences. In excerpt 6-31, Hanako initiates the greeting adjacency pair in line 3, and follows up with a personal state inquiry in line 5. After her partner reciprocates, she then provides the 2nd part in line 7.

Excerpt 6-31 (NDA2-3)

1. Hanako: ((knocks on table))
2. M: he:llo come in
3. Hanako: yes (.) hello: [M M
4. M: [oh hi Hanako]
5. Hanako: how are you today
6. M: yeah I'm- I'm good thanks how are you
7. Hanako: ah yeah thank- uh pretty good thank you
8. M: [oh good

Hanako also engages in some limited small talk in NDA2-2 and NDA2-4 also. In NDA2-2 for example, shown in Excerpt 6-32, Hanako initially produces a pre-pre in line 3, to which her partner responds by explaining what he is doing. Hanako then engages in this small talk to an extent in lines 5 and 7.

Excerpt 6-32 (NDA2-2)

1. Hanako: oh hi dad
2. M: oh hey (.) morning
3. Hanako: are you free now,
4. M: ah ju- yea:h just watching som[e=
5. Hanako: [(inaudible) ((laughs))]  
6. M: =I think it's like a Korean drama or something [yeah]  
7. Hanako: [a:h thanks]  
8. M: ((laughs))

6.4.1.2 Requesting

The request sequences in the NDA1 SIs are typified by a lack of pre-pres. Hanako attempts a pre-pre only once in the NDA1 stage, shown in Excerpt 6-33 below. Here, Hanako produces a form of pre-pre in line 5, which is embedded in a pre-request mention, which she begins in line 2. In this way, while the language is similar to a typical pre-pre, in actuality, it is part of a pre-request explanation of Hanako’s situation. Other than this example, she makes no other attempt at orienting her partner to the upcoming requests by using pre-pres.

Excerpt 6-33 (NDA1-3)

1. M: ooh hi Hanako.  
2. Hanako: hello M. (.) u:h (2.3) I (.) I'm talking (.) about my- e:r my  
3. project [u:n ((Japanese affirmative utterance))]  
4. M: [u:m  
5. Hanako: and (1) I ask me favour, (0.2) of you [um  
6. M: [ri::ght] (.) why  
7. Hanako: [u::m  

In the NDA2 stage however, Hanako uses clear pre-pres on two occasions- in NDA2-2, and in NDA2-3, shown in Excerpt 6-34. In this interaction, Hanako produces a pre-pre in line 5. The “why” question asked by her partner in line 8 indicates that he successfully orients to this as a pre-pre. Similarly, Hanako formulates a similar pre-pre in NDA2-2 also.

Excerpt 6-34 (NDA2-3)

1. Hanako: how are you today  
2. M: yeah I'm- I'm good thanks how are you  
3. Hanako: ah yeah thank- uh pretty good thank you
4. M: [oh good
5. Hanako: [u:m] ma- are you f- are you: free now?
6. M: wh- ((looks at watch)) u:h well I've got class in about ten
7. minutes=
8. Hanako: [ten minutes
9. M: =[but] hmm. (0.2) [why

Furthermore, while in the NDA1 stage, Hanako’s pre-requests are limited to 
mentions only, in the NDA2 stage, shown in Excerpt 6-35, she produces a pre-
request check of availability. In line 4, Hanako asks her partner if he is studying.
While this could be interpreted as a pre-pre (akin to asking if he is free), this can
also be seen as a pre-request check of availability. This is because the
upcoming request is for help with homework that evening. This is the only pre-
request check employed in the NDA2 stage. However, as with the NDA1 SIs,
pre-request mentions are used in all three of the interactions in which Hanako is
the requestor.

Excerpt 6-35 (NDA2-1)

1. M: hello (.) hi
2. Hanako: hi
3. M: ah heya
4. Hanako: yeah. (.) u:h are you: studying now:?  
5. M: yeah I'm just doing this report for (.) um class tomorrow morning
6. yeah
7. Hanako: a::h ok (.) and- so: (0.2) just- (0.3) just a few minutes (.) uh I
8. want to (.) u:h (0.4) now I'm (.) studying (0.4) I'm studying (.) uh English r
9. port,
10. M: mm:
11. Hanako: a:nd (1.2) bu:t (0.2) it i- (.) the report is a little hard for me, (.) to
12. write
13. M: ok

In terms of post-request expansion sequences, Hanako initiates both minimal
and larger expansions. In Excerpt 6-36, after the interlocutor agrees to fulfill the
request in lines 1-2, Hanako expresses appreciation and then produces a comment related to the previous turn in lines 3-4.

Excerpt 6-36 (NDA1-1)

1. M: u::h (.) uh ok. (0.3) ((intake of breath through teeth)) there you go
2. ((places money on table))
3. Hanako: (1) thanks- thank you very much (.) I return your money (.)
4. tomorrow morning
5. M: alright ok (.) I- I'll see you tomorrow in that case.

In the NDA2 stage also, Hanako produces larger post-request expansions, an example of which is shown in Excerpt 6-37. In this excerpt, the interlocutor agrees to carry out the request, ending in line 4, after which Hanako expresses appreciation in line 5, and then again in line 7, with an extra comment indicating the degree of her appreciation.

Excerpt 6-37 (NDA2-3)

1. M: ok so if you come to my office at maybe about eleven o clock
2. tomorrow morning,
3. Hanako: tomorrow morning eleven
4. M: the:n u:m yeah I'll take a look
5. Hanako: ahum thank [you
6. M: [and] see if I can (.) help you at all.
7. Hanako: yeah thank you very much (.) I really appreciate (0.2) ok.
8. M: mm ok yeah that's [fine.

6.4.1.3 Closing

Hanako does not initiate any terminal sequences at all in the NDA1 stage, and closing implicature environments are limited to expressions of appreciation. An example of this passive stance is shown in Excerpt 6-38. In lines 5-6 her interlocutor initiates a closing implicature environment, summarizing the conversation they have had. Hanako responds in line 7 with an expression of appreciation, which can be seen itself as another form of closing implicature.
Her partner then initiates the terminal sequence in lines 6-9, with Hanako providing the 2nd part in line 10.

Excerpt 6-38 (NDA1-3)

1. M: ok. (.) and I'll have to lower your grade because it's- it's [gonna] be late after the deadline  
2. Hanako: [yes (.)]  
3. uhum]  
4. M: u:m (.) but yeah if you bring it to my office I'll- (.) I'll take it from you (.) if you (.) get it to me by five o clock (.) yeah.  
5. Hanako: thank you very much (.). I'm sorry (1) [uhm]  
6. M: [ok] alright  
7. I'll see you tomorrow  
8. Hanako: see you

This passive stance is shown again in Excerpt 6-39, her partner initiates a closing implicature in lines 1, 2 and 4, summarizing their arrangement. Hanako remains passive, as the interlocutor initiates the terminal sequence in line 8.

Excerpt 6-39 (NDA1-2)

1. M: I'll pick you up(.) I'll be about ((looks at watch)) (1) twenty five minutes,  
2. Hanako: ok  
3. M: and I'll come and meet you (0.2) at the: front gate  
4. Hanako: uhum (.). ok [I'm waiting]  
5. M: [alright] I'll see you soon  
6. Hanako: see you  
7. M: bye  
8. Hanako: bye

In the NDA2 stage however, Hanako adopts a much more proactive approach to the interactions, producing both a wider variety of closing implicatures, and also initiating terminal sequences. In line 3 of Excerpt 6-40, Hanako initiates a clear closing implicature environment, summarizing the arrangement made during the prior request sequence. She then expresses appreciation in line 6,
another form of closing implicature, and again in line 8. In line 10, Hanako produces the 1st part of the terminal sequence. During the NDA2 stage, Hanako initiates both the closing implicature environments and terminal sequences in all three of the SIs in which she is the requestor- a marked change from the NDA1 stage.

Excerpt 6-40 (NDA2-1)

1. Hanako: yeah [thank] you (0.3)
2. M: [yeah]
3. Hanako: yeah so: (. ) one hour later? ye- (. ) ok (. ) I will (. ) come again,
5. Hanako: [ahuh]
6. Hanako: thanks a lot.
8. Hanako: thanks (. ) M ((mediator's name))
9. M: alright
10. Hanako: bye
11. M: [see ya] (. ) ok
12. Hanako: [((laughs; mimics closing door))

6.4.2 Social factors

In terms of linguistic range of greeting and leave-taking turns, Hanako does not demonstrate obvious development, with fewer greeting types used in the NDA2 stage than in the NDA1, and the same number of leave-taking realisations.

While there is no discernible connection evident between greeting types and context in the NDA1 stage however, the NDA2 stage does provide some evidence of this, with a different greeting realisation produced for the "distant relationship" SI than for the "close relationship" ones.

In terms of Hanako's NDA1 requesting turns, neither status or imposition seem to have a clear effect on language choices made, as the same lexis-grammar is used in NDA1-1 and 1-2. However, significantly more indirect language is used in NDA1-3, which involves a "distant relationship," indicating that she took social distance into account. In the NDA2 stage, Hanako uses a wider variety of lexis-
grammar to express her requests than in NDA1. However, the relationship between her linguistic realisations and context is not clear. For example, NDA2-1 is a "close relationship," with a medium imposition request. However, the language used is very indirect. However, despite NDA2-2 having a more troublesome request, the language is more direct. This seems to be somewhat of a backwards step, in terms of taking context into account. However, looking at the number of false starts and pauses when formulating these request turns, it is clear that Hanako is paying attention to her language choices. She may be in the “one step backward in order to take two steps forward” stage, where she is in the process of gaining control over requesting lexis-grammar taught in the treatment stage. For Vygotsky, learning is not a linear path, but rather there can be regression before progression takes place.

**Table 6-5:** NDA1 stage linguistic realisations of request turns by Hanako

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hanako/NDA1</th>
<th>NDA1-1</th>
<th>NDA1-2</th>
<th>NDA1-3</th>
<th>NDA1-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- distant</td>
<td>R- close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imp- medium</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening</strong></td>
<td>Hi</td>
<td>a) Hello</td>
<td>Hello</td>
<td>O:h hey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greeting</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>How about you (reciprocating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal state inquiry</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requesting</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>and (1) I ask me favour, (0.2) of you [um</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-pre</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-request checks</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request  can I: (1) 
can I borrow money to: (.)
come back my home (.)
can I- can I go to: (0.2) uh can I come to school (.)
to pick me up?
I'm sorry(.) er (.). I- could you (0.5) could you (.)
deextend (.). u:h. (0.3) deadline to (2.7) to: (0.3)
could you extend deadline (.).
two days (.). later?

Closing

Closing implicature
See you tomorrow (2nd part)
n/a
Thank you very much.
I'm sorry
n/a

Leave-taking
See you tomorrow
a) see you
b) bye
See you
Sorry

Table 6-6: NDA2 stage linguistic realisations of request turns by Hanako

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hanako/ NDA2</th>
<th>NDA2-1</th>
<th>NDA2-2</th>
<th>NDA2-3</th>
<th>NDA2-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- distant</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp- medium</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- low</td>
<td>Imp- high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opening

Greeting
Hi
Oh hi dad
Hello M
Ah hi M

Personal state inquiry
n/a
n/a
How are you today
n/a

Requesting

Pre-pre
Are you studying now
Are you free now
Are you free now
n/a

Pre-request checks
Are you studying now
n/a
n/a
n/a

Request
I will- (.). I really appreciate it if you: (0.3) if you help me (.). so could you (.). could you help me (.). about (.)
this report?
I'd like (.). you- uh? (.). could you: (.). could you pick me up (.). to- u:h (.). the (.). concert (.). hall?
would you mind- uh (.). would you mind- uh (.). so- nan da ((Japanese, meaning what is it)) (0.5) if you (0.5)
could you- could you help me to (.).

n/a
make flyer in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closing implicature</th>
<th>a) yeah so: (.) one hour later? ye- (.) ok (.) I will (.) come again, b) thanks a lot. c) thanks (.) M</th>
<th>Thanks a lot</th>
<th>a) [ahum] so(.) next mor- next- uh- (.) tomorrow (.) second period eleven o clock? b) [thank you very much.] c) See you tomorrow</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave-taking</td>
<td>Bye</td>
<td>See you then</td>
<td>See you tomorrow</td>
<td>Bye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.3 Hanako summary

With regards to opening sequences, Hanako co-constructs more complex openings in the NDA2 stage than in the NDA1 session, producing *personal state inquiries* as well as greeting adjacency pair turns for example. She also engages in small talk in two of the NDA2 SIs before beginning the request or pre-request stage of talk. Greater complexity is also evident in Hanako's increased use of pre-pres in the NDA2 stage. Further, Hanako produces a greater variety of pre-requests in the NDA2 SIs than in the NDA1 stage interactions, which were limited to *mention* type pre-requests only.

In closing task sequences, Hanako adopts a reactive stance in the NDA1 session, not initiating any terminal sequences, and limiting closing implicatures to *expressions of appreciation* only. The NDA2 stage closings however are marked by a more proactive approach, in which Hanako produces a variety of closing implicatures, and also initiates terminal sequences.

In terms of social factors however, while she employs a wider variety of request turn linguistic realisations in the NDA2 stage, there is limited evidence of her clearly taking into account the key concepts of social distance, status and imposition when formulating her language choices.
6.5 Ryota

6.5.1 Interactional factors

6.5.1.1 Openings

In general, Ryota’s performances in the NDA1 SIs are marked by problems with the opening stage of the interactions. In Excerpt 6-41 for example, rather than open the conversation with a greeting adjacency pair, Ryota begins by uttering “excuse me” to his “friend.” His interlocutor then provides the first part of the greeting in line 4, after waiting for Ryota to initiate it without success. Rather than provide a felicitous 2nd part (reciprocating the greeting), he simply responds by uttering “yeah,” before beginning a pre-request mention.

Excerpt 6-41 (NDA1-1)

1. Ryota: u:h (1.4) u:h actually (1) uh excuse me
2. M: um (.)
3. Ryota: [yeah
4. M: [ah (.) hey Ryota.
5. Ryota: yeah (.) actually (.) I lost my wallet
6. M: [a:h (.) ok]

Again, in Excerpt 6-42, Ryota adopts a passive approach, not initiating the greeting, but waiting for his interlocutor to do so in line 1. Immediately after providing the 2nd part of the greeting pair, Ryota begins a pre-request mention, without producing a personal state inquiry, or engaging in any small talk. Also, he does not identify himself, which is untypical for a telephone conversation such as this. This requires his partner to enquire as to who the caller is in line 3.

Excerpt 6-42 (NDA1-2)

1. M hello
2. Ryota: hello (0.2) u:h. (1.4) so I: (0.3) finished club activity (.) and
3. M: ah is that Ryota?
4. Ryota: yes
In Excerpt 6-43 below, while he does initiate the greeting, he waits for his partner to provide a personal state inquiry and take control of the conversation’s direction in line 6.

Excerpt 6-43 (NDA1-3)

1. Ryota  ((knocks on table))
2. M: come in
3. Ryota: (0.5) hey (.) I'm Ryota
4. M: ah Ryota
5. Ryota: yes
6. M: how are you today.
7. Ryota: yeah I'm fine very good.
8. M: ah ok (.) how can I help (.) what's wrong

Openings in the NDA2 stage show significant change however. Ryota initiates greetings in NDA2-2 and NDA2-3, and provides felicitous 2nd parts in NDA2-1 and NDA2-4. In the Excerpt 6-44, Ryota initiates the greeting in line 3, and then produces a personal state inquiry in line 5, taking a more proactive approach to managing the conversation. This is similar to the NDA2-1 SI, in which he also initiates both the greeting pair and personal state inquiry.

Excerpt 6-44 (NDA2-3)

1. Ryota: ((knocks on door))
2. M: hello come in
3. Ryota: oh hello
4. M: ah Ryota hi
5. Ryota: yeah (0.2) how are you
6. M: I'm (.) yeah (.) not bad thank you how are you today
7. Ryota: yes uh (.) I'm doing well
8. M: ah good [good] (.) mm
9. Ryota: [yeah]

In Excerpt 6-45, Ryota also engages in small talk during the opening. Ryota provides the 1st part of the greeting pair in line 1, then initiates a short sequence of small talk in line 3, discussing what TV programme his interlocutor is
watching. The interlocutor then initiates a *personal state inquiry* in line 12, to which Ryota responds by producing the 2nd part of the pair. Overall, Ryota takes control of the opening sequences to a significantly greater extent in the NDA2 stage compared with the NDA1 SIs.

Excerpt 6-45 (NDA2-2)

1. Ryota: hi dad (. ) good morning
2. M: a:h (. ) morning (. ) hey
3. Ryota: (0.3) yeah (. ) u:h (1) ((laughs)) (0.2) u:h (0.2) what did you watch
4. M: u:h just watching um: (.) uh just some: (.) um: (.) I think it's a Korean drama
5. Ryota: a:h [yeah
6. M: [I thi]nk yeah (0.2) yeah (.) it's not very good
7. Ryota: u:h (. ) I like it
8. M: yeah, a:h [ok] (. ) uh (. ) yeah (. ) it's alright
9. Ryota: [yes]
10. M: mm good
11. Ryota: hm:
12. M: so how are you today (.) are you ok?
13. Ryota: (0.2) yeah (0.3) I'm (0.7) good.
14. M: mm good

6.5.1.2 Requesting

Further significant change can be seen in the requesting portions of Ryota’s SI interactions. In the NDA1 stage, Ryota does not use any pre-pres at all to project the upcoming request to his partner. Further, he doesn’t use any pre-request checks of availability or ability, only using pre-request mentions. An example of this is shown below in Excerpt 6-46. Here, after M has completed the greeting adjacency pair in line 1, Ryota immediately begins a pre-request mention in line 2, explaining his situation. He does not attempt to orient his partner to the upcoming request by using a pre-pre. From lines 2-8 Ryota produces his pre-request mention, before making the request in line 10. The lack of a pre-pre is mirrored in NDA1-2 and NDA1-3 also.
Excerpt 6-46 (NDA1-1)

1. M: [ah] (. ) hey Ryota.
2. Ryota: yeah (. ) actually (. ) I lost my wallet
3. M: [a:h (. ) ok]
4. Ryota: [u:h so]
5. M: that sucks
6. Ryota: and this wallet is- (0.2) include (. ) my (. ) train (. ) ticket
7. M: a::h [no
8. Ryota: [so] (. ) yeah (. ) and (1) u:h (1.4) I (. ) can't (. ) go back my home.
9. M: a:h
10. Ryota: and (1.5) uh (. ) please (. ) give me- uh (. ) please (0.3) lend me my-
11. (. ) lend
12. me your money, (. ) for me
13. M: ((blows air through lips; winces)) [a::h really,
14. Ryota: "((laughs))

Another marked feature of Ryota's NDA1 request sequences is the complete reliance on pre-request mentions, with no pre-request checks used at all. In Excerpt 6-47, again Ryota begins a pre-request mention immediately following the greeting adjacency pair, without checking either his partner's availability or ability to carry out his upcoming request, which he produces in line 13.

Excerpt 6-47 (NDA1-2)

1. M hello
2. Ryota: hello (0.2) u:h. (1.4) so I: (0.3) finished club activity (. ) and
3. M: ah is that Ryota?
4. Ryota: yes
6. Ryota: u::h. (1.3) so: (0.5) but the weather is (0.2) uh (0.2) very heavy
7. rain, (0.5) 7. so (. ) I don't want to (. ) go to (0.2) station
8. M: m:
9. Ryota: ((laughs)) so it is difficult to: (0.4) uh walk
10. M: [m::
11. Ryota: [walk] (0.5) walk (0.2) until (. ) uh station
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12. M: right
13. Ryota: uh (0.4) ca:- can you pick me up (0.4) uh (1) can you- uh pick
14. me:
15. (.) up (0.4) my house, uh until my house?

Ryota produces post-request expansions in NDA1-1 and 1-3, but not in NDA1-2. This is shown in Excerpt 6-48; once his partner provides the 2\textsuperscript{nd} part of the request adjacency pair in line 4, Ryota does not produce a post-request expansion, just laughing in line 5. His partner then moves the conversation on to a closing implicature environment in line 6.

Excerpt 6-48 (NDA1-2)

1. M: u::h ((rubs face)) ok so where are you now?
2. Ryota: yeah (0.2) I am (.) on (.) KUIS ((university name)) (1) yeah (.) I'm
3. waiting (.) at the gate (.) of KUIS.
4. M: a:::h ((rubs face)) (0.3) ok: (0.2) alright
5. Ryota: ((laughs))
6. M: so: (.) I'll pick you up (.) in about (0.3) twenty five minutes?
7. Ryota: twenty five minutes, (.) uh ok (0.2) uh (.) I just standing (.) this
8. M: alright (.) ok. I'll see you soon

The NDA2 stage however, shows considerable development in Ryota's request sequence performance. In all three NDA2 request sequences in which he is the requestor, he produces pre-pres, projecting the upcoming requests, and also provides a pre-request check in NDA2-1, shown in Excerpt 6-49. In line 2, Ryota produces a pre-pre, asking his partner if he is busy. This could also be interpreted as a pre-request check of availability, as the later request involves asking for help with homework that evening, when his partner has some free time. Line 4 can also be seen as a pre-request check of availability, as Ryota asks his partner if he is occupied. This is evidenced by line 7, showing that the interlocutor has oriented to the previous turn as a projection of an upcoming request. Ryota then begins a pre-request mention from line 8, ending in a request in line 14.
Excerpt 6-49 (NDA2-2)

1. M: ah (.) good (.) good
2. Ryota: u:h (.) are you busy?
3. M: uh just um (.) doing this report for (.) tomorrow's class yeah
4. Ryota: a:h (.) so (.) you- uh you are doing (.) homework now?
5. M: yeah doing a bit of work yeah yeah
6. Ryota: a:h yeah
7. M: why (.) what's up
8. Ryota: (0.3) u::h (0.2) so I have a (0.2) a little bit (0.7) he- u:h (.) diffi- u:h
9. (0.2) a little bit (0.7) problem
10. M: ah ok [right
11. Ryota: [mm:] (0.5) u:h (2.3) u:h (0.7) I have a: (.) homework=
12. M: [mm:
13. Ryota: [=but] it's difficult (0.2) so I couldn't understand (.) so (0.8) I
14. want to (0.8) u:h (.) I was- u:h (.) I want you to help (.) my homework

Excerpt 6-50 (NDA2-2)

1. M: [a::h Ryota] Ryota it's late (.) ((blows air through lips)) (0.4) ok (.)
2. alright (.) I'll- yeah I guess I have no choice so (0.3) I'll come pick you up
3. at- (.) at midnight (0.2) [from=
4. Ryota: [yeah
5. M: =the u:h (.) from the concert place
6. Ryota: ah yeah
7. M: a:nd (.) um (.) yeah (.) so (.) just (.) text me- text message me (.)
8. maybe (.) an hour before the end, (0.) [and=
9. Ryota: [yeah
10. M: =come and pick you up
11. Ryota: o::h (0.3) it's good help

Ryota also produces larger post-request expansions in the first three SIs in the NDA2 stage, an example of which is shown in Excerpt 6-50. After his partner provides the 2\textsuperscript{nd} part of the request pair from lines 1-10, Ryota produces a larger post-request expansion in line 11, commenting on his interlocutor's previous turn, assessing it as “good help.”
6.5.1.3 Closing

In the NDA1 SIs, Ryota adopts a passive stance in the interactions. He initiates only one closing implicature environment (in NDA1-3), and does not initiate any terminal sequences at all. In the Excerpt 6-51 closing sequence, M initiates the first closing implicature environment in line 1, summarizing the arrangement made in the request sequence, and then produces another one in line 4 when Ryota does not take up the opportunity to close the conversation. Ryota’s interlocutor then initiates the terminal sequence in line 7. This passive-reactive performance is mirrored in the other NDA1 SIs, with Ryota not taking control and directing the interactions to any significant extent, relying on his partner to do so instead.

Excerpt 6-51 (NDA1-1)

1. M: alright (.) and u:h (.) yeah so I'll see you tomorrow morning then- if
2. you can give me the money back
3. Ryota: yeah
4. M: tomorrow morning. (1) alright (0.2) yeah- be more careful (0.3)
5. [next time
6. Ryota: [yeah (0.2)] sorry
7. M: alright I'll see you later
8. Ryota: see you

The closing sequences in the NDA2 stage again show considerable change in regards to IC, with Ryota adopting a significantly more active approach to the conversations. In Excerpt 6-52 for example, Ryota initiates a closing implicature environment in line 1, expressing appreciation for his partner agreeing to the request earlier in the interaction. He then produces a further one in line 4, summarizing the arrangement made, before providing the 1st part of the terminal sequence in line 6.

Excerpt 6-52 (NDA2-3)

1. Ryota: (0.2) I'm (.) I'm (0.5) u:h (.) very (0.8) thankful- thankful, (.)
2. grateful
3. M: a:h ok, ah no you're welcome (.) that's fine that's fine no problem.
4. Ryota: (0.8) ok u:h () see you this m- u:h tomorrow morning
5. M: ok yeah so I'll see you tomorrow morning (.9) ok.
6. Ryota: (0.8) yeah- u:h. () good bye
7. M: alright goodbye () see you later
8. Ryota: see you

In all, Ryota clearly initiates closing implicature environments in three of the four of the NDA2 SIs, and initiates terminal sequences in NDA2-3 and NDA2-4. In Excerpt 6-53 below, he also produces a terminal sequence 1st part in line 3 that can also serve as a closing implicature environment. It can be seen therefore, that Ryota takes significantly more control of the interactions in the NDA2 stage, directing the conversations, rather than relying on his partner to do so.

Excerpt 6-53 (NDA2-4)

1. Ryota: yeah () uh () no problem
2. M: a::h great thanks Ryota thanks. () ok.
3. Ryota: ok- u:h () see you on Friday
4. M: alright I'll see you on Friday yeah () cheers bye

6.5.2 Social Factors

Examining Ryota's opening stage realisations, his range of realisation types increases from two formulations used in NDA1, to three in NDA2, indicating an increased number of greeting types under his control. It is difficult to gauge the extent to which Ryota takes into account context with his NDA1 greetings, as he produces them in only two of the four SIs. However, he produces “hello” in NDA1-2 (a close relationship) and a “hey” in NDA1-3, which is a distant relationship, suggesting he may not be taking into account context when formulating his greetings.

In terms of closings, he uses the exact same leave-taking in 3 out of 4 NDA1 SIs, and the fourth one is a minor variant. This suggests he is not taking context into account. In the NDA2 stage, he uses the same “see you” leave-taking in 3 out of 4 SIs. However, in NDA2-3, a distant relationship interaction, he produces the utterance “goodbye.” While this may indicate taking context into account, it is difficult to say with certainty.
In the NDA1 stage there is some evidence of Ryota being influenced by social context when making requesting language choices. He uses direct language in NDA1-1 for a medium level of imposition, and a more indirect formulation in NDA1-2 for a higher level of imposition (both are close relationships, although the status relationship is different). In NDA1-3, a distant relationship, he uses at first a relatively indirect formulation, before switching to a direct form of requesting. In the NDA2 session he seems to take context into account to a greater extent however. He uses direct language in NDA2-1, a close relationship, medium imposition request, and a more indirect request is produced in NDA2-2, which again is a close relationship, but a higher degree of imposition, and a low-high status conversation. He also uses the same more indirect formulation in NDA2-3, a distant relationship. This is evidence therefore of some movement in the way Ryota made his lexis-grammar choices, as he uses more indirect language when the relationship is more distant, when the imposition is higher, or when the status relationship is low to high rather than equal.

Table 6-7: NDA1 stage linguistic realisations of request turns by Ryota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ryota/ NDA1</th>
<th>NDA1-1</th>
<th>NDA1-2</th>
<th>NDA1-3</th>
<th>NDA1-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- distant</td>
<td>R- close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imp- medium</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>Hello</th>
<th>Hey (.) I'm Ryota</th>
<th>O:h M (.) u:h (. ) I am very (0.3) good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal state inquiry</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-pre</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-request checks</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>please (.) give me- uh (0.3) please (0.3) lend me my- (. ) lend me your money, (. ) for me</td>
<td>can you pick me up (0.4) uh (1) can you- uh pick me: (. ) up 14. (0.4) my house, uh until my house?</td>
<td>could you (0.3) uh (1) u:h (1) could you uh (0.2) how can I say (. ) uh (1) so I want to: (. ) submit day after tomorrow</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>a) I will do my best  b) I will do my best</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave-taking</td>
<td>See you</td>
<td>See you thank you</td>
<td>See you thank you</td>
<td>See you thank you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6-8:** NDA2 stage linguistic realisations of request turns by Ryota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ryota/ NDA2</th>
<th>NDA2-1</th>
<th>NDA2-2</th>
<th>NDA2-3</th>
<th>NDA2-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- distant</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp- medium</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- low</td>
<td>Imp- high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Greeting</th>
<th>Personal state inquiry</th>
<th>Requesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hello</td>
<td>Hi dad (. ) good morning</td>
<td>How are you</td>
<td>Are you busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Oh hello</td>
<td>How are you</td>
<td>Do you want (. ) to continue: the watch TV?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Oh hello M</td>
<td></td>
<td>mm: (1.2) s- u:h (1) uh (. ) are you: (. ) do you have a (. ) time now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-pre</th>
<th>Are you busy</th>
<th>a) Are you busy</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-request checks</td>
<td>b) a:h (. ) so (. ) you- uh you are doing (. ) homework now?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>I want to (0.8) u:h (.) I was- u:h (.) I want you to help (.) my homework</td>
<td>Yeah so: (1.7) u:h so cou:- (.s) so- um: (0.3) so could you (.) pick me up (0.8) the concert (0.8) from- (.s) uh from concert (1) stage (.s) um? ((laughs)) from concert (.s) to: my home.</td>
<td>(1.2) so: (0.8) u:h (.) could you translate into (0.3) uh could you translate (.s) Japanese into English, (1.3) in (.s) this brochure, (.s) brochure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Closing implicature</td>
<td>a) ah ok. (.) so (.s) I: (0.5) I will be back (.s) in one (.s) hour and half minutes, b) yeah thank you</td>
<td>a) (0.3) u::h (2) ah so (0.7) u::h (1.3) u:m (1.5) so I'm waiting for- (.s) the in front of the (.s) concert gate b) [uh] I will (0.3) send a message (.s) at eleven (.s) p.m, c) Ok thankyou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave-taking</td>
<td>Yeah see you</td>
<td>Yeah see you</td>
<td>a) yeah- u:h. (.s) good bye b) See you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.3 Ryota summary

Ryota demonstrates considerable development in regards to opening sequences. While in the NDA1 stage he typically adopts a reactive stance, waiting for the mediator to initiate greetings or *personal state inquiries*, this is not the case in NDA2, in which he takes a more proactive approach, as well as providing felicitous 2nd parts to adjacency pairs.
In terms of requesting, Ryota does not produce any pre-pres at all in NDA1, and only one type of pre-request (a mention). As with the openings however, the NDA2 stage provides evidence of development, with Ryota producing three pre-pres and a pre-request check of availability. He also produces larger post-request expansions than in the NDA1 session.

Development is also evident in the closings of NDA2. While in the NDA1 stage Ryota took a passive stance, initiating only one pre-closing implicature environment, and not initiating any terminal sequences, this is not the case in NDA2. In NDA2, Ryota initiates pre-closing implicature environments three times and terminal sequences twice, thus taking greater control of the task sequences' closing interactions.

With regards to social factors, there is limited evidence of development in terms of opening and closing linguistic realisations. However, his NDA2 request turns do indicate that he is taking social context into account; this is not clearly evident in the NDA1 SIs.

6.6 Hikaru

6.6.1 Interactional factors

6.6.1.1. Openings

In the NDA1 stage SIs, Hikaru initiates the greeting adjacency pairs in all three interactions in which he is the requestor. However, he makes no personal state inquiries or small talk, leading to brief opening sequences that are simple in structure. Excerpt 6-54 is a typical example, with an initial greeting adjacency pair in lines 1 and 2 immediately followed by a pre-request mention in line 3. In this example, we can also see that Hikaru does not wait for his partner’s greeting pair 2nd part, shown by the overlapping speech in lines 2 and 3. This is a turn-taking issue, with Hikaru either incorrectly guessing the end of his partner’s turn, or alternatively not anticipating the greeting pair 2nd part.
Excerpt 6-54 (NDA1-1)

1. Hikaru hi M ((M is a substitution for researcher's name))
2. M: oh [hi Hikaru
3. Hikaru: [I'm sorry] (0.2) uh (.) I lost my wallet (0.2) [did you f-
4. M: [a:h
5. Hikaru: did you f:- (0.2) did you: (.) did you see my wallet?

The opening sequences in the NDA2 stage are similarly brief, with the exception of NDA2-3, shown in Excerpt 6-55. Here, Hikaru initiates the greeting again, in line 3. Rather than immediately begin the request sequence however, here he produces a personal state inquiry in line 5, and when his partner reciprocates in line 4, provides an answer in line 7. This somewhat more complex opening sequence however, is the only occasion in which Hikaru moves beyond the simple greeting pair opening in either the NDA1 or NDA2 stage.

Excerpt 6-55 (NDA2-3)

1. Hikaru((knocks on table))
2. M: come in
3. Hikaru: hi. (0.2) hello
4. M: ah Hikaru hi
5. Hikaru: how are you today
6. M: u:h yeah good thank you (.) how are you

6.6.1.2 Requesting

In the NDA1 stage, Hikaru produces a pre-pre in only one SI, shown in Excerpt 6-56, line 5. His partner orients to this as a pre-pre by asking "what's wrong" in the following turn. Hikaru then begins a pre-request mention from line 7, ending in a request in lines 15 and 16. While he successfully uses a pre-pre to orient his partner to the upcoming request here, this is the only time he does so in the NDA1 stage. In the other two SIs in which he is the requestor, he produces no
pre-pres and no pre-request checks of availability or ability, using only pre-request mentions as a way of foreshadowing the request to come.

Excerpt 6-56 (NDA1-3)

1. Hikaru ((knocks on door))
2. M: hello come in
3. Hikaru: thank you (.) hello M
4. M: o:h hey Hikaru
5. Hikaru: u::m (2) I want to talk about the project you ga- you gave me.
6. M: o::k (.) yep (0.2) what's wrong
7. Hikaru: u:h (0.8) u:h (.) I have to: (.) I have to (0.4) finish (.) it (0.2) u:h (.)
8. tomorrow:: (.) tomorrow's- by tomorrow's second koma ((Japanese noun, meaning period)) right,
9. M: mm. that's the deadline yep
10. Hikaru: yea:h (0.2) u:h I'm s:o afraid (.) to say (0.2) uh recently (.) I don't
11. have much time to: (0.2) do and try: (0.3) continue doing the project (0.2)
12. [so
13. M: [mm:
14. Hikaru: (1.7) I'm not sure but (.) maybe I can't finish the deadline so (.) I
15. ask you(.) for: (1.8) another two days (.) could you postpone the deadline?

In the NDA2 stage however, Hikaru makes extensive use of pre-pres, producing them in three SIs. He also produces a pre-request check in NDA2-1, shown below in Excerpt 6-57. Here, Hikaru begins the request sequence with a pre-pre in line 1, projecting the upcoming request. He then produces a pre-request check of ability in line 6, asking his partner about his English language proficiency (the request involves asking for assistance with English homework). Only once he has oriented his partner to the request does he begin the pre-request mention, explaining his situation, from line 10. This is a significantly more complex request sequence than seen in the NDA1 stage, and this increased complexity is shown in NDA2-2 and 2-3 as well (albeit without pre-request checks).
Excerpt 6-57 (NDA2-1)

1. Hikaru: are you free now?
2. M: u::h (.) yeah I guess I'm just- well just doing this work for
tomorrow's class but (.) yeah
3. Hikaru: ok?
4. M: yeah yeah (.) so what's up
5. Hikaru: uh (.) are you good at English,
6. M: (0.3) I'm ok=
7. Hikaru: [u::h
8. M: =[uh yeah] I'm not great (.) I'm: not bad (.) [why
9. Hikaru: [ugh] uh actually (.) I'm
doing my homework but it was ali- (.) a bit difficult to do (.) so (.) will
10. you help me?

In terms of post-request expansions, Hikaru’s performance is similar in both the pre-treatment and post-treatment stages. In the NDA1 SIs he produces one larger post-request expansion, and two minimal ones; in the NDA2 stage he produces one larger expansion, and three minimal post-request expansions. In this aspect, there is little change in Hikaru’s IC development.

6.6.1.3 Closing

Like other participants, Hikaru adopts a passive-reactive stance in the NDA1 stage in relation to the closing sequences. While he does initiate one closing implicature environment, shown in Excerpt 6-58 (appreciation in line 3), he does not initiate any in the other SIs, and does not provide any 1st turn parts in any of the terminal sequences.

Excerpt 6-58 (NDA1-3)

1. Hikaru: [yeah] by five o clock
2. M: yes please yeah yeah (. ) bring it to my office
3. Hikaru: ok thank you
4. M: alright (. ) I'll see you tomorrow
5. Hikaru: see you
In the NDA2 stage however, Hikaru shows considerable change in relation to closing sequences. In the NDA2-2, shown in Excerpt 6-59, Hikaru initiates three separate closing implicature environments- in lines 1-3 (summarizing the arrangement); line 6 (showing appreciation); and in line 8 (explicitly announcing the end of the conversation). He then provides the first part of the terminal sequence in line 10. This shows that, unlike the NDA1 SIs in which Hikaru played a passive role, here he is able to control the interaction to a much greater degree. This greater control is also seen in NDA2-3, in which he initiates a closing implicature environment also. Further, Hikaru provides the 1st parts of terminal adjacency pairs in all three NDA2 SIs in which he is the requestor.

Excerpt 6-59 (NDA2-2)

1. Hikaru: ok I promise (. ) ok (. ) so: (0.2) one hour before finish- (0.2)
2. twelve ok (. ) uh one hour before ((scratches head)) (0.5) ok I'll call you (. )
3. eleven thirty
4. M: ok yeah ( .) yeah ((scratches head)) ( .) call me- yeah as- (. ) yeah (. )
5. about an hour before yeah.
6. Hikaru: ok (. ) thankyou:. 
7. M: alright ok
9. M: alright ok I'll see you later on.
10. Hikaru: see you later.
11. M: see ya.

6.6.2 Social factors

Examining the greeting realisations produced by Hikaru in the NDA1 stage, there is not a clear connection between the social contexts of the SIs, and his language choices, with the same greeting turn "hello" employed in both NDA1-2 (a close relationship) and NDA1-3 (a distant relationship). In the NDA2 stage however, while he uses the greeting "hi" in the "close" relationship SIs, he produces "hello" for NDA1-3, a "distant" relationship context. This suggests his language choice is influenced in this SI by the social distance of the scenario. There is also a wider range of greetings employed in the NDA2 stage, with three in the post-EP session produced, compared with two in the pre-EP NDA1
session. In contrast, there is not clear evidence of taking context into account with the closing turns, with Hikaru producing the same realisation in both close and distant relationships in the NDA2 stage.

In terms of requesting, it’s not clear that Hikaru takes context into account in NDA1, with more direct language being used in NDA1-3 (distant relationship, large imposition) than in NDA1-1 (close relationship; medium imposition). In the NDA2 stage however, more indirect language is used in NDA2-2 (large imposition) and in NDA2-3 (distant relationship) than in NDA2-1. This indicates that the relationship and size of imposition are being taken into account when he makes his language choices during the requesting sequence.

**Table 6-9: NDA1 stage linguistic realisations of request turns by Hikaru**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hikaru/ NDA1</th>
<th>NDA1-1</th>
<th>NDA1-2</th>
<th>NDA1-3</th>
<th>NDA1-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- distant</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp- medium</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>Hi M</td>
<td>Hello (. )</td>
<td>Hello M</td>
<td>Hi M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hikaru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>calling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Personal state inquiry | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requesting</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-pre</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>u::m (2) I want to talk about the project you gave me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-request checks</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Request          | [so] if you don't mind (. ) could you lend me some money? | ah (. ) I ask you for: (. ) picking me up | I ask you 15. (. ) for: (1.8) another two days (. ) could you postpone the deadline? | n/a |

<p>| Closing         |       |     |     |     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closing implicature</th>
<th>Yeah thank you (response to partner’s closing implicature)</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>ok thank you (in response to partner’s initial closing implicature)</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave-taking</td>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>See you</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-10: NDA2 stage linguistic realisations of request turns by Hikaru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hikaru/ NDA2</th>
<th>NDA2-1</th>
<th>NDA2-2</th>
<th>NDA2-3</th>
<th>NDA2-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- distant</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp- medium</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- low</td>
<td>Imp- high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Hi:</th>
<th>Hi dad (.) good morning</th>
<th>Hi. (0.2) hello</th>
<th>Hi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal state inquiry</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>How are you today</th>
<th>(0.2) good (.) how about you ((in response to partner’s 1st part)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requesting</th>
<th>Are you free now</th>
<th>a) Are you free now</th>
<th>Uh well (.) do you have time now?</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-pre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Are you free now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I have a favour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-request checks</td>
<td>a) Are you free now</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) uh (.) are you good at English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>So (.) will you help me?</td>
<td>[so (.) if you could (.) u:h could you pick me up,</td>
<td>[so] (.) if you could ((places hands together)) (. ) u:h (.) could you help us (. ) translating (. ) into English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Closing | | | | |
6.6.3 Hikaru summary

Hikaru's performances change significantly when comparing the NDA1 stage with the NDA2 interactions. While the opening sequences are typically brief and uncomplicated in both stages, the request and closing sequences show considerable development. He projects the upcoming requests in the NDA2 stage to a much greater extent, using pre-pres, and a wider variety of pre-request types. The closing sequences also show a greater degree of control and a more pro-active stance, with Hikaru initiating closing implicature environments and terminal sequences in three of the four SIs (the fourth SI involves Hikaru being the requestee rather than the requestor).

In terms of social factors, there is evidence of some development in regards to greeting turns, with Hikaru's different linguistic realisations in SIs with differing levels of social distance indicating that his understanding of social context has increased. Hikaru's post-EP performance in terms of the request turns also indicates some development, with more indirect language employed in contexts involving a greater degree of imposition, social distance or status.
6.7 Mayumi

6.7.1 Interactional factors

6.7.1.1 Openings

As with other participants, Mayumi’s NDA1 openings are brief and simple in structure, consisting of a greeting adjacency pair, before immediately beginning a pre-request mention, as shown below in Excerpt 6-60. Here, Mayumi’s interlocutor answers the “telephone” (this is a telephone conversation scenario) in line 1. In line 2, Mayumi provides the 1st part of a greeting pair, which her partner completes in the following turn. She then begins her pre-request mention from line 4, without initiating a personal state inquiry, or any small talk.

Excerpt 6-60 (NDA1-2)

1. M he- hello
2. Mayumi: hello:. (.) u:h (0.2) I am Mayumi
4. Mayumi: u::h (1.3) I'm just finished my: clu- my club activity

The opening sequence in NDA1-1 (excerpt 6-61) is also brief, albeit with a personal state inquiry initiated by Mayumi’s interlocutor. In this interaction, Mayumi initiates the greeting pair, and responds to a personal state inquiry, without reciprocating. She then begins the request sequence in line 3.

Excerpt 6-61 (NDA1-1)

1. Mayumi hi
2. M: a:h hey Mayumi (. ) how(s it going.
3. Mayumi: u:h good, (. ) uh but (. ) something bad ((laughs))

In the NDA2 SIs, the opening sequences are lengthier and more complex, with Mayumi initiating small talk in NDA2-1 and NDA2-2, shown below in Excerpt 6-62. Here, Mayumi provides the 1st part of the greeting pair in line 1, before initiating a short sequence of small talk from line 3 until line 17. However, as in
the NDA1 stage, there are no personal state inquiries or other elements in any NDA2 SI that add further complexity to the opening sequences.

Excerpt 6-62 (NDA2-2)

1. Mayumi: hey da:d
2. M: a:h hey
3. Mayumi: hey. (1) wh:at- (. ) which (. ) programmes do you- are you
4. watching,
5. M: a:h it's just this this Korean (. ) drama
6. Mayumi: Korean drama (. ) [wow]
7. M: [yea:h] (0.5) Winter Sonatta [or something]
8. Mayumi: [is
9. it (. ) interesting?
10. M: u::h [eh] it's alright=
11. Mayumi: [a:h] ((laughs))
12. M: =it's alright (. ) nothing- nothing special (0.5) but [u:h]=
13. Mayumi: [a:h]
14. M: =yeah (. ) your mother recommended it [so]
15. Mayumi: [a:h] ((laughs))
16. (0.7) she really likes the: (. ) Korean (0.2) [programme] ((laughs))
17. M: [yeah] I know I know

6.7.1.2 Requesting

Unusually for the participants in the NDA1 stage, Mayumi uses pre-pres to project the upcoming requests on two occasions- in NDA1-1 and NDA1-3. The former is shown in Excerpt 6-63. In this excerpt, Mayumi produces a pre-pre in line 5, asking whether her partner has time. Her partner orients to this as projecting the coming request, shown by his questioning in line 11. She uses the same type of pre-pre in NDA1-3, asking her partner if they have time.

Excerpt 6-63 (NDA1-1)

1. Mayumi hi
2. M: a:h hey Mayumi (. ) how(s it going.
3. Mayumi: u:h good, (. ) uh but (. ) something bad ((laughs))
5. Mayumi: [u::h] (0.7) u::h do you have time now?
6. M: u::h (.)(looks at watch)) yeah [I've got
7. Mayumi: [o:nly three] minutes o:r (.) l
8. want to (.)
talk with you
10. Mayumi: ok?

Of the three NDA1 SIs in which she is the requestor, Mayumi produces pre-
request mentions on two occasions (NDA1-1 and 1-3), explaining her situation,
and laying the groundwork for the requests. However, she does not produce
any pre-request checks of availability or ability that would serve to orient her
partner to the requests to come.

In the NDA2 stage, Mayumi produces pre-pres in all three requestor SIs. One of
these pre-pres, in NDA2-1 shown in Excerpt 6-64, could also be a pre-request
check of availability. This is because of the nature of the SI scenario, in which
Mayumi asks her partner for help that evening with some homework. Mayumi
asks her partner if he is studying. As she wants help with her homework as
soon as possible, this could be either a pre-pre or a pre-request check of
availability. Once her interlocutor responds, Mayumi initiates another pre-
pre/pre-request check in line 9.

Excerpt 6-64 (NDA2-1)

1. Mayumi: ((knocks on table))
2. M: hey
3. Mayumi: (0.2) ah hi (.). M
5. Mayumi: ah now (.). are you studying?
6. M: yea:h just doing this report for tomorrow
8. M: hm[m]
9. Mayumi: [u:m] do you have (.). time (.). really?
10. M: u::h (.). why (.). what's up
In the NDA1 SIs, Mayumi initiates a post-request minimal expansion on three occasions, with one larger expansion in Excerpt 6-65, lines 3-4 (summarizing the arrangement):

Excerpt 6-65 (NDA1-3)

1. M: but (.) I will take it from you (.) if you can give it but- more than-
2. later than tomorrow and(.) u:m it's too late
3. Mayumi: o(.)kay I:'ll try hard a:nd (2.3) I'll give my: project to you: til (0.4)
4. tomorrow.
5. M: ok (0.2) and next time please make sure you do it on time
6. Mayumi: ((laughs)) ok
7. M: (0.4) ok (.) [alright
8. Mayumi: [thank you]
9. M: thanks Mayumi

Similarly, in the NDA2 SIS, Mayumi offers minimal expansions on two occasions, but also larger ones in two SIs also, an example of which is in Excerpt 6-66 below. In this excerpt, Mayumi’s partner completes his request pair 2nd part in lines 1-2, 4, and 6-7. Once he has agreed to the request, Mayumi expresses appreciation in line 8, and makes a comment on the arrangement. This type of larger post-request expansion can also be seen in NDA2-3.

Excerpt 6-66 (NDA2-2)

1. M: I guess I have (.) no choice (0.5) okay (.) I'll- I'll pick you up (.) u:m
2. (0.4) send me a text message maybe an hour
3. Mayumi: ahum
4. M: before (.) um (.) before the end of the concert
5. Mayumi: okay
6. M: and u:m (0.2) I'll come and pick you up from the (.) from outside
7. the (0.2) entrance
8. Mayumi: okay (.) thanks u::h (0.2) so: (0.8) thank you so much and I'll
9. send e-mail=
10. M: mm.
6.7.1.3 Closing

The closing sequences in the NDA1 stage show Mayumi taking control of the interaction to an extent, initiating a closing implicature environment in NDA1-2, and initiating two terminal sequences in NDA1-3 and 1-4. However, in NDA1-1 and 1-2, she does not provide the 2nd part of the terminal sequence, which can be seen as infelicitous pragmatic behaviour. In the NDA1-1 example shown in Excerpt 6-67, M initiates closing implicature environments in lines 3, and also in line 5 (announcing closure). When Mayumi does not take the opportunity to initiate leave-taking, her partner does so in in line 7, producing the 1st part of the terminal sequence. However, Mayumi does not complete the adjacency pair.

Excerpt 6-67 (NDA1-1)

1. Mayumi: ok. (0.2) I'll (0.2) I'll send e-mail to ca- u:h (0.4) to call- (0.2)
2. call, (1.3) and (. ) give you back this money (. ) tomorrow.
3. M: ah ok. no worries (. ) well (. ) yeah I hope you find your wallet.
4. Mayumi: ((laughs)) thank you
5. M: alright ((laughs)) I'll see you later I've got to go.
6. Mayumi: ok
7. M: see ya

This happens again in NDA1-2, shown in Excerpt 6-68. Mayumi’s interlocutor opens a closing implicature environment in lines 1-2, and the conversation turns become shorter thereafter, indicating pre-closing. In line 8, her partner produces another closing implicature, and then provides the 1st part of a terminal sequence in line 10; Mayumi however, like in NDA1-1, does not complete this adjacency pair. In this particular closing sequence, it may be put forward that her partner’s closing implicature in line 8 could also be interpreted as a terminal sequence 1st part, in which case Mayumi does provide a 2nd part in line 9. However, that does not seem to be the case, as the utterance “yeah” is an untypical leave-taking 2nd part.

Excerpt 6-68 (NDA1-2)

1. M: alright (. ) I'll be there in about (0.2) twenty minutes. (. ) I'll have to
get changed then I'll- I'll pick you up.
3. Mayumi: ok
4. M: [alright
5. Mayumi: [bye] I'm sorry
6. M: no it's ok
7. Mayumi: thank you
8. M: alright I'll see you soon
9. Mayumi: yeah
10. M: bye

In the NDA2 stage, overall, Mayumi takes more control, initiating closing implicatures in all three SIs in which she is the requestor, and providing multiple closing implicatures in NDA2-2 and 2-3. In excerpt 6-69, Mayumi opens a closing implicature in line 1, summarizing the arrangement made, and then another in line 5, expressing appreciation. She then initiates the terminal sequence in line 7. This pro-active stance is seen throughout the NDA2 SIs, with Mayumi initiating both closing implicatures and terminal sequences.

Excerpt 6-69 (NDA2-3)

1. Mayumi: yeah (.) a:nd (0.8) I'll see you: tomorrow second koma,
2. M: second koma that's [it
3. Mayumi: [brin]g (.) my (.) draft
5. Mayumi: yeah (0.5) thank you so much.
7. Mayumi: so see you (0.2) later
8. M: okay I'll see you later (.) bye n[ow]
9. Mayumi: [bye] ((laughs))

One issue arises in NDA2-1, shown in Excerpt 6-70. Here, the conversation turns become shorter in lines 2-4, indicating pre-closing has begun. There is a lengthy pause in line 4 of 6 seconds, as Mayumi's partner waits for her to close the conversation with a terminal sequence. Unsure if Mayumi has finished, the interlocutor asks her, using gesturing. This then prompts Mayumi to produce the terminal sequence 1st part in line 7.
Excerpt 6-70 (NDA2-1)

1. Mayumi: ((laughs))
2. M: alright
3. Mayumi: thank you
4. M: okay (6) ((looks at Mayumi, gives thumbs up or not thumbs up)
5. gesture, asking if finished))
6. Mayumi: ah (1) see you later ((laughs))

6.7.2 Social factors

In terms of greetings, there is little variety of language realisations in either NDA1 or in NDA2, with “hi” being the typical greeting produced throughout. This suggests that Mayumi is not taking social context into account when formulating her openings during either pre or post-treatment stages.

As with the greetings, closings do not show clear evidence of taking context into account when making language choices. While in NDA1-3 (a distant relationship) Mayumi utters “thank you” compared to “ok bye” in NDA1-4 (a close relationship), indicating some analysis of the scenarios, this is not shown in NDA2, in which variations of “see you later” are used in 3 of the 4 interactions.

Table 6-11: NDA1 stage linguistic realisations of request turns by Mayumi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayumi/ NDA1</th>
<th>NDA1-1</th>
<th>NDA1-2</th>
<th>NDA1-3</th>
<th>NDA1-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- distant</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp- medium</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imp- high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hello: (. ) u:h (0.2) I am Mayumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uh hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh hi M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal state inquiry

| n/a       | n/a       | n/a       | n/a       |

Requesting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-pre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[u::h] (0.7) u::h do you have time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to (0.2) talk with you now (. ) so do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding the NDA1 request sequences, Mayumi’s language choices do not seem to have been clearly influenced by the social contexts, with a more direct formulation used in NDA1-3 (a distant relationship; low-high status; medium imposition), than in NDA1-1 and 1-2 (close relationships, medium and large impositions). In NDA2 however, there is evidence that she has considered social context before producing her request sequence turns. In NDA2-1, a close relationship with a medium imposition request, the request formulation is relatively direct. In NDA2-2, in which the imposition is higher, and the status relationship is low-to-high, the lexis-grammar is more indirect. Further, in NDA2-3, a distant relationship situation, the language employed is more indirect still.

**Table 6-12**: NDA2 stage linguistic realisations of request turns by Hikaru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayumi/ NDA2</th>
<th>NDA2-1</th>
<th>NDA2-2</th>
<th>NDA2-3</th>
<th>NDA2-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- distant</td>
<td>R- close</td>
<td>R- close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- low-high</td>
<td>S- equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp- medium</td>
<td>Imp- large</td>
<td>Imp- low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>(0.2) ah hi (.)</th>
<th>hey da:d</th>
<th>hi (. ) Alla:n,</th>
<th>Oh hi Alla:n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal state inquiry</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leave-taking</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>yeah</th>
<th>Thank you</th>
<th>Ok bye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-request checks</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>a: h I'm sorry but I want you to lend me money - some money</td>
<td>so could you (0.2) could you pick me up?</td>
<td>so: (1.2) I:- I'd like you to (.) postpone the deadline for two days</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closing</th>
<th>Closing implicature</th>
<th>((laughs)) thank you (in response to partner’s closing implicature)</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave-taking</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>Ok bye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-pre</td>
<td>ah now (.) are you studying?</td>
<td>um (.) now (0.2) can I talk with you?</td>
<td>u:::n (0.8) do you have time? (. ) now? (. ) is it (. ) are you busy?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-request checks</td>
<td>ah now (.) are you studying?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>[so:] (.) can you help me to: (. ) do it,</td>
<td>I'm really sorry but (1) uh (1.2) would you ((laughs)) pick me up, (0.5) to: my-to home?</td>
<td>but (0.8) u:::h (0.8) if- if you are free (. ) I was wondering if you: (. ) could help me: to: translate the poster to: (0.5) English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>thank you</td>
<td>a) okay (. ) thanks u:::h (0.2) so: (0.8) thank you so much and I'll send e-mail tomorrow (. ) before: (. ) you came to the (. ) concert</td>
<td>a) yeah (0.2) so: (0.4) yeah (1) thank you (. ) for (0.2) cooperating</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing implicature</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) thank you so much ((laughs))</td>
<td>b) yeah (. ) a:nd (0.8) I'll see you: tomorrow second koma,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) yeah (0.5) thank you so much.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave-taking</td>
<td>See you later</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>a) so see you (0.2) later</td>
<td>mm see you: later (. ) bye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) bye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7.3 Mayumi Summary

Compared to other participants, Mayumi displays a relatively pro-active stance in her NDA1 interactions, using pre-pres to project the upcoming requests on two occasions, and initiating closing implicatures and terminal sequences in some SIs as well. While therefore, there is less obvious development between the pre and post-treatment stages with Mayumi, nonetheless, there is still some evidence of progression. Openings in the NDA2 stage are sometimes more complex (NDA21 and 2-2), and pre-pres are used more often than in the NDA1.
SIs. She also takes greater control of the conversations in general, initiating closing implicatures and terminal sequences more frequently.

In terms of developing understanding of how the concepts of social distance, status and rank of imposition affect linguistic realisations, there is some evidence of increased control of the concepts in relation to request turns; it is not clear on the other hand, that her greeting and closing turns are the result of contextual analysis.

6.7 Overall Summary

Overall, there was a marked change between the pre-EP NDA opening sequences and the post-EP NDA ones. The NDA1 stage opening was typically characterised by the learners adopting a reactive stance, allowing the interlocutor to initiate greeting adjacency pairs and personal state inquiries, with the learners providing only second turn parts. In the NDA2 stage however, learners took a more proactive approach, regularly initiating both greeting adjacency pairs, as well as personal state inquiries. There were also a number of instances of the learners initiating small talk, adding further complexity to opening sequences.

The closing sequences also underwent change. As with the openings, learners typically ceded responsibility to the interlocutor in the NDA1 stage SIs, largely reacting to the interlocutor's turns with 2nd parts of the adjacency pairs. In the NDA2 sessions however, the learners regularly initiated both closing implicature environments and terminal sequences with greater frequency. They also produced a wider variety of implicature environments, such as summary or fake arrangement types for example, as opposed to the showing appreciation type typical of the NDA1 sessions.

In terms of the request stages, the NDA1 SIs overall were marked by a lack of pre-pres being produced (with the exception of Mayumi). In contrast, pre-pres were far more frequent in the NDA2 stage, orienting the interlocutor to the upcoming request turn. Further, while pre-request turns were largely limited to
mentions (explanations) in the NDA1 stage, a wider range was produced by the participants in the NDA2 SIs, including the checking of availability and ability.

In general, there was some evidence of learners understanding the concepts of power, social distance and rank of imposition to a greater extent in the post-EP NDA2 sessions, and taking them into account when formulating their language choices. In particular, there was evidence of learners' request turns being influenced by context to a greater degree in the NDA2 SIs than in the NDA1 stage. Results were more mixed for the opening and closing stages of talk, with some learners' performances indicating development in this regard (Ema and Hikaru), but less so for others (Hanako, Akiko, Ryota and Mayumi).

6.9 Conclusion

In this chapter, the actual level of development of the six learner-participants was assessed. This was done by examining the transcript data of two key stages of the study- the NDA1 stage, and the NDA2. In both of these stages, the interactions between the learners and the author were non-dynamic, meaning that the author did not provide mediation during the sessions. Rather, the author's role was solely of interlocutor for the learners, co-constructing the task sequences of talk. This allows an assessment of the learners' independent performance to be assessed.

To this end, the NDA1 and NDA2 stage sessions were recorded and transcribed. The transcripts were then analysed in a number of ways. Firstly, the frequency of certain target features, such as pre-requesting for example, was examined. This was complemented by an assessment of the variety of linguistic realisations produced by the learners, and the relationships, if any, between language choices and the social contexts of the SIs. In this way, participant performances in the pre-EP NDA1 stage could be contrasted with the post-EP NDA2 performances.

This analysis produced a number of findings. Overall, it was found that learners' performances underwent marked change. Interactions became more complex, and learners assumed a greater degree of control over the task sequences.
Evidence was also found of learners taking social context into greater account when formulating their language choices.

In the next chapter (Chapter Seven), attention turns to the dynamic stages of the current study. In particular, the ways in which the mediation sequences are both opened and closed are closely examined.
Chapter Seven

Successful Mediation Sequences: A Condition for Development

7.1 Introduction

The focus of this chapter is on one particular aspect of the participants’ interactional competence (IC) as DA participants—how the openings and closings of mediation insertion sequences are negotiated. For the purposes of data analysis, successful mediation sequences are defined here as those that are both opened and closed, and in which the object of mediation is oriented to. How openings and closings are initiated and oriented to by the participants will be examined in detail, analysing the micro-interactional practices that the participants employ in negotiating these “boundaries” (van Compernolle, 2013) between task-related talk and mediation sequences. Further, any changes over time (comparing DA1 and DA2 sessions), in terms of how these “boundaries” (van Compernolle, 2013) are negotiated, will be discussed.

According to van Compernolle (2013), the ability to successfully negotiate the boundaries of a mediation insertion sequence and orient to the object of mediation is both a pre-requisite for development and also an indication of development itself. This, in conjunction with the need for greater understanding of how mediation unfolds in DA sessions and how the participants interact with each other (Poehner, 2005; Ableeva, 2010) signifies the importance of closely examining mediation insertion sequences. In this chapter, the opening and closing boundaries between task and mediation talk will be examined in detail, identifying the micro-interactions that lead to successful negotiations between the mediator and learner participants. In Chapter Eleven how the participants orient to the object of mediation, and how that orienting develops between DA1 and DA2 sessions will be assessed.

In presenting typologies of opening and closing micro-interactional and verbal strategies, it is important to note that the typologies were not identified before the DA sessions took place. Rather, and in keeping with the principles of interactionist DA, mediation interactions were sensitive to the particular needs
of each participant, and unfolded without prior planning. Thus, a grounded analysis of the data was performed, and micro-interaction patterns identified.

Also in keeping with the principles of interactionist DA, these typologies are not meant to be prescriptive, but descriptive. According to Poehner (2005), Ableeva (2010) and van Compernolle (2013), there is a need for increased understanding of what happens in DA mediation, shedding light on these unplanned, often complex interactions between mediator and learner. By presenting these opening and closing boundary negotiation moves in a systematic fashion, this chapter contributes to the current body of knowledge, and also affords us the ability to assess the development of this particular aspect of the participants’ interactional competence.

7.2 Types and frequency of opening moves in DA1 and DA2 sessions

The table below shows the number of micro-interactions during the negotiations of opening mediation insertion sequences in both DA1 and DA2 sessions.

Table 7-1: Micro-interaction types identified during negotiations of opening mediation insertion sequences (all DA sessions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-interaction</th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th>DA2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediator-initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit verbal move</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bridges between task and mediation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower volume</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating learner’s utterance</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending arm towards learner</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Micro-interaction types are ordered in terms of whether they are "verbal" or paralinguistic. Verbal strategies are listed first, followed by paralinguistic strategies.

### 7.2.1. Explicit verbal initiation of opening boundary

As can be seen in Table 7-1, typically, throughout both DA1 and DA2 sessions, mediation insertion sequences were initiated by the mediator (M). In doing so, M employed a variety of resources, both verbal and paralinguistic. Of all the opening strategies initiated by M, the most direct were explicit verbal haltings of the task sequence; an example of this is shown below.

**Excerpt 7-1 (DA1-1)**

1. M: mm: so: () okay I'll stop you there ((moves left hand, palm
2. facing down in direction of Akiko; establishes mutual gaze,
3. then shifts gaze downwards)
4. Akiko: ((nods head; shifts gaze downwards))

In excerpt 7-1, M produces the utterances “mm:” and “so:” with elongated vowel sounds, before briefly pausing. He then produces an explicit verbal initiation of the mediation insertion sequence in line 1. At the same time, he extends his arm towards Akiko and establishes mutual gaze. Akiko orients to these actions as opening a mediation sequence, shown by her nodding her head and shifting her gaze downwards in line 4. These three simultaneous actions involving verbal instruction, gesture and gaze are seen throughout the DA strategic interactions.

7.2.2. Verbal "bridges" between task and mediation sequence

Another frequently employed verbal opening move is the use of verbal utterances that form bridges between the preceding task sequence and the mediation sequence to follow, as shown in excerpt 7-2:

Excerpt 7-2 (DA1-7)

1. M: ((looks down)) mm okay (. ) so:: (. ) stop you there ((e
2. tends arm towards Hanako)) so: (0.3) this is (. ) what do you think
3. (. ) big favour or small favour ((est mut gaze; both arms on desk))
4. Hanako: (0.3) not big ((looks up)) but not small I think ((est
5. mut gaze))

In excerpt 7-2, M begins negotiating the opening by producing three verbal utterances, “mm,” “okay,” and “so::” in line 1, followed by an explicit verbal initiation (discussed in 7.1.1). In the data, these three utterances are examples of typical utterances produced by M immediately preceding the opening of a mediation insertion sequence. This indicates that they serve the purpose of orienting the learner to the halting of the task, and the initiation of opening boundary negotiations. These utterances, with the elongated vowel sound, are typical examples of this, used by M to lead into a mediation sequence, and for the purpose of this analysis are labeled "verbal bridges," as they serve to link the task and mediation sequences together. Following this bridge, M then explicitly halts the task sequence in line 1, with a simultaneous extension of his
arm towards the learner participant. Hanako’s turn in line 4 indicates that she has oriented to M’s turn as opening a mediation sequence, shown by her pause and response to M’s question in line 2.

7.2.3 Lower volume utterances

A more implicit resource sometimes employed by the participants is a lowering of voice volume when initiating a mediation sequence opening. The contrast between the volume of the task sequence and the quieter opening move utterance appears to serve the function of alerting the interlocutor to the mediation-initiating nature of the utterance. This is illustrated in excerpt 7-3.

Excerpt 7-3 (DA1-3)

1. M: u::h (.) okay ((lowers volume of voice; est mutual gaze, shifts gaze downwards, before reestablishing mutual gaze)) would you ((leans back in chair))
2. Mayumi: would you:; ((shifts gaze downwards; laughs))

In excerpt 7-3, M initiates the mediation sequence with the verbal bridge “u::h (.) okay,” which is produced at a lower volume than the preceding task sequence turns. In conjunction with the use of gaze and adjusting of sitting position, this serves to orient Mayumi to the opening, shown by her turn in line 4, in which she repeats M’s utterance and shifts her gaze downwards, before laughing. Following this opening, orientation to the object begins in the turns after line 4. The frequent nature of this action, and the way in which the learner-participants orient to it (as well as other simultaneous actions) indicates that the change in volume level acts as a contrast to the task sequence level, and thus acts as another method of the DA participants negotiating the boundary between task and mediation.

7.2.4. Repetition of learner-participants’ preceding utterance

A resource frequently used by M throughout all DA sessions was repetition of the interlocutor’s previous utterance, in cases where that utterance is the object of the mediation. Typically, such repetition is employed in combination with rising intonation of the final syllable, as demonstrated in excerpt 7-4.
Excerpt 7-4 (DA2-6)

1. Ema: next (. ) uh (. ) Saturday, (1.3) so u:h (6) if uh (. ) if you free I:
2. (2) want to ah-
3. (0.3) want to- (0.5) I want to ask (1.3) you: (1) to: (0.3) bring, (0.5)
4. M: ((lowers volume of voice)) take, (. )
5. Ema: take (. ) me
6. M: maybe hm
7. Ema: to: (. ) the shopping centre
8. M: a:h (. ) so ((lowers volume of voice; est mutual gaze)) I want- I
9. want to ask you: (0.3) is that okay, ((maintains mutual gaze))
10. Ema: I think so

In excerpt 7-4, M initiates the opening using a combination of resources, both verbal and paralinguistic. After producing a verbal bridge with a lower volume of voice in lines 8-9, simultaneously establishing mutual gaze with Ema, he then repeats Ema’s utterance in the preceding turn, serving to both open the mediation sequence and highlight the object of mediation as well. Ema orients to these moves as initiating a mediation sequence, responding to M’s question in line 10.

7.2.5. Extension of arm towards learner-participant

While M typically employs the gesture of an extended arm towards Akiko in conjunction with an explicit verbal halting of the task sequence, this is not always the case. In excerpt 7-5 below, M’s initiation of the opening is more implicit.

Excerpt 7-5 (DA1-6)

1. Akiko: thank you (1) u:m (0.4) one of [my friends=
2. M: [((extends left arm towards
3. Akiko, palm facing downwards; looks at Akiko; smiles))
4. Akiko: =wait (. ) what ((establishes mutual gaze))
Figure 7-1: Mediator extending arm towards learner as part of negotiating opening boundary of mediation sequence

In line 1 of excerpt 7-5 Akiko begins her turn in the task sequence, and is interrupted by M in line 2, who extends his arm towards Akiko, shifts his gaze towards her, and smiles. These three different elements of paralinguistic behaviour are sufficient for Akiko to orient to M’s turn as opening a mediation sequence, shown by her turn in line 4, in which she enquires as to what the object is, establishing mutual gaze with M.

7.2.6. Adjustment of sitting position

An interesting paralinguistic move frequently employed by M in negotiating the opening of a mediation insertion sequence is the use of body position to orient the learner-participant to the opening of the mediation. This is most typically seen in the form of leaning back in his seat, as shown in excerpt 7-6.

Excerpt 7-6 (DA2-5)

1. M: ((leans back; begins to extend arm slightly towards Mayumi; est mutual gaze)) so:: how are you
2. Mayumi: ((shifts gaze downwards)) wha- what (1) is it (0.5) formal,
3. ((shifts gaze to M))
4. M: ((leaning back; shifts gaze upwards; hands laced together))
In excerpt 7-6, M makes use of a number of paralinguistic moves to negotiate the opening of the mediation sequence. In lines 1-2, M simultaneously leans back in his seat, extends his arm in Mayumi’s direction, and establishes mutual gaze, before producing a verbal bridge in line 2. These micro-interactions are sufficient to orient Mayumi to the halting of the task sequence and opening of mediation, shown by her pauses in line 3, shifting of her gaze to M, and her question to M regarding the nature of the object being mediated (formality).

7.2.7. Nodding

Nodding is used on a number of occasions throughout the DA sessions to indicate that M has identified an object of mediation, and is negotiating the opening of a mediation sequence. As with other negotiating moves, rather than being an isolated micro-interaction, nodding is used in conjunction with other resources, as shown in excerpt 7-7.

Excerpt 7-7 (DA2-6)

1. M: ((gaze up; nods slowly once; mut gaze)) (2.5) a:::hum ((tilts head)) (1.5) is that okay, ((mut gaze))
3. Hikaru: (0.5) u:m ((gaze up; counts on hand using finger)) ((in-
4. audible private speech))

In excerpt 7-7, M employs several implicit moves to begin negotiating the mediation sequence opening, shifting his gaze upwards before establishing mutual gaze, while nodding slowly in line 1. M then pauses for (2.5) seconds, before producing a verbal bridge with an elongated vowel sound (“a::hum”), and tilting his head. After a second pause of (1.5) seconds, M produces a question in lines 1 and 2. Hikaru orients to these moves as signalling the halting of the task sequence and the opening of a mediation sequence, pausing in line 3, and shifting his gaze upwards, before engaging in private speech.

7.2.8. Smiling

Smiling is often used by M in the DA sessions to signal to the learner that he has identified an object for mediation. Excerpt 7-8 provides an example of this.

Excerpt 7-8 (DA1-5)

1. Akiko: thank you so much
2. M: [alright
3. Akiko: [((laughs))
4. M: ((laughs)) (0.2) um ((establishes mutual gaze; half smile))
5. Akiko: (1) bye, ((maintains mutual gaze; raises hand in waving
type gesture))
6. M: aha (.) okay [((laughs))
7. Akiko: [((laughs))
8. M: alright [((laughs))
9. Akiko: no goodbye, ((shifts gaze to mediator; leans forward))
10. M: we::- (.) u:m ((shifts gaze upwards; leans back))
Figure 7-3: Mediator smiling as part of negotiating opening boundary of mediation sequence

In excerpt 7-8, Akiko completes her turn in line 1 (a post-request). M produces an affirmative “alright” in line 2, and both participants laugh in lines 3 and 4. At this point M waits for 0.2 seconds, then establishes mutual gaze with Akiko, half-smiling, and waits for 1 second. Akiko orients to M’s actions as opening the mediation sequence in line 5, producing what she believes to be the object of M’s mediation- closing. From this point, the two participants begin negotiating orientation to the object (pre-closing and closing).

7.2.9. Head position (tilting)

A highly implicit negotiating move, a slight tilting of the head to one side by M (and sometimes looking at the learner at a slight angle), in combination with other negotiating moves, is often used successfully by M to orient the learner to the mediation sequence. Excerpt 7-9 demonstrates the use of this subtle negotiating resource.

Excerpt 7-9 (DA2-1)

1. M: ((nods head)) ahum (0.3) ((tilts head slightly)) (0.5) so::
2. ((laughs))
3. Ema: ((laughs))
4. M: ((volume of voice lowered slightly)) want- (. ) want you, ((e
5. establishes mutual
gaze)) (0.7)
7. Ema: uh ((maintains mutual gaze)

![Image of mediator tilting his head and looking at learner from a slight angle]

**Figure 7-4:** Mediator slightly tilting his head and looking at learner from a slight angle as part of negotiating opening boundary of mediation sequence

In excerpt 7-9 line 1, M produces a number of implicit moves, nodding his head, before producing a verbal bridge, pausing for (0.3) seconds, and tilting his head slightly to one side. A second verbal bridge with a elongated vowel sound follows. Ema’s orientation to these moves as opening a mediation sequence is shown by her reaction in line 3, laughing, which is mirrored by M. M then proceeds to begin the process of orienting Ema to the object of mediation in line 4.

7.2.10. Waiting

Excerpt 7-10 (DA1-1)

1. M: alright thank you ((smiles; nods head)) (1.7)
2. Ryota: um: (2) u::h ((leans back)) (2) uh (1.3) it's not finished
3. ((leans forward; laughs;)
4. waves hands in finishing gesture))
5. M: ((shakes head; smiles; maintains gaze))
6. Ryota: yea:h (1.3) a:h (1.5) what should I say
In excerpt 7-10, M responds in line 1 to Ryota’s preceding post-request turn, uttering the second part of the post-request adjacency pair. Following this, he employs a number of implicit negotiating resources, smiling, nodding, and then waiting for (1.7) seconds. Ryota orients to this as opening a mediation sequence, indicated by his turn in line 2, pausing for (2) seconds, leaning back in his chair, pausing twice more, and then finally directing a question towards M, which begins the process of locating the object of mediation. Waiting on the part of the mediator is one of the most frequently employed negotiating moves in the DA sessions, and is shown here to be an implicit but effective way of orienting the learner to the mediation sequence.

7.3 Learner-initiated opening negotiations

As discussed in 9.1.1. above, in most cases, the opening of a mediation sequence was initiated by the mediator. However, negotiations were also begun by the learner participants on a number of occasions, as shown in Table 7-1 above. These initiating moves by the learners took a variety of forms.

7.3.1. Direct question to mediator

Of the learner-initiated openings in the DA sessions, the second most frequent resource employed was a direct question to M, as shown in excerpt 7-11.

Excerpt 7-11 (DA2-5)

1. Mayumi: okay (0.3) u::h so- u::h (0.7) u:h (1) um ((shifts gaze downwards)) (0.3) eh ((Japanese particle)) (0.3) u::h (4) I want to- uh I want to ask you ((est mutual gaze; extends arm to- wards M))
2. M: ahuh ((leaning back; hands laced; maintains gaze at M)
3. yumi))
4. Mayumi: ((looks up, then down)) u::h (. when I (.) make (.) the
5. fake arrangement ((est mutual gaze; hands, palms facing each
6. other, distance apart))
In excerpt 7-11, Mayumi struggles to produce her turn in the task sequence in line 1, pausing several times, and producing the Japanese particle “eh,” indicating uncertainty. Following this, she initiates the opening of a mediation sequence with a direct question to M in lines 2-4 and 7-9, simultaneously establishing mutual gaze and extending her arm towards M. M orients to this as negotiating the opening of a mediation sequence, leaning back and maintaining mutual gaze with Mayumi in line 4.

7.3.2 Rising intonation

Frequently, when initiating an opening, the learners initiated negotiations by employing rising intonation at the end of their turn to indicate uncertainty to the mediator. This serves a similar function to the direct question move shown in the previous excerpt, and is typically accompanied by the shifting of gaze towards M. Excerpt 7-12 provides an example of this.

Excerpt 7-12 (DA1-7)

1. Akiko: (0.5) see: you: (. ) later, ((establishes mutual gaze))
2. M: ((shifts gaze downwards; nods)) [okay] (. ) hmm
3. Akiko: [bu- (. ) yeah]
4. M: [do you=
5. Akiko: [no,]
6. M: {=think that's okay, what do you think ((shifts gaze to Ak-
7. iko))}

In excerpt 7-12 line 1, Akiko provides the first part of a terminal sequence. The elongated vowel sound of “you:” alongside the brief pause, rising intonation at the end of the turn, and the establishing of mutual gaze however indicate she is uncertain of the appropriateness of her utterance. M orients to this as opening a mediation sequence, shown by his nodding “hmm” filler, followed by a question in lines 4 and 6. Here then, Akiko employs relatively implicit resources in negotiating the opening.

7.3.3 Gaze
The most frequently employed resource used by learners in opening a mediation sequence is that of gaze. By shifting their gaze to M and typically establishing mutual gaze, they signal to M that negotiations have begun to open a mediation sequence. Excerpt 7-12 above demonstrates this, with Akiko struggling to provide the first part of the terminal sequence in line 1, shown by her pause, and uncertainty in producing her turn, shown by the rising intonation. Upon producing her turn, she establishes mutual gaze with M, who orients to this as opening a mediation sequence by uttering a verbal bridge (“hmm”) in line 2, and a question to Akiko in lines 4 and 6. Overall, the data shows gaze to be one of the most frequently employed resources by both mediator and leaners in opening mediation sequences.

### 7.4 Types and frequency of closing moves in DA1 and DA2 sessions

Throughout the dataset, a number of key resources emerge that the participants use to bring about the successful transition from mediation sequence to task sequence talk. Table 7-2 below shows the types and frequency of micro-interactions used to close mediation insertion sequences and initiate the task sequence.
Table 7-2: Micro-interaction types identified during negotiations of closing mediation insertion sequences (all DA sessions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-interaction</th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th>DA2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative utterances</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit verbal identification of task sequence initiation point</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief pause</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of arm</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting of gaze downwards</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual gaze</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodding</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting sitting position (leaning forward)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewind gesture</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of task sequence without closing moves</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>481</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4.1. Affirmative utterances

The most frequently produced move by the mediator when negotiating the boundary between mediation sequence and initiating the task sequence was affirmative utterances. Typically, these utterances were accompanied by a shifting of gaze downwards, and nodding of the head. Excerpt 7-13 provides an example.
Excerpt 7-13 (DA1-2)

1. M: okay ((shifts gaze downwards; nods head)) (0.3) alright (.)
2. u::m I'll pick you up from the front gate
3. Ryota: ah yeah yeah (0.3) okay I- (.). I will wait (.). here

Excerpt 7-13 shows M producing two affirmative utterances in line 1, “okay” and “alright,” followed by a brief pause, before M initiates the task sequence himself in lines 1 and 2. These affirmative utterances perform a similar function to the verbal bridges discussed in section 7.1.2., signalling the transition from mediation sequence to tasks sequence. In combination with the paralinguistic resources employed in line 1 (a shifting of gaze and nodding), these serve to orient the learner to the transition, shown in line 3.

7.4.2. Explicit verbal identification of task initiation point

An important element of the closing negotiations in both the DA1 and DA2 sessions that influences how efficiently the participants transition back to the task sequence is the identification of the point from which the task should be initiated. In the SIs, M frequently specifically identifies the point at which the task should begin. Excerpt 7-14 demonstrates an efficient closing, in part due to specific verbal identification of where to begin the task.

Excerpt 7-14 (DA1-1)

1. M: =ok (.). ((shifts gaze downwards)) so let's (.). go back
2. ((makes rewinding motion with left hand; eye contact;)
3. raised eyebrows)) let's: rewind=
4. Akiko: ((looks up; nods head))
5. M: =a:nd (.). let's start again at the greeting ((mutual gaze;
6. half smile))
7. Akiko: [((nods head))]
8. M: {[so:: ((laughs))]} (0.2) hey how's it going
9. Akiko: ( (leans back in chair)) (0.2) I'm- I'm really bad.

In lines 1-2 of excerpt 7-14, M begins the closing negotiation, inviting Akiko to return to the task sequence. Akiko orients to this in line 4, nodding her head and
shifting her gaze upwards. In line 5 M verbally identifies the point at which they will begin the task again, identifying the specific stage to return to. Akiko shows her understanding with a minimal turn in line 7, simply nodding her head, and from line 8 M takes the floor and initiates the task sequence.

In contrast, excerpt 7-15 shows a less successful closing negotiation, in which the participants require a larger number of turns to successfully complete the mediation sequence.

Excerpt 7-15 (DA1-1)

1. M: is it big ((hands in front gesture, palms facing each other; nods head; maintains mutual gaze)) (0.3) so you want to be polite
2. Akiko: ((nods head in agreement))
3. M: okay ((nods head; shifts gaze downwards then back at Akiko; lengthens left arm, palm facing up in direction of Akiko)) (. ) cool (. )
4. yeah (0.2) [((laughs))] 
5. Akiko: [((laughs; looks down))] 
6. M: please continue (. ) so once more please [ask me ((extends arm towards Akiko; looks at Akiko))]
7. Akiko: [([laughs])]
8. M: [uh:] (0.3) I was wondering if,
9. Akiko: (0.3) I was wondering if you: (. ) give me some (. ) money:

In excerpt 7-15, M checks with Akiko that she wants to express politeness in her language choice in lines 1 and 2, which is met with an affirmative response in line 3. Once the object has been successfully resolved, M then begins negotiating the closing of the mediation sequence in line 4, with limited success. At first, M employs a combination of gestures, gaze and verbal utterances in line 4 to signal closing, to which Akiko appears to orient in line 5, breaking mutual gaze and laughing. In line 8, M verbally invites Akiko to initiate the task sequence, shifting his gaze to her and extending his arm. Akiko’s uncertainty in line 10 however indicates that M’s negotiating move has been unsuccessful, leading to Akiko’s rising intonation at the end of her turn. M nods his head to confirm, and from line 13 Akiko begins the task sequence, with the closing
successfully negotiated. This sequence demonstrates the need therefore to express with specificity task initiation points in role-play type tasks after a mediation sequence has interrupted proceedings.

7.4.3. Intonation and gaze

In negotiating the boundary between mediation sequence and returning to the task, participants make extensive use of intonation and gaze. In particular, gaze is used in a number of ways to orient the interlocutor to the closing of the mediation sequence. Excerpt 7-16 below shows how the shifting of gaze downwards is used as a closing move by participants.

Excerpt 7-16 (DA2-6)

1. M: okay ((looks down; nods head)) cool. (.) so:: (.) so let's rewind
2. ((makes rewinding gesture; leans back in chair)) and one more
3. time (.) from that bit.
4. Mayumi: (0.5) can I ask you a favour, ((shifts gaze to M))

In line 1 of excerpt 7-16, M produces two affirmative utterances, with the second one showing lowered intonation on the final syllable (“cool.”). Simultaneously, M shifts his gaze downwards, nodding his head. Following these moves, M explicitly identifies the task sequence initiation point in lines 1-3. After a (0.5) second pause, Mayumi initiates the task sequence, demonstrating that she has successfully oriented to the closing of the mediation sequence.

In excerpt 7-17, M uses the shifting of gaze to transition to the task sequence again, here initiating the task himself. The boundary between mediation and task sequence is marked in lines 2-5 by the shifting of M’s gaze upwards, breaking eye contact, followed by a brief pause and initiation of the task, with M taking the floor.

Excerpt 7-17 (DA1-1)

1. Akiko: or just a bye, ((maintains mutual gaze))
2. M: yeah (.) could do bye ((nods head; shifts gaze upwards, then reestablishes mutual gaze)) (.) yeah. (.) okay. (.) so let's try it ((left
4. arm outstretched towards Akiko, palm facing up)) (0.2) okay
5. ((shifts gaze downwards)) (. so here's the mo[ney.
6. Akiko: [okay] (0.3) thank you so much=

While the previous two excerpts showed mutual gaze being broken after the mediation object was satisfactorily resolved, indicating the closing of the mediation sequence, excerpt 7-18 demonstrates the use of mutual gaze to negotiate a closing.

Excerpt 7-18 (DA1-6)

1. M: ((nods head; shifts gaze downwards)) so if I'm your father (0.3)
2. family member (0.3) what do you think is: ((looks at Akiko))
3. Akiko: I just say ((looks down)) thank- thanks, ((looks at medi-
4. ator))
5. M: okay. ((nods head; establishes mutual gaze)) (0.2) alright. (0.3)
6. so let's rewind ((makes rewinding gesture))
7. Akiko: [okay.
8. M: [and] then (. {okay ((extends left arm, palm facing away from
9. Akiko; shifts gaze downwards}))} (0.2) do you wanna take a seat

In excerpt 7-18, line 5, M shows he is satisfied with Akiko’s resolution of the object of mediation, nodding his head and establishes mutual gaze with his interlocutor. Both participants orient to this as indicating closing negotiation has begun, as, after two pauses in line 5, M initiates the task sequence in line 8, taking the floor.

7.4.4. Brief pausing

A further closing move often used to mark the boundary between mediation and task is to briefly pause; this is one of the most frequently drawn upon resources in closing negotiations by participants. Excerpt 7-19 demonstrates this resource in use.
In excerpt 7-19, M produces two affirmative utterances, with lowered intonation on the second “okay.” Simultaneously, M shifts his gaze downwards while nodding, the pauses for (0.3) seconds, before taking the floor himself and initiating the task sequence.

7.4.5. Extension of arm

While less frequently employed than the use of gaze or affirmative utterances for example, M sometimes extends his arm in the direction of the learner when negotiating a closing, as shown in excerpt 7-20.

**Figure 7-5**: Mediator extending arm towards learner as part of negotiating closing boundary of mediation sequence

Excerpt 7-20 (DA2-1)

1. M: that okay (.) so let's rewind a little bit ((makes rewinding gesture; maintains mutual gaze))
2. Ema: okay
3. M: a:nd one more time ((extends arm towards Ema briefly; shifts gaze downwards)) (0.3) um okay yeah I'll- I'll try I'll- after I've fin-
6. ished I'll come in and take a look

In line 1, M produces a rewind gesture as a closing move, and in line 4 shifts his gaze downwards, while at the same time extending his arm briefly towards Ema. After a brief pause of (0.3) seconds, M takes the floor, initiating the task sequence.

7.4.6. Head movement (nodding)

Nodding of the head is a frequent implicit move employed by both the mediator and learners to signal the closing of a mediation sequence. Excerpt 7-21 below shows both participants drawing upon this resource.

Excerpt 7-21 (DA2-1)

1. M: are you busy that kind of thing okay ((nods head; gaze down-)
2. wards)) (. so: let's rewind a little bit ((makes rewinding gesture))
3. (. ) and yeah from the pre-request ((shifts gaze to Mayumi; hands
4. extended in direction of Mayumi))
5. Mayumi: ((nods slowly; shifts gaze downwards))
6. M: (0.3) yeah please (. please go ((shifts gaze downwards))

In excerpt 7-21, M employs a number of implicit moves in order to negotiate the closing, nodding his head and shifting his gaze downwards in line one, before explicitly identifying the task initiation point in line 3, extending his arm in the learner’s direction. In line 5, Mayumi also uses nodding as a closing resource, shifting her gaze downwards also at the same time. As can be seen, nodding is typically a closing move produced in conjunction with a shift of gaze, and sometimes a lowering of intonation.

7.4.7. Adjustment of sitting position (leaning forward)

While a frequently used opening move on the part of the mediator is leaning back, when closing a mediation sequence, often the participants adjust their body positions, leaning forwards towards their desk. Excerpt 7-22 provides an example.
Figure 7-6: Mediator leaning forward as part of negotiating closing boundary of mediation sequence

Excerpt 7-22 (DA1-5)

1. Akiko: something like that,
2. M: something like that (0.2) yeah ((shifts gaze downwards, nods head quickly; leans forward))
3. Akiko: hmm. ((gazes at mediator, then shifts downwards))
4. M: {okay (. ) shall we try that one more time ((gaze downwards))}
5. (. ) {from the beginning ((looks at Akiko))}

Excerpt 7-22 shows the mediator drawing upon the use of head movement to signal approval, and the altering of the position of his upper body. This can be seen in lines 2-3, in which M signals his satisfaction with Akiko’s previous turn by nodding his head quickly, shifting his gaze downwards, and leaning forward in his chair. These actions signify that M is ready to return to the task sequence, indicated by his instructions to begin the task again in lines 5-6.

7.4.8 Rewinding gesture

The rewinding gesture is solely used in the DA sessions by the mediator. It is typically accompanied by other implicit moves, and is frequently followed by an explicit verbal identification of the task initiation point. Excerpt 7-23 provides an example.
**Figure 7-7:** Mediator employing a rewind type gesture as part of negotiating closing boundary of mediation sequence

Excerpt 7-23 (DA2-2)

1. Hikaru: ahum ((shifts gaze downwards))
2. M: u::h re- let's rewind one more time ((rewind gesture; est mut gaze; ext arm towards Hikaru)) and from the request. ((shifts gaze downwards))
3. Hikaru: okay (. ) u:h u:::m okay (. ) as you know (. ) I'll go to the con-
4. cert tomorrow

In excerpt 7-23, after Hikaru signals resolution of the object of mediation, shifting his gaze downwards in line 1, M instructs the learner to “rewind” to the task sequence, simultaneously producing a rewind gesture with his hands, establishing mutual gaze, and then extending his arm. In line 5 Hikaru initiates the task sequence, indicating he has oriented to M’s closing moves.

7.4.9. Amended task sequence turn as closing move

While occurring less frequently than other closing moves, there are a number of instances in which the learner puts forward an amended task sequence utterance in response to the mediator opening a mediation sequence. The mediator shows his approval of the amended utterance by continuing with the task sequence. In this way therefore, it is the amended utterance by the learner
itself that acts as a closing move. An example of this is shown in excerpt 7-24, in which M opens the mediation sequence implicitly by shifting his gaze to Mayumi, smiling, and waiting for (2.3) seconds for Mayumi to initiate the terminal sequence of the task. Mayumi orients to these as opening moves, shown by her turn in line 2, in which, after M's waiting, she produces a terminal sequence first part, and establishes mutual gaze with M. M shows his satisfaction that the object of mediation has been successfully resolved by continuing with the task sequence in line 3.

Excerpt 7-24 (DA2-6)

1. M: mm n- no worries ((shifts gaze to Mayumi; smiles))
2. Mayumi: (2.3) see you ((est mutual gaze))
3. M: alright I'll see you later.

7.5 Development of IC competence over time- DA1 vs DA2 sessions

According to van Compernolle (2013), evidence of increasing competence in negotiating the opening and closing boundaries of mediation insertion sequences (and also orienting to the object of mediation, examined in chapter four) is both a pre-requisite for development in the target skills, and indicative of development itself. In this section therefore, the dataset will be examined for evidence of developing competence in the interlocutors' (M and the learners) ability to successfully and efficiently negotiate these boundaries between task and mediation. A benefit of developing the typology of opening and closing moves discussed above is that it identifies micro-interactions varying in degrees of explicitness. It is put forward then, that any movement from the use of explicit resources to more implicit ones is indicative of the development of interactional competence (IC) in the participants.

Table 7-3 shows the frequency of both explicit and implicit mediator-initiated opening moves in both DA1 and DA2 sessions. Explicit opening moves are defined as ones involving an explicit verbal halting of the task sequence, as described in section 9.1.1. Implicit moves include all other resources drawn upon by the participants to negotiate mediation sequence openings: extending
the arm towards the learner; the raising of eyebrows; the use of gaze; the changing of body position (such as leaning back); nodding; rewind gesturing; smiling; the tilting of the head, and waiting. Verbal strategies also categorised as implicit are the production of an elongated vowel; repeating the learner’s utterance (frequently with rising intonation on the final syllable); the use of verbal bridges, and the changing of voice volume level.

Table 7-3: Mediator-initiated opening moves, categorised in terms of explicitness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner Participants</th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th>DA2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akiko</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ema</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanako</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayumi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikaru</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryota</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-3 shows a clear pattern in terms of the frequency of explicit and implicit opening moves by the mediator. While in the DA1 sessions overall, there were approximately equal numbers of explicit and implicit openings (51%), in the DA2 sessions, there are significantly fewer explicit openings, and more frequent implicit ones (24% explicit openings). There are individual differences between the participants; Akiko’s DA2 sessions for example included similar numbers of explicit and implicit openings. In contrast, Ema, Mayumi and Hikaru all experienced far fewer explicit openings, and an increase in implicit ones compared to their DA1 sessions. Overall then, this is strong evidence of the participants showing development in terms of efficiently negotiating mediation.
sequence openings, and therefore of this aspect of their interactional competence.

Table 7-4 shows the frequency of explicit and implicit microinteractional strategies for the closing boundaries of mediation sequences. Here, explicit closing strategies comprise 19% of the DA1 total microinteractional practices for closings, compared with 22% of the DA2 closing strategies. Unlike the opening boundary practices therefore, there is no movement towards less frequent use of explicit negotiating strategies for closing mediation insertion sequences. While the negotiating of an opening boundary however is marked by the mediator offering as implicit strategies as possible to assess learner development, the closing is marked by the need to negotiate the starting point for initiating the task sequence again. Sometimes it is clear to the interlocutors where the task reinitiation point is, but others times it is not. By expliciting communicating the point in the task sequence he would like the learner to begin at, the mediator is in effect increasing the efficiency with which the closing boundary can be negotiated, avoiding the possibility of the learner initiating the task sequence at an inappropriate point. Inevitably therefore, there will be a certain amount of explicit closing negotiations in mediation sequences. Unlike the opening boundary negotiations therefore, it is difficult to draw conclusions as to the significance of the closing sequence strategies' frequencies.

**Table 7-4**: Microinteractional practices employed for closing mediation insertion sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner Participants</th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th>DA2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akiko</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ema</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanako</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayumi</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikaru</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, the opening and closing boundaries of mediation insertion sequences were analysed, and microinteractional strategies employed by the mediator and learners identified and described. In this way, typologies of opening and closing practices were presented. Further, the DA1 and DA2 stages were compared in order to assess any changes in how these boundaries were negotiated over time. It was found that, while pre-EP DA1 stage mediation sequences consisted of both explicit and implicit strategies in similar amounts, the post-EP DA2 stage saw a greater proportion of implicit microinteractional practices. This indicates that the participants were able to negotiate the boundaries between task and mediation sequence more efficiently over time, one aspect of their interactional competence.

In the next chapter (Chapter Eight), the extent to which the dynamic assessment was able to identify the specific locations of learner difficulties is examined in detail.
8.1 Introduction

An issue concerning language assessment in general, including pragmatics assessments is the focus on independent performance, rather than the diagnosis of problem areas for learners. One of the key elements of DA that gives it a unique advantage over non-dynamic assessments then is its potential for such a diagnostic capacity. By unifying instruction and assessment, DA allows both the development of learners to be examined, and can also uncover sources of difficulty for learners as well. Through dialogic interaction between the mediator and learners, knowledge or abilities that would otherwise have remained hidden can be uncovered, and the extent of learner problems diagnosed (Poehner, 2008; Ableeva, 2010).

The aim of the current chapter is to uncover specific aspects of co-constructing the requesting speech act that caused difficulty for the learner participants. This is done through both a basic quantitative approach, tabulating the occurrence and frequency of objects of mediation during the DA sessions, and through a qualitative approach, in which the dialogic interactions between the mediator and participants are analysed. In particular, the mediation sequences in the data set are focused upon, in which the mediator and learner temporarily pause the task sequence in order to address a problem that has arisen. During these sequences, the participants work together towards resolving the issue, with the mediator providing assistance designed to both assess the learner participants’ abilities, while simultaneously promoting their development. Common problems for the participants are identified and discussed in turn, with excerpts from the dataset provided to illustrate them. The data set used for this chapter consists of both the pre-enrichment programme DA1 sessions, and also the post-enrichment programme DA2 and TA sessions.

The first section addresses the participants’ problems regarding the concepts of politeness and formality. Dialogic interactions between the mediator and
participants uncovered a number of challenges for the learners in terms of these concepts. In particular, participant problems could be broken down into three key areas - conflating politeness and formality; mistaking a conceptual problem with a content problem (such as grammar-syntax), and struggling to connect language choices to the social context of the requesting scenario.

The second section of the chapter examines learner participant problems regarding the organisation of the request talk-in-interaction, such as the pre-closing and pre-requesting stages of talk, which frequently proved challenging for the learner participants. The chapter following this one (Chapter Nine) will then address the issue of learner development, examining the extent to which the learners' abilities developed and matured throughout the DA sessions.

8.2 Politeness and formality

Analysis of the data showed the concepts of politeness and formality to be among the most frequent of the objects of mediation, accounting for 43% of all objects in the DA and TA sessions. Grasping these concepts, and how they relate to their language choices and socio-cultural contexts, proved consistently challenging for all participants in both the pre-EP and post-EP sessions.

Learner participant difficulties could be placed into three general sub-categories: conflating the concepts of politeness and formality; mistaking problems as content-related rather than concept-related; and connecting the context of scenarios to their language choices. Each will be discussed in turn, with examples provided from the data set. Note that for the purposes of this analysis, the concept of politeness is viewed as the level of directness employed by the learners. Following Hudson et al (1995), the concept of formality relates to the participants' "word choice, phrasing, use of titles, and choice of verb forms" (Hudson et al, 1995, p.165).

8.2.1 Conflating politeness and formality

Throughout the DA1 session, Akiko struggles with distinguishing the concept of politeness from formality in relation to language choices. On a number of
occasions she struggles to grasp the differences between these two concepts, as in excerpt 8-1.

Excerpt 8-1 (DA1-5)

1. M: not that you've necessarily done anything wrong (.) so can I- (0.2) can
2. I borrow (.) what do you think ((est mutual gaze; left hand raised))
3. Akiko: ((shifts gaze upwards)) can I borrow (1) that's okay, (.) no
4. M: why ((maintains mutual gaze)) (0.5) why is it okay
5. Akiko: cos we're friends ((shifts gaze upwards))
6. M: hmm
7. Akiko: (1) and (.) yeah (0.2) it can be casual
8. M: (0.5) mm. ((shifts gaze upwards)) (0.2) yep (.) true ((nods head)) (0.3)
9. is it- what kind of favour (.) are you: (.) asking ((est mutual gaze))
10. Akiko: kind of, ((leans forward; shifts gaze downwards; hand on face))
11. M: mm. ((shifts gaze downwards)) (0.2) is it (.) do you think about the fa-
12. vour
13. Akiko: it's a (.) a little big
14. M: (0.3) [mm
15. Akiko: [fav]our (.) cos (0.2) I need it (.) for a couple of days
16. M: yeah ((shifts gaze downwards, then est mutual gaze)) so I can't listen
17. (.) to music for a couple of days
18. Akiko: yeah ((laughs; shifts gaze downwards)) (.) I'm really sorry
19. M: mm ((laughs)) (0.) so: (0.2) can I borrow ((shifts gaze away; uses left
20. hand in chopping motion in air, to emphasise each word)) (.) for a couple
21. of days ((est mutual gaze))
22. Akiko: could (.) I, ((shifts gaze downwards, then est mutual gaze after ut-
23. terance)) (0.3) could I borrow that (0.2) or (.) could you (.) lend me,
24. M: mm. ((shifts gaze downwards, nods slowly)) (0.2) yeah: (.) you think
25. that's more polite, ((est mutual gaze))
26. Akiko: mm yes ((maintains mutual gaze))
27. M: polite enough, ((maintains mutual gaze))
28. Akiko: ((shifts gaze upwards, then downwards)) (0.2) I think it's: (.) yes.

In lines 1 and 2 of excerpt 8-1, M draws Akiko's attention to the requesting turn and phrase "can I borrow," asking her to explain her choice of language.
Initially, in line 3, Akiko states that she believes her choice to be appropriate for the context, and when asked to provide the reason why in line 4, states that it is because “we are friends” and so “it can be casual.” However, the mediator implies that formality - the level of directness- rather than the formality of the language is the target of his intervention in line 11, in which he asks about the size of the favour; and explicitly asks Akiko about the suitability of her level of politeness in lines 24 and 25. Akiko offers an alternative possible phrasing of “could I borrow that” in lines 22-23, a more indirect requesting formulation than “can I borrow,” though no more or less casual. This mediation sequence indicates that Akiko is struggling to differentiate between expressing politeness in the L2, and expressing differing levels of formality.

Excerpt 8-2 again shows Akiko struggling to differentiate politeness from formality.

Excerpt 8-2 (DA1-6)

1. M: so: ((shifts gaze downwards; extends left arm)) (0.3) what did you say
2. when you asked me, ((est mutual gaze))
3. Akiko: (0.3) could I (.) could I borrow
4. M: mm. ((shifts gaze downwards)) (0.3) what do you think (.) is that ok
5. ((est mutual gaze; taps desk slowly with finger and thumb))
6. Akiko: (0.3) well this money is really (0.3) big money
7. M: (0.5) hmm ((shifts gaze to Akiko))
8. Akiko: (0.5) but (.) I think I was wondering if (.) is too (.) much polite to- (.)
9. to family
10. M: hmm: ((shifts gaze upwards; hand on chin)) (1) is- is ((shifts gaze downwards; extends left arm, chopping motion on desk with hand)) fami-
11. ly: (.) or friends (.) is that the only:: (.) important thing (1) is there anything
12. else that's (.) important, ((est mutual gaze))
13. Akiko: (0.3) how (.) big (0.2) that favour is
14. M: okay ((shifts gaze to Akiko; nods head))
15. Akiko: so it's really big favour:
16. M: okay ((nods))
17. Akiko: that means ((shifts gaze downwards)) (1) a: (1) I'd better use
18. ((leans back; gaze downwards)) (0.5) I was wondering if,
In a similar way to excerpt 8-1, in excerpt 8-2 the mediator draws Akiko’s attention to her request turn language choice “could I borrow” and enquires as to its appropriateness for this social context. In lines 8 and 9, Akiko explains that she thinks the phrase “I was wondering if…” would be inappropriate as it would be “too much polite to family.” As with the previous excerpt, this indicates that Akiko may be confusing politeness with being casual, due to the close social distance between her and her father. Later, in the same strategic interaction (SI), the issue of formality and politeness is directly addressed by the mediator (excerpt 8-3):

Excerpt 8-3 (DA1-6)

1. M: mm thank you so much (0.3) what do you think about it here do
2. you think it's casual or polite or
3. Akiko: ((shifts gaze upwards)) to father, (0.3) but (.) this is a really big f
4. vour,
5. M: ahum
6. Akiko: so I thought I can be poli:te,
7. M: mm ((shifts gaze away; hand on chin)) (0.4) is polite (0.2) is polite
8. and formal the same thing,
9. Akiko: a::h it's not the same. ((shifts gaze away))
10. M: a:h ok. (0.5) so can you be polite but casual, ((est mutual gaze; hand
11. near mouth, chewing nails))
12. Akiko: (2.5) how ((shifts gaze upwards; smiles))
13. M: mm
14. Akiko: (2.3) tense (0.5) oh I don't know ((est mutual gaze))
15. M: ((shifts gaze upwards)) mm (1.3) you don't know ((est mutual gaze,
16. then shifts gaze away; leans forward)) mm::: (.) so:: (.) it depends
17. how casual you want to be but  ((shifts gaze downwards)) (0.2) if you're
18.(.) talking with your father maybe quite casual because you're family
19.((est mutual gaze; raises shoulders; hands down))
20. Akiko: yes

In excerpt 8-3, after initiating the mediation sequence, M draws Akiko’s attention
to her post-request turn phrase “thank you so much,” noticing that she
frequently uses this phrase throughout the various SIs, and therefore potentially
not taking social context into account when making her lexis-grammar choices.
In lines 3, 4 and 6 Akiko explains her choice, indicating that, while she is
speaking to her father on the one hand, she chose the wording due to the large
size of the imposition, and therefore wanted to be polite. At this point, the
mediator realizes Akiko may be confusing politeness for formality, indicated by
his question in lines 7 and 8 as to whether they are the same concept. In line 9
Akiko utters “a::h” with an elongated vowel, indicating that she has realized her
confusion. However, while she realizes this, she is unsure how to express
differences in politeness and formality in the L2, shown by her question in line
11. The remainder of the mediation sequence consists of the mediator
explaining ways in which differing levels of formality might be expressed in the
L2.

8.2.2. Mistaking problems as content-related rather than concept-related

There are also instances in which the learner participants mistake the object of
mediation for a content problem, when in fact the object is formality or
politeness. This is consistent with the literature (van Compernolle, 2013). In
excerpt 8-4, the learner participant mistakenly believes the object of mediation
is related to the word form of a vocabulary item, when in fact the object is
related to the level of formality:

Excerpt 8-4 (DA1-1)

1. Ryota: u::h (0.3) l: (0.5) u::h (.) I want to: - (.) ah no (0.3) consulta- I want
to,  ((est mutual gaze)) (0.3) consultation
2. to, ((shifts gaze up))) (0.3) consultation
3. M: ((shifts gaze upwards; leaning back))
4. Ryota: consul- uh ((shifts gaze downwards)) (0.3) consult (.) [with you
In line 3 of excerpt 4, M shifts his gaze upwards and alters his body position; this is interpreted as initiating a mediation sequence by Ryota, shown by his attempt to reformulate his turn in line 4. After M waits for Ryota to continue in line 5, withholding assistance, Ryota bids for assistance in lines 6 and 7, asking for a translation of *soudan suru* (a Japanese verb phrase meaning “to consult with”). This suggests that Ryota believes the problem to lie in the word form of “consultation,” rather than the appropriateness of its level of formality. Ryota’s failure to orient to the object of mediation leads to M guiding him to the source of the problem from line 11- Ryota’s language choice of “consultation” in relation to the context of the strategic interaction scenario (talking with a close friend). It
is not until line 24 that Ryota realises the object is the formality of his language choice.

8.2.3 Conceptual understanding of language choices and social context

At times in the DA sessions, the learner participants demonstrate that they are aware of a range of lexis-grammar choices related to formality and politeness. However, throughout the DA1 SIs they struggle to connect these options to the social contexts of the interactions. In excerpt 8-5, the learner participant struggles to produce an appropriate level of formality for the context:

Excerpt 8-5 (DA1-1)

1. Ema: so (. ) may I borrow (. ) money,
2. M: a::h (. ) um ((establishes mutual gaze; outstretches left arm, palm down)) so (. ) may I (. ) borrow money,
3. Ema: uhum ((nods head; continues gaze at M))
4. M: (0.3) may I (. ) do you think (0.3) is that okay
5. Ema: eh ((Japanese particle indicating uncertainty; shifts gaze up- wards))
6. M: ((laughs)) I'll be doing this a lot ((laughs)) a lot of questions today (.)
7. may I borrow money (. ) do you think that's okay or not okay ((shifts gaze to Ema))
8. Ema: (0.3) maybe not I don't know
9. M: hmm why not
10. Ema: eh ((Japanese particle indicating uncertainty)) (3) ((establishes mutual gaze)) (1) I don’t know
11. M: it's okay (. ) don't worry ((shifts gaze downwards)) (0.3) may I: ((shifts gaze upwards)) (0.3) does that sound (. ) so we're friends ((establishes mutual gaze))
13. M: ((shifts gaze upwards)) may I borrow some money (0.3) may I: (. ) is that casual or:: ((looks at Ema))
14. Ema: ((shifts gaze upwards; smiles)) ah
15. M: formal [what do you
16. Ema: [formal
24. M: formal okay (.) so::: ((tilts head slightly; maintains mutual gaze))
25. Ema: can I,

Excerpt 8-5 is taken from a SI in which the learner participant requests a loan of some money from a friend. In lines 2 and 3, M repeats Ema’s utterance in line 1 with rising intonation. Ema interprets this as initiating a mediation sequence, as evidenced by her affirmative utterance and mutual gaze in line 4. When M directly asks Ema if she thinks the phrase “may I” to be appropriate for the situation, she expresses uncertainty in line 6, and again in line 11. It is not until M explicitly identifies the object in lines 19, 20 and 22 that Ema successfully orients to the object (formality), identifying he original request formulation of “may I” as being formal. This interaction shows that the learner does not appear to be taking into consideration the social context when making her language choices, or is unsure how the context affects language.

In excerpt 8-6, Ema struggles to connect the social context to the level of politeness of her request turn:

Excerpt 8-6 (DA1-6)

1. M: (2.5) is that okay, (0.3) I want to borrow money ((moves right hand in chopping motion across desk))
2. Ema: (2.5) no ((est mutual gaze))
3. M: why not ((smiles; maintain gaze))
4. Ema: ((laughs)) (0.5) u:h (12) u:m ((looking down))
5. M: is it ((looks straight ahead)) (0.5) is it (0.3) polite, ((shifts gaze to Ema))
6. Ema)
7. Ema: not polite ((shifts gaze to M)
8. M: mm ((nods head slowly)) (0.3) why not ((est mutual gaze)) (.) why is it not polite
9. Ema: because I: ask- (.) asking, ((shifts gaze downwards, then at M))
10. M: mm ((looks straight ahead)) I want to ((shifts gaze to Ema)) does it
11. sound strong or soft
12. Ema: strong
13. M: maybe quite strong (0.5) so how could you: ask: (.) more softly ((tilts head slightly; smiles; maintains mutual gaze)) more politely
17. Ema: I'd like to borrow, ((shifts gaze downwards briefly, then shifts gaze back to M))
18. M: that would be softer ((shifts gaze upwards, then back at Ema; nods head)) mm. (0.3) and then asking, (. ask me
19. Ema: money (. eh ((maintains mutual gaze; Japanese particle indicating uncertainty))
20. M: right (. okay (. I'm your dad again now ((smiles; est mutual gaze))
21. Ema: ((laughs))
22. M: and then ((shifts gaze downwards)) (3) mm
23. M: (1.5) so you want to ask me ((est mutual gaze)) (0.3) for money (.)
24. okay so ask me ((nods head; smiles)) (. for money (. yeah
25. Ema: (0.3) ah (. I'd like to 81) borrow money, (. so uh- (0.3) can you- (.)
26. um ((shifts gaze downwards)) (2.5) ah (2.5)
27. M: can you, ((looks at Ema))
28. Ema: ((looks at M; laughs)) (0.3) eh ((Japanese particle indicating uncertainty; shifts gaze upwards, then down))
29. M: (1.5) is that polite,
30. Ema: (1.5) no
31. M: mm so (. more polite ((est mutual gaze))
32. Ema: ((shifts gaze downwards)) (2)
33. M: give me money ((left hand raised just above desk)) (. can you give
34. me money ((raises hand higher)) (0.3) ((raises hand higher; est mutual gaze; raises eyebrows)) (1) give me money is not polite at all
35. Ema: mm
36. M: can you give me money mm ((raises eyebrows)) a bit more ((moves hand in air)) more polite
37. Ema: eh ((Japanese particle indicating uncertainty)) could you, ((main- tain mutual gaze))
38. M: ((nods head))
39. Ema: could you,
In excerpt 8-6, M questions Ema in line 1 about the appropriateness of her request turn (“I want to borrow money”). While she can recognise that there is a problem with her request in line 3, she is unable to identify the nature of the object of mediation until M draws her attention to her level of politeness in line 6. With assistance from M, Ema is able to establish that her turn was not polite and “strong.” From lines 17 to 50, with prompting from M, she then is able to produce a number of alternative request formulations, including “I’d like to,” “can you,” and “could you.” This indicates that the learner participant has knowledge of a variety of request formulations, but is struggling to understand how they relate to social context.

8.3 Organisation of talk-in-interaction

8.3.1 Pre-pre/pre-requesting

One of the elements of a typical request interaction structure that the learner participants frequently struggle with in the DA sessions is the pre-pre and pre-requesting stages. In excerpt 8-7, Akiko struggles to orient to pre-requesting as the object of the mediation.

In excerpt 8-7, the mediator initiates the mediation sequence in line 1, and in lines 4-5 draws her attention to the pre-requesting stage of the conversation, in which she produces an explanation of her situation (losing her wallet). The mediator asks as to whether there is anything else she could say before this (a pre-pre, or pre-request checks of availability or ability). The long pause in line 6 indicates that Akiko is uncertain, leading to the mediator again locating the stage of the conversation under scrutiny in lines 7-10. Akiko’s laughing in line 13 and offering of a possible answer “please” in line 18, shows that she is unsure of the object, and thinks it might be related to her level of politeness. The mediator then offers more explicit assistance in line 19, hinting that the object is related to checking for information. This more explicit mediation leads to Akiko orienting to the object (pre-requesting) in line 21-22, indicated by her “a::h” exclamation, with an elongated vowel sound.
Excerpt 8-7 (DA1-1)

1. M: so: (0.4) first you: (0.3) explained ((both hands raised, palms facing away from Akiko))
2. Akiko: ((nods head))
3. M: a like (. ) I've lost my wallet (0.2) before that (0.2) is there anything else (0.3) you could say,
4. Akiko: ((strokes chin; shifts gaze upwards)) (2.5) before I lost my wallet, (0.2) and then you said actually I'm really bad (0.5) and then ((makes eye contact; teeth on lower lip; makes forward gesture with upper body and hands)) [a-]
5. Akiko: [be]cause,
6. M: ((shifts gaze upwards)) [mm::
7. Akiko: [((laughs))]
8. M: [((laughs))] (1) so: (0.5) when you're (.) asking (.) a fa-
9. vour ( . ) from someone (1) before you: ask (0.2) is there anything else
10. ((uses left hand to make a chopping motion on the desk)) (1) you [could do]
11. Akiko: [please,]
12. M: mm: (0.5) ((makes sucking teeth sound) so checking ( . ) something ( . )
13. maybe,
14. Akiko: a::h (0.3) do you have, (1) do you have, ((places closed hand against mouth)) ( . ) money,
15. M: ((makes teeth sucking sound; shifts gaze upwards; left hand in chopping position on desk))
16. Akiko: [((laughs))]
17. M: [a::h] maybe ((shifts gaze upwards)) do you have money (. ) o:r ( . )
18. anything else, ( . ) that I have, ( . ) maybe:
19. Akiko: can I ask you a favour,

Throughout the DA1 sessions, the learner participants often explain their situations as a type of pre-request, preparing the ground for the request (this is also seen in the participants' non-dynamic performances, discussed in an earlier chapter). However, they do not often produce pre-pres, or other types of pre-requesting, such as the checking of availability or ability. Dialogic
interactions between the mediator and the learners however, show that, often, they do have knowledge of these alternatives, even if their ability to control and produce them “online” has not yet matured.

Excerpt 8-8 below offers an example of this. In the talk immediately preceding this excerpt, Hanako had begun explaining her situation to M, laying the groundwork for her upcoming request turn. M then initiates the mediation sequence. In lines 1-4, M repeats Hanako’s earlier greeting utterance, asking if there is anything else she could say after her greeting turn. In line 5, Hanako is able to successfully orient to the object of mediation, identifying a pre-pre as an option she could have produced before her explanation. She is also able to provide a simple rationale for using such a pre-pre. This rationale is perhaps closer to a “rule of thumb” (Negueruela, 2008) than a conceptual understanding of pre-requesting, but nonetheless shows that she has some awareness of pre-pres’ function in talk. Through this mediation sequence then, a significantly more nuanced view of Hanako’s understanding and control of this important stage of talk can be seen, a view that could not have been seen through analysis of only her non-dynamic, independent performance.

Excerpt 8-8 (DA1-1)

1. M: ((shifts gaze downwards)) so: let's rewind ((rewind gesture)) (0.3) so
2. hi ((shifts gaze upwards)) I say hi Hanako (0.5) after that ((est mut gaze;
3. places hand in chopping position on table)) (0.5) anything else ((tilts
4. head))
5. Hanako: could you do me a favour, ((maintains mut gaze))
6. M: mm could do okay ((nods head; both hands at chest level; eyebrows
7. raised)) (0.3) why (. ) why would you ask that
8. Hanako: u:h like ((shifts gaze downwards)) (0.7) the- (. ) I want to s- say
9. (0.5) something ((looks straight ahead)) (. ) favour, ((est mut gaze))
10. M: ahem
11.Hanako: to my friends
12.M: yeah
13.Hanako: think ((shifts gaze downwards))(0.5) un to ((Japanese particles))
14.(0.7) um so: the beginning of the favour like I ((est mut gaze)) (0.3) be-
15. ginning before I ((shifts gaze upwards)) I said I lost my wallet ((est mut
16. (gaze))
17. M: m[m:
18. Hanako: [like] (1) no- yeah I want to my friends to pay (.) attention to me
19. ((est mut gaze))
20. M: okay [okay

8.3.2 Post-requesting

Though less frequently than pre-requesting, on a number of occasions mediation sequences were initiated with *post-requesting* as the object. A post-request stage, following the granting or refusing of the request turn, is a common stage in talk, often used to show appreciation for example, in cases where a request is granted. A number of times however in both the DA and NDA sessions, after the learner participant produced their request turn, and M had granted the request, a post-request stage was not apparent in the talk. While the NDA sessions, in which the learners are not assisted through mediation, it is difficult to know the extent of this issue, the DA mediation sequences offer an opportunity to assess learners’ knowledge of the post-request stage. Excerpt 8-9 below offers an example of this.

Excerpt 8-9 (DA2-1)

1. Ema: okay
2. M: (0.3) ((shifts gaze downwards)) so:: (.) before that ((est mutual gaze;
3. makes rewinding gesture)) do you say anything else, so: (.) did I grant
4. or refuse (.) the request ((maintains mutual gaze))
5. Ema: grant ((maintains mutual gaze))
6. M: okay ((shifts gaze downwards)) (.) and so after I grant it (0.3) some-
7. times (.) how- how would you respond ((est mutual gaze))
8. Ema: ah ((smiles; looks straight ahead)) (0.3) thank you ((est mutual
gaze))
9. M: a:h okay (. ) like a post-request kind of (. ) so a:h thank you or ((con-
10. tinues gazing at Ema))
12. Ema: yeah ((laughs))
13. M: or sorry
14. Ema: yeah
15. M: ((laughs)) (0.3) so: in this situation (.) do you need ((est mutual gaze))
16. Ema: yes

In lines 2-4 of excerpt 8-9, M guides Ema to the location of the object of mediation, before asking Ema what a typical response to the granting of a request might be in lines 6 and 7. Ema then successfully orients to the object as relating to a post-request stage, shown by her “ah” utterance and smiling in line 8. She then proceeds to produce a post-request utterance signifying her appreciation of the request being granted. Ema follows this by asserting that a post-request is necessary for that role-play scenario in line 17. This interaction between M and the learner shows that, while she did not initially produce a post-request in the task sequence, with mediation from M, she was able to successfully orient to the object, and displayed some knowledge of an appropriate post-request. Ema’s ability to produce a post-request independently may not yet be fully matured and under control, but it is certainly in the process of maturing.

8.3.3 Pre-closing

In a number of SIs, the learners struggled to produce a pre-closing stage turn, instead moving from the post-request stage directly to a terminal sequence. An example of this is shown in excerpt 8-10, in which, despite M offering implicit mediation in the form of waiting, adjusting his head position and producing a prompt in lines 1-3, the learner participant produces a terminal sequence first turn in line 5. Her uncertainty as to what the object of mediation is is shown by the rising intonation of her turn, and pause.

Excerpt 8-10 (DA1-1)

1. M: alright. (0.5)((shifts gaze downwards; then shifts gaze upwards, establishe... (0.2) ((estabishes mutual gaze; tilts head slightly to right)) after that,
2. Akiko: ((maintains mutual gaze; then after end of mediator’s turn, shifts gaze upwards)) (0.4) goodbye, ((extends right arm, palm down towards mediator))
3. (continues after))
This frequent omission of the pre-closing stage, typical in authentic talk, is also seen in the NDA sessions as well. The mediation sequences of the DA sessions however, offer an insight into the learners’ awareness and understanding of pre-closings that the NDA data set does not. In excerpt 8-11 below, Hanako follows an earlier post-request turn by immediately initiating a terminal sequence in line 3. M initiates a mediation sequence in line 4, evidenced by the pause, slow nodding and the maintenance of mutual gaze. Hanako responds to this as a mediation sequence opening in line 5, but fails to orient to the object, leading to M guiding her to the location of the issue in line 8. Hanako continues to struggle to orient to the object however, leading to a more explicit mediating move in line 16, in which M identifies pre-closing as the object. This prompts Hanako to produce “I have to go: for next class,” a type of pre-closing first turn, signifying the upcoming terminal sequence. While therefore, Hanako struggles to orient to the object in this sequence, once she does orient to it, she displays knowledge of pre-closing realisations, something that was not evident in the prior task sequence, in which she moved directly from post-requesting to the terminal sequence. It can be seen therefore, that Hanako has some conceptual understanding of pre-closings here, even though she does not yet have full control over producing them “online.”

Excerpt 8-11 (DA2-7)

1. M: mm:: ((shifts gaze to Hanako; nods; head resting on hand, elbow on desk))
2.  
3. Hanako: so (. ) bye see you- see you later ((mut gaze))
4. M: (0.3) ahum ((nods slowly; mut gaze)) (0.3) mm:,
5. Hanako: mm: ((mut gaze; smiles))
6. M: ([(laughs]])
7. Hanako: [(laughs; gaze down))]
8. M: anything before that, ((maintains gaze and pose)) maybe
9. Hanako: before see you later ((rubs face)) I ask other friends
10. M: [mm
11. Hanako: [to:] whether (1) I ask other friends
12. M: yeah a-
13. Hanako: thank you,
14. M: after that,
15. Hanako: ((mut gaze))
16. M: but before leave-taking ((same gaze and pose)) (0.7) pre-closing or anything
17. Hanako: o:h ((gaze down)) (3) okay I have to go (.) for- uh ((mut gaze))
18. M: ((nods)) (0.5) mm
19. Hanako: I have to go: for next class ((mut gaze))
20. M: (0.5) something like that yeah okay ((gaze down)) okay yeah so let's try
21. ((mut gaze; ext arm to Hanako; smiles; gaze down))
22. Hanako: mm
23. M: okay ((low volume))
24. Hanako: (0.3) I have- (0.3) o:h (.) thank you (.) I- uh (.) okay I have to go
25. next class

A further characteristic of some learner participant performances is an uncertainty as to how to proceed once the post-request stage is completed. In authentic talk, shorter turns with intonation falling on the last syllable can signal that the conversation is coming to a close. However, in some task sequences, the learner participants do not respond to this shortening of turns, instead displaying uncertainty as to how to proceed. Again however, dialogic interaction during mediation sequences, as in excerpt 8-12 below, provides greater insight into the learners' understanding. In excerpt 8-12, M initiates the mediation sequence in line 2, drawing Ryota's attention to the length of the turns in lines 3-4 and 6. When questioned as to what this may signify, Ryota offers firstly a content-related answer (line 15), before orienting to the object successfully in line 18, showing an awareness of shortening turns as potentially signifying a closing opportunity in the talk. This shows the learner has some level of understanding of the object of mediation, even if he is unsure as to how a pre-closing stage can be realised in conversation.

Excerpt 8-12 (DA1-3)

1. Ryota: (0.5) a::h (1)
2. M: ((ext arm towards Ryota; est mutual gaze)) I'll stop you there (.) so (.)
3. listen to what I'm saying ((moves hand near mouth in rolling gesture; maintains mut gaze)) (0.7) my:- my- (.) my turns
4. Ryota: yeah
6. M: are they long now ((hands in air, wide distance between palms)) (.)
7. or are they short ((brings closer together)) am I giving you long answers
8. or short answers
9. Ryota: short, ((est mut gaze))
10. M: ((nods head)) mm no (.) yes (.) right
11. Ryota: ah yeah yeah
12. M: okay (0.5) what does that mean ((furrow brow, maintains mut gaze))
13. why- why am I just giving you very short answers now (.) what does that
14. mean
15. Ryota: maybe (1.5) uh maybe you don't want to extend the deadline
16. ((looks straight ahead, then shifts gaze to M))
17. M: no I don't that's true (.) anything else,
18. Ryota: or ((looks straight ahead)) (0.5) a:h (.) you want to finish the con-
19. versation ((est but gaze))
20. M: ((nods head)) right right right (.) okay (.)

### 8.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, the extent to which DA was able to locate the specific locations of learner difficulties in the transcript data was investigated. Analysis uncovered a number of key problems for learners that arose during the DA sessions. Learners found the concepts of politeness and formality challenging, as well as organising the talk. In terms of organisation, the participants particularly struggled with the pre-requesting stage of request-based interaction, and the pre-closing stage.

In the next chapter (Chapter Nine), learner development will be assessed by analysing the efficiency with which they orient to and resolve the objects of mediation in the DA and TA stages of the study.
Chapter Nine

Tracking Learner Development Through Mediation Sequences

9.1 Introduction

This study assesses learner development in a number of ways. Chapter Six examined learner-participants’ non-dynamic (independent) performances, both pre and post-treatment. In this manner, it is possible to gauge the participants’ actual level of development, or zone of actual development (ZAD) at these two points in time. Chapter Seven examined the various ways in which the boundaries between task and mediation sequences in DA sessions were negotiated by the mediator and learner-participants. These negotiating moves employed in the opening and closing of mediation sequences were categorised in terms of their level of explicitness, with employment of increasingly implicit moves seen as indicating learners’ developing abilities to recognise and negotiate these boundaries. For van Compernolle (2013), such efficiency (in terms of fewer and less explicit negotiating strategies) is indicative of increasing interactional competence.

The current chapter focuses on the dialogic interactions within the mediation sequences, once the openings have been negotiated, and prior to the closing and reinitiating of the task sequence. While Chapter Seven was concerned with the learners’ ability to orient to the opening and closing of a mediation sequence, the purpose of this chapter is to examine the extent to which the learners developed those elements of their interactional competence (IC) related to their ability to orient to the objects of mediation, and resolve the object successfully.

To this end, a microgenetic analytic approach is taken, in which the dialogic interactions between the mediator and learner-participants are closely examined for evidence of development. In SCT terms, development here is defined as the movement within a learner’s ZPD, from dependent, assisted performance, towards the ability to perform without mediation. This movement
therefore, from requiring explicit forms of mediation to more implicit ones, is seen as evidence of this development.

In the field of second language learning, two prominent typologies of mediating moves have been put forward, by Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) (see Figure 9-1), and Poehner (2005) (see Figure 9-2). Importantly, both arose from a grounded analysis of their respective data, and are thus descriptive, rather than prescriptive in nature. Both typologies are organised in terms of degrees of explicitness or directness, following the organising principle of Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994), and also that of Poehner (2005). The current study’s analysis is informed by these typologies, and also by the work of van Compernolle, who puts forward that learners’ IC is related to both the efficiency with which they can orient to the object of mediation, and also the efficiency with which it is resolved (as well as negotiating the boundaries between sequences, discussed in Chapter Two). In coding the current data set therefore, a coding scheme was needed that would reflect both of these elements of IC (orientation to, and resolution of, the object of mediation).

**Figure 9-1:** Regulatory scale- implicit (strategic) to explicit (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994: 471)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.</td>
<td>Tutor asks the learner to read, find the errors, and correct them independently, prior to the tutorial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Construction of a “collaborative frame” prompted by the presence of the tutor as a potential dialogic partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Prompted or focused reading of the sentence that contains the error by the learner or the tutor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Tutor indicates that something may be wrong in a segment (e.g., sentence, clause, line)- “is there anything wrong in this sentence?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Tutor rejects unsuccessful attempts at recognising the error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tutor narrows down the location of the error (e.g., tutor repeats or points to the specific segment which contains the error).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Tutor indicates the nature of the error, but does not identify the error (e.g., “There is something with the tense marking here.”).

7. Tutor identifies the error (“You can’t use an auxiliary here”).

8. Tutor rejects learner’s unsuccessful attempts at correcting error.

9. Tutor provides clues to help the learner arrive at the correct form (e.g., “It is not really past but something that is still going on”).

10. Tutor provides the correct form.

11. Tutor provides some explanation for use of the correct form.

12. Tutor provides examples of the correct pattern when other forms of help fail to produce an appropriate responsive action.

**Figure 9-2: Mediation Typology (Poehner, 2005:160)**

1. Helping Move Narration Along
2. Accepting Response
3. Request for Repetition
4. Request for Verification
5. Reminder of Directions
6. Request for Reparation
7. Identifying Specific Site of Error
8. Specifying Error
9. Metalinguistic Clues
10. Translation
11. Providing Example or Illustration
12. Offering a choice
13. Providing Correct Response
14. Providing Explanation
15. Asking for explanation
Figure 9-3: “Five general levels of transition from intermental to intramental functioning” (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994: 470)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The learner is not able to notice, or correct the error, even with intervention from the tutor.”</td>
<td>“The learner is able to notice the error, but cannot correct it, even with intervention.”</td>
<td>“The learner is able to notice and correct an error, but only under other-regulation.”</td>
<td>“The learner notices and corrects an error with minimal, or no obvious feedback from the tutor and begins to assume full responsibility for error correction.”</td>
<td>The learner becomes more consistent in using the target structure correctly in all contexts.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In developing a suitable and practical coding scheme that would allow learner development within the ZPD to be tracked, an inter-rater reliability check was carried out, involving both the author as primary investigator (PI), and a second rater. A detailed discussion of this check is provided in Chapter Seven. The refined coding scheme is shown in Figure 9-4, which is the result of the inter-rater reliability check.

Figure 9-4: Coding scheme used for tracking learner-participant development in DA1, DA2 and TA mediation sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifying the object</th>
<th>Resolving the object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unable to notice or identify the object without explicit assistance from M.</td>
<td>1. Unable to resolve the object without explicit assistance from M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Able to notice and identify the object with implicit assistance from M.</td>
<td>2. Able to resolve the object with implicit assistance from M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Able to notice and identify the object with no assistance required</td>
<td>3. Able to resolve the object with no assistance required from M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the coding scheme allows learners’ development to be seen however, a qualitative analysis is also important to assess how the learners’ conceptual understanding of the target concepts developed over time. This is because the coding scheme does not capture the ways in which the learners take control of mediation sequences, or the learners' verbalisations regarding the target concepts. In order to take these important aspects of development into account, learners’ verbalisations of their understanding and knowledge are assessed. These verbalisations, in which the learners explain their reasoning for their language choices, their understanding of the target concept, or their knowledge of relevant linguistic realisations of the object of mediation, are seen as significant indicators of development (Poehner, 2005; Negueruela, 2003). The extent to which learners become pro-active participants in mediation sequences is also examined. Initiating mediation sequences themselves, explicitly asking for help, and taking responsibility for resolving objects of mediation all offer evidence of learners taking increasing control of the interactions, and of their developing IC.

Section 9.2 presents a table summary of the overall coding results, aggregating all object types and scores. Results for each participant are shown, allowing their development to be seen in regards to specific objects of mediation, and also general levels of development over time. Section 9.3 breaks down the results into object type, with median scores and frequency distributions shown. For this section, the four most frequently occurring objects are focused upon, as this allows a more complete comparison of mediation across pre and post-EP stages. As discussed above however, the coding scheme by itself does not necessarily capture all of the elements of learner development. Quantitative analysis of each object type therefore is complemented by a microgenetic, qualitative analysis of the transcript data. In this way, a rich, detailed view of learner development can be seen that provides insights into how the learners responded to the DA mediation and enrichment programme. When appropriate, sequences in which participants verbalised their understanding of an object are used to demonstrate their level of conceptual understanding or knowledge.
Finally, section 9.4 provides a summary of the development of each individual participant, discussing particular areas of interest or change for each learner.

9.2 Aggregated Data Analysis of overall central tendencies and frequency distributions in the DA1, DA2 and TA stages.

Table 9-1 shows the total number of objects of mediation for each participant, the total scores, based on the coding scheme in Figure 9-4, and the median central tendencies for each participant, and in aggregate. The total scores are calculated by combining both the scores assigned for orienting to the objects of mediation, and the scores assigned to successful object resolution. An object assigned a coding of “2-1” for example, would have a total score of 3. The lowest possible score is 2, in which the learner struggles to both orient to, and resolve the object. The highest possible score is 6, in which the learner is able to both orient to the object and resolve it without requiring any assistance from the mediator. The purpose of the coding scheme and this table is to show movement within the learners' ZPDs, and of the overall ZPD movement in aggregate. The minimum median score is "2," in which both identification of the object and resolution of the object are coded as "1" each (and so a combined total of 2), and the maximum median score is "6" (in which both coding categories are coded as a "3," making a combined total of 6). The higher the median score therefore, the closer the learner is to self-regulation of the object of mediation.
Table 9-1: Total number of objects of mediation, total scores, and the median scores, both for each participant and in aggregate (scores shown are the combined totals of both coding scheme categories- identification of object and object resolution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th></th>
<th>DA2</th>
<th></th>
<th>TA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Obs</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>No. Obs</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>No. Obs</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akiko</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ema</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanako</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayumi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryota</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikaru</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=6 Note: The above data do not include mediation sequences categorised as “verbalisation,” or mediation sequences categorised as “other” (i.e. related to grammar or paralinguistic features).

It should be noted that the data exclude sequences in which the object was not a “target” object, such as being related to grammatical errors, or paralinguistic features of the task performance. It also excludes verbalisation mediation sequences, in which the task is interrupted specifically to probe learner-participants’ conceptual understanding or awareness, rather than to address infelicitous pragmatic utterances.

It is also important to note that, for the purposes of this chapter’s analysis, the focus of the assessment of development is within mediation sequences, rather than looking at the numbers of mediation sequences the learners engaged in across the stages. That is to say, development was tracked by examining the data with the mediation insertion sequence talk, assessing the efficiency with which the learners oriented to and resolved the objects. While the numbers of mediation sequences in the DA1, DA2 and TA stages are provided in the tables, comparing the frequency of mediation sequences (between DA1 and DA2 for example) is not put forward as necessarily being indicative of development. While on the face of it, it may seem that engaging in fewer such sequences post-EP when compared with pre-EP SIs would be indicative of improvement.
(with the learners requiring fewer interventions from the mediator), this may not necessarily be the case.

For example, Table 9-1 shows Ema engaging in 13 mediation sequences in DA1, as opposed to Akiko’s 20. However, this is not indicative of Ema demonstrating greater interactional competence and control over the target objects. Rather, Ema frequently struggled with the SI tasks throughout the pre-EP NDA and DA sessions. Following interactionist DA methodology, it is the mediator’s responsibility to be sensitive to the particular needs of each individual learner. In Ema’s case, it is put forward that the lower number of mediation sequences can be attributed to the mediator not wishing to overload the learner with too many objects of mediation at a stage when she was struggling with the language tasks.

Further, higher numbers of mediation sequences might also be due to a learner attempting more complex task sequence talk, and therefore requiring more mediation to bring the SIs to successful conclusions. Less complex task talk therefore might lead to fewer mediation sequences, but it could not be said this was necessarily indicative of a learner demonstrating greater control of the target concepts. For these reasons therefore, the frequency of mediation sequences is not necessarily reliable as a means of tracking development. Instead, this chapter focuses on the interactions within mediation sequences, orienting to and resolving the objects of mediation.

It can be seen that the total number of objects of mediation are similar for both the DA1 sessions and the DA2 sessions. The median score of 3 for the DA1 stage overall, indicates that the strategic interaction (SI) tasks were generally challenging, with the participants frequently requiring relatively explicit assistance from the mediator. In contrast, the median score for the DA2 stage was 4, providing evidence of an overall movement within the ZPDs of the participants away from other-regulation, and towards self-regulation. It also indicates however, that the learners still typically required implicit assistance to both orient to and resolve the objects of mediation.

The transfer assessment stage (TA) comprised of three SIs, carried out immediately after the DA2 stage. These TA SIs were designed to assess and
promote the learners’ ability to adapt and apply their developing understanding to novel situations, differing in challenging ways to the SIs found in the DA sessions. The first TA SI was designed as a “near” transfer task, in which the task, while novel, was still clearly related to the type of SIs in the DA stages. The second TA SI was a “medium” transfer task, in which the learners were required to produce two requests in the same SI, each with differing contextual information to take into account. The final TA SI was a “far” transfer task, in which the learners were required to co-construct a different speech act altogether from requesting (inviting). The overall number of objects for the TA stage was significantly lower, reflecting the small number of SIs. With the proviso then of there being fewer objects of mediation to assess, the median score of 4 indicates that the development seen in the DA2 stage was maintained in the TA stage.

Within these overall trends, there is considerable variation among the participants, as can be seen in Table 9-1. This indicates that the participants have varying levels of development, and responded to mediation and the enrichment programme (EP) in differing ways. Each participant will be discussed in turn, in section 11.4.

Figures 9-5, 9-6 and 9-7 show the overall distribution of scores in the DA1 (Figure 9-5), DA2 (Figure 9-6) and TA (Figure 9-7) stages. A clear trend can be seen, with a general increase in the frequency of higher scores in the post-EP DA2 and TA stages, compared with the DA1 stage. While in the DA1 sessions the most frequent score was 2 (the lowest possible), in the DA2 sessions, there was a movement towards scores of 3, 4 and 5, with 4 being the most frequent. This trend continues in the TA stage, with scores of 4 and 5 being the most frequent among the participants. The distribution of scores is more even in the DA2 and TA stages, indicating a variation in performances of the participants, and a movement away from the relatively homogenous scores of DA1, to more heterogeneous scores in the post-EP stages.
**Figure 9-5:** Frequency distribution of scores in DA1 sessions among all participants

Note: Developmental scores combine scores given for both orientation to the objects of mediation, and also for resolution of the objects of mediation.

**Figure 9-6:** Frequency distribution of scores in DA2 sessions among all participants
9.3. Analysis of central tendencies, frequency distributions for specific objects of mediation, and microgenetic analysis

In this section, the specific objects of mediation identified and discussed in the previous chapter (Chapter Eight) are examined. Specifically, the four most frequently occurring objects in the data are focused upon—politeness, formality, pre-requesting, and pre-closing. Analysis is approached in two ways: there is a basic quantitative analysis based on the coding scheme in Figure 9-4, and a microgenetic analysis of the data. The quantitative analysis provides the median scores of the six participants for each object of mediation, and the frequency distribution of scores as well. The microgenetic analytic approach examines the data qualitatively, analysing the interactions between the mediator and learners closely for evidence of development.

9.3.1 Formality
Table 9-2: Aggregated data showing the total number of mediation sequences in which the object is “formality”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akiko</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ema</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanako</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayumi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikaru</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9-2 shows the number of objects, overall scores and median central tendencies for the object of formality. The table shows an overall movement in development among the participants, with the DA1 stage median score of 2 contrasting with the median scores of 3 for both post-EP stages. The low scores overall suggest that the participants particularly struggled with the concept of formality, borne out by a micro genetic analysis of the data. Qualitative analysis also supports the results in Table 9-2 however, providing evidence of movement towards self-regulation in the participants’ ZPDs (see section 11.2.2.3. below).

Figures 9-8, 9-9 and 9-10 show the distribution of scores for formality. In the DA1 stage, there is a clear grouping of lower scores, with the lowest possible score the most frequent. The DA2 stage sees a clear movement towards higher scores, indicating less explicit assistance was necessary to orient and resolve the objects. The TA stage shows a spread of scores, indicating variation in the performances of participants.
**Figure 9-8:** Frequency distribution of scores in DA1 sessions among all participants for “formality”

**Figure 9-9:** Frequency distribution of scores in DA2 sessions among all participants for “formality”
9.3.1.1 Microgenetic analysis of learner development relating to formality.

While the coding scheme provides insight into the general movement of learners within their respective ZPDs, a microgenetic analysis provides a more granular view of learner development. A close, microgenetic analysis of the dialogic interactions between the mediator and participants allows a more nuanced assessment, and presents further insight into the extent of learner development, uncovering the extent of conceptual understanding, and the ability or willingness to assume control of the interaction.

The median scores and frequency distribution histograms above show a general movement from other-regulation, towards self-regulation- albeit with learner-participants still requiring extensive mediation in order to orient and resolve objects. This insight into learner development is supported by a close analysis of the transcript data. The following excerpts focus on the participant “Akiko,” and show evidence of increased interactional competence (IC), more efficiently orienting to the objects of mediation, and resolving the mediation sequences with increasing efficiency also. This mirrors the findings from the quantitative analysis shown in Table 9-2, in which Akiko's median score moved from "2" in the DA1 stage to "4" in the DA2 stage. She also provides evidence
of developing conceptual understanding of the concept of formality, and willingness to take some control of mediation sequences. This development is evident both within the first DA1 session, and also across sessions, showing increased IC and control of the target concept.

Initially, in the DA1 stage SIs, Akiko struggles to both orient to, and resolve the object of formality, as shown in Excerpt 9-1. In initially negotiating the object, M repeats Akiko’s utterance in line 2, locating the part of the task sequence that is of interest, before asking a general question asking her what she thinks about it. Akiko responds by shifting her gaze downward and expressing her lack of knowledge of alternative phrases. This response by Akiko indicates that she is thinking in terms of content or meaning, rather than the concept of formality, or may be thinking in terms of rules of thumb (the frequency with which she employs this particular closing in both DA and NDA sessions is indicative of this). In the following turn, M provides more explicit mediation, explicitly drawing Akiko’s attention to the issue of formality in lines 6-9. Akiko identifies her task closing turn as being casual, but states that she does not know any other, less casual, closings. When M prompts her to attempt a more informal closing in lines 15-18, Akiko again states that she does not know, and bids for assistance, indicated by the rising intonation at the end of her turn, and the establishment of mutual gaze in line 21. M then provides explicit assistance, producing a possible, more formal alternative closing in lines 22 and 23, and again in lines 25-26. In this excerpt therefore, we can see Akiko firstly struggling to orient to the object of mediation, requiring M to provide relatively explicit assistance in identifying formality as the focus of attention. She then is unable to self-correct, leading to M providing explicit help in the form of providing example closings. It is only at this point that the participants are able to successfully close the mediation sequence.

Excerpt 9-1 (DA1-3)

1. Akiko: ((looks up)) see you, ((maintains mutual gaze))
2. M: ((looks up)) yeah see you, ((establishes mutual gaze)) see
3. you. (.) what do you think (.) is that
4. Akiko: ((smiles)) ((crosses arms; looks down)) I don't know any
5. other
7. ok for like here like ELI style (0.3) {what would you: (looks up)}(.)
8. so {see you do you that's casual or polite or .) what do you think
9. (looks at Akiko)}
10. Akiko: {casual;, (leaning back in chair; arms crossed; looks
11. straight ahead)}
12. M: mm: (looks away)
13. Akiko: but I don't know {the other greetings: (establishes mutual
14. gaze)}
15. M: {yeah so how else could you finish with a teacher (0.5) (looks
16. up}) you could keep it simple ((establishes mutual gaze)) what
17. would be a simple way of (0.2) saying (0.2) finishing a conversa-
18. tion, (0.3) maybe less casual
19. Akiko: {less casual and simple, (looks away))}
20. M: {yeah ((continues looking at Akiko))}
21. Akiko: (1.3) I have no idea. ((looks at mediator))
22. M: {hmm (looks up))} (0.2) I guess the way- like thank you very
23. much ((looks at Akiko))
24. Akiko: [a::h (looks up; leans forward))
25. M: [[and] (0.2) um (0.2) I- (.) maybe I'll see- (0.2) thank you very
26. much I'll see you tomorrow or [something like that ((establishes
27. mutual gaze))]

In excerpt 9-2 below, Akiko shows a lack of conceptual knowledge in a
verbalization sequence. Excerpt 9-2 provides insight into Akiko's understanding
of formality in regard to closings. Initially, M asks her about her language in
lines 1-3, hinting that his question relates to the relationship of the two
interlocutors. Akiko states that she is happy with her language choices, as they
were “not too polite” in line 8. This leads to M explicitly identifying the object
(formality) in the following turn. Akiko is silent for 3 seconds, indicating
uncertainty, or a lack of knowledge. M then identifies a specific part of the task
sequence- the closing- and asks Akiko for her opinion, who states that her
American friends say “goodbye;” she then puts forward that “see you” is the
English language equivalent of the Japanese “matane.” This indicates that, in
regard to formality, Akiko is relying on specific experiences from her past, or rules of thumb, rather than employing a conceptual understanding of formality.

Excerpt 9-2 (DA1-4)

1. M: bye (0.2) alright (. ) cool (. ) so how was that do you think (1) how
2. about you: (. ) language (1) what do you think (. ) was it (0.2) okay (. )
3. so these are two friends
4. Akiko: two friends
5. M: what do you think
6. Akiko: I think it was (. ) okay:
7. M: mm
8. Akiko: not too polite (1) I think
9. M: ahum (0.3) and (0.2) how about like f- u:h formal (. ) was it- (. )
10. what do you think
11. Akiko: (3)
12. M: like at th end (. ) like see you (0.2) do you think that's suitable for
13. (. ) two friends
14. Akiko: see you (3.5) my: (0.3) American friends always say goodbye
15. M: hmm ((nods head))
16. Akiko: but I always say see you
17. M: yeah
18. Akiko: I think that goodbye is more casual
19. M: goodbye:: ((looks up))
20. Akiko: goodbye or . ) just bye
21. M: bye ((looks up)) mm (0.3) so bye is probably more casual than
22. goodbye (. ) yeah.
23. Akiko: see you is (. ) like (0.2) in Japanese (0.3) matane

In excerpt 9-3 below, Akiko again struggles to distinguish the concept of politeness from that of formality. Initially, M locates the relevant area of the task sequence, repeating Akiko's utterance in lines 4 and 5, and asks her a general open question regarding her task turn. Akiko fails to orient to the object, so M then offers more explicit mediation, hinting that it is related to the formality of her language choice. Akiko then appears to confuse politeness for formality, stating that she wanted to be polite as it is a large favour to ask in lines 10 and
13. M’s mediation then becomes more explicit, directly addressing the issue of politeness and formality in line 17. Akiko utters a state-changing particle “a::h” in line 16, indicating that she has oriented to the object of mediation, but is unable to self-correct, shown in line 21, where she bids for help from M, shifting her gaze to him. This leads to M offering explicit mediation, explaining and then offering a possible answer. In this mediation sequence then, we can again see Akiko struggling to both orient to the object, and resolve the mediation sequence. M largely controls the negotiating, offering explicit mediation moves in both negotiating the object, and successfully concluding the sequence.

Excerpt 9-3 (DA1-6)

1. Akiko: okay thank you thank you so much (0.3) dad
2. M: ((laughs)) alright (. ) that sounds a bit strange ((laughs)) (0.5) u:h
3. (. ) stop you there ((extends left arm; establishes mutual gaze; leans forward)) (0.5) u:h so {thank you so much (. ) ((looks up))} what do you th- is that okay do you think (. ) thank you so much (0.2) I've noticed you use it a lot ((looks at Akiko; leans back in chair))
4. Akiko: yes ((establishes mutual gaze, then looks down))
5. M: {mm thank you so much (0.3) ((looking at Akiko))) what do you think about it here do you think it's casual or polite or ((looks down))
6. Akiko: ((looks up)) to father, (0.3) but (. ) this {is a really big favour, (looks down)}
7. M: ahum ((looks down))
8. Akiko: so I thought I can be polite,
9. M: mm ((looking away; hand on chin)) (0.4) is polite (0.2) is polite and formal the same thing,
10. Akiko: a::h it's not the same. ((looking away))
11. M: {a:h ok. ((looks at Akiko))) (0.5) so can you be polite but casual,
12. ((looks at Akiko; hand near mouth, chewing nails))
13. Akiko: (2.5) how ((looks up; smiles))
14. M: mm
15. Akiko: (2.3) tense (0.5) oh I don’t know ((looks at mediator))

In excerpt 9-4, there is some evidence of Akiko developing both in terms of orienting to the object, and also resolving the mediation sequence. Akiko’s task
turn in line 3 shows uncertainty, indicated by the rising intonation at the end of her turn, and the establishment of mutual gaze. This shows that she may be beginning to think about formality when formulating closings. M offers implicit help in line 4, nodding his head and uttering “hmm,” and then asks a general question. In lines 9 and 10 Akiko orients to the object, realizing she has produced the same closing as in a previous mediation sequence. M encourages her to continue in line 11, withholding assistance; Akiko then revises her turn to “I'll see you later.” M promotes Akiko’s agency in lines 15-17, ceding responsibility for the language choice to the learner-participant. Akiko then affirms her decision in line 18, shown by the falling intonation at the end of her turn. This sequence therefore shows development in terms of orienting to the object, with M not being required to explicitly identify what the object is. Further, she also takes more control of resolving the mediation sequence, with M providing relatively implicit mediation in the forms of questioning and waiting. Unlike previous mediation sequences, he is not required to explain or provide possible answers in order to close the sequence.

Excerpt 9-4 (DA1-7)

1. M: okay no problem ((makes eye contact; leans forward slightly to-
2. wards Akiko; smiles))
3. Akiko: (0.5) see: you: (.) later, ((establishes mutual gaze))
4. M: ((looks down; nods)) [okay] (.) hmm
5. Akiko: [bu- (.) yeah]
6. M: [do you=
7. Akiko: [no.]
8. M: {=think that's okay, what do you think ((looks at Akiko))}
9. Akiko: ((hand on chin; looks away)) (2.3) se- (.) no ((shakes head))
10. (.) wait (.) I did the same thing ((leans forward; looks down))
11. M: mm, ((looks down))
12. Akiko: (1) u::m (0.3) I'll see you (0.3) {I'll see you later ((establishes
13. mutual gaze; extends both arms a little, raising them with palms
14. facing upwards))}
15. M: ((makes eye contact, then looks down, then makes eye contact
16. again; nods briefly; raises right arm, palm facing Akiko)) okay (.) are
17. you happy with that, ((maintains eye contact))

300
18. Akiko: yes. ((makes eye contact))

Further development is shown in excerpt 9-5 below. Interestingly, in the final mediation sequence related to formality, Akiko initiates the sequence herself in line 3, for what she perceives to be an overly casual closing (“bye”). In line 5 she bids for help, seeking confirmation that her mediation initiation is appropriate by raising her intonation and shifting her gaze to M. M then identifies the nature of the object in line 6, enquiring as to whether Akiko thinks her closing is too casual. Akiko resolves the issue in line 10, reaffirming her decision with falling intonation. M shows his satisfaction with Akiko’s choice, shown by his affirmative “okay” with falling intonation. Here then, we can see Akiko assuming greater control of the mediation sequence. She initiates the sequence herself, self-revising what she perceives to be an error, and resolving the sequence with only relatively implicit assistance from M.

Excerpt 9-5 (DA1-7)

1. M: oh okay (. ) I'll see you later ((makes eye contact)) (0.5) bye
2. ((looks down))
3. Akiko: bye (. ) ah ((puts head in hands; laughs)) (1) I said bye
4. M: ahum ((looks at Akiko; leans forward))
5. Akiko: it's not good (1) right, ((looks at mediator))
6. M: ((looks up)) hmm:: you think it's too casual,
7. Akiko: yeah,
8. M: mm ((looks away; raises hand slightly)) if you think so ((main-
9. tains mutual gaze)) (1) [for a new t-
10. Akiko: [no bye.] ((leans back in chair; raises both
11. hands, palms facing away from her; makes eye contact))
12. M: okay. ((laughs)) (0.2) alright. ((looks down)) okay.
13. Akiko: cancel. ((raises arms, crosses them in air))
14. M: okay. ((laughs)) alright. (0.5) okay. thank you very much.

It is evident then, that Akiko has undergone development within the single DA1 session, in terms of her ability to orient to the object of formality, and to assume some responsibility for resolving it successfully. Her post-EP DA2 stage SIs provide further evidence of movement towards self-regulation.
In excerpt 9-6 for example, there is evidence that Akiko is developing her control of the concept of formality. M provides an affirmative “mm” in line 3, establishes mutual gaze, and asks a general question “what do you think”) about the previous task turn. When Akiko responds, stating that she believes it to be appropriate in line 4, M asks her to verbalise her reasoning for the language choice. In lines 7-10, Akiko explains her reasoning for including this turn as a pre-request, failing to orient to the actual object of mediation, formality. This leads to M providing more explicit mediation in helping Akiko orient to the object, identifying its general nature, (the language), but without specifically identifying it. In lines 14-17, Akiko successfully orients to the object, indicated by the production of the change of state particle “a::h” and verbal bid for help, asking M is there is a “frank” or “friendly” way to express the pre-request. In lines 18-21, M offers relatively explicit mediation, locating the words of the pre-request that signify formality (“may I”); Akiko identifies this phrasing as being formal in line 22. M then asks Akiko in line 27 to produce alternatives, which she does in line 28, and again in line 31, seeking approval of her choice from M (shown by the rising intonation and shifting of her gaze to the mediator). In excerpt 9-6 then, Akiko fails initially to orient to the object of mediation, leading to M providing more explicit assistance, identifying the nature of the object, but without specifically identifying it. Without this specific identification of the object, Akiko is still able to successfully orient to it, and asks for help in resolving the issue. M offers relatively explicit mediation at this point, but withholds explicit explanations or provision of possible solutions, as he frequently does in the DA1 session. Despite this, Akiko is able to produce a satisfactory alternative pre-request, and the mediation sequence is successfully closed. She is also able to verbalise to an extent her understanding, identifying the formality of her original task turn.

Excerpt 9-6 (DA2-1)

1. Akiko: (2.3) heh ((Japanese sound, indicating surprise or uncertain- ty)) may I ask you a favour, ((establishes mutual gaze))
2. M: mm. ((maintains mutual gaze)) (. ) what do you think
3. Akiko: (2.3) ((looks down)) I think it's okay ((establishes mutual gaze))
4. M: okay (. ) becau:se ((maintains mutual gaze; half-smile))
In excerpt 9-7, Akiko demonstrates her developing conceptual understanding of formality, and its relation to context. She orients to the object after the provision of relatively implicit mediation from M, and is able to verbalise her reasoning using appropriate metalanguage to analyse the context. She is also able to resolve the sequence with M providing implicit assistance, such as rephrasing, shifting of gaze, and nodding. Throughout this sequence therefore, Akiko shows an increasing level of control over formality in her L2 language choices. In line 2 Akiko states that her task turn is “kind of polite” but after M introduces the concept of formality in the following turn, with rising intonation indicating the
questioning nature of his repetition, Akiko immediately corrects herself in line 4. In lines 4 and 5, she then explains why the situation of the SI means she does not need to be formal. After prompting from M, both verbal and in the form of hand gestures, Akiko explains further, using metalanguage such as “social distance” and “the favour is not big” to justify her language choice. In line 21, M prompts Akiko to reproduce her task turn pre-request, indicated by the elongated vowel sound, which leads to Akiko producing a pre-request in line 22, with the rising intonation and shifting of her gaze to M indicating she is seeking confirmation. M provides implicit mediation in line 24, shifting his gaze upwards, which leads to Akiko confirming her choice in line 25, shown by the falling intonation. In this mediation sequence then,

Excerpt 9-7 (DA2-6)

1. M: mm ((looks up)) so may I ((establishes mutual gaze)) (0.5) wh-
2. Akiko: for (.) that is the (0.3) kind of polite, ((looking down at desk))
3. M: or f- formal, ((looks at Akiko))
4. Akiko: formal (.) yeah formal so: (1) will be a (1) father and (.) kid so
5. (.) I thought I don't- (0.5) I don't need to be (.) formal ((looks at me-
6. diator))
7. M: mm I would agree I think yeah ((nods head; looks up, then looks
8. at Akiko)) (0.5) so (.) quite casual
9. Akiko: casual, ((looking away))
10. M: because (.) of the ((raises hands, palms facing each other,
11. brings them close together)) (1) if you think of the three ((makes a
12. triangle shape in the air with fingers))
13. Akiko: ah [yeah
14. M: [things] the
15. Akiko: {social distance is very close and ((looks down))}
16. M: um
17. Akiko: I think this favour is not (.) so big
18. M: right right you think it's a small- smallish favour, ((looks at Aki-
19. ko))
20. Akiko: ((nods head; looking down))
21. M: okay (0.3) so::
22. Akiko: so:: how about (.) can I- can you help me, ((looks at media-
In excerpt 9-8, Akiko demonstrates further development. Initially, in lines 1 and 2 Akiko self-correction her post-request task turn to a more informal formulation, without requiring any mediation. She does however seek assurance from M, shown by the rising intonation at the end of her turn, and the shifting of her gaze. M halts the task sequence in line 7, and enquires as to why Akiko changed her mind. In line 12, Akiko responds that “thank you so much” is too polite; however, after M repeats her utterance of “polite” in line 15, she self-corrects in the following turn, adding the concept of formality to her reasoning. In lines 22 and 23, M then probes Akiko further, asking why she corrected herself in line 1, to which she replies that “thanks” is “more impolite and more casual.” After further prompting in the form of a question in line 26, Akiko provides further explanation in line 28, employing metalanguage to analyse the social context of the SI. This excerpt then shows further development in the learner. She is able to self-correct (as shown in line 1), demonstrating that she is thinking about the role that social context plays in influencing politeness and formality, and is able to verbalise her reasoning, showing conceptual understanding. Akiko therefore, shows she is able to take greater control of the mediation sequences related to formality than she could demonstrate in the DA1 SIs.

Excerpt 9-8 (DA2-6)

1. Akiko: so (. ) yeah than- thank you so much- th- thanks, ((makes eye contact with mediator))
2. M: ((looks up )) mm:: ((laughs)) alright that's {okay ((looks down))}
3. Akiko: [thanks
4. M: [that's okay] [mm
5. Akiko: [dad]
6. M: I'll stop you there ((looks at Akiko; extends left arm towards
7. Akiko) [so=
8. Akiko: [yeah]
10. M: {=you changed (. ) why did you change thank you ((looks at
11. Akiko}}
12. Akiko: thank you so much is too polite ((looks down))
13. M: ((leans back in chair; folds arms; looking at Akiko)) okay
14. Akiko: [I thought ((looks at mediator))
15. M: [polite] um
16. Akiko: polite [formal,
17. M: [could] be polite (.) a little bit formal maybe, (0.3) so you
18. changed it to ((looks at Akiko))
19. Akiko: thanks ((establishes mutual gaze))
20. M: ((looks straight ahead)) and you're {happy, ((looks at Akiko))}
21. Akiko: ((nods head; looks down))
22. M: ((looks down at desk; brings right hand to chin)) (0.5) okay why
23. did you choose thanks
24. Akiko: (0.3) {thanks is more like- (.) more impolite and (0.3) more
25. casual ((looks down))}
26. M: mm (.) {because (.) and why is that suitable for this (.) situation
27. ((makes eye contact; arms folded))}
28. Akiko: small favour, (.) close distance, (.) you're father:

9.3.2 Politeness

**Table 9-3**: Aggregated data showing the total number of mediation sequences in which the object is “politeness”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DA1 No. Obs</th>
<th>DA1 Total Score</th>
<th>DA1 Median</th>
<th>DA2 No. Obs</th>
<th>DA2 Total Score</th>
<th>DA2 Median</th>
<th>TA No. Obs</th>
<th>TA Total Score</th>
<th>TA Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akiko</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ema</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanako</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayumi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryota</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikaru</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9-3 shows the median scores relating to the object of *politeness* in the DA1, DA2 and TA stages. As with *formality*, the post-EP stages both show higher median scores (4), than the pre-EP DA1 stage, indicating development of interactional competence (IC) within the mediation sequences.

**Figure 9-11**: Frequency distribution of scores in DA1 sessions among all participants for “politeness”

**Figure 9-12**: Frequency distribution of scores in DA2 sessions among all participants for “politeness”
Figures 9-11, 9-12 and 9-13 show a clear movement towards higher scores, and less frequent instances of the low score of 2. The relatively low number of objects in the TA stage renders analysis tentative; the spread of scores however indicates the participants responding to mediation and the EP in differing ways.

9.3.2.1 A microgenetic analysis of learner development relating to politeness.

A further issue that arose from analysis of the DA1 session data was the difficulty learner-participants often had with making the connection between their language choices and the social context of the strategic interaction role-plays, indicating a lack of conceptual understanding. In the following section, using “Akiko” as an example, development in understanding the role contextual factors play in influencing L2 politeness will be assessed.

Akiko’s DA1 stage mediation sequences offer an insight into her limited conceptual understanding of politeness and its relationship with context. In excerpt 9-9, Akiko demonstrates efficiency in orienting the object of mediation, and exerts a degree of control in resolving the mediation insertion sequence. However, she does not demonstrate any conceptual understanding of
politeness, failing to provide verbal reasoning for her language choice. Akiko orients to the object in line 11, with only relatively implicit forms of mediation from M, in the form of repeating Akiko’s request turn utterance and asking her the general question “what do you think…” In line 5, Akiko pauses for 1.2 seconds before uttering a negative “no,” with rising intonation, indicating she is surprised at the initiating of mediation by M. At this point M reiterates in lines 6-8 that opening a mediation sequence does not necessarily mean pragmatic dissonance has occurred. In the following turn, Akiko states that she believes her turn is “really polite.” After M probes further to understand her reasoning, she instead offers more polite request turn formulations in lines 18-19. She does not however verbalise her reasoning for her language choices, and in the following turn asks M if she should be more polite, showing uncertainty. At this point M then promotes Akiko’s agency, encouraging her to assume responsibility for her language choice from lines 20 to 29.

Excerpt 9-9 (DA1-3)

1. M: [give] me (0.3) two more days ((emphasises the words using fingers pointing in the air; maintains mutual gaze)) (0.3) what do you think is that-
2. [what- (. ) what do you think about that ((looking at Akiko; tilts head slightly to right))](0.2) is that okay,
3. Akiko: (1.2) no, ((establishes mutual gaze with mediator))
4. M: {mm ((looks up, raises shoulders, smiles; gestures with both arms outstretched to Akiko)} I'm just asking you what do you think ((looks down, then at Akiko again; smiles))
5. Akiko: ((laughs))
6. M: ((laughs))
7. Akiko: {I was wondering if (. ) this really polite, ((looking down at desk))}
8. M: do you think it's polite enough, ((looks at Akiko; drinks from bottle of water))
9. Akiko: (0.5) I: can (0.8) I can make it more polite ((establishes mutual gaze))
10. M: {how ((maintains mutual gaze; tilts head slightly to right))} (. ) what [could you say
11. Akiko: {[I was] wondering (. ) if (1.2)
12. you: ((looking up))) (0.2) could, ((looks at mediator))
20. M: u:h okay ((looks up)) that would be (.) maybe more polite than can (.)
21. yeah ((looks at Akiko; nods head))
22. Akiko: (1.2) mo:re, ((establishes mutual gaze))
23. M: (raises eyebrows, tilts head)) mm it's up to you what do you think (.) is
24. that polite enough,
25. Akiko: (0.5) {I guess so ((looks down at desk; hand resting on chin))}
26. M: okay ((nods head; looks at Akiko))
27. Akiko: ((looks down at desk)) {I was wondering if you could give (.) me:
28. (0.7) or: (.) you could ((looking down at desk))} extend, ((establishes
29. mutual gaze))

In excerpt 9-10, M puts forward a general question, asking Akiko what she
thinks about her turn. Akiko then identifies a relevant contextual factor
(imposition) in lines 6 and 7; she then also says the relationship is familial, and
therefore “I was wondering if” would be too polite a request form. Here, Akiko’s
understanding of the difference between politeness and formality is unclear. M
then draws Akiko’s attention back to the imposition of the request, which she is
able to identify with metalanguage in line 12. M then utters an evaluative “okay”
and waits; Akiko continues by uttering that it is “a really big favour.” Following
this, in lines 16 and 17 Akiko self-revises her task request turn, deciding that “I
was wondering if…” would be a more suitable expression of politeness. M then
probes to check her understanding of how different expressions reflect differing
degrees of politeness, to which Akiko produces a satisfactory response in line
23 (M’s satisfaction is shown by his affirmative “okay” in line 24).

In Excerpt 9-10’s mediation sequence therefore, there is evidence that
conceptually, Akiko is confused regarding politeness and formality in her
verbalisations. She is able to orient to the object after M draws her attention to
the size of the favour, and then offers only relatively implicit assistance as Akiko
self-revises her request turn. She shows knowledge of a range of lexis-
grammatical expressions of politeness, but, in connecting language to context,
focused initially primarily on the relationship between the interlocutors. Once M
draws attention to other factors (imposition), she then is able to self-revise her
task turn with only minimal mediation from M. This shows her taking some
control of resolving the mediation sequence. She also shows some awareness
at this point for how contextual factors can affect language choices.
Excerpt 9-10 (DA1-6)

1. M: mm. ((looks down)) (0.3) {what do you think (.) is that ok
2. ((establishes mutual gaze; taps desk slowly with finger and thumb))
3. Akiko: ((leans back in chair; crosses arms; looks down)) (0.3) well this
4. money is really (0.3) big money
5. M: (0.5) hmm ((looks at Akiko))
6. Akiko: (0.5) {but (.) I think I was wondering if (.) is too (.) much polite to-
7. (.) to family ((looking down)))
8. M: hmm: ((looks up; hand on chin)) (1) is- is ((looks down; extends left
9. arm, chopping motion on desk with hand)) family: (.) or friends (.) {is that
10. the only:: (.) important thing (1) is there anything else that's (.) important
11. ((establishes mutual gaze))}
12. Akiko: (0.3) how (.) big (0.2) {that favour is, ((looks down))}
13. M: okay ((looks at Akiko; nods head))
14. Akiko: so it's really big favour:
15. M: okay ((nods slowly; looks at Akiko))
16. Akiko: that means ((looking down)) (1) a: (1) I'd better use ((leans back;
17. looking down)) (0.5) I was wondering if, ((looks at mediator))
18. M: ((looks away; raises eyebrows)) (0.3) hmm (0.2) if you want to (.)
19. {is that more polite ((looks at Akiko)) than could you,}
20. Akiko: (looks away; leans back))
21. M: {which is more polite could you or: ((extends left arm, palm facing
22. away from Akiko)) (.) I was wondering if ((continues looking at Akiko))}
23. Akiko: I was wondering (.) if is more polite,((establishes mutual gaze))
24. M: okay do you want to be more polite ((raises eyebrows; maintains
25. mutual gaze))

In initiating the mediation sequence in Excerpt 9-11 below, M repeats Akiko’s request turn, and asks a general question about it in lines 1-3. Akiko immediately orients to the object, stating that it is “a little direct.” M then probes Akiko to verbalise her reasoning for think so, which leads to Akiko citing a grammatical reason, rather than a conceptual one (lines 6-21). Later in the sequence, Akiko again states that her request turn was “very strong” (line 24). When M asks if she wants her request to be that “strong,” she states that she “she really needs it.” At this point, M recognizes that Akiko is not analyzing all
the contextual factors, and so draws her attention to the relationships between the interlocutors (teacher-student) in line 31. Following this, Akiko states that she should be more polite, and after M checks this, she again states that she should be more polite in line 42.

Excerpt 9-11 (DA1-7)

1. M: {so: (.) your asking was ((looks down; both arms extended, palms facing each other on desk))} (. I'd like you to (0.2) what (.) do you think
2. ((establishes mutual gaze)) (0.2) is that okay, ((looks down))
3. Akiko: ((looks down)) I'd like you to (0.5) uh it's (0.5) a little (1.3) direct
4. M: (1.3) hmm ((looking at Akiko)) (0.5) why do you think so
5. Akiko: (0.5) because ((looking away)) (1.3) the (2) uh I forgot the (.)
6. word's (. ) name (1.3) es-es- (. ) I forgot the name wait ((laughs; briefly
8. looks at mediator, then looks away again))
9. M: {a:h (.) subject, (.) [no ((looks at Akiko))]
10. Akiko: [{(makes drawing gesture with hand in air)]) (0.3)
11. no the (0.2) it's a grammar (1.3) grammar (0.3) ((inaudible)) things (0.3)
12. {me (.) I (. ) I ((establishes mutual gaze; places hands on throat))}
13. M: subject, ((makes eye contact))
14. Akiko: does the su- subj- ((laughs)) I can't say
15. M: S V O, ((maintains mutual gaze; uses right hand to emphasise the
16. letters))
17. Akiko: {yes yes ((establishes mutual gaze))}
18. M: mm subject
19. Akiko: subject
20. M: yeah
21. Akiko: was ((breaks eye contact, looks down)) me
22. M: ((looks away)) ahum ((nods head slowly)) I'd like you to (.) [mm
23. Akiko: [I'd like you] to (0.3) I don't know it's (0.5) very strong ((looks down))
24. M: mm ((looks down; both arms resting on desk)) could be (. ) yeah: (. )
25. [so: (0.5) do you want to be that strong, ((looks at Akiko))
27. Akiko: [(makes eye contact with mediator)]
28. M: (0.5) or not ((looking at Akiko))
29. Akiko: ((looks down)) (0.3) but I think it's in {ne- (. ) I really need it
30. ((looks down)))
31. M: you really need it ((looks down)) ahum (0.3) who are you talking to
32. ((establishes brief mutual gaze))
33. Akiko: ((establishes brief mutual gaze, then looks down at desk)) (0.5)
34. new teacher,
35. M: teacher ((looking down. then looks again at Akiko))
36. Akiko: ((looking down)) hmm. (1) a::h (2) should I be more (. ) polite,
37. ((establishes mutual gaze))
38. M: ((arms down; looks down)) do you want to be more polite,
39. ((establishes mutual gaze))
40. Akiko: (1) a new teacher ((looking down))
41. M: mm ((looking at Akiko))
42. Akiko: uh yes yes I need to be more polite. ((establishes mutual gaze))

In Excerpt 9-11 therefore, Akiko quickly orients to the directness of her language as being the object of mediation, although not for contextual reasons, but for what she believes to be a grammatical one. M then draws her attention to the contextual factors of social distance and status, and this then leads to Akiko self-revising her request turn. M then is required to explicitly highlight context, but once Akiko orients to this, she is able to cooperatively resolve the mediation sequence, with M providing relatively implicit assistance in the form of prompting and questioning. Overall however, this shows Akiko again struggling to connect context to her language choices without mediation. With assistance however, she is able to show some conceptual understanding.

In the DA2 stage mediation sequences related to politeness below, Akiko provides evidence of further movement towards being able to resolve the object without mediation. In these post-EP SIs, she twice decides to retain her original task sequence language choice, and was able to provide reasoning as to why. This indicates an increasing confidence and control over the target object, and her explanations provide evidence of increasing conceptual understanding. Her range of linguistic realisations however is still limited, when prompted to verbalise alternative language choices.

In Excerpt 9-12, Akiko displays further development in her conceptual understanding. After Akiko’s request turn, M halts the task sequence, repeating
Akiko’s turn and asking a general question in lines 1-2. Akiko answers that she is satisfied with her language choice, leading to M prompting her to provide reasoning in line 4, shown by the elongated vowel sound. Akiko states that she believes it is polite; the size of the favour is large, but the social distance is close, and therefore she does not need to use a more indirect formulation such as “I was wondering if…” M offers implicit mediation, maintaining mutual gaze and nodding, leading to Akiko stating that “I guess it’s too polite” in line 11 (referring to “I was wondering if”). At this point M reminds her that the choice is hers, but also draws her attention to contextual factors in lines 12-14. M then summarises Akiko’s verbalizing up to that point (close family, but large favour). This leads to Akiko further verbalizing her reasoning, touching on the three contextual factors raised in the enrichment programme stage of the study.

In this sequence then, Akiko is able to orient to the object quickly, and with relatively implicit assistance. While cooperatively resolving the sequence, M raises the three main contextual factors of imposition, social distance and status, and Akiko demonstrates she is able to understand and apply them to the situation at hand during her verbalization turns. This displays conceptual understanding of how context influenced her language choice. While M provides mediation in drawing her attention to the contextual factors, once he has done this, Akiko is able to relate her language choice to them with only implicit assistance in the form of gaze, waiting and questions that promote her agency. She is able therefore to demonstrate a considerable degree of control in this mediation sequence.

Excerpt 9-12 (DA2-2)

1. M: a::h °okay°(0.3) could you is that okay do you think ((tilts head slightly; makes eye contact))
2. Akiko: I think it's okay ((maintains eye contact))
3. M: {becau:se ((looks at Akiko))}
4. Akiko: ((looking down; hands together)) because it's poli:te (. ) and this is a big favou:r (. ) but you're family: [so:
5. M: [ahum]
6. Akiko: I thought I (. ) don't need to- (. ) I don't need to (. ) use i- I was won-
9. dering if ((makes eye contact))
10. M: ((maintains mutual gaze; nods head))
11. Akiko: I guess it's too polite ((maintains eye contact))
12. M: ((looks up; leaning back in chair)) it's up to y-u:m. (. ) remember the
13. the- the three things ((raises left arm; looking up; then makes eye con-
14. tact))=
15. Akiko: yeah ((maintains mutual gaze))
16. M: =it depends on yeah (. ) ((looks away)) so I guess like the size of (. ) the
17. favour ((looks at Akiko)) social distance (. ) and (. ) social status so (0.3) if
18. you're happy cos it's your father (. ) but it's a big favour {you think ((looks at
19. Akiko))}
20. Akiko: ((looks down; laughs))
21. M: {hmm. ((looks up))}
22. Akiko: {for me father is not (0.3) he's really close ((looks down))}
23. M: hmm. ((looks at Akiko; nods head slowly))
24. Akiko: but the favour is big
25. M: ahum ((looking at Akiko))
26. Akiko: ((looking down)) and (. ) the social states, a:h social states (1.5)
27. maybe I should sa:y (0.3) like (. ) I need to res- (. ) more respect
28. M: ((looks up; half smiles))
29. Akiko: ((laughs)) I don't know how can I say ((looks at mediator))
30. M: ((laughs)) for your fa- uh we- more respect for your father, ((makes eye
31. contact))
32. Akiko: yeah
33. M: hmm okay. ((looks diagonally down))
34. Akiko: normally I didn't- {I don't respect [but ((looks at mediator))]
35. M: [((laughs)) right right (. ) okay (. )
36. so:: (0.3) you're happy with could you or would you (. ) change it at all,
37. ((makes eye contact))
38. Akiko: could you ((looks up)) (0.3) could you. ((makes eye contact; nods
39. head))

Excerpt 9-13 demonstrates Aruko’s increasing control and understanding of 
politeness. In lines 1 and 2, M initiates the mediation sequence after Akiko’s 
request turn, asking her to repeat it, which Akiko does in line 3. M then asks a 
specific question regarding whether she is satisfied with her choice of language.
and level of politeness in line 4, with his gaze directed at Akiko. Akiko answers affirmatively, citing the amount of money she is asking for in the request. M then checks again in lines 8-9 that she is satisfied with the politeness expressed in her language choice, and again she responds affirmatively, nodding her head. Following this M probes further Akiko’s range of request turn formulations, asking her if she could form a more polite request (lines 14-15). Akiko struggles with this, leading to M explaining how it could be done. Here then, M explicitly states the object in this mediation sequence, meaning that Akiko has no problem identifying it. M then prompts her to verbalise her reasoning for her request turn choice, which she does, citing the degree of imposition. She also shows confidence and a degree of control in not wanting to change her original request language choice. Towards the end of the mediation sequence, M probes further to gauge her range of lexis-grammatical formulations. While she struggles to produce a request more indirect than her task turn, this is understandable, considering that such a level of politeness had rarely been required throughout both DA sessions and the EP also. Of particular note in this mediation sequence is the confidence level and control Akiko demonstrates in affirming her satisfaction with her language choice, not bidding for help at any point.

Excerpt 9-13 (DA2-7)

1. M: so: (. ) your request was (. ) one more time I was wondering if
2. ((continues looking at Akiko))
3. Akiko: {I was wondering if you could help me ((establishes mutual gaze))}
4. M: okay are you happy with that level of politeness, ((maintains mutual gaze; leaning back in chair; hands clasped together; head tilted slightly to right briefly))
5. Akiko: ye:s: ((looks down at desk)) (0.3) yes: three hundred dollar
6. M: is that the kind of ((looks up)) (. ) u:m (0.3) mm is- so {you think that’s polite enough, ((establishes mutual gaze))}
7. Akiko: ((maintains mutual gaze; nods head))
8. M: okay ((breaks eye contact; nods head)) ((looks at Akiko)) so you wouldn't change anything
9. Akiko: {yes ((looks down))}
10. M: {(0.3) ((looks down))} if you wanted to be (0.3) {even more polite is
15. there anything you could ch- anything you could say, ((looks at Akiko))
16. Akiko: ((looks away)) (1) I: (1.5) eh ((Japanese sound indicating surprise
17. or uncertainty)) I: was (0.5) wondering (2.3) eh ((Japanese sound
18. indicating surprise or uncertainty)) I don't know ((looks at mediator))

Comparing Akiko’s *politeness* related mediation sequences in the pre-EP and post-EP stages then, considerable development can be seen. Her median score increases from 4 in the DA1 session to 5 in the DA2 session, and this development is also evident through close analysis of the transcript data above. She shows increased control of the mediation sequence, frequently deciding to retain her original language choices, supporting her choices with explanations that demonstrate some conceptual understanding of the target concept, and relies on increasingly implicit assistance to orient to and resolve the objects of mediation.

9.3.3. Pre-requesting

Table 9-4 shows the overall scores in the pre-EP DA stage and the two post-EP stages. As with the general trend of the overall results, the median scores provide evidence of learner development, with the DA1 stage median score of 2 contrasting with median scores of 3 for the post-EP DA2 stage, and 4 for the TA stage respectively. With regards to this particular object however, it is difficult to state with certainty that the development trend continued in the TA transfer tasks, as there were only two objects in total. This lower number may be due to the lack of need for mediation sequences (a possible indication of development itself), but may also be due to the TA stage consisting of only three SIs.

Figures 9-14, 9-15 and 9-16 present the frequency distribution of scores for the three stages. As with the median scores, the distribution of scores also points towards movement towards self-regulation. While in the DA1 stage the low score of 2 was the most frequent, in the DA2 sessions there is a more even spread of scores between 2 and 4, with one score of 5. It is difficult to extrapolate a firm conclusion from the TA stage distribution however, due to the small number of objects.
Table 9-4: Aggregated data showing the total number of mediation sequences in which the object is “pre-requesting”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th>DA2</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Obj</td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>Media n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akiko</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ema</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanako</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayumi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikaru</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9-14: Frequency distribution of scores in DA1 sessions among all participants for “pre-requesting”
**Figure 9-15:** Frequency distribution of scores in DA2 sessions, all participants, “pre-requesting”
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**Figure 9-16:** Frequency distribution of scores in TA sessions, all participants, “pre-requesting”
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9.3.3.1 A microgenetic analysis of learner development relating to pre-requesting

The following excerpts focus on Hikaru’s mediation sequences related to pre-requesting. As will be demonstrated, Hikaru initially struggled to orient to and resolve pre-requesting objects of mediation, and has a median score of 2 for the DA1 stage. For the post-EP DA2 stage, his median score is also 2; this provides an incomplete picture however of his development with regards to this particular object. By examining his mediation sequence and verbalisation transcript data, increased conceptual understanding and control over the concept can be seen, indicating that movement within his ZPD is taking place, though his competence is still maturing.

Excerpt 9-14 below shows a mediation sequence from Hikaru’s DA1 session, and shows him struggling with pre-requesting. In lines 1-3 M explicitly halts the task sequence and mediates in the form of locating the sire of the object. Hikaru struggles to orient, shown by his repeating of M’s utterances in line 4 and 6, pausing and shifting his gaze. This leads to M offering further mediation, clarifying the object’s location in the task sequence interaction. After Hikaru continues to struggle in lines 10-12, he bids for help, shown by his rising intonation and shifting of gaze to M. M proceeds to then provide more explicit mediation, identifying the type of object with a prompt in line 15, and again in line 17. This leads to Hikaru orienting to the object, and offering a possible resolution tentatively, with his rising intonation on the final syllable of his turn. When M probes him for the reasoning behind his suggestion, Hikaru struggles, pausing in line 23, before offering a basic explanation related specifically to the particular context of the strategic interaction (SI) role-play. It can be seen then that Hikaru struggles in this excerpt to orient to the pre-requesting object, and his explanation does not demonstrate understanding on a conceptual level (one in which his knowledge can be applied beyond the immediate task at hand).

Excerpt 9-14 (DA1-3)

1. M: okay I'll stop you there ((ext arm towards Hikaru; est mut gaze; smiles; tilts head slightly)) for a second (.) so before that ((both arms raised above desk))
4. Hikaru: before ((hands raised; mut gaze)) that
5. M: anything else ((leaning back; tilts head; maintains gaze))
6. Hikaru: (0.5) anything else ((looks up; hand on chin))
7. M: mm: before you begin explaining
8. Hikaru: mm
9. M: (0.3) is the:re anything ((mut gaze)) (1) maybe
10. Hikaru: u::h (0.3) ((intake of breath; looking up)) (1.5) ((moves hands in air; leans forward)) (2) something like (. ) I have something to (. ) tell you (. ) or like that, ((shifts gaze to M))
11. M: (looks up)) mm:::
12. Hikaru: no,
13. M: anything you want to ask me ((mut gaze; tilts head slightly))
14. Hikaru: yes (1)
15. M: any qu- any questions
16. Hikaru: any question
17. M: before you
18. Hikaru: u::h (.) do you have time, ((est mut gaze))
19. M: okay okay (. ) and why would you ask that (0.7) why may- why is that a good idea maybe ((mut gaze))
20. Hikaru: (1.3) why, ((looks straight ahead))
21. M: mm ((maintains gaze))
22. Hikaru: why. (. ) maybe ((rubs hands together)) (. ) this kin- (. ) talk or- r
23. M: yeah ((nods head slowly))
24. Hikaru: why so ((looks straight ahead)) (. ) I need- (. ) I think (. ) I need
to: (0.5) ask teacher: (0.3) they have time or not ((est mut gaze))

In a second mediation sequence from the DA1 stage (excerpt 9-15), Hikaru cedes control of the mediation sequence to M, adopting a reactive stance, bidding for help in lines 8-9. He struggles again to orient to the object, repeating M’s utterance in line 6, leading to further mediating moves in line 7 by M, in the form of a questioning prompt and an adjustment in body position. After a 1 second pause, Hikaru tentatively offers a possible resolution with rising intonation, establishing mutual gaze. He does not however verbalise the reasoning behind his resolution.
Excerpt 9-15 (DA1-6)

1. Hikaru: ((coughs)) (1.5) mm (0.5) may I (.) ask a favour, ((shift gaze to M))
2. M: a:::h okay I'll stop you there ((est mut gaze; ext arm towards Hikaru;)
3. smiles))
4. Hikaru: can I,
5. M: mm ah ((ext arm towards Hikaru; smiles)) it's okay but um before that
6. Hikaru: before that
7. M: anything else, ((leans back; hands laced))
8. Hikaru: u::h ((looks straight ahead; leans back)) (1) do I need to ask how
9. going or do you have time now, ((waves hand in air; est mut gaze))
10. M: you don't- you don't need to ((leaning back; mut gaze))
11. Hikaru: need to
12. M: but you could
13. Hikaru: you could
14. M: if you want to
15. Hikaru: okay ((looks down))
16. M: yeah ((leans forward; nods head; looks down; hands down))
17. Hikaru: (0.7) okay (0.5) hi dad

In contrast, Hikaru demonstrates considerably deeper conceptual understanding of pre-requesting in the DA2 stage, as shown in his two verbalisation sequences. In excerpt 9-16, Hikaru demonstrates a level of understanding that was not shown in his pre-EP DA1 stage SIs. In this verbalisation sequence, M halts the task sequence in order to evaluate Hikaru’s knowledge regarding pre-requesting, shown by his question turn in line 1, asking for Hikaru to explain his language choice, and repeats the question in line 3. Hikaru offers a brief explanation in line 4, and then demonstrates upon further probing conceptual knowledge of pre-requesting in line 6, identifying the nature of his task sequence turn. M then enquires further, leading to the learner offering a metalinguistic explanation of the rationale behind the pre-requesting stage of the requesting speech in talk. This conceptual explanation then offers a significant contrast to his basic explanation in the DA1 stage (excerpt 9-14), in which his verbalisation provided reasoning related specifically to the task at hand.
Excerpt 9-16 (DA2-1)

1. M: what was that ((ext arm towards Hikaru)) (0.3) why did you ask that
2. Hikaru: ((looks straight ahead; hands down)) (1.3) now:, ((est mut gaze))
3. M: do you have time now (. wh- why did you ask me that ((mut gaze))
4. Hikaru: (0.5) to check you have the time or not ((maintains gaze))
5. M: okay and what- what is that ((est mut gaze))
6. Hikaru: (0.5) what is that- a:h ((looks up)) (0.3) u:m (0.3) pre-request, ((est mut gaze))
7. M: okay ((nods head; looks down, then est mut gaze)) (. why do we:- (0.3)
8. why do people do pre-requests
9. Hikaru: (0.3) u::h so (. to check (. the time (. a:nd ability or (. if neces-
10. sary (. we need to explain (. why
11. M: alright good (. thank you very much ((looks down; hands down; est
12. mut gaze; laughs)) (0.5) good (. ((laughs))

Hikaru's developing understanding is in further evidence in excerpt 9-17, another verbalisation sequence. Here, M employs the metalinguistic term “pre-request” in line 1 to orient the learner to the object of the verbalisation sequence. Hikaru shows his understanding in line 3, identifying his pre-request task turn appropriately, without further mediation being needed. M then probes further, asking Hikaru if there is an alternative pre-request turn type that could be appropriate. This leads to the Hikaru producing one in the following turn (lines 10-11). He is also able to explain the rationale behind the different pre-request type in line 14.

While therefore the median scores do not show progression by Hikaru in terms of pre-requesting, the above microgenetic analysis of his DA1 and DA2 stage mediation sequences and verbalisations uncover important differences. While in the DA1 session, Hikaru offered little in the way of conceptual level explanations of his language choices, in the post-EP sessions he offers more detailed conceptual verbalisations, showing a deepening level of understanding and control over the pre-requesting object.
Excerpt 9-17 (DA2-3)

1. M: u:m ((gaze straight ahead)) (0.5) so what was your pre-request ((shifts gaze to Hikaru))
2. Hikaru: (2) do you have time now, ((est mut gaze))
4. Hikaru: and explanation,
5. M: explanation yeah ((nods head; gaze straight ahead)) yeah (.) in this situation (0.3) and that was fine (.) no problem ((est mut gaze; ext arm to Hikaru; gaze down)) (. u:m I was wondering (.) in this situation is there any other (.) um (.) pre-requests that you could (.) ask ((est mut gaze))
6. Hikaru: (0.5) u::h ((gaze straight ahead; arms on desk)) (2.5) are you good at (.) translating (.) from Japanese into Jap- into English, ((est mut gaze))
7. M: ((nods; mut gaze)) something like that yeah (.) what is- what type of pre-request would that be
8. Hikaru: mm check ability ((maintains gaze))
9. M: ah okay right right ((nods; gaze down)) so I guess it's kind of important for this situation ((est mut gaze; tilts head))
10. Hikaru: ahum ((nods once))

9.3.4. Pre-closing

For pre-closing, the overall median scores of the pre-EP DA1 stage and the post-EP DA2 stage were the same, indicating limited development. Comparisons however are difficult here to an extent, as there were significantly fewer mediation sequences related to this object in the DA1 stage than in the DA2 sessions, with three participants not experiencing any pre-closing mediation sequences during the DA1 SIs. Focusing on the participants that did engage in both pre and post-EP pre-closing mediation sequences, two of the three had higher mediation scores in the DA2 stage. Ryota appeared to regress, with a score of 2 in the DA2 session, compared with 4 in the DA1 stage. While this seems counter-intuitive, it is in keeping with sociocultural theory, which views development as being non-linear, with periods of regression as well as progression to be expected (Vygotsky, 1998).
Figures 9-17 to 9-19 show the frequency distribution of the three stages. It can be seen that, while most of the DA1 scores were 4, the DA2 scores were more heterogeneous, spread from 2 to 5. The most frequent DA2 score however was 5, indicating that may have been some movement within participants’ ZPDs.

**Table 9-5**: Aggregated data showing the total number of mediation sequences in which the object is “pre-closing”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th></th>
<th>DA2</th>
<th></th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Obj</td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>No. Obj</td>
<td>Total Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akiko</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ema</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanako</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayumi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikaru</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9-17**: Frequency distribution of scores in DA1 sessions, all participants, “pre-closing”
Figure 9-18: Frequency distribution of scores in DA2 sessions, all participants, “pre-closing”

Figure 9-19: Frequency distribution of scores in TA sessions, all participants, “pre-closing”

9.3.4.1 A microgenetic analysis of learner development relating to pre-closing

Microgenetic analysis of the pre-closing mediation sequences offers further insight into learner development. Hikaru provides an interesting example of how
some of the participants showed evidence of movement within their ZPDs. In
the pre-EP DA1 stage, he shows a willingness to take some control of the
mediation sequences related to *pre-closing*, often initiating them himself. This
self-initiation also shows that he is able to identify infelicitous pragmatic
elements of the task sequence, without the need for mediating moves from M.
An example of this is shown in excerpt 9-18. Hikaru initiates the mediation
sequence in line 1, explicitly bidding for help and establishing mutual gaze. He
identifies the issue appropriately (a lack of a pre-closing stage in the task
sequence talk), and bids for assistance again in line 5. M proceeds to negotiate
the precise location of the object with Hikaru in lines 6-17, then prompts Hikaru
to produce a resolution; this leads to Hikaru struggling and bidding for help in
line 18-20, establishing mutual gaze. M then provides an explanation of how
*pre-closing* sequences are typically realised in request talk. It can be seen then
that Hikaru in this mediation sequence is able to orient to the object efficiently,
but at this stage lacks the ability to resolve the object without relatively explicit
mediation from M.

Excerpt 9-18 (DA1-5)

1. Hikaru: is it okay, (est mut gaze; brings hand down in cutting motion))
2. (0.3) see you- (. ) it's uh ((looks down)) (0.3) um (. ) I felt that (. ) the end of
3. the topic and a little bit short or ((est mut gaze))
4. M: mm ((leaning back; hands laced))
5. Hikaru: do I need to add s::omething, ((mut gaze))
6. M: could do (. ) so: ((looks straight ahead)) (. ) after I give it to you ((handing
7. over gesture))
8. Hikaru: yes
9. M: a:nd then you said (. ) what did you say (. ) you said thank you ((mut
10. gaze))
11. Hikaru: thank you (. ) or:
12. M: a:nd (0.3) I'll return it to you by Monday ((ext arm))
13. Hikaru: ahem
14. M: or I'll give it back to you by Monday ((looks straight ahead)) (0.3) yeah
15. at that point (. ) and I- and then I went okay no problem (0.3) at that point
16. ((mut gaze, then looks straight ahead)) (0.3) what could you do if you
17. wanted to ((est mut gaze))
18. Hikaru: (0.5) mm:: okay ((looks up)) (2) I can say thank you o:r ((est mut
19. gaze; hands in air)) (1) um: ((rolling gesture with hand)) I'm sorry I have no
20. idea ((mut gaze)) do you say,

In excerpt 9-19, Hikaru again is able to identify the object without mediation,
initiating the mediation sequence himself, in line 2. This leads to M providing an
explanation in lines 12-16 regarding the *pre-closing* stage of talk-in-interaction.
As with the previous excerpt therefore, while Hikaru shows awareness of the
pre-closing stage that is typical of talk, he struggles to resolve the object without
extensive assistance from M.

Excerpt 9-19 (DA1-5)

1. M: ahum
2. Hikaru: so:: then ((leans back; est mut gaze)) [con- talking
3. M: [mm ((nods head) yeah yeah yeah so yeah what kind of music have
4. you been listening to recently o[:r
5. Hikaru: [u::h]
6. M: yeah what are you doing this Saturday or ((mut gaze)) anything you like
7. yeah cos we're mates we're friends ((moves hand between self and
8. Hikaru)) (0.3) so you can just talk about anything
9. Hikaru: yes
11. Hikaru: thank you
12. M: and then again ((looks straight ahead; hands in air, palms facing each
13. other)) (0.3) as like the topic ((mut gaze)) closes
14. Hikaru: yes
15. M: the turns get shorter ((brings hands closer together)) (.) intonation goes
16. down
17. Hikaru: mm ((nods head; maintains gaze))
19. Hikaru: I see it

In contrast to Hikaru's DA1 stage mediation sequences, in the post-EP DA2
stage, he demonstrates impressive development, with increased control of the
pre-closing object. In excerpt 9-20, he orients to M's highly implicit mediating
moves in line 1 (the establishment of mutual gaze and smiling) after a short pause, and is able to resolve it without further assistance needed, producing a pre-closing turn in line 2 (announcing the end of the talk). M indicates his satisfaction by producing an affirmative utterance in line 3 and continuing the task sequence. This sequence shows therefore Hikaru’s ability to resolve the object efficiently without explicit mediation; a significant contrast to the DA1 stage.

Excerpt 9-20 (DA2-2)

1. M: a:h okay yeah (.) don’t worry about it ((est mut gaze; smiles))
2. Hikaru: (0.3) o:h (.) I gotta go
3. M: ah right okay (. ) you got to: - (. ) you’re meeting a friend,
4. Hikaru: yes

In Excerpt 9-21, Hikaru orients to M’s implicit mediating moves in line 1 (an elongated syllable and adjustment of arm position), producing a possible resolution, using the metalinguistic term for a type of pre-closing (a “fake arrangement”). After questioning from M in lines 9 and 11, Hikaru further demonstrates conceptual knowledge of the object, verbalising another potential pre-closing type that could be appropriate for the task sequence interaction. This excerpt shows Hikaru’s increasing conceptual understanding of pre-closings, and ability to orient to and resolve the issue efficiently.

Excerpt 9-21 (DA2-5)

1. M: (0.3) alright ((est mut gaze; tilts head; frowns)) mm: ((crosses arms))
2. Hikaru: ((gaze straight ahead)) (2) fake arrangement, ((est mut gaze))
3. M: ((laughs; gaze down)) (0.3) do you think that was a very quick end
4. ((mut gaze))
5. Hikaru: [a:h
6. M: [very] very- that was a very (. ) (1) boom finish ((moves hands in air; mut gaze))
7. gaze))
8. Hikaru: mm
9. M: yeah (0.3) so if you wanted to:
10. Hikaru: to:: ((mut gaze))
11. M: more gradually f- (.) end the conversation what could you do
12. Hikaru: ((gaze straight ahead)) u:h (0.5) I can summarise ((mut gaze))
13. M: mm okay ((nods once))

9.4. Individual learner-participant development

In this section, the development of each individual participant is assessed, examining their overall median scores and frequency distributions. In addition, particular areas of interest in terms of change over time are focused on, with both a quantitative and qualitative, microgenetic approach taken to the data to demonstrate this change.

9.4.1. Akiko

Akiko’s overall aggregated median scores suggest some movement taking place within her ZPD, with her median score of 3 in the DA1 stage followed by a score of 4 in the DA2 stage (see Table 9-1). Her score of 3 in the TA transfer tasks suggest she found these tasks, in which she needed to apply her knowledge in new ways, particularly challenging, which is unsurprising. Figures 9-20, 9-21 and 9-22 show her distribution of scores in the three stages. These histograms provide further insight into her development, showing a considerable movement in the DA2 stage towards higher scores, with the most frequent score being 5. In the TA stage also, despite the median score being the same as that of the DA1 stage, it can be seen that there are no scores of 2 (the lowest possible score), while 2 is the most frequent score in the pre-EP DA1 session.

Table 9-6: Overall median scores for Akiko

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th>DA2</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9-20: Frequency distribution of scores for Akiko in the DA1 stage

Figure 9-21: Frequency distribution of scores for Akiko in the DA2 stage
Examining Akiko’s response to mediation of specific objects, she demonstrates particular evidence of development in relation to the objects of *formality* and *politeness* (see sections 9.3.1.2 and 9.3.2.2 for detailed microgenetic analyses). Akiko’s median scores for *formality* of 2 in the DA1 stage, 4 in the DA2 stage, and 3 in the TA stage (see Table 9-2), and scores of 4 in the DA1 stage for *politeness*, 5 in the DA2 stage, and 3.5 in the TA stage (see Table 9-3), indicate movement towards self-regulation of these objects. The frequency distributions shown in Figures 9-23 to 9-28 support this, showing higher scores becoming more frequent in the post-EP stages, while low scores become less frequent.
**Figure 9-23:** Frequency distribution of scores for Akiko, for the object of *formality*, DA1 stage

![Graph showing frequency distribution of scores for Akiko, DA1 stage.]

**Figure 9-24:** Frequency distribution of scores for the object of *formality*, DA2 stage

![Graph showing frequency distribution of scores for the object of *formality*, DA2 stage.]
**Figure 9-25:** Frequency distribution of scores regarding the object of *formality*, TA stage

![Frequency distribution of scores regarding the object of formality, TA stage](image)

**Figure 9-26:** Frequency distribution of scores for the object of *politeness*, DA1 stage

![Frequency distribution of scores for the object of politeness, DA1 stage](image)
In terms of the *pre-requesting* object, the descriptive statistics offer a limited view of Akiko's development, as there were no mediation sequences related to the object in the post-EP stages to compare with her DA1 mediation sequences.
A microgenetic analysis of the transcript data however reveals two interesting features of Akiko’s dynamic assessment interactions. Firstly, the pre-requesting related mediation sequences in the DA1 stage provide evidence of learner development, in terms of assuming greater control of the interactions with M. In the first mediation sequence (excerpt 9-22), Akiko struggles to both orient to and resolve the object without relatively explicit mediation. After M’s initial questioning prompt in line 4, Akiko struggles to orient to the object, shown by the long pause in line 6. This leads to M identifying the location of the object in the following turn, with a prompt in lines 9-12. When this fails to lead to orientation, M employs more explicit moves in lines 18-20 in the way of an explanation, and again in lines 23 and 24. It is not until later in the mediation sequence that Akiko produces a possible resolution to the object.

Excerpt 9-22 (DA1-1)

1. M: so: (0.4) first you: (0.3) {explained ((both hands raised, palms facing away from Akiko; makes eye contact))}
2.  
3. Akiko: ((nods head))
4. M: {a like (.i) I've lost my wallet (0.2) before that (0.2) is there anything else (0.3) you could say, ((maintains eye contact))) ((tilts head slightly to right))
5. Akiko: ((strokes chin; looks up)) (2.5) before I lost my wallet,
6. M: {mm:. so you said he:y how's it goin:g ((moves hands, palms facing away from Akiko; looks at Akiko))} (0.2) and then you said actually I'm re
7.  
8. ally bad (0.5)=
9. Akiko: ((establishes mutual gaze))
10. M: =and then ((makes eye contact; teeth on lower lip; makes forward ges-
11. ture with upper body and hands)) [a-
12.  
13. Akiko: [be]cause,
14. M: ((looks up)) [mm::
15. Akiko: [((laughs; leans forward))]
16. M: [((laughs))] (1) so: (looks diagonally downwards))
17. Akiko: (looks at mediator; hand on chin))
18. M: (0.5) when you're (.i) asking (.i) ((establishes mutual gaze)) a favour (.i)
19. from someone (1) before you: ask (0.2) is there anything else ((uses left
20. hand to make a chopping motion on the desk)) (1) you [could do]
21. Akiko: {{please, (looks
22. at mediator]))
23. M: mm: (0.5) ((makes sucking teeth sound; looks up) so checking, (.)
24. something, (.) maybe, ((looks at Akiko))
25. Akiko: {a::h (0.3) do you have, (1) do you have,(.) money, ((places closed
26. hand against mouth; establishes mutual gaze))

In contrast, later in the DA1 session, Akiko identifies the object herself, initiating
the mediation sequence, as shown in lines 1-3 of excerpt 9-23 below. She then
provides a resolution to the object in lines 7-8. This indicates that there was
uptake on M’s previous mediating moves in excerpt 9-22, allowing her to orient
to the object efficiently, and resolve it in a small number of turns.

Excerpt 9-23 (DA1-1)

1. Akiko: (0.3) I: lost my w-(.) (scratches head)) (0.3) oh wait ((looks up)) (2)
2. ((uses hand to make counting gesture in air)) before I lost my wallet ((looks
3. at mediator))
4. M: mm: (.) ((looks up;)) maybe you could do {before (.) yeah (.) ((establis
5. est mutual gaze)}) like (.) ((uses left hand, palm facing away from Akiko))
6. are you: like-
7. Akiko: are you bus- ((scratches head)) (1), are you busy, ((uses left arm
8. and hand, palm faced upwards; brings down to desk outstretched))
9. M: uh (.) no (.) no what's up

The final mediation sequence related to pre-requesting shows Akiko taking
further control of the interaction, making the decision to retain her original task
sequence language choice, rejecting the mediator’s assistance, shown in
excerpt 9-24. There is some evidence to indicate limited micro genetic
development within the DA1 session therefore, with Akiko moving from
struggling to orient to the object, to identifying it herself, and to assuming control
of the final sequence, deciding to retain her initial language choice in the task
sequence.

Excerpt 9-24 (DA1-2)

1. Akiko: [I only] (.) hi and (.) could you (0.3) [pick me up
2. M: [oh right] ((laughs))
3. Akiko: ((laughs))
4. M: okay (.) so you wouldn't (.) ask hi:m (.) you know if he's busy o:r if he's
5. Akiko: ye:s ((laughs))
6. M: really ((laughs)) oh right okay (0.3) {so: ((looks diagonally down))} (.)
7. mm (.) alright (0.2) so you don't want to check ((moves both hands towards
8. Akiko, fingertips pressed together))
9. Akiko: (0.4) yea:h (1) yeah. ((looks away; establishes mutual gaze))
10. M: okay ((mutual gaze))
11. Akiko: I don't do
12. M: alright okay (.) it's up to you (.) your choice.

What is not demonstrated however in the DA1 stage, is conceptual understanding. While there are no mediation sequences in the DA2 stage, a DA2 verbalisation sequence does indicate development of Akiko’s control of the pre-requesting concept, shown in excerpt 9-25. Here, Akiko appropriately identifies her task sequence pre-request turn in line 2, in response to M’s metalinguistic prompt. This alone indicates an understanding of the pre-requesting concept that was not evident in the early DA1 stage mediation sequence. After further prompting from M in lines 3-4, Akiko demonstrates knowledge of a range of pre-request realisations, producing an alternative pre-request type in line 5. She also demonstrates further conceptual knowledge in line 19, identifying a type of pre-requesting using the metalinguistic term “possibility.” M interprets this as meaning the checking of ability, one of the main categories of pre-requesting. It can be seen then, that while there is still extensive mediation in this sequence, with M producing a number of prompts and leading questions, Akiko does demonstrate some conceptual understanding of the pre-request stage of talk, identifying it in the task sequence, and displaying knowledge of pre-request types.

Excerpt 9-25 (DA2-3)

1. M: yeah (.) what was your pre-request again ((maintains eye contact))
2. Akiko: ((looks down)) are you busy, ((looks at mediator))
3. M: are you busy. (.) is there anything else you could ask ((lowers hand;
4. maintains eye contact))
5. Akiko: (0.3) do: ((looks straight ahead)) you have time ((looks at mediator))
Overall, the descriptive statistics show impressive movement from Ema towards self-regulation of the target objects. In the pre-EP NDA and DA1 stages, she was typically lacking in confidence, often adopting a reactive stance in mediation sequences. Her median score for the DA1 stage, and the frequency distribution of scores shown in Figure 9-29 reflect this, with a median score of 2 (the lowest possible), and scores grouped homogeneously in the 2 to 3 range. The post-EP stages show a considerable change, with a DA2 median score of 3.5, and a TA score of 4. The distribution of scores in the DA2 stage is also very different, with a heterogeneous spread from 2 to 5, with 3s and 4s being the most frequent. This pattern continues with the TA stage, albeit with fewer mediation sequences available to code.
Table 9-7: Aggregated data for overall median scores, Ema

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th>DA2</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9-29: Overall frequency distribution of scores for Ema, DA1 stage

Figure 9-30: Overall frequency distribution of scores for Ema, DA2 stage
A close analysis of the transcript also reveals evidence of development by Ema, in terms of her ability to assume control of the mediation sequences, and verbalise her conceptual understanding in relation to her language choices. This is particularly evident in mediation sequences related to the object of *politeness*. Throughout the DA1 mediation sequences related to *politeness*, Ema shows little evidence of taking on responsibility or control of the interactions. M provides relatively explicit mediating moves throughout, both to promote orientation to the object, and also its resolution. A typical example of this is shown in excerpt 9-26 below. In this sequence, M draws Ema’s attention to her task sequence request turn, repeating it, then questioning its suitability in line 1. Ema struggles to orient to the object, shown by her use of “*eh,*” a Japanese particle indicating surprise or uncertainty. On three occasions, in lines 6, 9 and 28, Ema cedes control of the mediation sequence, stating that she does not know how to resolve the object at hand. This leads to M taking on responsibility for resolving the sequence. This pattern is repeated throughout Ema’s DA1 mediation sequences, in which she adopts a reactive stance in interactions, ceding control of object resolution to M, producing short turns that are typically second turn parts of question and answer adjacency pairs. She does not initiate any mediation sequences herself, and shows a limited ability to verbalise the reasoning behind her language choices, or analyse the social context of the SI's.
Excerpt 9-26 (DA1-1)

1. M: (0.3) may I (. ) do you think (0.3) is that okay
2. Ema: eh ((Japanese particle indicating uncertainty; shifts gaze up))
3. M: ((laughs)) I'll be doing this a lot ((laughs)) a lot of questions today (. )
4. may I borrow money (. ) do you think that's okay or not okay ((shifts gaze to
5. Ema))
6. Ema: (0.3) maybe not I don't know
7. M: hmm why not
8. Ema: eh ((Japanese particle indicating uncertainty)) (3) ((establishes mu-
9. tual gaze)) (1) I don't kno:w
10. M: it's okay (. ) don't worry ((gaze down)) (0.3) may I: ((gaze up)) (0.3)
11. does that sound (. ) so we're friends ((establishes mutual gaze))
13. M: ((gaze up)) may I borrow some money (0.3) may I: (. ) is that casual or::
14. ((looks at Ema))
15. Ema: ((gaze up; smiles)) ah
16. M: formal [what do you
17. Ema: [formal
18. M: formal okay (. ) so::: ((tilts head slightly; maintains mutual gaze))
19. Ema: can I,
20. M: ((gaze up)) mm (. ) and you wanna borrow money ((establishes mutual
21. gaze)) (. ) is that (. ) so: ((gaze away, then reestablishes mutual gaze)) can
22. I is that (. ) suitable ((smiles)) for (. ) asking for money,
23. Ema: um: ((gaze away; smiles)) (1) eh ((Japanese particle indicating sur-
24. prise or uncertainty))
25. M: what do you think ((lowers volume of voice))
26. Ema: (1.5) ((laughs))
27. M: ((laughs)) (0.3) is there anything else you could say,
28. Ema: (7.3) I don't know ((establishes mutual gaze))

In the post-EP stages however, Ema shows evidence of having undergone considerable development since the DA1 session. In excerpt 9-27 below, Ema is firstly able to orient to the object efficiently, with only relatively implicit mediation from M in the form of an open question in line 3. She proceeds to offer an explanation of the rationale behind her language choice, showing an
ability to analyse the social context of the SI in lines 5-6. After further probing by M, she then offers further explanation of her language choice in lines 18-19, showing an awareness of the rank of imposition being a relevant factor in formulating requesting realisations. This is evidence of Ema attempting to connect context to her language choices, something that was not in evidence in the DA1 stage SIs. Also, rather than opting out of assuming some responsibility, as in the DA1 sequences (“I don’t know”), here, she puts forward an opinion that her original language choice was appropriate, offering reasoning regarding the size of the imposition. She fully participates in resolving the mediation sequences by choosing to retain her initial task sequence language choice.

Excerpt 9-27 (DA2-1)

1. M: I want you- so um I want you
2. Ema: ah ((looks away; smiles))
3. M: you said is that that ((lowers volume of voice)) (0.3) why did you choose
4. that
5. Ema: (0.3) ((laughs; looks straight ahead)) (0.5) u:h (2.5) because (. ) uh
6. (0.3) you're a brother ((est mutual gaze))
7. M: (((nods head; maintain mutual gaze)) oh right okay (. ) yeah (0.3) and
8. so:: ((looks down)) (. ) u:m (. ) I want you: ((moves hands in chopping mo-
9. tion)) (. ) would you say that's polite or not polite ((est mutual gaze))
10. Ema: not polite
11. M: (((looks down; nods head)) okay bu:t (. ) suitable for this situation, ((est
12. mutual gaze))
13. Ema: (1.5) u:m ((slowly nods head)) (0.3) I think
14. M: okay ((looks down)) (. ) u:m (. ) so:: (. ) it's suitable because I'm your
15. brother ((est mutual gaze))
16. Ema: ((nods head))
17. M: a:nd anything else any other reason
18. Ema: (0.3) u:m ((looks away, then down)) (2.3) u:h (0.5) not (. ) ((est mutual
19. gaze)) so big (1) asking
20. M: ((looks down)) (0.3) um ((est mutual gaze)) the favour,
21. Ema: favour ((nods head))
This change in stance, from reacting to M’s mediating moves with short turns and generally ceding control, to one of actively participating in object resolution, and providing reasoning, is further in evidence in excerpt 9-28. When M questions Ema in lines 1-2, she responds affirmatively, in line 3, verbalising her reasoning in lines 5-6 and 9, indicating increasing conceptual understanding of the contextual factors that can influence request talk. She then assumes control of the resolution of the object, uttering her satisfaction with her language choice in line 13. It can be seen therefore, that there is a significant contrast between interactions with Ema in the DA1 stage, and in the post-EP stages. While in the DA1 SIs she is typically passive, allowing M to take responsibility for resolving the objects, struggling to orient to the objects, and providing little evidence of conceptual understanding, post-EP, she demonstrates an ability to assume some control of the sequences, and shows an increased understanding of the _politeness_ concept. This supports therefore, the evidence of development shown in the descriptive statistics discussed above.

Excerpt 9-28 (DA2-5)

1. M: a::h okay ((lowers volume of voice)) so want to (.) are you happy (.)
2. with that, ((est mutual gaze)) you want to,
3. Ema: ((maintain mutual gaze)) yes ((smiles))
4. M: okay (.) why ((smiles; maintains mutual gaze))
5. Ema: ((looks down)) (0.3) cos (0.7) u:h (.) to good friends, ((shifts gaze to M))
6. M)
7. M: okay ((nods head; maintains mutual gaze)) (.) yeah (.) anything else,
8. ((tilts head slightly))
9. Ema: ((looks down)) (0.5) mm (3.5) small favour ((shifts gaze to M))
10. M: mm okay mm ((looks downn; nods head)) (0.3) so (.) small favour (.)
11. ((est mutual gaze)) good friend (.) so l- (.) I want to (.) you're happy with
12. that suitable
13. Ema: I'm happy ((maintains mutual gaze; smiles; nods slightly))
9.4.3 Hanako

Table 9-8: Aggregated data for overall median scores, Hanako

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th>DA2</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9-32: Frequency distribution scores for Hanako, DA1 stage

Figure 9-33: Frequency distribution scores for Hanako, DA2 stage
Analysis of Hanako’s coding scheme scores show some interesting results, with her median score related to the object of *formality* being lower in the post-EP DA2 stage than in the pre-EP DA1 session (see Table 9-2). While this appears to show that Hanako did not respond to mediation and the enrichment programme, the Vygotskian view of development as being non-linear (Vygotsky, 1998) offers a possible explanation. With this proviso notwithstanding however, the quantitative results do not show development.

A second important point regarding Hanako and the object of formality is that, while the median scores decreased overall in the DA2 stage, micro genetic analysis does reveal some evidence of her being able to verbalise her reasoning for language choices in greater detail and complexity, and an increase in control over the formality concept. Often in the DA1 stage mediation sequences related to formality, Hanako is able to orient to the object relatively quickly, with only implicit mediation required. However, she offers little in the way of explanations for her language choices. When she verbalises her understanding of formality, it is typically in the form of question-and-answer adjacency pairs, with Hanako providing a short second turn part. For example, in excerpt 9-29 below, she adopts a reactive stance, attempting to analyse the context of the SI in response to M’s relatively explicit moves, in the form of...
questions and summarising the contextual analysis (lines 12-14 and 13). This leads to Hanako producing a possible resolution to the object in line 16. It can be seen then, that Hanako requires here extensive mediation from M in order to analyse the context in terms of formality.

Excerpt 9-29 (DA1-6)

1. M: I really appreciate it (.) so: who- who am I ((touches chest; est mut
gaze))
2. Hanako: (0.5) father- my father
3. M: yea:h so family ((mut gaze))
4. Hanako: mm
5. M: does that sound (0.5) hm okay, I really appreciate it does that sound
6. formal or casual ((mut gaze)) what do you think
7. Hanako: hm: ((looks up, then down)) (0.3) not- not formal, ((est mut gaze))
8. M: ((looks up)) appreciate (0.5) does it sound casual, ((mut gaze))
9. Hanako: not casual
10. M: not casual hm (.) but I'm your dad ((touches chest; mut gaze)) so l
11. guess family members (0.3) in English language at least ((rolling gesture
with hand))
12. Hanako: mm ((nods head))
13. M: is (0.3) quite casual maybe (0.3) ((looks up; leaning back)) so:
14. Hanako: pl- please lend me (. ) some money, ((tits head; maintains gaze))
15. M: hm: ((looks up)) could do yeah [yeah yeah

In comparison, in excerpt 9-30 from the DA2 session, Hanako is able to provide a much more detailed analysis, with M providing more implicit mediating moves. In line 6, M prompts Hanako to verbalise her analysis of the SI context, which she does from lines 7-16. While she produces her analysis, M offers only implicit mediation, in the form of affirmative utterances (line 9 for example) and nodding (line 16). With only this implicit assistance however, she produces an analysis that incorporates the concepts of social status and distance, two key concepts that can affect language choice. She also takes some control of resolving the object, deciding to change the initial task sequence turn in line 21. Despite the median score being lower therefore in the DA2 stage, excerpts 9-29
and 9-30 provide some evidence of development, in terms of Hanako’s ability to control the concept of formality.

Excerpt 9-30 (DA2-3)

1. M: a:h (. ) okay ((leans back; gaze down)) (. ) so::: (03) what do you think
2. ((mut gaze)) is that suitable greeting,
3. Hanako: no ((inaudible))
4. M: mm ((gaze up)) it depends maybe
5. Hanako: mm ((mut gaze))
6. M: what does it depend on ((frowns; tilts head; mut gaze))
7. Hanako: (0.5) mm: if you- (. ) if teacher is (. ) u:h teacher and I ((hands to-
8. gether; gaze down)) u:h (. ) so (. ) this situation is (0.3) I and (. ) my teacher
9. M: mm ((gaze down))
10. Hanako: have known (1) for two months, ((shifts gaze to M))
11. M: mm ((gaze down)) (1) ((shifts gaze to Hanako))
12. Hanako: so ((gaze straight ahead)) (0.7) not (. ) so close ((claps hands to-
13. gether))
14. M: right ((maintains gaze))
15. Hanako: and not s- and ((gaze down)) (0.3) they don't know each other
16. M: mm: ((gaze up, then reest mut gaze nods slowly)) okay mm:
17. Hanako: maybe hello is better, ((maintains gaze at M))
18. M: ((gaze down)) (0.7) ((nods))
19. Hanako: mm: ((gaze down))
20. M: so: (. ) okay so you wanna change ((shifts gaze to Hanako))
21. Hanako: ((mut gaze; nods))

Regarding the object of politeness, both the descriptive statistics and microgenetic analysis indicate development. Near the beginning of the DA1 session, Hanako struggles to orient to the object, with M explaining in line 10 of excerpt 9-31 that the object is not related to grammar, attempting to direct her attention towards politeness. After a questioning prompt from M in lines 21-23, Hanako expresses her lack of knowledge regarding the relationship between the social context and the possible linguistic realisations of her request turn. Here then, Hanako requires explicit mediation to orient to the object, and shows a lack of conceptual knowledge regarding the target concept.
Excerpt 9-31 (DA1-2)

1. M: ((laughs; leans back; est mut gaze; both hands raised chest level)) I
2. want(.) to ask you ((smiles)) (0.5) I want to ask you ((shrug gesture; main-
3. tains mut gaze))
4. Hanako: I
5. M: hm ((laces hands together; maintains gaze))
6. Hanako: ((looks up)) I wan ((low volume))- I want to ask ((looks away)) (1)
7. you
8. M: is that okay ((rest head on hand; elbow on desk; est mut gaze))
9. Hanako: (0.7) I want to ask ((low volume)) (0.3) you
10. M: yeah gr- grammar is okay ((raises eyebrows; "ok" sign with thumb-fin-
11. ger; mut gaze))
13. M: but(.) the message ((frowns slightly; both hands raised)) (0.3) is it okay
14. do you think,(.) think about(.) the favour is it a big favour small favour
15. what do you think ((maintains mut graze; maintains pose))
16. Hanako: ((leans forward; looks down; hand on mouth)) (2) big ((shifts gaze
17. to M))
18. M: mm ((looks up)) do you think- mm(.) yeah ((waggles hand in air; mut
19. gaze)) (0.5) maybe(.) medium big or some[thing
20. Hanako: [um.]
21. M: so: (.) I want to ask you (0.3) is that- hmm what do you think is that(.)
22. okay ((mut gaze; smiles)) o:r (.) would you use different language (.) may-
23. be
24. Hanako: I don't know it's- (.) I don't know it's (.) appropriate (.) phrase
25. ((looks straight forward, then est mut gaze)) (.) for favour

In the DA2 stage however, Hanako demonstrates an increased ability to
analyse the context, and draw a connection to her language choices. In excerpt
9-32 below, in response to M’s question in line 7, Hanako produces a detailed
explanation of the rationale behind her task sequence language choice, citing
the size of the imposition in lines 8-11 and 15; further, she opts to retain her
original request formulation in line 20. This therefore provides evidence of both
developing conceptual understanding of the politeness concept and the
relationship between context and linguistic realisations, and also of assuming
greater control of the resolution of the target object.

Excerpt 9-32 (DA2-2)

1. M: what ((tilts head; arm ext on desk)) (0.3) what did you say one more
time (. ) your req[uest
2. Hanako: [could you] pick me up
3. M: okay are you happy with that language, ((mut gaze; arm ext on desk))
(0.3) for this situation,
4. Hanako: (0.3) mm yeah
5. M: okay ( . ) why ((tilts head; mut gaze))
8. Hanako: (0.3) ((mut gaze; elbow on desk, head resting on hand)) maybe
9. (. ) it is (0.3) um: the ordering (. ) ah (. ) the request is ((gaze down, then mut
10. gaze)) (0.5) u:h (. ) the size of request is a little (. ) mm: (. ) uh not big (. ) uh
11. not sm- mm not (0.3) small ((clasps hands; gaze down; smiles))
12. M: mm ((gaze down)) one hour drive ((mut gaze))
13. Hanako: yes:
14. M: on Sunday night ((nods; gaze down))
15. Hanako: a little big (. ) that- so: (. ) I thought (. ) it is (. ) uh could is better
16. M: mm: ((gaze down))
17. Hanako: to or- order
18. M: is that- do you think it's- (. ) u:m do you think it's polite enough (. ) do you
19. think ((mut gaze)) (. ) or:
20. Hanako: maybe (. ) yes

9.4.4 Mayumi

Table 9-9 and Figures 9-35-9-37 show the overall median scores and frequency
distributions for Mayumi. The median scores show a progression from a score
of 4 for the pre-EP DA1 stage overall, to a score of 4.5 in the post-EP TA stage.
The distribution of scores provides further insight into Mayumi’s movement
away from other-regulation towards self-regulation, with more scores falling into
the 4 and 5 categories in the DA2 stage than in the DA1 session. In the TA
stage, there are no scores of 2 at all (the lowest possible), with a discernible
shift towards higher scores in general.
Table 9-9: Aggregated data for overall median scores, Mayumi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th>DA2</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9-35: Frequency distribution of scores for Mayumi, DA1 stage

Figure 9-36: Frequency distribution of scores for Mayumi, DA2 stage
The quantitative analysis shows movement towards self-regulation in particular in mediation sequences related to *formality* and *politeness*. For formality, Mayumi’s median scores were 2.5, 4 and 3.5 for the DA1, DA2 and TA stages respectively; for politeness her median scores were 4, 4.5 and 6. Figures 9-38-9-43 show the frequency distribution of scores for both of these objects, for Mayumi. The frequency distribution histograms shown below show a clear movement towards the awarding of higher scores in the post-EP stages for both objects. It is important to note however, that there were relatively few mediation sequences related to formality and politeness for Mayumi, meaning that only tentative conclusions can be drawn from these statistics.

**Figure 9-37:** Frequency distribution of scores for Mayumi, TA stage

![Figure 9-37](image-url)
Figure 9-38: Frequency distribution of scores for the object of formality for Mayumi, DA1 stage

Figure 9-39: Frequency distribution of scores for the object of formality for Mayumi, DA2 stage
Figure 9-40: Frequency distribution of scores for the object of formality for Mayumi, TA stage

![Bar chart showing frequency distribution of scores for the object of formality for Mayumi, TA stage.]

Figure 9-41: Frequency distribution of scores for the object of politeness for Mayumi, DA1 stage

![Bar chart showing frequency distribution of scores for the object of politeness for Mayumi, DA1 stage.]

Figure 9-42: Frequency distribution of scores for the object of politeness for Mayumi, DA2 stage

![Frequency distribution of scores for the object of politeness for Mayumi, DA2 stage](image)

Figure 9-43: Frequency of distribution of scores for the object of politeness for Mayumi, TA stage

![Frequency of distribution of scores for the object of politeness for Mayumi, TA stage](image)

That Mayumi underwent development in regards to these two objects however is supported by a microgenetic analysis of the transcript data. Close examination of the dialogic interactions during the mediation sequences and
verbalisation sequences shows Mayumi developing in terms of the efficiency with which she orients and resolves objects, the amount of control she exerts in directing the mediation sequences, and her verbalisation explanations of the concepts.

In excerpt 9-33 below, from the DA1 session, Mayumi struggles to orient to the object of formality, indicated by the frequency pauses and shifting of gaze downward between lines 3 and 7. The interlocutors engage in extensive dialogic interaction in order to negotiate an analysis of the context, with Mayumi adopting a reactive stance throughout, providing short second turn parts to question-and-answer adjacency pairs. This sequence is typical of Mayumi’s DA1 mediation sequences in which the object is formality.

Excerpt 9-33 (DA1-1)

1. M: may I ask you a favour may I ask you a favour (.) may I ((maintains gaze at Mayumi))
2. Mayumi: ((leans forward; looking down))
3. M: (0.3) is that okay,
4. Mayumi: I can, can,
5. M: hmm (.) may I (0.3) is that (1.3) formal
6. Mayumi: (1) casual ((gaze still downward, then shifts gaze to M))
7. M: ((looks downwards; nods head slowly once)) h::m. (0.3) Mayumi (.) may
8. I borrow your bottle of tea (.) please
9. Mayumi: ((looks away)) (0.5) good use ((laughs))
10. M: (0.3) Mayumi can you just pass me the tea ((shifts gaze to Mayumi))
11. Mayumi: (0.3) yes ((reaches for the drink bottle))
12. M: which one- ((est mutual gaze)) (.) which one is formal which one is
13. casual
14. Mayumi: [u:m] may I (.) is formal, ((looked down, then est mutual gaze))
15. M: okay maybe more formal ((maintains gaze at Mayumi; nods head)) (.)
16. so: (.) who are you talking to ((est mutual gaze))
17. Mayumi: friends
18. M: okay (.) so: may I ask you a favour ((maintains mutual gaze)) (0.3) is
19. that okay do
20. you think or:
22. Mayumi: u:h ((shifts gaze downwards))
23. M: (0.3) what do you think
24. Mayumi: (0.5) u:h it's too polite to: friends, (.) I think ((shifts gaze to M))

In contrast, her DA2 mediation sequences provide evidence of considerable movement towards her gaining control of the concept. In excerpt 9-34 for example, Mayumi initiates the mediation sequence herself, identifying the object without assistance in line 1, with the rising intonation of the final syllable indicating a bid for help. The fact that she self-corrects herself in line 1, changing “thanks” to “thank you” indicates she has identified formality as being the object. She is then able to produce a possible resolution in line 20, which she later confirms as her language choice for the task sequence. This shows evidence of development over the DA1 mediation sequences, in which she frequently struggled to orient to the object without explicit mediating moves from M.

Excerpt 9-34 (DA2-3)

1. Mayumi: thanks ((laughs)) ta- thanks ((est mutual gaze)) thank you,
2. M: mm it depen- well
3. Mayumi: u::h
4. M: so (.) [how
5. Mayumi: [maybe] no thanks
6. M: ((laughs))
7. Mayumi: ah
8. M: it depends ((est mutual gaze)) on (. ) you know (0.5) it depends on the
9. relationship
10. Mayumi: mm ((looks down))
11. M: (0.3) but (0.3) generally ((shifts gaze to Mayumi)) (0.5) in general
12. ((looks down)) you've known the teacher for two months ((est mutual
gaze)) so wh- what do you think ((maintains gaze))
13. Mayumi: (0.5) sh:::- should be polite,
14. M: okay ((nods head slowly; maintains gaze))
15. Mayumi: so:
16. M: for polite or f:o:r[mal
17. Mayumi: [formal]
19. M: mm ((nods head; looks down))
20. Mayumi: thank you: (0.3) thank you, ((laughs))

Further, in excerpt 9-35 below, Mayumi shows developing conceptual understanding of formality, verbalising her analysis of the social context of the SI in lines 3-10. In this verbalisation, she uses the concept of *social distance* to analyse the situation, and provide a rationale for her language choice. This is something she did not do in the pre-EP DA1 stage.

Excerpt 9-35 (DA2-2)

1. Mayumi: [thanks,] (0.3) than-
2. M: because, (0.5) why (. ) why thanks why not thank you maybe
3. Mayumi: ((looks down; leans back)) (2.3) mm:: (2) I can (1) be (0.7) u::h I can sa:y then thank you ((est mutual gaze, then looks straight ahead))
4. (0.5) thanks (1) casual, (0.5) so
5. M: because ((maintains gaze at Mayumi)) (0.5)
6. Mayumi: because (0.5) our (. ) relationship
7. M: mm ((maintains gaze; nods head))
8. Mayumi: (0.3) is (. ) u:m (. ) too ((mods hands closer and farther apart, palms facing each other)) (. ) close ((laughs; shifts gaze to M))

This development is also seen in mediation sequences related to *politeness*. While in the DA1 stage, Mayumi offered little in the way of verbalisations analysing the context, or demonstrating conceptual knowledge, in the DA2 sequences, she does so. An example of this can be seen in excerpt 9-36, in which M questions Mayumi as to her choice of language in line 1. Mayumi responds by providing a detailed explanation of the reasoning behind her linguistic realisation, incorporating the concept of the *degree of imposition* in line 10. This explanation is produced with only implicit mediating moves from M, in the form of affirmative utterances (lines 5 and 11), nodding of the head (line 13), and questioning in line 7.

Excerpt 36 (DA2-1)

1. M: are you happy with that choice of language
2. Mayumi: (1) u:m may I is formal,
4. Mayumi: can I is more casual ((looking down))
5. M: right ((maintains gaze))
6. Mayumi: so we are friends
7. M: ahum .) is it polite enough do you think,
8. Mayumi: ((looks straight ahead)) (1) hmm not (. so: polite
9. M: hmm. ((maintains gaze and pose))
10. Mayumi: (1.7) but (. ye- yes the: size of favour is very big ((looks up))
11. M: right
12. Mayumi: so: I should be more (. polite,
13. M: ((nods head once; maintains gaze)) okay
14. Mayumi: so cou:::ld I,
15. M: [could I,
16. Mayumi: [could I] ask you a favour ((shifts gaze to M))

9.4.5. Ryota

Ryota was initially one of the learner-participants who most struggled with the SIs in the pre-EP NDA and DA1 stages, and this is reflected in his overall median score of 2.5. The DA1 frequency distribution shows his scores at this stage grouped primarily at 2 and 3, the two lowest scores possible, indicating a reliance at this point on other-regulation. In comparison, there is a discernible movement in the post-EP DA2 stage, with a median score of 3, and a heterogeneous spread of scores between 2 and 5. While in both stages the most frequent score was 2, there were significantly fewer in this category in the DA2 session. The TA stage sees the continuing of this trend, with a median score of 4, and scores grouped primarily in the 4 and 5 categories; an important proviso here is the relatively small number of objects coded for this stage, making firm conclusions regarding trends difficult.

Table 9-10: Overall median scores for Ryota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th>DA2</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 9-44:** Overall frequency distribution of scores for Ryota, DA1 stage
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**Figure 9-45:** Overall frequency distribution of scores for Ryota, DA2 stage

![Bar graph](image2)
A close examination of Ryota’s transcript data lends support to the evidence of development in his median scores and distribution of scores. While in the DA1 stage, Ryota typically struggles to orient and resolve objects, and offers only very limited verbalisations regarding the social context of a SI, or his reasoning behind language choices, the post-EP stages reveal an increased level of conceptual understanding and awareness of context. Excerpt 9-37 below shows a mediation sequence from the DA1 session, in which the object is *formality*. Here, Ryota adopts a reactive stance in the interaction, producing short second turn parts to question and answer adjacency pairs. M largely assumes responsibility for analysing the social context of the SI, providing explicit mediating moves in the form of prompting questions (lines 6-7) and offering Ryota a choice of his turn being *formal or casual* (line 11). This leads to Ryota tentatively providing his analysis in line 12, his uncertainty shown by the rising intonation of the final syllable. Upon further probing by M in lines 13-19, Ryota further expresses his limited control regarding the concept of formality in line 20, producing the Japanese utterance of “e::h,” indicating surprise or uncertainty.

Excerpt 9-37 (DA1-1)

1. M: so (. ) consultation but ((extends arm; looks up)) (0.3) so I'm your friend
2. ((touches chest with hand))
3. Ryota: ah yeah ((maintains gaze; nods head))
4. M: consultation (.) is that (.) okay, (.) for friend ((mutual gaze))
5. Ryota: yeah for friend
6. M: yeah (.) is that okay, (.) is it ((looks up)) (0.5) is i:t (0.3) suitable ((shifts gaze to Ryota))
7. Ryota: suitable ((shifts gaze to M))
8. M: the word f:o:r ((looks up))
9. Ryota: a:h
10. M: like a- (.) is it formal or casual ((maintains gaze; right hand raised))
11. Ryota: (0.5) casual, ((est mutual gaze))
12. M: consultation, ((tilts head slightly))
13. Ryota: ah consultation is uh formal ((mutual gaze))
14. M: formal. ((nods head)) (0.3) and I'm your friend ((brings hand to chest))
15. Ryota: (0.5) a:h how ((looks down))
16. M: so:: what do you think ((leans against back of chair; hands laced))
17. Ryota: (0.7) hmm: ((looks away; hand on chin))
18. M: what's more casual ((maintains gaze)) (. ) than
19. Ryota: [e::h ((Japanese))]

In contrast, in DA2 mediation sequences related to formality, Ryota demonstrates an increased level of understanding and control of the concept, shown below in excerpt 9-38. In line 4, M prompts Ryota to explain his task sequence language choice; this leads to the learner revising his greeting to a more casual version in line 8-9. When M prompts Ryota to verbalise the reasoning behind the change, he produces an analysis of the context, incorporating the concept of social distance in line 9-12. This shows that he is now making the connection between the context of the SI and his language choices, and is evidence of developing conceptual understanding.

Excerpt 9-38 (DA2-1)

1. M: mm ((gaze straight ahead)) (.) you said hello- hello M, ((maintains gaze))
2. Ryota: hello M ((mut gaze))
3. M: yeah what- (.) what do you think about that ((laces fingers; leaning back; mut gaze))
6. Ryota: (1.3) my brother ((raises both arms))
7. M: ((nods; maintains gaze))
8. Ryota: ((gaze straight ahead)) hello ((lowers arms; gaze up)) (2) mm: (4)
9. hi- hi- hi M,
10. M: ((tilts head slightly; mut gaze)) because why- why hi ((smiles))
11. Ryota: (0.3) because uh relationship is uh close ((mut gaze)) (1) we are brother
12. M: a::h okay ((nods; mut gaze)) so (. ) the (. ) social distance ((brings palms
13. close together in air; tilts head))
14. Ryota: ah yeah ((leans forward; arms on desk))
15. M: okay ((gaze down; leaning back)) so you think hi (. ) is more ((shifts
16. gaze to Ryota)) (. ) suitable,
17. Ryota: ((gaze up; hand on chin)) (0.7) yes

While overall there is evidence of Ryota developing control over the target
concepts related to the speech act of requesting, this development is not seen
for all objects of mediation. In particular, he does not demonstrate increased
control over the pre-closing stage of talk. In the DA1 stage, he shows an ability
to orient to the object efficiently, and resolve the object with implicit mediation
only. An example of this is shown in excerpt 9-39 below, in which M initiates the
mediation sequence by waiting for 0.5 seconds and shifting his gaze to Ryota in
line 1. Ryota orients to this, providing a pre-closing turn in line 2; M closes the
mediation sequence by producing a task sequence turn in line 3.

Excerpt 9-39 (DA1-2)

1. M: okay ((shifts gaze to Ryota))
2. Ryota: (0.5) uh so: (1) uh see you soon, ((shifts gaze to M))
3. M: okay I'll see you soon
4. Ryota: ((laughs))
5. M: see you

In the DA2 stage however, Ryota’s median score for pre-closing does not move
towards self-regulation, instead decreasing from 4 to 2. There is not clear
evidence therefore of Ryota developing increased control of this concept in
response to the mediation in the DA stages and enrichment programme; this
conclusion is supported by an analysis of his verbalisations in the DA2 session. In excerpt 9-40 below, M draws Ryota’s attention to the pre-closing stage of talk, locating the site of the object in line 4. Ryota struggles to orient however, leading to M offering a more explicit mediating move in line 9, identifying pre-closing as being the object of the mediation sequence. M probes Ryota’s understanding of this stage of talk between line 9 and 21. Ryota shows an awareness of turns becoming shorter when interaction come to a close in line 13, but is unable to provide further explanation of the concept in line 16. This leads to M providing an explanation of the concept. Throughout this interaction, Ryota adopts a reactive stance, producing short turns, and demonstrating only limited knowledge of pre-closing. This is repeated in later mediation sequences regarding pre-closing, and indicates that the learner has not responded to mediation in regards to this concept in the same manner as he has to others (such as formality).

Excerpt 9-40 (DA2-1)

1. M: (0.7) it's very- that was very ((clicks fingers; maintains gaze)) (.) very
2. quick
3. Ryota: ah yeah ((laughs; gaze straight ahead))
4. M: so (. ) befo:re (0.3) closing (.) is there anything else (. ) you could
5. Ryota: mm:: ( (gaze straight ahead))
6. M: say
7. Ryota: (0.5) mm: ( (gaze up)) (4.5) mm: (7) have a (. ) good- (0.3) ah no
8. mm:
9. M: (1.5) so do you remember: (0.3) like pre:-closing
10. Ryota: uh yes ( (gaze up)) (3) u::h (4.3)
11. M: when people ((maintains gaze)) want to ((mut gaze)) (0.5) kind of begin
12. to finish the conversation
13. Ryota: a:h so shorter, ( (brings palms close together in air))
14. M: shorter yeah ((maintains gaze)) (0.3) and do they (. ) sometimes say
15. something,
16. Ryota: (0.5) mm: ( (gaze straight ahead)) (14.5) I don't remember ((mut
17. gaze))
18. M: ((laughs; looks at watch)) so maybe like something like you remembe:r
19. ((gaze up)) (. ) things like (. ) a fake arrangement, ((shifts gaze to Ryota)) (. )
20. [something=  
21. Ryota: [ah yeah]  
22. M: =like that (.) do you remember (.) or summary ((mut gaze)) (0.5)  
23. Ryota: [a:h yeah

9.4.6 Hikaru

Hikaru’s median score for the pre-EP DA1 stage is 3, indicating that overall he found the SIs challenging. The distribution of his scores shows the most frequent score being 2, the lowest possible; there is a spread however of scores, including high scores of 5, indicating that he found some objects of mediation more challenging than others. In the DA2 stage, his median score does not change. However, there are fewer low scores of 2, and one instance of the highest possible score, 6. Overall, the frequency distribution in this stage is heterogeneous, indicating, as with the DA1 stage, that Hikaru’s development was uneven, and that some objects provided more difficulty than others. In the TA stage, Hikaru’s median score is a significantly higher 4.5, indicating development towards self-regulation. While alone this does not provide conclusive evidence of development (there were only six objects of mediation in this stage), in conjunction with the microgenetic analysis of transcript data, Hikaru does demonstrate evidence of increasing control over the target concepts. Sections 9.2.3.2 and 9.2.4.2 above describe in detail Hikaru’s microgenetic development regarding the concepts of pre-requesting and pre-closing, with the learner showing through verbalisation sequences increased control over, and understanding of, these concepts.

**Table 9-11**: Overall median scores for Hikaru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DA1</th>
<th>DA2</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 9-47:** Frequency distribution of scores for Hikaru, DA1 stage

**Figure 9-48:** Frequency distribution of scores for Hikaru, DA2 stage


9.5 Conclusion

This chapter examines and discusses the development of the learner-participants in the three dynamic assessment stages- DA1, DA2 and TA. Unlike the NDA stages, assessed in Chapter Six, in the dynamic assessment sessions, leaners co-constructed the request-based interactions with the mediator, who engaged in mediation sequences and verbalisation sequences throughout. While Chapter Six assessed learner development through analysis of their independent performance, and thus assessed their actual level of development, the purpose of the current chapter is to assess learner development through close examination of the mediation sequences. By assessing the movement of learners away from explicit mediation and other-regulation, towards implicit mediation (or no mediation at all) and self-regulation, insights into learners’ potential level of development can be gained.

In this manner, learner development was analysed in two ways. Firstly, a coding scheme was applied to the mediation sequence interactions, allowing sequences to be categorised in terms of the efficiency with which objects were oriented to, and also with which they were resolved. Scores were attributed to
the codings, allowing for movement within learners’ ZPDs to be seen from a numerical point of view. Overall median scores and frequency distributions are shown for the three dynamic stages, showing a general movement towards higher scores over time, and thus towards self-regulation of target concepts. Providing further support for the descriptive statistical analysis, a microgenetic analysis of the transcript data was carried out, to provide further insights into learner development that were not necessarily captured by the coding scheme. By analysing mediation sequences and verbalisations in this way, a complete view of learner development was gained. This qualitative analysis generally lent support to the quantitative evidence of development among the participants.
Chapter Ten

Discussion

10.1 Introduction

This thesis details an investigation into the dynamic assessment of the requesting speech act among Japanese EFL learners in a higher educational institutional setting. Founded on Vygotskian sociocultural theory and informed by a diverse range of methodologies developed by Feuerstein, Gal'Perin, Di Pietro and the body of conversation analysis research, the study examines learner development in detail.

Findings result from an eight-week process, in which the learners participated in six key stages. Following DA methodology, initially the participants carried out four strategic interactions (SIs) with the researcher in the NDA1 stage. Here, the researcher co-constructed the language task with each learner in individual one-to-one sessions; however, no mediation sequences took place. The purpose of the non-dynamic assessment and its post-EP NDA2 counterpart was to assess the participants' zone of actual development (ZAD)- what they were capable of producing independently, without assistance. This serves as a baseline indicating the abilities that the participants have under self-regulatory control. Chapter Eight assesses the pre and post-EP NDA interactions for evidence of change in the learners' ZAD regarding interactional competence (IC). This was followed by the DA1 stage in which the same four SIs were carried out again, with an additional four SIs. Here, once more the researcher (mediator) co-constructed the language tasks with the learners individually. However, whenever a learner difficulty was identified, a mediation sequence was initiated, in which the interlocutors worked towards resolving the issue, or "object." Follow up post-EP DA2 sessions were also carried out, allowing learner development to be assessed. Finally, there was a transfer assessment (TA) stage, consisting of a near transfer task SI, a medium transfer task, and a far transfer task, designed to investigate the learners' ability to transfer their knowledge to novel contexts beyond those encountered in the DA sessions.

The mediation sequences that occurred in the DA and TA stages of the study are the focus of Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine. Chapter Seven examines the
ways in which the boundaries between the task and mediation sequences are negotiated by the interlocutors. Chapter Eight investigates the diagnostic capacity of these mediation sequences in terms of their ability to uncover the specific locations of learner problems. Chapter Nine examines the mediation sequences in detail to find evidence of learner development in relation to the efficiency with which they orient to and resolve the objects of mediation.

In the following sections, the findings of the study will be discussed in relation to each research question, and the literature reviewed in earlier chapters.

10.2 Negotiating boundaries between task and mediation insertion sequences

The first, second and third research questions ask:

1. How are mediation sequences established and accomplished by the Japanese learners of EFL and interlocutor during the dynamic assessment?
2. During DA sessions, is there change in the type and frequency of micro-interactional strategies over time?
3. Is there evidence of increased efficiency in negotiating these boundaries over time?

Poehner (2005; 2008) and Ableeva (2010) conceptualise mediation in terms of mediating moves by the mediator, and reciprocating moves by the learner, thus viewing mediation in a dynamic assessment as essentially a one-directional process, from expert to novice. This current study follows a different approach, proposed by van Compernolle (2013). In this approach, mediation is conceived as an insertion sequence, interrupting the task sequence in a DA session in order to address and resolve an issue identified by one or both of the interlocutors. This reframing allows mediation to be viewed as a more cooperative process, in which both the mediator and learner work together in the insertion sequence to overcome the problem.

Once mediation has been conceived as an insertion sequence, the ways in which the boundaries between task sequence and the mediation insertion
sequence are negotiated become important. For van Compernolle (2013), negotiating these boundaries efficiently indicates increasing *interactional competence* (IC) in the participants. Identifying the various types of opening and closing micro-interactional practices also uncovers the ways in which successful negotiations are accomplished. The purpose of the first research question in the current study therefore was two-fold- to provide an analysis of the strategies produced to open and close mediation insertion sequences and, by analysing the types and frequency of such strategies, assess the extent to which the learners' IC had increased over time.

In analysing the micro-interactional practices employed by the mediator and learners in negotiating the opening and closing boundaries, van Compernolle's (2013) proposal of adopting a conversation analysis-informed approach to data analysis was followed. Unlike the mediational moves in previous studies (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Poehner, 2005; Ableeva, 2010), in which the moves described were all verbal in nature, a CA-informed approach to the raw video-audio data allows other paralinguistic aspects of interaction to be captured. This wider lens proved effective in the current study in uncovering various practices by both interlocutors produced in opening and closing negotiations.

Analysing the data in this way, typologies of opening (see Chapter Seven, section 7.2) and closing practices (see section 7.4) were produced. Importantly, these typologies are descriptive, rather than prescriptive in nature, emerging from the data. Rather than aiming to prescribe strategies for use in mediation, the typologies aim to contribute to the body of knowledge and increase understanding of how successful mediation sequences are co-constructed. The descriptive nature of the typologies follows the *interactionist* DA methodology put forward by Poehner (2008), recognising the need for mediators to provide flexible mediation sensitive to the distinctive individual needs of the learner at particular moments in time. The lack of a "one size fits all" typology of negotiating strategies speaks to the need for the field to build a substantial body of descriptive typologies, emergent from a variety of contexts and learner proficiency levels. One goal of the current study then, is to contribute to such a body of knowledge.

10.2.1 Openings
Microgenetic analysis of the transcript data firstly uncovered the strategies employed during negotiation of mediation sequence *openings*, the majority of which were initiated by the mediator in both DA sessions. Following Aljaafreh and Lanto (1994), these moves were organised according to the principle of explicitness (Poehner, 2005). The mediator employed a range of strategies to initiate mediation sequences, both verbal and paralinguistic in nature. It is important to note that these moves were typically not produced in isolation; frequently multiple strategies were produced simultaneously (see excerpt 7-1 for an example of this). In terms of verbal strategies, the mediator frequently employed explicit verbal utterances to halt the task sequences and begin mediation, as well as verbal "bridge" utterances that served to create a link between the task and mediation sequences (see section 7.2.2). It also emerged from the data that the mediator used volume as a strategy at times, lowering the volume of his voice in comparison to his task talk turns (see section 7.2.3). A further verbal practice took the form of repeating the learners' previous task-turn utterance (see section 7.2.4). Other paralinguistic strategies produced by the mediator included the extensive use of gaze. This primarily took the form of establishing mutual gaze with the learner, but also included the shifting of his gaze in an upward direction. A move that often occurred simultaneously with an explicit verbal strategy was the extension of the arm towards the learner (section 7.2.5). Nodding or tilting of the head were also seen in the data, as well as smiling, which frequently occurred alongside the establishment of mutual gaze. The most implicit form of opening move observed took the form of *waiting* (see section 7.2.10), providing time for the learner to orient to the mediation sequence.

While less commonly found in the data than mediator-initiated moves, there were also instances of mediation sequences being opened by the learners themselves. Strategies frequently involved the use of gaze, such as the establishing of mutual gaze with the mediator, explicitly initiating mediation by posing a question (often accompanied with rising intonation on the last syllable), and pausing (see section 7.3 for examples of these opening strategies).

10.2.2 Closings
Closing micro-interactional practices were also organised in terms of the level of explicitness. As with the opening strategies, these practices were typically produced together with one or more other practices. Verbal strategies were frequently employed, and were organised into two categories. The first was the explicit verbal identification of the task initiation point (see section 7.4.2), in which the mediator verbally described where the task sequence should begin again. As well as helping the learner locate the stage of the task talk to begin his turn, this also serves to explicitly orient the learner to the closing of the mediation sequence. Affirmative utterances were also frequently produced in negotiating closings (see section 7.4.1), as was intonation, lowered on the final syllable of a turn. Paralinguistic moves included pausing; the breaking of mutual gaze and the subsequent shifting of gaze in a downward direction (see section 7.4.3); nodding (see section 7.4.6), and use of a "rewind" gesture by the mediator to signify reinitiating the task sequence at an earlier stage (see section 7.4.8). Mutual gaze was also employed, and the adjusting of sitting position (see section 7.4.7) was used to indicate the closing of a mediation sequence, with the interlocutors sitting forward in their chairs. There were also instances of the task sequence being reinitiated upon resolution of the object, without any apparent closing strategies, signifying that the interlocutors were satisfied the mediation sequence had been resolved (see section 7.4.9).

Reviewing the strategies produced in opening and closing negotiations therefore, the usefulness of widening data analysis to include paralinguistic behaviour can be clearly seen. Both interlocutors, in negotiating both opening and closing boundaries, regularly draw upon a variety of non-verbal practices in conjunction with verbal ones. This approach to analysis provides a rich account of how the DA interlocutors went about the process of transitioning from task sequence to mediation insertion sequence, and vice versa. The typologies of negotiating practices that emerged from the data therefore contribute to our body of knowledge of how mediation is accomplished in the second language learning field. Studies are beginning to address the aforementioned need for mediational practices to be captured in a variety of contexts. Poehner (2005) investigated grammatical aspect; Ableeva (2010) focused on listening comprehension; and van Compernolle (2013; 2014) applied DA to sociopragmatic performance. The current study investigates a further context,
that of Japanese EFL learners, and a further target of assessment- realising a speech act in talk-in-interaction. In this way, by framing mediation as an insertion sequence with boundaries, and by capturing paralinguistic as well as verbal practices, the findings of the current study make an important contribution.

10.2.3 Negotiating boundaries with increasing efficiency

Van Compernolle (2013) puts forward that the efficient negotiating of opening and closing boundaries between task and mediation sequences is one indicator of increasing interactional competence in the participants. Other indicators of development include increased efficiency in orienting to the object of mediation, and its resolution, and are discussed in the other research questions. The current study therefore frames learner development in terms of these three key elements. In contrast, previous studies of DA in the second language learning field (Poehner, 2005; 2008; Ableeva, 2010) have assessed learner development by analysing the types and frequency of both mediating moves by the mediator and reciprocating moves by the learner, and how these change over time. It is put forward that the approach in the current study, in which development is assessed in three ways- analysing openings and closings; orientation to objects, and object resolution, offers an alternative perspective, in which a highly granular and detailed view of learner development can be seen.

Grouping opening micro-interactional practices therefore by level of explicitness provided insights into changes in the ways openings were negotiated in the pre-EP and post-EP sessions. Explicit opening moves were defined as ones involving a direct verbal halting of the task sequence, with all other strategies drawn upon in negotiating the boundary categorised as implicit. By categorising the practices in this way, frequencies could be tabulated, allowing a comparison between stages (see Table 7-3 in section 7.5). This analysis showed approximately the same numbers of implicit and explicit moves produced in the DA1 sessions. In the DA2 sessions however, implicit moves were far more frequent than explicit ones. Following van Compernolle’s argument that efficiently negotiating boundaries provides evidence of increasing IC, this therefore indicates increased IC among the participants, with less explicit negotiating strategies required in order to orient to the initiation of a mediation
sequence. While this is only one aspect of learner development assessed in the current study, in conjunction with the other aspects discussed below, it offers a window into how the learners' IC changed over time.

10.3 Tracking learner development- orientation to and resolution of the objects of mediation

The fourth research question, addressed in Chapter Nine, pertains to learner development in terms of orienting to and resolving the objects of mediation:

Is there evidence of increased interactional competence regarding mediation sequences, demonstrated by efficient identification and resolution of the objects of mediation, and by learner verbalisations?

While the first research question addressed one aspect of IC, the second question assesses another aspect— the ability to successfully identify the object of a mediation sequence and resolve it with the mediator. Alongside increasingly efficient negotiations of the boundaries of mediation sequences, further evidence of development is defined for the purposes of this study as an increasing efficiency in this orientation and resolution process. Efficiency is viewed as a movement away from extensive explicit micro-interactional strategies, and towards fewer and more implicit strategy types. This approach to tracking learner development is based on the sociocultural concept of the ZPD, describing the space between what a learner can do with assistance from another (other-regulation), and what they can do independently (self-regulation). In line with previous studies investigating mediation between an "expert" and a "novice" (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Poehner, 2005; 2008; Ableeva, 2010), the characteristics and frequency of mediational practices can be used to plot the learner's course towards internalisation of a skill or ability. While, for example, the frequent production of relatively explicit mediational practices indicates a learner does not yet have control of the target ability, fewer and more implicit practices provides evidence of a learner moving towards internalisation and control of the object of mediation.
To assess learner change over the course of the study in relation to object orientation and resolution, a two-pronged approach was taken. Firstly, in analysing the transcript data, a coding scheme was applied with the aim of quantifying learner movement within the ZPD (see Figure 9-4, Chapter Nine). Initially, Aljaafreh and Lantolf's (1994) regulatory scale was employed to meet this aim in the inter-rater reliability check stage of this study. Following the methodology set out by Campbell et al (2013), the primary investigator (myself) and a secondary investigator applied the scale to a sample of the mediation sequences in the transcript data. Whenever coding disagreements arose, negotiations between the coders took place, and elements of confusion and ambiguity in the coding scheme discussed. As the reliability check progressed, it became apparent that there was a tension between the original scale of Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994), and the current study's aim of coding two separate (though related) elements of IC- object orientation and resolution. To clarify the coding scheme for this purpose therefore, and to improve inter-rater agreement, the coding scheme was revised to reflect the current study's goals.

The revised coding scheme resulting from the inter-rater reliability check and applied to the full data set therefore reflects the aim of tracking these two elements of mediation sequences, and also the practical necessity of being able to apply the scheme to the data with clarity. While then Aljaafreh and Lantolf's scale has five points and one category, the coding scheme applied in this study has three points of development, but two categories (one for object orientation, and one for object resolution). This allowed a number to be assigned to both aspects of the learners' IC, and learner movement to be tracked from other-regulation to self-regulation. Using this information, a basic quantitative analysis was carried out, allowing median scores for participants to be calculated for both pre-EP and post-EP stages (see Table 9-1), and frequency distributions to be represented in histogram form (see Figure 9-5 for an example of this, showing the frequency distribution of scores in the DA1 sessions).

In conjunction with the quantitative analysis described above, a qualitative microgenetic analytic approach was taken to the data, following the approach taken by Poehner (2005; 2008), Ableeva (2010) and van Compernolle (2013). This microgenetic analysis, in which the transcript data is analysed closely for evidence of moment-to-moment changes in learner development, is a typical
approach to data analysis in DA L2 studies. Its usefulness lies in its potential for uncovering evidence of movement within the ZPD in the interlocutors' interactions, and allows detailed descriptions of changes in microinteractional practices carried out by the participants. It also allows analysis of learner verbalisations, in which the learners verbalise their current level of understanding of a target object. These verbalisations provide insight into the depth of a learner's understanding and awareness of target concepts (Negueruela, 2008).

10.3.1 The development of the learners

Aggregating all scores for all learners based on the coding scheme, and calculating median scores for the pre-EP DA1 stage and post-EP DA2 and TA stages, the median score for all participants in the DA1 stage was 3 (with a minimum possible score of 2, and maximum of 6). This median score was calculated from scores assigned to a total of 199 mediation sequences. In comparison, across a similar number of mediation sequences, the overall DA2 median score was 4, showing an overall movement towards the self-regulation end of the coding scheme spectrum. This score of four was maintained in the transfer assessment stage, albeit based on a smaller number of mediation sequences.

Within these overall median scores, there are individual differences between the learners, reflecting their unique ZPDs. While Akiko, Ema and Ryota for example showed a higher overall median score in the DA2 stage, Hanako, Mayumi and Hikaru showed no overall increase between the DA1 and DA2 stages. These differences are not unexpected, with similar variation found in previous DA L2 studies (Poehner, 2005; Ableeva, 2010), and may reflect the distinctive nature of each participant's ZPD.

The frequency distributions offer a view of development from another angle, and provide supporting evidence of overall learner development. The three frequency distributions of scores for the DA1, DA2 and TA stages respectively (see Figures 9-5, 9-6 and 9-7) show a clear movement of scores away from the low end of the coding scheme, towards the higher numbers (and thus self-regulation).
Within these overall analyses, there is a considerable amount of nuance and variation, both in terms of the various objects of mediation, and the individual learners. Analysing the four most frequently occurring objects of mediation provides further insight into this variation. In terms of the object of formality for instance, overall median scores and frequency distributions indicate development among the learners (albeit from a relatively low pre-EP median score of 2). A learner that showed particularly strong evidence of movement in her ZPD was Akiko, whose median score increased from 2 in the DA1 session to 4 in the DA2 (see Table 9-2). This is supported by microgenetic analysis, which shows further evidence in the data of development. A clear progression is demonstrated in her interactions with the mediator, from struggling to orient to and resolve the objects of mediation (see excerpt 9-1), to being able to do so with relative efficiency in the DA2 SIs (see excerpt 9-7 for example).

Considerable overall movement is seen in relation to the object of politeness also, with median scores moving from 2 in the DA1 stage, to 4 in DA2, and 5 in the TA sessions (see Table 9-3). This movement is also borne out in the frequency distributions and microgenetic analysis. Learners showed increased IC in relation to how interactions are typically organised, with them showing greater control over the concepts of pre-requesting (see Excerpt 9-16 for an example of this) and pre-closing (see Table 9-5).

Microgenetic analysis provides a detailed account of ways in which the learners demonstrated increased control over the target concepts in the study. One important feature of the findings is the tendency for the learners to take increasing control of the mediation sequences in the post-EP sessions, relative to the pre-EP DA1 stage. This manifested itself in a number of ways. One such way was learners initiating mediation sequences themselves and bidding for help from the mediator (see excerpt 9-23 for example). This shows both an increased awareness of the target concepts, and willingness to raise the issues with the mediator (as opposed to relying on the mediator to always initiate a mediation sequence). A second way in which learners demonstrated control of mediation sequences is seen in the increased willingness to take on responsibility for object resolution (excerpt 9-23 also shows this increased level of control). Learners having the confidence to retain their original task language
choice in the face of an intervention by the mediator is seen in the DA2 data more frequently than in the DA1 sessions.

Both Negueruela (2008) and Gal'Perin (1979) put forward the use of verbalisations to both assess and promote learner conceptual understanding, and attending to such learner verbalisations in the current study's data proved supportive of their argument, providing insights into the learners' awareness and understanding of key concepts. While typically in the DA1 stage learners struggled to provide explanations of their language choices, or show awareness of how request-based interactions are structured, this is not the case post-EP. In the DA2 stage, the learners are generally more able to provide explanations of their linguistic realisations (see excerpt 9-25 for one example), linking their choices to the social concepts of power, distance, and imposition for example. They also demonstrate an increased awareness of the stages of talk, such as pre-requesting. These learner verbalisations prove to be a valuable way of investigating the level of learners' conceptual understanding therefore.

While in general the learners showed increased IC across the various objects of mediation, this is not always the case. Hanako for example, showed a regression in relation to the object of formality, with a median score of 4 in the DA1 stage followed by a 3 in the DA2 session (see Table 9-2). From a Vygotskian perspective, this is not necessarily unexpected. For socioculturalists, development can often be seen as being non-linear, with the possibility of learners struggling with a target object before achieving a breakthrough. This kind of regression, though untypical in the data analysis as a whole, has also been seen in previous studies (Ableeva, 2010). This particular instance, in which Hanako shows a lower post-EP median score, also shows the value of the microgenetic approach to analysis, which can provide insights into the data not captured by the quantitative analysis. While Hanako's median score is lower in the DA2 then, the qualitative analysis does provide some evidence of her developing increasing control over the formality concept, with her being able to offer more detailed, conceptual-level explanations for some of her language choices.

10.3.2 Transfer assessments
A feature of many DA studies, including DA L2 ones, is the transfer assessment stage, which takes place upon completion of the DA stages. The purpose of the transfer stage lies in a key characteristic of DA- the promotion of "transcendence," or the ability to move beyond the immediate task at hand and apply one's knowledge to new contexts (Feuerstein, 1979). In promoting this ability to transcend a task, Feuerstein emphasises the need for there to be "mediation of meaning," in which the mediator promotes in the learner a deep, conceptual understanding of the target of the DA. This deep understanding should then allow the learner to apply their knowledge to new situations and challenges. The goal of the transfer stage then, is to assess the learner's ability to apply their knowledge of the target concepts to novel contexts, and is a part of previous studies carried out by Poehner (2005; 2008) and Ableeva (2010). It is also a feature of non-L2 DA studies, such as that carried out by Brown and Ferrara (1985) and Campione et al (1984), which employed a "multiple transfers" approach. This approach, also utilised in the current study, entails a number of transfer tasks, each one more challenging than the one preceding it. The purpose of this is to see just how far a learner is able to extend their abilities.

For the current study therefore, the TA stage consisted of three transfer tasks. For the near transfer task, the SI involved requiring the learner to make a request as before, but this time to the head of the university department. This is a contrast to the normal DA SIs, which were drawn from the learners' typical everyday experiences of requests in their lives. This scenario, in which the status and social distance would be considerable, was deemed to test the learners' ability to adapt their language choices to this unusual context. The medium transfer task involved the learners needing to make two separate requests in the same SI, each with differing levels of imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Finally, the far transfer task required the learners to co-construct an invitation speech act, an entirely different speech act to the request-based interactions of the previous SIs. While requesting and inviting-based interactions share some similarities (in terms of taking into account socio-contextual factors and the stages of talk), the fact that it is a different speech act required a shift in thinking by the participants.
TA tasks are considered to be challenging for learners, and studies by Poehner (2005) and Ableeva (2010) have found learners to respond in various ways. Poehner generally found the learners in his study to be able to extend their abilities to the TA stage task, requiring relatively infrequent and implicit mediation. This indicates that the DA successfully promoted the learners' conceptual understanding of the target concept (grammatical aspect in French). Ableeva (2010) on the other hand found the learners to struggle with some TA tasks, with some instances of regression. Analysis of this current study’s TA stage indicates that overall, learners were able to extend their increased IC shown in the DA2 stage to the TA sessions (see Table 9-1). Median scores overall, and for the four most frequent objects, were all higher than in the DA1 stage, and for three of the four objects, were higher than in the DA2 stage also. This indicates that the DA and EP stages had some level of success in promoting conceptual understanding in the learners.

10.4 Tracking learners' zone of actual development (ZAD)

Chapter Six of the thesis investigates the fifth research question, relating to the learners' ZAD:

As a result of mediation and the enrichment programme, is there evidence of change in learners' actual level of development, shown in their pre and post-treatment non-dynamic assessments?

While the DA1, DA2 and TA stages of the study were designed to assess learner potential and conceptual understanding through mediation sequence interactions, the NDA1 and NDA2 stages’ purpose is to assess the learners' independent performance, without mediation. These non-dynamic stages are typical of dynamic assessments (Lidz, 1991), and provide the researcher with information regarding the “baseline” abilities of a study participant. This independent ability is referred to in sociocultural terms as the zone of actual development, and contrasts with a learner’s zone of proximal development (ZPD), which describes the space between independent performance, and what can be accomplished with help from a more able other.
To this end, strategic interaction type role-plays (SIs) were carried out between the researcher and learners in the same manner as with the DA stages. However, unlike the DA sessions, no mediation sequences were inserted into the task sequence talk. Target concepts of the current study fall into two main categories. The first relates to the ways in which talk-in-interaction is typically organised, with interlocutors co-constructing various stages of talk, such as *openings or pre-closings*. When the interaction is request-based, there are also other stages to be aware of, such as *pre-requesting and post-request* expansions. In analysing the NDA data then, the organisational features were identified, providing insight into the extent of learner awareness of ability to co-construct these stages of talk.

The second category of target concepts relates to contextual factors, the learners’ awareness of them, and their ability to take them into account when making their language choices. In order to assess this therefore, the linguistic realisations of the learners were examined for both variety and evidence of being influenced by the social context of the various SI scenarios. In this way, learner performance could be assessed for understanding and control of the target concepts relating to talk organisation and Brown and Levinson’s (1987) concepts of *power, distance*, and rank of *imposition*.

10.4.1 Complexity

Overall, while there were individual differences in performance among the six participants, three themes can be discerned from the data regarding changes and development in learner performance. The first can be described as *complexity*. There is a general movement from simply structured interactions in the NDA1 stage towards interactions of more complexity in NDA2. The increasing complexity of these task sequence interactions is manifested in a number of ways.

The opening stages of task sequences for example undergo considerable change when comparing the pre-EP and post-EP NDA stages. During the NDA1 stage, openings are typically characterised by the simple co-construction of a greeting adjacency pair, which is immediately followed by a pre-request *mention*, or the request turn itself (see excerpt 6-17 for an example of this). In
the NDA2 stage however, data analysis shows opening stages of the SIs to frequently be more complex than this, incorporating personal state inquiries for example (Sidnell, 2010), in which the learner inquires as to the wellbeing of the mediator-interlocutor (see excerpt 6-18).

Small talk, in which the interlocutors produce turns regarding topics unrelated to the primary objective of the interaction (the upcoming request) are also seen in NDA2 SIs. While not all of the learners demonstrated these more complex openings in the NDA2 stage (specifically Ema and Hikaru), four of the six learners did frequently co-construct more complex openings in the post-EP stage (see excerpt 6-4).

Similarly, the NDA1 stage saw few pre-pres produced by the learners. Ryota for example, did not produce any pre-pres in the NDA1 SIs (and in fact, only one pre-request turn). Rather, Ryota’s NDA1 performances were characterised by opening turns being immediately followed by a request turn (see excerpt 6-41). In marked contrast, Ryota produces three pre-pre in the NDA2 session- a considerable increase (see excerpt 6-49).

Related to the increased production of pre-pres, learner change is also seen in terms of the pre-request stage, both in terms of the production of pre-request turns, and the variety of pre-request turn types. In the pre-EP stage, SIs were typically marked by either the lack of a pre-request sequence of turns, or the production of just the one type- a mention, in which the learner explains their predicament, foreshadowing the upcoming request (see excerpt 6-51). In the post-EP stage however, pre-requests are typically present, and a wider range of them produced, including checks of availability and ability (see excerpt 6-57).

In addition to the above aspects of the trend towards more complex request-based interactions in the data, the pre-closing stage of talk also underwent change in the NDA SIs. While in the NDA1 sessions, there was a lack of closing implicature environments initiated by the learners, (in which they produce a turn that implies the interaction is coming to a close), learners frequently initiated them in the NDA2 stage of the study. Hikaru for example, produces only one such turn in the NDA1 SIs, but produces three in the NDA2 stage (excerpt 6-59).
It can be seen therefore, that in a number of ways, the post-EP NDA2 interactions were more complex than their pre-EP NDA counterparts, and that this complexity is evident throughout the interactions, from the opening stages to the pre-closings. Within this overall trend there are individual differences from learner to learner, with each demonstrating change in differing ways. Ema’s NDA2 openings for example were similar to those in the NDA1 SIs, as were Hikaru’s. All learners’ data however showed development in some or all of the ways described above, indicating the learners’ increased awareness and control of the target concepts regarding how talk is organised.

10.4.2 Control

Related to the increase in complexity discussed above, a second key theme from the data is that of control. In the NDA1 stage, learners overall displayed a passive or reactive stance to the interactions. By this, it is meant that the learners frequently allowed the researcher interlocutor to take responsibility for initiating stages of conversation. In comparison, the NDA2 stage typically sees the learner participants assume greater responsibility for moving the interactions forward. This is demonstrated by the learners in various ways.

In terms of openings, the learners show increased control by initiating the greeting adjacency pair with greater consistency. Though infrequent, there were instances in the NDA1 stage in which learners relied upon the mediator to initiate the opening greeting. Ryota for example, typically does not initiate greetings in the NDA1 SIs (excerpt 6-41). In the NDA2 sessions however, all learners consistently do so without issue. It is important to note here the possibility that this lack of initiating greetings by Ryota in the NDA1 stage could possibly be due to the nature of the context, in which controlled language tasks are carried out, with him uncertain as to how to proceed. Despite clear instructions given to the participants, it is possible that this hesitancy in initiating greetings might not have been present in a naturalistic discourse setting.

As mentioned above, the NDA2 phase also sees the learners expanding upon opening sequences. While in the NDA1 sessions it was typically the mediator who initiated personal state inquiries or small talk, in the NDA2 stage the
learners frequently assumed control of the opening stage, initiating first turn parts of personal state inquiries and small talk sequences (see excerpt 6-44).

Change is also seen in the ways learners address the requesting stages of the SIs. While in the NDA1 stage, learners typically do not project upcoming requests with pre-pre, in the NDA2 sessions they frequently do so. This is a more pro-active approach to the interactions, projecting the request to the mediator. For Brown and Levinson (1987), such projecting serves to mitigate the face-threatening nature of the request, and offers the interlocutor the opportunity to pre-empt it by making an offer to help. This increase in pre-pre therefore is a further indicator of the learners attempting to take greater control of the interactions.

A further aspect of the NDA interactions that shows considerable change is the closing stage of the SIs. While in the pre-EP NDA sessions learners were frequently passive, relying on the mediator to initiate closing implicature environments, this is not the case in the NDA2 stage. In the post-EP sessions, the learners regularly initiated such implicature environments themselves, taking a more pro-active stance in managing the interactions (see excerpt 6-52). This is also seen in the terminal sequences. As with the closing implicature environments, in the NDA1 SIs learners typically waited for the mediator to produce the terminal sequence first turn part. In the NDA2 stage on the other hand, again a more active approach is taken by the learners, with them frequently providing the terminal sequence first turn parts themselves.

It can be seen therefore, that there is considerable change in how learners approach interaction management between the pre-EP NDA1 and post-EP NDA2 stages. In the NDA1 sessions, learners generally adopt a more reactive, passive stance, with the mediator initiating various stages of the talk. Post-EP however, the learners overall adopt a more pro-active approach, moving the talk forward with much greater frequency.

10.4.3 Social factors

The third theme in regards to change in the learners’ ZAD relates to social factors. Awareness of the social context within which an interaction takes place, and the effect that context can have on interlocutors’ language choices, is
fundamental to pragmatic and interactional competence (Mey, 1993). To assess learners’ ZAD in this area, the data was analysed in two related ways. The variety of lexis-grammar employed by the learners was assessed. For the purposes of this study, a wide range of lexis-grammar in learners’ language choices indicates they are not simply using the same linguistic realisations in the SIs, regardless of the differing contexts. Further, the data is analysed for evidence of the learners responding to the differing levels of power, distance, and imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987) in the SI scenarios, producing different language choices in different contexts. Together, these two elements allow an assessment of learners’ sensitivity to context.

In terms of the variety of lexis-grammar produced throughout the various stages of talk, there are individual differences among the learners. Akiko for example, does not produce a wider variety of terminal sequence turn types in NDA2 than in NDA1 (see Tables 6-1 and 6-2), while Mayumi does not increase her range of greeting turn types over time either. However, overall, there is a wider range of lexis-grammar employed in the NDA2 stage than in the NDA1 sessions. Most of the learners increase their range of greeting turns and request turns. There is less evidence however of an increased range of terminal sequence first turn parts.

Assessing the learners’ sensitivity to the contextual factors of power, distance, and imposition, there is considerable evidence in the data of learner development. In the NDA1 SIs, there is little evidence overall of learners taking into account the three contextual factors. There is some evidence of Akiko (see Table 6-1) and Hanako (Table 6-5) being influenced by distance (but not imposition or status), but the other learners do not provide evidence of taking the contexts into account.

In the NDA2 stage however, there is clear evidence of learners being aware of the context and being influenced by the factors when making their language choices. In particular, the learners appeared to take the factor of distance into account when formulating their turns; there is also evidence however, of the other factors being influential on linguistic realisations as well. This increased sensitivity to context is particularly evident in the learners’ request turns. It is somewhat less evident in regards to greetings and terminal sequences, with
some of the learners demonstrating evidence of their openings and closings being influenced by context, while others not. Overall however, the data analysis strongly indicates development when comparing the pre-EP and post-EP NDA stages.

One exception is Hanako, who does not provide clear evidence of development in regards to control of the concepts of power, distance and imposition (see Table 6-6). However, her NDA2 interactions are marked by frequent hesitation, pauses, and false starts when formulating her turns. This is perhaps indicative of her being aware of the contextual factors, but struggling to gain control of how they affect the lexis-grammar.

10.5 Diagnostic capacity of DA and speech acts

The sixth and final research question relates to dynamic assessment's diagnostic capacity, and is addressed in Chapter Eight of the thesis:

*Is the dynamic assessment able to diagnose the locations of learners' difficulties regarding interactional competence and the performance of the requesting speech act among the Japanese EFL participants?*

The potential for a dynamic assessment to diagnose learner difficulties is an important function that serves to differentiate it from non-dynamic testing. Pragmatics assessments implemented by Hudson et al (1992; 1995), Roever (2005) and Liu (2007) serve as tools for independent performance evaluation, and are not designed to be diagnostic. Ishihara and Cohen (2010), in their classroom-based set of assessments states that the testing items used in the study had a diagnostic capacity. While however, she puts forward that the assessments were grounded in the learners’ ZPD, she does not offer details of how this was achieved, or the extent to which this grounding was systematic. A further issue with previous pragmatics assessments lies in their testing of “offline” knowledge, rather than “online” performance. This means that a learner may be tested for example on their knowledge of conversational implicatures via a written test, rather than by eliciting actual conversational data from them. This raises validity issues when attempting to assess talk-in-interaction. Further,
even when test items are supposed to be diagnostic, such as in Ishihara’s (2009) investigation of classroom-based assessments, the lack of online performance data arguably limits this function.

Dynamic assessment has two main purposes- to promote and assess abilities simultaneously. In order to effectively promote a learner’s development therefore, an important aspect of DA lies in its ability to diagnose the specific difficulties a learner has, so that they may be addressed through mediation and the enrichment programme. The diagnostic capacity of DA has been previously investigated in regards to L2 grammar and listening comprehension, but few studies to date have applied the methodology to pragmatics assessment, and in particular to speech act realisation in talk-in-interaction. This aspect of DA’s diagnostic function then (the other being its ability to diagnose the level of maturity of a learner’s target skill or ability; this is addressed in the second research question) is the focus of the fourth research question of this study. The purpose of this question is to investigate the extent to which the DA can diagnose specific areas of difficulty for the learners, and to ascertain what those specific problems are. In doing so, the aim is to assess the degree to which DA can address the need for a diagnostic function in pragmatics assessments.

10.5.1 Learner difficulties regarding politeness and formality

In analysing the mediation insertion sequences in the dynamic assessment stages’ data, four specific aspects of interactional competence in relation to requesting consistently caused difficulties for the learners in the study. The concepts of politeness (the level of directness) and formality proved particularly challenging for the learners. The participants frequently struggled to distinguish between the two concepts, mistaking the object of mediation as being politeness for example, when in fact the mediator had intervened due to an issue with formality (see section 8.2.1). The underlying potential causes of this conflation are unknown. The work of Gal’Perin (1979) and Negueruela (2008) however, suggests that learner difficulties may be due to the use of “rules of thumb” in pragmatics instruction, in which pragmatic norms are reduced to simplified generalisations. A lack of deeper, conceptual understanding of the two key concepts would explain the difficulties the learners experienced.
The learners also struggled to connect their language choices to social context (see section 8.2.3). While they were sometimes able to produce a range of lexis-grammar, the connection with the particular contexts of each SI was not always clear. A relatively direct request turn for example may have been produced in a SI in which the level of imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987) was low.

10.5.2 Learner difficulties regarding the organisation of talk-in-interaction

The organisation of talk-in-interaction also proved challenging for the learners. In particular, two stages of talk were frequently the objects of mediation- *pre-requesting* and *pre-closing* sequences. Typically in the DA1 stage, the learners either produced a pre-request *mention* (explaining their predicament), or omitted the pre-request stage altogether. They did not typically produce *prepres* or pre-request checks of availability or ability (see section 8.3.1). The pre-closing stage of talk also frequently caused problems. *Closing implicature environments*, common in authentic discourse, were not frequently initiated by learners in the pre-EP DA1 stage.

Sometimes, upon probing by the mediator, the learners displayed some conceptual understanding of the problematic concepts. Hanoi for example, in a verbalisation sequence in the DA1 session, did display some understanding of pre-closings, even though she had not produced one in the preceding task sequence of talk. These instances indicate that some of the learners had some awareness of the concepts, but their control over them was incomplete, and thus they were unable to produce them “online” (in task).

10.6 Conclusion

Taken together, Chapters Eight and Nine offer a detailed view of DA’s diagnostic potential in regards to the requesting speech act-in-talk. While Chapter Eight details the specific locations of learner difficulty, Chapter Nine provides insights into the learners' ZPDs in relation to these problems. By examining the mediation sequences in other words, we can see how close a
learner is to overcoming the difficulty, bringing the challenging concept under self-regulation.

The four data analysis chapters together, in addressing the research questions, provide a rich picture of the learners' development. Chapter Six examines the development of learners' ZADs, or independent performance. Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine focus on the DA and TA stages of the study, and together provide insights into the participants ZPDs and microgenetic development in relation to interactional competence. By closely examining the mediation sequence openings and closings, the efficiency with which the learners orient to the objects of mediation, and the efficiency with which the objects are successfully resolved, we can view the learners' increasing levels of IC in relation to requesting in interaction.

With most L2 pragmatics assessments to date being non-dynamic in nature (assessing independent knowledge or performance), and relying on instruments such as discourse completion tasks (DCTs), few studies have elicited data that allow learners' talk-in-interaction to be analysed in detail. While DA L2 studies (Poehner, 2005; Ableeva, 2010; van Compernolle, 2014) do elicit data that allow this, they are few in number, and have focused on other aspects of communicative competence.

This study therefore is able to make a contribution to knowledge by providing a close, in depth analysis of learner development of interactional competence using DA methodology. It is able to do so in a number of ways. By analysing learner-mediator interactions in the non-dynamic stages, it provides a detailed assessment of development regarding the learners’ zone of actual development (ZAD) in relation to interactional competence and requesting. This study finds considerable learner change in this regard over time, with interactions increasing in complexity, learner control of the task sequences, and awareness of concepts related to the social contexts of the SIs.

It is also able to assess development from another angle- by analysing the mediation sequence interactions between the mediator and learners in the dynamic assessment stages. By framing mediation as an insertion sequence (van Compernolle, 2013), development can be assessed in three related ways.
The boundaries between task and mediation sequences can be analysed, examining the efficiency with which the interlocutors negotiate these opening and closing sequences. Analysis of these boundaries proved effective in both identifying practices that led to successful negotiations, and also in tracking learner development. With increasing amounts of implicit microinteractional strategies being employed in the post-EP DA sessions, and fewer instances of explicit ones, evidence is found of increasing learner interactional competence.

Further, by assessing learner efficiency in terms of orienting to and resolving the objects of mediation, two further aspects of interactional competence can be assessed. Applying a basic quantitative analysis in conjunction with an in depth qualitative, micro genetic analysis of the mediation insertion sequences allowed learner IC development to be further tracked. This analytical approach proved effective in uncovering evidence of learner development across the stages of the study. By viewing mediation sequences as being co-constructed, the study offers an alternative approach to DA in the L2 field, differing from approaches taken by Poehner (2005; 2008) and Ableeva (2010), and building upon the approach of van Compernolle (2013).
Chapter Eleven

Conclusion

11.1 Introduction

This study was motivated by the author's personal experiences of teaching EFL in higher education in Japan, and a resulting awareness of the issues facing pragmatics instruction and assessments. The central purpose of the study was to incorporate dynamic assessment methodology into pragmatics teaching and assessment, unifying the two in the process. In so doing, the aim was to address the issues regarding the instruction of pragmatics discussed in Chapter One of this thesis, and assessment, discussed in Chapter Four. With pragmatics underserved in instructional materials, developmental pragmatics still a burgeoning area of research, and pragmatics assessment a relatively young field, this study seeks to contribute to all three of these important areas.

Specifically, the purpose of the study was to gain knowledge in four key respects. Firstly, knowledge was gained regarding the ways in which the learners and the mediator negotiated the opening and closing boundaries of mediation insertion sequences. This knowledge allows us to both understand how successful negotiations are accomplished, and also to see if these negotiating practices changed over time, becoming less explicit. Such a change would indicate an increase in the interactional competence of the participants. Secondly, the study aimed to assess the extent to which DA methodology is effective in locating precise sites of difficulty for learners in regards to requesting-in-interaction. This diagnostic potential differentiates DA from more traditional assessments, and effective diagnosis allows for informed pedagogical interventions to take place. In addition, the study aimed to assess the ZAD of the learners, examining their unassisted performances in request-based SIs. This is a typical element of DA studies, and allows for us to understand the current level of the learners when performing independently. Finally, the study aimed to assess learner development through a detailed analysis of the mediation sequence interactions between the learners and the
mediator. By comparing interactions before the enrichment programmae and after it, changes in learner development over time could be identified.

In this conclusion chapter, the research questions set out in Chapter One are revisited, and the limitations of the study will be discussed, with reference to a number of matters that can be addressed in future research. Following this, this study's implications for future L2 research will be examined in relation to both the pragmatics field and the still young L2 DA field also. The implications for pedagogy will then be evaluated, with reference to pragmatics instruction, concept-based instruction, conversation analysis and instructional materials created for the study. Implications for pragmatics assessment will also be discussed. The final section of the chapter will look at possible related future areas of research.

11.2 Addressing the research questions

The first, second and third research questions ask:

1. How are mediation sequences established and accomplished by the Japanese learners of EFL and interlocutor during the dynamic assessment sessions?
2. During DA sessions, is there change in the type and frequency of micro-interactional strategies over time?
3. Is there evidence of increased efficiency in negotiating these boundaries over time?

The importance of these questions lie in van Compernolle’s (2013) conception of mediation as being insertion sequences. From this perspective, the efficiency with which the interlocutors can negotiate the movement from task sequence to mediation sequence talk is indicative of the participants’ interactional competence, and therefore provides insights into learner development over time. Analysis of successful negotiations also contributes to the body of knowledge regarding DA interactions in the field of second language acquisition.
Analysis of the data allowed typologies of negotiating practices for both opening and closing boundaries to be put forward, organised in terms of explicitness. It was found that the participants employed a variety of strategies, both verbal and paralinguistic in negotiating these transitions both to and from task sequence talk. While it was the mediator who most frequently initiated negotiations, there were also instances of the learners initiating openings and closings of mediation sequences as well. As with mediator-initiated practices, learner-led strategies included both verbal and non-verbal examples.

Comparing pre and post-EP DA and TA stages, differences were found in terms of both the types and frequency of practices employed in negotiating boundaries over time. While in the DA1 sessions explicit and implicit strategies were employed with similar frequency overall, implicit strategies were far more frequent than explicit ones in the post-EP DA2 stage. This indicates that the participants were able to negotiate these boundaries with greater efficiency, and thus there is evidence of learner development in terms of interactional competence here.

The fourth research question, addressed in Chapter Nine, pertains to learner development in terms of orienting to and resolving the objects of mediation:

Is there evidence of increased interactional competence regarding mediation sequences, demonstrated by efficient identification and resolution of the objects of mediation, and by learner verbalisations?

The fourth research question relates to evidence of learner development within mediation sequences in the pre and post-EP DA and TA stages of the study. Specifically, the focus of this question was examining evidence of learner development in terms of identifying and resolving the objects of mediation between the mediator and learners; these are two key aspects of interactional competence identified by van Compernolle (2013). Evidence of increased efficiency in these two aspects would indicate development in interactional competence regarding requesting-in-interaction therefore. In analysing the data, both quantitative and qualitative approaches were taken, with a coding scheme employed to enable object identification and resolution to be assigned scores, with higher scores being indicative of learners being closer to control of the
object. Further, a microgenetic approach was taken to close analysis of the transcript data, with the aim of uncovering evidence of development.

Analysis showed strong evidence of learner development over time, when examining pre and post-EP mediation sequences. Overall, median scores for mediation sequences were higher in the DA2 stage than in the DA1 sessions, indicating movement towards self-regulation among the learners. Further, microgenetic analysis uncovered further evidence, with considerable evidence of learners’ increasing conceptual understanding of the target concepts. Evidence was also found of learners assuming greater control of the mediation sequences themselves- sometimes opting to retain their original task sequence language choices for example- rather than relying on the mediator to take the lead in resolving objects.

The fifth question relates to the NDA stages of the study, in which the learners’ ZADs were assessed in regards to requesting-in-interaction:

As a result of mediation and the enrichment programme, is there evidence of change in learners’ actual level of development, shown in their pre and post-treatment non-dynamic assessments?

Unlike the DA stages, in these sessions the mediator and learner co-constructed the SIs, but no mediation sequences were inserted into the interactions. The purpose here therefore, was to analyse the task sequence talk both before and after the EP stage of the study, in order to assess the degree of change over time in the ways requesting was realised. Three key themes emerged from the data. The post-EP NDA interactions were generally more complex than in the pre-EP NDA1 stage, with the learners frequently producing pre-requests or pre-closing stages of talk, for example; these were less frequently produced in the NDA1 sessions. Further, learners also exhibited a greater degree of control in the SIs post-EP, initiating the various stages of task talk with greater frequency, rather than ceding responsibility for directing the interactions to the mediator. A third theme is evidence of the learners being increasingly aware of the social contexts of the SIs. In the NDA2 sessions, a wider variety of linguistic realisations were employed, with less direct request turns for instance employed in contexts in which the degree of imposition of the
request was high. Evidence was also found of learners’ language choices in opening and closing turns being influenced by social context to a greater extent in the NDA2 stage than in the NDA1 SIs. These three key themes to emerge from the data provide further evidence therefore of learner development in the current study.

The sixth and final question relates to the potential for DA to diagnose specific areas of learner difficulty in relation to the target concepts:

*Is the dynamic assessment able to diagnose the locations of learners’ difficulties regarding interactional competence and the performance of the requesting speech act among the Japanese EFL participants?*

Specifically, the purpose of the question was to examine the extent to which the DA methodology applied to requesting in talk was effective in locating specific sites of learner problems in regards to the target concepts of the study.

Analysis found the DA stages to identify a number of key areas in which learners struggled. The concepts of politeness and formality proved particularly challenging for the participants, as well as connecting their language choices to the varying social contexts of the SIs. In terms of talk organisation, learners struggled with the pre-requesting and pre-closing stages of talk in particular, with pre-EP interactions often marked by their absence. The DA sessions were therefore effective in enabling the identification of specific problem areas for the learners, which informed the EP stage, in terms of being able to focus on particular areas of difficulty.

Figure 11-1 puts forward a typology of locations of learner difficulty in co-constructing request-based talk-in-interaction. The typology presents two umbrella categories of difficulty—those related to the context of the interactions, and those related to the structure or organisation of the talk. The sub-categories show the specific locations of difficulty that arose from the close analysis of the data. These categories are organised in terms of the frequency of their occurrence as objects of mediation, with the most frequent objects placed above the less frequent ones. It can be seen therefore, that, under the “social context” category, connecting the context with linguistic realisations of politeness or formality was the most frequent source of difficulty for learners. In
organising talk, learners most frequently struggled with the pre-closing stage of their interactions, with the pre-requesting stage of talk also frequently a problem. On the other hand, while issues concerning opening or closing talk did arise in the DA sessions, they were less common.

**Figure 11-1:** A typology of locations of learner difficulty regarding request-based talk-in-interaction

![Diagram](image)

*Note: The locations of learner difficulties are categorised in terms of frequency, in descending order.*

*Note: P = Politeness    F = Formality*
11.3 Limitations of study

There are a number of limitations to the current study, each to be discussed in turn. One issue is in regards to the DA interactions between the learners and the mediator. While Poehner (2005) puts forward that DA mediation sequences are best carried out in the learners’ L1, this was not possible in the current study, due to the author's limited Japanese oral communicative ability. Therefore, mediation sequences were carried out primarily in the learners' L2. Effort was made to mitigate this, with all written instructional materials provided to the learners in both the L1 and L2. Further, in targeting the participants, intermediate learners were intentionally chosen. The intention of this was to select participants whose L2 communicative ability would be sufficient to understand the mediator, but the language tasks would still prove challenging. However, inevitably carrying out the mediation sequences in the L2 led on occasions to sub-optimal communication between the mediator and learners. While this was rarely an obstruction, it did lead to occasional misunderstandings, especially with Ryota, who was the least fluent participant.

A further important limitation is in regards to its generalisability. The study offers an investigation of a dynamic assessment in a specific context- that of intermediate level Japanese EFL learners in a higher education institution, administered by one mediator to a small number of learners. Further, it is a dynamic assessment of a highly specific target object (or set of objects)-requesting-in-interaction. This is one aspect of interactional competence, which itself is just one element of overall communicative competence. It is important therefore not to overstate the study’s findings’ applicability to other contexts and other target abilities. While the findings do contribute to the body of knowledge in the field of DA in SLA, it is important to bear this in mind. It is also important to note that this study did not include a control group of learners who did not receive mediation at all. This was due to the constraints on the ability of one researcher to carry out an assessment of more than a small number of learners, and limited resources. Such a control group would have offered an interesting contrast to the data elicited from the learners who did receive such mediation-based interactions.
An additional limitation relates to the choice of instrument for eliciting data. While it is argued in this study that SIs- a type of role-play- offer more opportunities for capturing rich data than other test instruments (such as DCTs, discussed in Chapter Four), as Kasper and Rose (2002) point out, role-plays do not necessarily always provide valid substitutions for authentic discourse. Efforts were made to mitigate the artificial nature of the SIs (by using situations for example that the learners were likely to encounter in their daily lives), but nevertheless, it cannot be said with certainty that the artificiality of the SIs did not influence the interactions at all, and that the data elicited reflects with accuracy that which might be captured through real-life discourse.

A final problem is with regard to those strategic interactions (SIs) in the NDA and DA stages in which the mediator was the requestor and the learners were the requestees. While in the majority of the strategic interactions the learners were required to produce the request turn (as the requestor), in one of the NDA strategic interaction role-plays, and two of the DA ones, the roles were reversed. In these SIs, the mediator took the role of making a request, and the learner the person responding. When the SIs were originally created, it was thought that these SIs would assess the learners' ability to recognise requesting as a dispreferred first pair part (FPP; see Chapter Two), and respond appropriately. However, as the NDA and DA sessions were carried out, it became apparent to the mediator (author) that the primary issues learners had were with regards to producing requests as the requestor. These issues included the organisation of request-based interactions, such as the pre-requesting stage, and the social contextual concepts of power, distance, and rank of imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987). This led the author to focus on these aspects of interactional competence in the EP and DA sessions, and less so on how the learners reacted to a FPP. This meant that these particular SIs, while only 25% of the NDA and DA stage SIs, were of limited value in the data set.

11.4 Implications for L2 research

11.4.1 Implications for pragmatics research
Sociocultural theory provides the theoretical foundation upon which this study investigates development, utilising Vygotsky’s concept of the ZPD and Feuerstein’s concept of the mediated learning experience (MLE) to conceptualise it in terms of movement from other-regulation to self-regulation. By tracking the ways in which mediation sequences were opened and closed, the ways in which objects were oriented to and resolved, and the efficiency with which these foci were achieved, development could be assessed. This theoretical, principled approach to investigating the pragmatic development of learners addresses the issue of a lack of development research that adopts a theoretical lens raised by Kasper and Rose (2002). The tracking and assessment of development was achieved in two ways—employing a coding scheme to allow a basic quantitative analysis to be carried out, and through microgenetic analysis. This study demonstrates the efficacy of adopting both of these approaches that together form a more complete picture of learner development over the course of the study.

11.4.2 Implications for DA research

This study contributes to DA research by adding to the body of knowledge regarding how mediation is provided in DA sessions in a particular context. This is important, as delivering mediation in DA can be both challenging and daunting for practitioners (Haywood & Lidz, 2007; Ableeva, 2010). While previous DA L2 studies have conceptualised mediation in terms of mediating moves produced by the mediator, and reciprocating moves by the learner, van Compernolle argues for a movement beyond this bifurcated approach, instead viewing mediation sequences as being co-constructed, with opening and closing boundaries negotiated. This study contributes to this movement by providing a detailed analysis of how these boundaries are negotiated, with the findings increasing our understanding of how successful mediation sequences are carried out by the interlocutors. This has implications for future classroom assessment practices.

11.5 Implications for L2 pedagogy

11.5.1 Implications for pragmatic instruction
As discussed in Chapter One, there are a number of issues with how the pragmatic element of L2 communication is taught in the EFL classroom. McConarchy and Hata (2013) point out that speech acts are underserved in instructional materials, and when they are presented to learners there are further problems. These problems include treating speech acts as isolated adjacency pairs without context, examples based on the author's intuition rather than research findings, and metapragmatic information that tends towards prescriptive rule making. These "rules of thumb" (Negueruela, 2008) are seen as a cause of much pragmatic misunderstanding and confusion among L2 learners.

This study addresses these issues in two key ways. By adopting a concept-based approach to instruction based on the work of Gal'Perin (1979) and Negueruela (2008), the study moves beyond the use of rules of thumb and instead presents learners with concepts based on conversation analysis research, that allow them to understand how authentic discourse is typically co-constructed. This conceptual approach avoids oversimplification and reductionism, and allows learners to employ their knowledge to novel situations, rather than simply to the immediate task at hand. By using concepts drawn from conversation analysis research, the study also addresses another of McConarchy and Hata's criticisms, which relates to a reliance on author intuition when presenting example interactions in teaching materials. The results of this study, in which the learners showed considerable improvement overall, indicate that this approach to pragmatics instruction was an effective one. With the important proviso of the highly specific nature of the study's context, and the small number of participants, the study contributes to the body of knowledge that can inform future classroom practice. By incorporating conversation analysis findings into pragmatic instruction, this study also follows the suggestion of Arundale (1999) and Kasper (2006), who argue for pragmatic instruction to move beyond the treatment of speech acts as isolated adjacency pairs, and towards a view of speech acts informed by conversation analysis research. This shift in perspective sees speech acts as unfolding over multiple turns in interaction, with both interlocutors jointly responsible for their construction. By presenting key conversation analysis concepts related to
requesting to learners therefore, this study provides a demonstration of how this can be done, and also of its value in the classroom.

The current study also demonstrates the synergy between the concept-based approach to pragmatic instruction and the use of Di Pietro's (1987) strategic interactions (SIs). Di Pietro's three stages of his methodology—orientation, execution and control—dovetail with Gal'Perin's approach, with the author of this study presenting concepts to the learners in the orientation stage, before the learners put their knowledge into practice in the execution stage, carrying out the role-play tasks. The relative authenticity of the SI approach, in which the learners' "roles" were as themselves (rather than as a "doctor" or "customer") allowed for more meaningful interactions that were familiar to the learners. This allowed a large collection of data to be elicited.

A further contribution of this study lies in the materials created. By following a systematic procedure for generating example situations, following that set out by Liu (2007), a set of SIs were created that are grounded in the everyday experiences of the target population, and that also reflect Brown and Levinson's (1987) concepts of power, distance and rank of imposition in different ways. These materials could be used as a basis for textbooks or other classroom materials in the future.

11.6 Implications for pragmatics assessment

Until relatively recently, pragmatics assessment was little researched in the L2 field. Significant studies have since been carried out by Hudson et al (1992; 1995), Roever (2005) and Liu (2007), as well as by Ishihara (2009). While these assessments allowed pragmatic competence to be evaluated to an extent, there are a number of issues. The typical item employed by the aforementioned assessments was the discourse completion task (DCT), in which learners complete a turn in writing. While this allows research to carefully control the behaviour to be elicited, and allows for standardisation and large amounts of data to be collected, the data tends to differ from authentic discourse (Beebe & Cummings, 1996; Golato, 2003). Walters (2009) also criticises DCTs for failing
to elicit sequences of talk, which are considered key to explaining speech acts from a conversation analytic perspective.

The use of role-plays, in which learners carry out roles such as being a "business person" or a "waiter" in a restaurant also presents issues. Data elicited from these assessment items, while being closer to authentic discourse than that elicited by DCTs, still tends towards being short and simplified in nature (Eisenstein and Bodman, 1993). Kasper and Rose (2002) argue that the use of role-plays can place a stress on learners by requiring them to imagine a situation while simultaneously producing the L2. This study addresses these issues by employing SIs. While technically a type of role-play, the learners in SIs "play" as themselves, and the situations are meaningful and familiar to them. These design features of the test instrument may not fully mitigate for the artificiality of the SIs, and the employment of such an instrument is inevitably a compromise, compared to truly authentic discourse. It is put forward however, that this potentially reduces the cognitive load placed upon the learners, and also increases the chance of elicited data being closer to authentic discourse.

A further contribution this study makes relates to the incorporation of dynamic assessment (DA) into pragmatics assessment, and assessment of speech acts in particular. The tests described above (and in detail in Chapter Four) are "static" tests, in that they assess independent performance of the learner. While this can tell us about the learner's zone of actual development (ZAD), it does not provide insights into the learner's zone of proximal development (ZPD), and thus his or her future potential. This study, by carrying out a microgenetic analysis of mediation sequences in DA sessions, provides rich information regarding what learners can do in a context in which they co-construct a language task together with a mediator. For Vygotsky (1978) this is more interesting, as it informs us about functions still maturing under the surface, abilities that are still to an extent other-regulated, but have the potential to become self-regulated in future. In this sense, DA is concerned with bringing into view that which remains hidden when a learner performs independently, and allows a view of development that standard psychometric testing does not provide.
Incorporating DA into pragmatics assessment provides a further function that psychometric tests do not— a diagnostic capacity. Microgenetic analysis of the data provided insights into specific locations of learner problems, and also where on the ZPD spectrum that begins with other regulation and ends with self-regulation the problem lies. This information informs the mediator as to the appropriate focus of both DA mediation and the enrichment programme.

11.7 Directions for future research

11.7.1 Group dynamic assessment

Dynamic assessment in the L2 field is still a young topic of research, with a small but growing number of studies contributing to the current body of knowledge (Poehner, 2005; Ableeva, 2010; Lantolf & Poehner, 2011; Davin & Donato, 2013). DA methodology lends itself to a mediator-individual learner context, and thus the majority of the studies to date have involved individualised dyadic assessments. However, if DA is to make inroads into the classroom of the EFL learner, this dyadic approach may need to be extended to take account of learning environments in which this approach is not feasible. It is put forward that incorporation of DA methodologies into classroom practice would address some of the issues raised in recent years regarding teacher-based assessment (TBA) in the EFL classroom. While TBA is becoming increasingly popular in the field (Davison & Leung, 2009), research has been marked by "a lack of systemic principles and procedures, and a dearth of information as to the impact of TBA on learning and teaching" (Davison & Leung, 2009, p.394). One possible way to address these issues is to investigate the application of DA methodologies to multiple learners simultaneously in group settings.

Poehner (2009) points out that Vygotsky (1978; 1998) applied the ZPD concept only to individual learners in his work, and thus did not outline the basis upon which group DA could be carried out. Indeed, the fact that interactionist DA places an emphasis on adapting mediation to the particular needs of an individual would appear to be obstructive to attempts to extend DA in this way. Feuerstein et al (1988) however, argue that a group context can actually enhance the quality of the learning environment, due to a diversity of strengths,
Weaknesses and abilities being present among the learners. For Feuerstein et al, this diversity can create a more optimal setting for development.

Poehner (2009), in agreement with Feuerstein et al, puts forward the possibility of carrying out a DA of a group of learners, arguing that the methodology can "[render] classroom interactions more systematic and more attuned to learners' emergent abilities" (Poehner, 2009, p.488). Poehner puts forward two types of group DA (G-DA) - concurrent and cumulative. In a concurrent G-DA, the mediator engages with the group as a whole; in cumulative G-DA however, the mediator works with individual learners towards the resolution of a problem shared by the group. The aim is to move the group forward in their shared ZPD, while working with learners in one-to-one interactions.

Lantolf and Poehner (2011) report on an investigation into the latter category of G-DA, carried out by a primary school teacher of Spanish as L2. The teacher-mediator in this study spent 15 minutes per day administering an interventionist form of DA to groups of children aged between 8-11 years. Lantolf and Poehner put forward that the G-DA was successful, with learners needing less explicit and less frequent mediation over time, indicating microgenetic development. The fact that this study took an interventionist approach to DA, with scripted interventions, is perhaps reflective of the large numbers of learners, making emergent, interactionist mediation strategies a challenging proposition.

Davin and Donato (2013) carried out a study in which a teacher-led DA was applied in a classroom setting, along with subsequent small group tasks. It was found that this combination of DA and peer-peer mediated task work provided some evidence of effectiveness. Evidence was not found however of learners adopting DA mediation strategies in their peer-peer interactions. Saniei et al (2015) also put forward the idea of small group DA being an appropriate compromise between one-to-one DAs typically carried out, and entire classroom procedures such as that detailed in Lantolf and Poehner (2011). Further research in this area will be of considerable benefit, exploring the viability of classroom interactionist DA in both whole-classroom and small group assessments.

11.7.2 Integrating technology and L2 pragmatics DA assessments
An alternative approach to addressing the issue of incorporating DA methodology typically administered to individual learners into classrooms, and increasing its efficiency, is the implementation of technological advances. While G-DA works towards a mediator carrying out DA to groups of learners concurrently or cumulatively, computerized DA (C-DA) delivers DA via the use of computer technology. Poehner et al (2015) investigated the implementation of a C-DA of L2 reading and listening comprehension. Informed by Vygotsky's concept of the ZPD, the C-DA employed multiple-choice test items in combination with a set of prompts ranging from implicit to explicit in nature. Poehner et al argue that this interventionist C-DA approach was effective in assessing learners' L2 development and informing subsequent instruction.

The field of pragmatics instruction and assessment has also been increasingly interested in incorporating technology into current practices in recent times. Roever (2013) for example, found that computer-based pragmatic testing, consisting of a combination of DCT and multiple-choice test items, was a reliable and efficient method of assessment of routines and the requesting, apologising and refusing speech acts. Focusing on feedback, Holden and Sykes (2012) investigated the use of a mobile augmented reality game called Mentira on learners' pragmatic awareness in Spanish L2. Based on a narrative in which the learners were required to solve a murder mystery, the game combined virtual game-based characters with real-life locations the learners needed to visit. A key part of the game was the requirement to interact with the characters in the game in the L2 in order to resolve the problem of the murder. Through these interactions, the learners received implicit feedback on pragmatic aspects of the interactions; there was a lack however, of feedback from a "real" mediator or peers. Takamiya and Ishihara (2013) report on the use of blogging to mediate the learning of the refusal speech act in Japanese L2. The study found that asynchronous online interactions involving the posting of blog entries and responses increased the participants' pragmatic understanding of the target speech act.

The use of technology to enhance DA pragmatics assessments is an area rich with potential. Some of the aforementioned studies show how this technology can be implemented in a way that increases the efficiency of pragmatics testing (Roever, 2013) and DA (Poehner et al, 2015). This author argues however, that
the challenge for future research is to combine the advances in technology employed in the above studies with an approach that takes into account individual learner needs. The interventionist methodology seen in Poehner et al (2015) is a significant step forward in extending DA beyond the limits of a dyadic interaction; if however, a more flexible approach to mediation in C-DA can be developed, this will increase C-DA's sensitivity to individual learner needs further. To this end, Takamiya and Ishihara's (2013) asynchronous approach to feedback may be instructive.

11.7.3 Investigating DA's compatibility with other aspects of interactional competence and other learning contexts

While this current study investigates the microinteractional strategies employed to negotiate the boundaries between task and mediation sequences, this relates to the context of intermediate Japanese EFL learners and interactional competence regarding a speech act. To better understand the ways in which successful mediation sequences are co-constructed, further research should investigate other elements of interactional competence (such as implicatures for example), as well as other aspects of communicative competence. In addition, extending the methodology developed for this current study to other learning contexts, involving those with advanced level learners for example, would contribute further to the body of knowledge.
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Research Study Description

Researcher:

Project title: A dynamic assessment of the pragmatic competence of Japanese learners of EFL.
プロジェクトタイトル：日本人英語学習者のプラグマティック能力の評価

Project description:

This project aims to teach you ways in which native English language speakers typically make requests, assess your ability to make requests in English, and also discover any reasons why you might find making requests in English challenging.

In this study, you will perform a number of request role-plays with the researcher in individual sessions. You will also take part in group learning sessions, in which we will discuss and practise ways in which requests occur in English. During this project, you will work together with both the researcher, and other learners as well. The project will last for approximately eight weeks in total.

After you have completed all the sessions in this project, you will receive 15,000 Yen as payment.

Data collection and analysis:

The project sessions with the researcher and with the other participants will be video-recorded. The video files will be kept safe and secure in a password-protected file, on a password-protected computer. The computer will be kept in a locked office. The video files will be kept private, and will not be published or shown to anyone other than the researcher, a small number of independent raters, and the researcher’s supervisors.

The video files will be transcribed, and written conversations will be kept in a locked cabinet. Only the researcher and his supervisors will have access to the transcripts.

Your personal information will not be used for this project. The written project will not use your real names, and any identifying information will be erased from the transcripts. Only the researcher will have access to your personal information.

Data collection and analysis:

The project sessions with the researcher and with the other participants will be video-recorded. The video files will be kept safe and secure in a password-protected file, on a password-protected computer. The computer will be kept in a locked office. The video files will be kept private, and will not be published or shown to anyone other than the researcher, a small number of independent raters, and the researcher’s supervisors.

The video files will be transcribed, and written conversations will be kept in a locked cabinet. Only the researcher and his supervisors will have access to the transcripts.

Your personal information will not be used for this project. The written project will not use your real names, and any identifying information will be erased from the transcripts. Only the researcher will have access to your personal information.

Data collection and analysis:

The project sessions with the researcher and with the other participants will be video-recorded. The video files will be kept safe and secure in a password-protected file, on a password-protected computer. The computer will be kept in a locked office. The video files will be kept private, and will not be published or shown to anyone other than the researcher, a small number of independent raters, and the researcher’s supervisors.

The video files will be transcribed, and written conversations will be kept in a locked cabinet. Only the researcher and his supervisors will have access to the transcripts.

Your personal information will not be used for this project. The written project will not use your real names, and any identifying information will be erased from the transcripts. Only the researcher will have access to your personal information.

データ収集と分析：

研究者、そして他のプロジェクト参加者とのセッションは録画されます。動画ファイルはパスワードロックをかけて保護され、かつパスワードロックをかけたコ
Data Protection Notice - The information you provide will be used for research purposes and your personal data will be processed in accordance with current data protection legislation and the University's notification lodged at the Information Commissioner's Office. Your personal data will be treated in the strictest confidence and will not be disclosed to any unauthorised third parties. The results of the research will be published in anonymised form.

データ保護に関して:

提供された情報は研究目的でのみ使用され、個人情報は現在のデータ保護法と大学のデータ取り扱いポリシーに基づき処理されます。個人情報は厳重に取り扱われ、許可なく第三者に開示されることはありません。研究結果は匿名形式で発表されます。
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Requesting Questionnaire

Below, I would like you to write up to 6 example situations where you have made a request in your daily life, or examples where you have seen other people make requests.
日常生活で自分から人にした、または人から自分にされたことのある依頼内容の例を最大6つ下記に記入して下さい。
To write your examples, you can use either English or Japanese.
回答は日本語と英語のどちらでも構いません。

| Example: | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Who:** Myself and my parents | **Where:** At home | **Request:** I sometimes ask my parents if I can borrow their car at weekends, so I can go driving with my friends | 依頼内容: 友人とドライブに出かけるため、週末、両親に車を借りる事がある |

1. **Who:**
   **Where:**
   **Request:**

2. **Who:**
   **Where:**
   **Request:**

3. **Who:**
   **Where:**
   **Request:**

4. **Who:**
   **Where:**
   **Request:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Who:</th>
<th>Where:</th>
<th>Request:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>________________________</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>________________________</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E

#### Requesting Situation Likelihood Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requesting Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Below are some situations where you would request another person to do something for you.

下記では、皆さんに物事を依頼するようなシチュエーションをいくつか取り上げました。

How often have you experienced the situations below? Please read each situation, and circle the appropriate number.

その様なシチュエーションを経験した事があるかどうか、ある場合にはどの位の頻度で経験しているかを、該当する番号を○で囲み回答して下さい。

1. Never
   経験した事がない
2. Occasionally (2-3 times a year)
   まれにある（1年に2〜3回位）
3. Sometimes (1-2 times a month)
   時々ある（月に1〜2回位）
4. Regularly (1 or more times a week)
   よくある（1週間に1回以上）

a. I have asked a friend for help with my homework or classwork.
   友人に宿題を手伝ってくれるよう頼む。

   1  2  3  4

b. I have asked to borrow something (for example, a pen or eraser) from a classmate.
   クラスメートに物（例：ペンや消しゴム）を借りる依頼をする。

   1  2  3  4
c. I have asked to borrow money from a friend.
友達にお金を借りる依頼をする。

d. I have asked to borrow money from my parents.
親にお金を借りる依頼をする。

e. I have asked my parents to buy me something (for example, clothes, a PC).
親に物(例:服、PC)を買ってくれるよう頼む。

f. I have asked to borrow something from my brother or sister (for example, a comic, clothes etc).
兄弟、姉妹に物(例:マンガ、服等)を借りるよう頼む。

g. I have asked my brother or sister for help with studying English.
兄弟、姉妹に英語の勉強を手伝ってくれるよう頼む。

h. I have asked a friend or classmate to borrow notes, to prepare for a test.
テストに備え、友人やクラスメートに授業のノートを借りる依頼をする。

i. I have asked my mother or father to pick me up by car from somewhere.
親に車で迎えにきてもらうよう頼む。

j. I have asked a stranger in the street for directions to somewhere (for example, the post office).
見知らぬ人に道を聞く。（例：郵便局）

1 2 3 4

k. I have asked a stranger to take a photo of me with family or friends while sightseeing.

旅行中、通りすがりの人に自分と家族や友達の写真をとってくれるよう頼む。

1 2 3 4

l. I have asked a teacher to extend a deadline for an assignment.

先生に課題の提出期限を延ばしてくれるよう頼む。

1 2 3 4

m. I have asked a teacher for help with an assignment or homework.

先生に課題や宿題を手伝ってくれるよう頼む。

1 2 3 4
Appendix F

Power, Social Distance & Size of Imposition Evaluation Questionnaire

Power, Social Distance and Size of Imposition Evaluation

In order to ensure that evaluations of power, distance and imposition are based on the feedback of a variety of speakers of English as L1, please circle your judgements of the following situations.

***For each answer, please circle one of the 5 points on the scale.***

There are three variables to consider:

i) **Power (P)** - this concerns the relationship of the interlocutors in terms of their relative positions of power, or social status. For example, in a doctor-patient relationship, you may consider this to be a high-low situation, in which the doctor has “high” power, and the patient “low” power. In the following situations, you need to place a marker on two continuums - one for each person. **Your choice of marker should be based on the power relationship in this particular situation, relative to the other person.*** ***If you assess the power relationship as equal, place your marker in the centre of both continuums.***

ii) **Social distance (D)** - this relates to the degree of “closeness” between the interlocutors. In a “close” relationship for example, the two people may know each well, for a considerable period of time. In a “far” relationship on the other hand, the two people may never have met before, or do not regularly come into contact. Thus, the social distance between a patient and a doctor they are meeting for the first time would be quite different to a patient’s relationship with their “family” doctor, whom they have known for a number of years.

iii) **Size of imposition (R)** - this relates to the nature of the request in each situation, and the burden placed on the recipient of the request. If you feel the imposition is considerable, place your marker on the “large” end of the continuum. If the burden is small, place your marker on the “small” half of the continuum.

1. Situation:

   **Person A**
Where: on campus (KUIS)
Situation: You have lost your purse/wallet with your train ticket in it. You see your friend from class and walk over to talk with him/her. Ask your classmate to lend you some money to pay for your train fare to go back home (your home is in Saitama, 90 minutes from KUIS)

**Person B**
Where: on campus
Situation: It is afternoon, after the last class has finished. Your friend approaches you to talk with you.

**Power:**

**Person A: Low**

**Person B: Low**

**Social Distance:**

**Close**

**Size of Imposition:**

**Small**

---

2. Situation:

**Person A**
Where: on campus (KUIS)
Time: evening
Situation: You have just finished club practice, and it’s now about 7pm in the evening. Usually you take the train home with your friends, but this evening the weather is not very nice (windy, light rain), so you don’t want to walk to the train station (you live in Tsudanuma).
Call your father and ask him to pick you up from KUIS.

**Person B**
Where: at home
Time: evening, 7pm
Situation: You have just got home from work. You receive a telephone call from your son/daughter. You’re tired, and don’t intend to go out again this evening.

**Power:**

**Person A: Low**
Person B: Low------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|High
Social Distance:
Close-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|Far
Size of Imposition:
Small--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|Large

3. Situation:
Person A
Where: on campus, teacher's office
Time: daytime
Situation: Your teacher (you have known him for 6 months) has given you a project to complete by tomorrow, 2nd period. However, you have been busy recently with part-time work, club activities etc, so haven't had much time to work on the project. Ask your teacher to extend the deadline for another 2 days.

Person B
Where: on campus
Time: daytime
Situation: You are a teacher at KUIS, sitting in your office, working at your desk. One of your students (you have been teaching him/her for the last 6 months) knocks on the door and asks to come in. (You have a policy of not allowing students to hand in work late unless they have a very good excuse). Invite them to come in and talk with them.

Power:
Person A: Low------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|High
Person B: Low------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|High
Social Distance:
Close-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|Far
Size of Imposition:
Small--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|Large

4. Situation:
Person A
Where: on campus
Time: lunchtime
Situation: This coming weekend, you are moving to a new apartment, as your current one is too expensive. You can’t afford to hire a removal company to help you move, so you want to ask your friend to help. You know he/she has a large car that could be used to help you move your stuff.

You see your friend in the cafeteria, and walk over to begin talking.

**Person B**

Where: on campus
Time: lunchtime

Situation: You have recently bought a big, new car, and this weekend you want to drive to Nagano to try it out. It will be fun driving along the mountain roads, and you’re looking forward to it.

You are sitting in the cafeteria eating lunch when you see your friend. He/she comes over to talk to you.

**Power:**

*Person A: Low----------------/-------------------/-------------------/-------------------High*

*Person B: Low----------------/-------------------/-------------------/--------High*

**Social Distance:**

*Close-------------------/-------------------/-------------------/----------Far*

**Size of Imposition:**

*Small-----------------/-------------------/-------------------/-------------------Large*

5. **Situation:**

**Person A**

Where: on campus (KUIS)
Time: lunchtime

Situation: You’ve just bought a new album, and you really want to listen to it.

Unfortunately, your mp3 player/phone isn’t working properly so you can’t listen to it.

You see your friend sitting in the cafeteria, and walk over to him/her. You want to borrow your classmate’s mp3 player for a couple of days.

**Person B**

Where: on campus
Time: lunchtime
Situation: You’re having lunch in the cafeteria. You see your friend approaching you, and you have a conversation with them.

Power:
Person A: Low-----------------l--------------l-------------------l High
Person B: Low-----------------l--------------l-------------------l High

Social Distance:
Close-----------------l--------------l-------------------l Far

Size of Imposition:
Small-----------------l--------------l-------------------l Large

6. Situation:
Person A
Where: at home
Time: evening
Situation: You are at home. This morning, your friend from KUIS invited you to join him/her on a trip to Kyoto to see the Gion festival. You want to go, but unfortunately you don’t have much money.
Go to the living room (your father is watching TV) and ask him to lend you enough money to travel to Kyoto. You will need money for the train, the cheap business hotel, and also food/drink.

Person B
Where: at home, in the living room
Time: evening
Situation: You are the father of Person A. You are watching TV in the living room, when your son/daughter comes in. Have a conversation with them.

Power:
Person A: Low-----------------l--------------l-------------------l High
Person B: Low-----------------l--------------l-------------------l High

Social Distance:
Close-----------------l--------------l-------------------l Far

Size of Imposition:
Small-----------------l--------------l-------------------l Large
7. Situation:

Person A
Where: on campus (KUIS)
Time: morning

Situation: Your teacher (Person B) (you have known him for 6 months) has given you a project to do for homework. The deadline is three days from now. This homework is challenging for you, and you are not sure how to complete it. You want your teacher’s help/advice, so go to his office and talk with him about it.

Person B
Where: on campus
Time: Morning

Situation: You are a teacher, and are in your office working at your desk. One of your students (you have been teaching her/him for the last 6 months) knocks on the door. You invite them in and talk with them.

Power:
Person A: Low-----------------------------High
Person B: Low-----------------------------High

Social Distance:
Close-----------------------------Far

Size of Imposition:
Small-----------------------------Large

8. Situation:

Person A
Where: on campus, KUIS
Time: daytime

Situation: You are a student, and you have some writing homework to do for later this week. It’s a compare/contrast essay comparing British culture with Japanese culture. You’re not sure what do though.

You see your friend who is in the same class, and go to ask him/her for help.

Arrange to get help from them later today or tomorrow sometime.

Person B
Where: on campus
Time: daytime

Situation: You are on campus, walking to the library because you have a lot of homework to do. You see your friend coming towards you. Have a conversation with him/her.

Power:
Person A: Low-----------------------------High
Person B: Low-----------------------------High

Social Distance:
Close-----------------------------Far

Size of Imposition:
Small-----------------------------Large
Appendix G
Cognitive Map

The Social Context:
1. The formality of the language
2. The level of politeness of the language
3. Appropriate use of conventional expressions/ routines
4. Understanding of L2 pragmatic norms

Interactional Factors
1. Overall conversational structure
   i) opening
   ii) centring
   iii) closing

   -closing implicature environments: actions/topics, after which closing may become relevant. E.g.:
      a) announcing closure ("I've gotta go")
      b) arrangements- of some future interaction between the participants
      c) summaries- summarising topics talked about.
      d) appreciations- esp. in telephone calls
      e) back references- referring back to something previously said, commonly used in telephone calls.

   -pre-closing (designed to ensure nothing remains to be said). Often short turns, falling intonation. Closings require both pre-closing and terminal sequence (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973)
   -terminal sequence- final leave-taking ("bye" "bye")

2. Organisation of request sequence
   i) pre-pre request
      -H's orientation to pre-pre or pre as a pre-request and responding with a block, offer, or a go-ahead.
   ii) pre-request
      -pre-mentions (explaining situation)
      -pre-conditions (checking availability, ability)
iii) request
iv) post-request expansion
   - can be minimal “OK” “oh” or non-minimal, commenting on 2nd pair part of base adjacency pair.

3. Preference organisation (when L is the recipient of a request)
   i) behaviour when giving preferred response
   ii) behaviour when giving dispreferred response

4. Ability to project upcoming turns (ability to orient to a pre-request when L is the recipient of a request, or ability to project upcoming request by using a pre-request when doing the requesting)
   - When S has finished topic with falling intonation, gaze etc, H’s ability to orient to this and take next turn. Especially relevant to pre-closing sequences.
   - end of turn signified verbally, or non-verbally, intonation falling, gaze.

5. Ability to repair conversations when communication breaks down

6. Topic management (e.g. transitioning from opening to centring; from one topic to the next)
   - orient to topic/conversation ending through shorter turns, FB tokens, falling intonation
   - use of new topic signifying phrases (“actually” “by the way” etc)

7. Listener behaviour (to show affiliation/interest in speaker)
   i) gaze-
      - signifying end of turn for example
   ii) facial expressions
   iii) kinesics (body language)
Appendix H

NDA1 Strategic Interactions

ROLE-PLAY ONE

***Person A (student participant)

Where: on campus

Situation: You have lost your purse/wallet with your train ticket in it. You see your classmate and walk over to talk with him/her.

Ask your classmate to lend you some money to pay for your train fare to go back home (your home is in Saitama, 90 minutes from KUIS).

Person B (researcher; no mediation to be given)

Where: on campus

Situation: It is afternoon, after the last class has finished. Your classmate approaches you to talk with you.

ROLE-PLAY TWO

***Person A (student participant)

Where: on campus

Time: evening

Situation: You have just finished club practice, and it’s now about 8pm in the evening. The weather is not very nice (windy, light rain), so you don’t want to walk to the train station (you live in Tsudanuma).

Call your father and ask him to pick you up from KUIS.

Person B (researcher, no mediation to be given)

Where: on campus

Time: evening, 8pm

Situation: You have just got home from work. You receive a telephone call from your son/daughter. You’re tired, and don’t intend to go out again tonight.

ROLE-PLAY THREE

Person A (student participant)
**登場人物 A(学生の参加者)**

**Where:** on campus, teacher's office  
場所：キャンパス、講師のオフィス  
**Time:** daytime  
昼間  
**Situation:** Your new teacher has given you a project to complete by tomorrow, 2nd period. However, you have been busy recently with part-time work, club activities etc, so haven't had much time to work on the project.

新しい講師から、明日の2コマ目まで完成させなければならないプロジェクトを渡されていました。しかし、あなたは最近ずっとパートとクラブ活動等で忙しく、プロジェクトにとりかかった時間がほとんどありませんでした。

Ask your teacher to extend the deadline for another 2 days.

講師に締め切りを2日間延ばしてもらうよう頼んで下さい。

**Person B**

**Where:** on campus  
場所：キャンパス  
**Time:** daytime  
昼間  
**Situation:** You are a teacher at KUIS, sitting in your office, working at your desk.

You have a policy of not allowing students to hand in work late unless they have a very good excuse.

Invite them to come in and talk with them.

**ROLE-PLAY FOUR**

**Person A (researcher, no mediation to be given)**

**Where:** on campus  
場所：キャンパス  
**Time:** lunchtime  
昼間  
**Situation:** This coming weekend, you are moving to a new apartment, as your current one is too expensive. You can’t afford to hire a removal company to help you move, so you want to ask your friend to help. You know he/she has a large car that could be used to help you move your stuff.

You see your friend in the cafeteria, and walk over to begin talking.

**Person B**

**Where:** on campus  
場所：キャンパス  
**Time:** lunchtime  
昼間  
**Situation:** You have recently bought a big, new car, and this weekend you want to drive to Nagano to try it out. It will be fun driving along the mountain roads, and you’re looking forward to it.

You are sitting in the cafeteria eating lunch when you see your friend. He/she comes over to talk to you.
カフェテリアでランチをしていたところ、友達を見かけます。その友達があなたのところに話しに来ます。
ROLE-PLAY ONE

***Person A (student participant)

登場人物 A(学生の参加者)

Where: at home
場所：自宅
Situation: You are studying at home, doing some English homework given to you by your English teacher. You are finding the homework difficult, so you ask your older brother to help you.
シチュエーション：講師から与えられた英語の課題を自宅で行っていますが、内容が難しいことに気づき、兄に助けを求めます。

Person B (researcher; no mediation to be given)

Where: at home

Situation: You are studying at home in your room. Your younger brother/sister approaches you. Talk with them.

ROLE-PLAY TWO

***Person A (student participant)

登場人物 A(学生の参加者)

Where: at home
場所：自宅
Time: morning
時間：朝
Situation: You are at home, and it's the weekend. Tomorrow, you want to attend a music concert by a band you like in Tokyo. The concert will finish too late for you to catch a train home, so you want your father to pick you up from the concert. It takes about 1 hour to drive there from your home.
シチュエーション：週末自宅にいます。明日、あなたの好きなバンドのコンサートが東京であるので行きたいのですが、コンサートの終了時間が遅く電車で帰ってくることが出来ないため、父親に車で会場まで迎えに来てもらいたいと思っています。自宅からは車で1時間位かかります。

Person B (researcher, no mediation to be given)

Where: at home

Situation: You are at home, when your son/daughter approaches you. Talk with them.

ROLE-PLAY THREE

Person A (student participant)

登場人物 A(学生の参加者)
Person A (researcher, no mediation to be given)

Where: on campus
Time: lunchtime
Situation: You are a student at university. You have to prepare a group presentation for English class with your classmate (the group is you and your partner only, who is your friend), and the deadline is 4 days from now. Unfortunately, you are not feeling very well, and don’t feel able to prepare for the presentation much. Ask your partner to do most of the preparation (Powerpoint slides, script etc).

Person B

Where: on campus
Time: lunchtime
Situation: You are a student at university. You have a presentation project to prepare for 4 days from now with your friend, who is also your presentation partner. You are in the cafeteria eating lunch when your presentation partner approaches you. Talk with your partner.

Situation: You are a student at university, and a member of a university music club. Your club wants to organize a performance for next week, and you need to make a flyer, in both Japanese and also in English. The language is quite difficult though, so you want your English teacher to help you translate the flyer into English. You have known your teacher for 2 months. Ask your teacher for help.

Person B

Where: on campus
Time: daytime
Situation: You are a teacher at KUIS, sitting in your office, working at your desk. One of your students knocks on the door and asks to come in. Talk with them.
Appendix J
DA1 Strategic Interactions

ROLE-PLAY ONE
***Person A (student participant)
登場人物 A(学生の参加者)
Where: on campus
場所：キャンパス
Time: lunchtime
時間：ランチタイム

Situation: You’ve just bought a new album, and you really want to listen to it. Unfortunately, your music player isn’t working properly so you can’t listen to it. You see your friend sitting in the cafeteria, and walk over to him/her. You want to borrow your classmate’s music player for a couple of days.
シチュエーション：最近新しいアルバムを買ったので是非聴きたいのですが、残念な事にオーディオ機器が作動せず聴く事が出来ません。友人をカフェテリアで見かけたので話しに行きます。あなたはその友人からオーディオ機器を２－３日程借りたいと思っています。

Person B (researcher/mediator- mediation to be given if/when appropriate)
Where: on campus
Time: lunchtime
Situation: You’re having lunch in the cafeteria. You see your friend approaching you, and you have a conversation with them.

ROLE-PLAY TWO
***Person A (student participant)
登場人物 A(学生の参加者)
Where: at home
場所：自宅
Time: evening
時間：夜

Situation: You are at home. This morning, your friend from KUIS invited you to join him/her on a trip to Kyoto to see the Gion festival. You want to go, but unfortunately you don’t have much money.
Go to the living room (your father is watching TV) and ask him to lend you enough money to travel to Kyoto. You will need money for the train, the cheap business hotel, and also food/drink.

シチュエーション：自宅にいます。今朝、KUISの友人から祇園祭を一緒に見に、京都に行かないかと誘われました。行きたいのですが、あなたは今あまりお金がありません。

居間（父親がテレビを見ている）にありが、父親に京都旅行のためのお金を貸してくれるよう頼んで下さい。列車、格安ビジネスホテルそして飲食代が必要です。

Person B
Where: at home, in the living room
Time: evening

Situation: You are the father of Person A. You are watching TV in the living room, when your son/daughter comes in. Have a conversation with them.

ROLE-PLAY THREE
***Person A

登場人物 A

Where: on campus
場所：キャンパス

Time: morning
時間：朝
Situation: You have just started a new course with a new teacher (Person B). The teacher has given you a project to do for homework. The deadline is three days from now. This homework is challenging for you, and you are not sure how to complete it.

You want your teacher’s help/advice, so go to his office and talk with him about it.

Person B
Where: on campus
Time: Morning
Situation: You are a teacher, and are in your office working at your desk. One of your students knocks on the door. You invite them in and talk with them.

ROLE-PLAY FOUR

Person A (researcher-mediator)
Where: on campus
Time: daytime
Situation: You are a student, and you have some writing homework to do for later this week. It’s a compare/contrast essay comparing British culture with Japanese culture. You’re not sure what do though.

You see your friend who is in the same class, and go to ask him/her for help. Arrange to get help from them later today or tomorrow sometime.

***Person B (student participant)

Situation: 新しい講師（登場人物 B）のコースをとり始めました。宿題としてあるプロジェクトを渡されましたが、締め切りは今日から3日後です。この宿題はあなたにとって難しく、どうやって完成させるか定かではありません。講師の助け / アドバイスがほしいので、オフィスに話しに行きます。

Person B
Where: on campus
Time: Morning
Situation: You are a teacher, and are in your office working at your desk. One of your students knocks on the door. You invite them in and talk with them.

 ROLE-PLAY FOUR

Person A (researcher-mediator)
Where: on campus
Time: daytime
Situation: You are a student, and you have some writing homework to do for later this week. It’s a compare/contrast essay comparing British culture with Japanese culture. You’re not sure what do though.

You see your friend who is in the same class, and go to ask him/her for help. Arrange to get help from them later today or tomorrow sometime.

***Person B (student participant)

登場人物 B(学生の参加者)

Where: on campus

場所：キャンパス
**Time**: daytime

**Situation**: You are on campus, walking to the library because you have a lot of homework to do. You see your friend coming towards you. Have a conversation with him/her.

シチュエーション：宿題がたくさんあるため、キャンパスの図書館に向かっています。友人があなたの方にやってくるのが見えます。その友人と会話をして下さい。
Appendix K
DA2 & TA Strategic Interactions

ROLE-PLAY ONE
***Person A (student participant)
登場人物 A(学生の参加者)

Where: at home
場所: 自宅
Situation: You are studying at home, doing some English homework given to you by your English teacher. You are finding the homework difficult, so you ask your older brother to help you.
シチュエーション：講師から与えられた英語の課題を自宅で行っていますが、内容が難しいことに気づき、兄に助けを求めます。

Person B (researcher; no mediation to be given)
Where: at home
Situation: You are studying at home in your room. Your younger brother/sister approaches you. Talk with them.

ROLE-PLAY TWO
***Person A (student participant)
登場人物 A(学生の参加者)

Where: at home
場所: 自宅
Time: morning
時間：朝
Situation: You are at home, and it’s the weekend. Tomorrow, you want to attend a music concert by a band you like in Tokyo. The concert will finish too late for you to catch a train home, so you want your father to pick you up from the concert. It takes about 1 hour to drive there from your home.
シチュエーション：週末自宅にいます。明日、あなたの好きなバンドのコンサートが東京であるので行きたいのですが、コンサートの終了時間が遅く電車で帰ってくることが出来ないため、父親に車で会場まで迎えに来てもらいたいと思っています。自宅からは車で1時間位かかるです。

Person B (researcher, no mediation to be given)
Where: at home
Time: morning, weekend
Situation: You are at home, when your son/daughter approaches you. Talk with them.

ROLE-PLAY THREE
Person A (student participant)
登場人物 A(学生の参加者)
Where: on campus, teacher's office
場所：キャンパス、講師のオフィス
Time: daytime
時間：昼間
Situation: You are a student at university, and a member of a university music club. Your club wants to organize a performance for next week, and you need to make a flyer, in both Japanese and also in English. The language is quite difficult though, so you want your English teacher to help you translate the flyer into English. You have known your teacher for 2 months.
Ask your teacher for help.

シチュエーション：あなたは大学生で、大学の音楽クラブに所属しています。クラブでは来週、演奏会を企画していて、あなたは日本語と英語のチラシを作成しなければなりません。英語で作るのはかなり難しいので、英語講師に翻訳を手伝ってもらうとしています。その講師とは知り合って2ヶ月です。
講師に助けを求めて下さい。

Person B
Where: on campus
Time: daytime
Situation: You are a teacher at KUIS, sitting in your office, working at your desk. One of your students knocks on the door and asks to come in. Talk with them.

ROLE-PLAY FOUR
Person A (researcher, no mediation to be given)
Where: on campus
Time: lunchtime
Situation: You are a student at university. You have to prepare a group presentation for English class with your classmate (the group is you and your partner only, who is your friend), and the deadline is 4 days from now. Unfortunately, you are not feeling very well, and don’t feel able to prepare for the presentation much. Ask your partner to do most of the preparation (Powerpoint slides, script etc).

Person B
登場人物 B
Where: on campus
場所：キャンパス
Time: lunchtime
時間：ランチタイム
Situation: You are a student at university. You have a presentation project to prepare for 4 days from now with your friend, who is also your presentation partner. You are in the cafeteria eating lunch when your presentation partner approaches you. Talk with your partner.

シチュエーション：あなたは大学生で、今日から4日間でプレゼンテーションプロジェクトの準備を、プレゼンのパートナーである友人と行います。プレゼンパートナーが、カフェテリアでランチをとっているあなたのところにやってきました。その友人と話して下さい。
VERY NEAR TRANSFER TASKS (ROLE-PLAYS 5-8)

ROLE-PLAY FIVE
Person A (参加者)
Where: on campus
場所:  on campus
Time: daytime
時間: 昼間
Situation: You are a student at university. You were absent from last class (writing), and want to borrow the notes from your good friend to help you catch up. Ask your friend.
施設エーション：あなたは大学生です。前回のライティングのクラスを欠席したので、親友からノートを借りて授業に追いつきたいと思っています。友人に頼んで下さい。

Person B (researcher-mediator)
Where: on campus
場所:  on campus
Time: daytime
時間:  昼間
Situation: You are a student at university. Your friend from writing class approaches you. Talk with him/her.
施設エーション：

ROLE-PLAY SIX
Person A (participant)
Where: at home
場所:  自宅
Time: evening
時間:  夜
Situation: You are a university student, and you are at home. Next Saturday (one week from today), you want to go to a shopping centre to buy some clothes for the new university semester. You want your father to take you there by car. The journey takes about 10 minutes. Ask your father.
施設エーション：あなたは大学生で、今自宅にいます。来週の土曜、大学の来期に向けて服を買いにショッピングセンターに行こうと考えていますが、父親に車で連れて行って欲しいと思っています。車ではそこまで10分程かかります。父親に頼んで下さい。

Person B
Where: at home
場所:  自宅
Time: evening
時間:  夜
Situation: You are the parent of Person A, and you’re in your home office, reading. Person A approaches you. Talk with them.
施設エーション：

ROLE-PLAY SEVEN
Person A (participant)
Where: on campus
Time: daytime
Situation: You are a student at university. The semester has just begun, and you need to buy several expensive textbooks for your classes (cost=approx. $300). However, you don’t have enough money, because you've spent time travelling during your winter vacation. You don’t want to ask your parents. The only person you can think of who could help is your friend (Person B)

Person B
Where: on campus
Time: daytime
Situation: You are a student at university. You are on campus, drinking coffee/tea in the café, waiting for next class to begin. Your friend approaches you. Talk with them.

ROLE-PLAY EIGHT
Person A (researcher-mediator)
Where: on campus
Time: daytime
Situation: You are a student at university. You volunteer part-time in the library (unpaid), organizing books on the shelves, putting returned books back in their original places etc. You are scheduled to work today, from 5-8pm. However, you accidentally booked a private language lesson for the same time, to help you prepare for an English exam next week. Ask your friend to cover your library shift today.

Person B (participant)
Where: on campus
Time: daytime
Situation: You are a student at university. You are on campus, drinking coffee/tea in the café, waiting for next class to begin. Your friend approaches you. Talk with them.
NEAR TRANSFER TASK
Person A (participant)
Where: on campus
Time: daytime
Situation: You are a student at university. You want to study abroad next year at a university in the United Kingdom, for one year. As part of the application, you need a letter of recommendation from the head of your department at university (Person B). You have not met the department head before. Ask the department head for a letter of recommendation.

Person B
Where: on campus, in office
Time: daytime
Situation: You are the head of the International Communication department at university. You are in your office working when a student knocks on your door. Talk with them.

MEDIUM TRANSFER TASK
Person A (participant)
Where: on campus
Time: daytime
Situation: You are a senior member of a music club at university. In two weeks time, your club will perform a concert on campus, as part of the university summer festival. To prepare, you want to ask other members to help. Person B is a junior member, although he is not taking part in the concert. You want to ask Person B for help preparing for the concert. Ask Person B to i) lend you their music sheet with the music for one song so you can photocopy it; ii) to design and make the flyers and posters for the concert, in both Japanese and English.

シチュエーション：あなたは大学生で、カフェでコーヒー/紅茶を飲みながら、次の講義が始まるのを待っています。そこにあなたの友人が近づいてきました。話して下さい。
Where: on campus
場所：キャンパス
Time: daytime
時間：昼間
Situation: You are a university student, and you are in the campus café drinking coffee/tea with a classmate. You see your English teacher sitting nearby. Invite your teacher to sit and chat with you.
シチュエーション：あなたは大学生で、大学のカフェでクラスメートとコーヒー/紅茶を飲んでいます。英語の講師が近くに座っているのを見つけます。その講師を自分達のところに来て一緒にしゃべりしないか誘って下さい。

Person B
Where: on campus, cafe
場所：キャンパスのカフェ
Time: daytime
時間：昼間
Situation: You are a teacher at university. You are on a break, and are sitting in the university café, drinking a coffee/tea. One of your students approaches you. Talk with them.
シチュエーション：あなたは大学の講師で、休憩中、大学のカフェでコーヒー/紅茶を飲んでいます。1人の学生が接近してきます。話す事。

Person A (participant)
Where: on campus, cafe
場所：キャンパスのカフェ
Time: daytime
時間：昼間
Situation: You are a university student, and you are in the campus café drinking coffee/tea with a classmate. You see your English teacher sitting nearby. Invite your teacher to sit and chat with you.
シチュエーション：あなたは大学生で、大学のカフェでクラスメートとコーヒー/紅茶を飲んでいます。英語の講師が近くに座っているのを見つけます。その講師を自分達のところに来て一緒にしゃべりしないか誘って下さい。
Appendix L
Sample Enrichment Programme Mediator Model

Request Model (5)

1) STAGE ONE: OPENING

2) STAGE TWO: CENTRING (REQUEST)
   i) Pre-Request

Person A: Makes a pre-request: a) ability; b) time
       Person B: Make an offer (guesses what Person A wants)
               Go ahead
               Block (negative response) ✗

ii) Request

Person A: REQUEST
       Person B: Asks for more information.
               Grant ✓
               or
               Refuse ✗

Person A: Gives information
       Person B:

3) STAGE THREE: CLOSING

SIZE OF REQUEST

CULTURE
Appendix M
Sample Enrichment Programme Learner-Created Model

REQUEST MODEL FIVE

Draw/write your basic model for requesting below, based on the information we’ve talked about in today’s session.

[Diagram of a flowchart showing the steps of a request model, including opening, pre-request, request, and closing stages, with decision points for making an offer, going ahead, blocking, asking for more information, accepting, refusing, and giving more information.]
Appendix N
Sample Enrichment Programme Material: Power, Social Distance & Imposition

- **Social Status**
  - lower? The same? Higher?
  - Teacher and student; doctor and patient; best friends; child and parents
  - What language would you use?

- **Social Distance**
  - How well do you know the person? How close are you?
  - Are you meeting them for the first time?
  - Have you known them for many years?
  - Are they close friends? Family? Or just an acquaintance?

- **Size of the Request**
  - How troublesome is the request?
  - Is it a big favour? (e.g. lending 10,000 yen)
  - Is it a small favour? (e.g. lending a pencil)
Appendix O

Transcript Conventions (adapted from Jefferson, 2004)

: lengthened sound
. falling intonation
, slight rise in intonation
- incomplete/ false start
(( )) describing something that can’t be easily represented in writing. E.g. ((laughing))
(( )) transcriber’s notes
= turn starts with less than a beat’s rest from previous turn. Placed at end of 1\textsuperscript{st} turn, and beginning of second.
[ ] overlapping speech
(.) short pause
(0.5) longer pause, more than 2/10ths second. (Doesn’t need to be exact, but internally consistent within transcript)
( ) transcriber’s best guess at what was said, difficult to hear. If impossible to catch, leave brackets blank.
* * quiet/ whispered talk
Appendix P
Sample of Transcript: Hikaru, DA2-1 and DA2-2 Strategic Interactions

[00:06:29.26]
Hikaru: ((knocks on desk))
M: hey
Hikaru: hi Al (. ) what are you doing
M: a:h hey a:h just um (. ) just kind of doing this report for tomorro:w
Hikaru: o:h (. ) really
M: yea:h
Hikaru: do you have time now,
M: u::h yeah ((est mut gaze; ext arm towards Hikaru; tilts head)) (. ) okay so I'll stop you there ((slightly lower volume))
Hikaru: yes
M: (0.3) so: ((looks down; arm ext on desk)) (0.5) in you:r gre- in your opening
Hikaru: ahum ((nods head; maintains gaze))
M: you did a- a greeting, ((est mut gaze)) (0.5) did you do a health inquiry, ((tilts head; maintains mut gaze))
Hikaru: ((looks up)) (1.5) no: i- (. ) no way,- no no- (. ) no ((est mut gaze))
M: a::h okay so why did you: ((mut gaze; hands down)) (. ) choose not to do a health inquiry
Hikaru: (0.7) ((looks straight ahead)) u::h (1.3) I'm not sure but (1.5) mm: ((looks down)) (0.5) I felt ((est mut gaze, then looks straight ahead)) (. ) it's neces- it's not necessary ((est mut gaze; leans back))
M: okay ((nods head))
Hikaru: just I thought
M: ah okay why (. ) any- any reason,
Hikaru: reason why ((looks straight ahead)) (. ) u::h (1.5) distance (. ) social distance is ((hands raised)) (. ) really close [so
M: [mm]
Hikaru: that's why ((mut gaze))
M: ((looks up)) (0.5) okay so: when the social distance is close ((looks at hands; hands raised, palms close together)) (0.5) you- do you think you don't need a health inquiry, ((est mut gaze))
Hikaru: ((nods head; mut gaze))
M: ((looks up)) okay interesting (0.7) ((looks down)) so: well (0.3) hm I'm not sure I agree
Hikaru: ahum
M: you- you- you definitely (. ) don't always need a health inquiry ((shakes head))
Hikaru: yes ((mut gaze))
M: (0.3) but I- I'm not sure (0.5) I don't think social distance ((hands raised; palms facing)) ((mut gaze))
Hikaru: ahum
M: is- I don't think it depends on social distance (0.3) maybe it depends on ((looks down)) (0.3) when was the last time you saw them ((mut gaze; hands down)) (. ) so how long (. ) a gap ((raises hands, palms facing))
Hikaru: ahum ((nods head))
M: between the- the previous meeting ((ext arm towards Hikaru))
Hikaru: ((nods head))
M: and today so ((looks straight ahead)) (. ) if it's been like- if you spoke to them half an hour ago ((mut gaze; points behind self with thumb))
Hikaru: ahum ((mut gaze))
M: then maybe you don't need health inquiry (. ) cos you spoke to them very recently ((points behind again))
Hikaru: mm ((nods head))
M: but if you spoke to them I don't- yesterday (. ) or two days ago (. ) maybe ((mut gaze)) (0.3) you can use a health inquiry(0.3) health inquiries are very very common
Hikaru: [mm:
M: [in English] language (. ) conversations
Hikaru: yeah
M: almost (0.7) ((shakes head)) au- automatic (0.5)
Hikaru: ((arms crossed on desk)) actually (. ) now I did it like the Japanese way ((mut gaze))
M: mm ((nods head))
Hikaru: in Japanese wa:y ((looks straight ahead)) (. ) a health inquiry is no:t (. )
usual things
M: [mm:
Hikaru: [so]- (0.3) so I was curious
M: mm ((maintains gaze))
Hikaru: so: (. ) I tried to (. ) do it like Japanese way
M: a::h right okay ((nods head slowly; looks up)) (. ) so: um you don't always have
to have a health inquiry
Hikaru: ahum
M: but it's very common (. ) in English conversations yeah ((mut gaze)) okay so:
let's try one more time. ((rewind gesture; mut gaze))
Hikaru: yes ((looks down; leans forward))
M: um from the beginning ((leans forward; looks down))
Hikaru: (0.5) ((leans back; looks up)) (2) okay (. ) ((knocks on desk))
M: hey
Hikaru: hi Al (. ) [how's it goin
M: [ah hey] (. ) yeah alright how are you doin
Hikaru: mm (. ) so so::
M: a:h
Hikaru: what are you doing now
M: ah I'm just doing my homework for tomorrow's class
Hikaru: oh (. ) yeah do you have time now,
M: u:m: (. ) yeah I guess (0.3) so:: (. ) I'll stop you there ((tilts head; est mut gaze;
ext arm towards Hikaru; looks down))
Hikaru: ahum
M: what was that ((ext arm towards Hikaru)) (0.3) why did you ask that
Hikaru: ((looks straight ahead; hands down)) (1.3) now::, ((est mut gaze))
M: do you have time now (. ) wh- why did you ask me that ((mut gaze))
Hikaru: (0.5) to check you have the time or not ((maintains gaze))
M: okay and what- what is that ((est mut gaze))
Hikaru: (0.5) what is that- a:h ((looks up)) (0.3) u:m (0.3) pre-request, ((est mut
gaze))
M: okay ((nods head; looks down, then est mut gaze)) (. why do we:- (0.3) why do people do pre-requests
Hikaru: (0.3) u::h so (. to check (. the time (. a:nd ability or (. if necessary (. we need to explain (. why
M: alright good (. thank you very much ((looks down; hands down; est mut gaze; laughs)) (0.5) good (. ((laughs))
Hikaru: ((laughs)) o:h
M: that stopped me (.) alright good ((looking down))
Hikaru: thank you
M: alright (. u:h (0.3) yeah so let's continue ((ext arm towards Hikaru; est mut gaze))
Hikaru: yeah
M: u:m ((looks straight ahead)) (0.3) from one more time (. please ask me ((mut gaze))
Hikaru: okay (. do you have time now,
M: (0.3) well (. I- I need to get this finished (. so:: I'm a- I'm a little bit busy (. right now
Hikaru: yes
M: how come
Hikaru: u::h (0.3) actually now (. I'm also doing homework=
M: [a::h
Hikaru: [=English] one (. but (. it's a bit difficult for me to do
M: [right
Hikaru: [so] if you could (. wou- (. will you help me,
M: u::h okay (. will you why ((tilts head; mut gaze; leaning back; hands down))
(0.3) will you (0.5) if you could will you help me
Hikaru: becau:se (0.5) we are (. brothers
M: ahum
Hikaru: so: (. at first I should (0.3) I wanna use (0.3) could or can ((mut gaze))
M: mm: ((nods head))
Hikaru: but (0.5) reconsider ((looks straight ahead, then est mut gaze)) (0.3) then (. decide to use (. will
M: what's the difference between 80.3) you think between will and can or could
Hikaru: a::h politeness ((mut gaze))
M: okay ((nods head slowly)) (. ) which is more polite
Hikaru: could ((mut gaze))
M: could okay ((looks down; nods head)) so you- you wanna be less polite ((est mut gaze))
Hikaru: yes
M: because of the social distance, ((hands close together, palms facing))
Hikaru: yeah (. ) but I noticed (. ) you were busy and you have to: (0.3) you have a task to do (. ) by tomorrow so (. ) ((looks straight ahead)) maybe I have sh:- I should use a: (0.3) can or could ((est mut gaze))
M: ph: you want to change it, ((raises eyebrows; mut gaze))
Hikaru: yeah ((maintains gaze))
M: okay it's up to you ((looks down; laughs))
Hikaru: ((laughs))
M: alright (. ) so:. ((rewind gesture)) in that case let's rewind and one more time ((ext arm towards Hikaru))
Hikaru: okay (0.5) o::h (. ) now (. ) uh (. ) I'm also doing homework
M: mm
Hikaru: but it's (. ) bit difficult for me to do
M: a::h
Hikaru: so if you could (. ) could you help me,
M: what kind of homework is it
Hikaru: u::h (. ) it's (. ) English ones (. ) just reading and translating
M: a::h okay how much (. ) text
Hikaru: ah (. ) not so much just two or three or four sentences
M: alright okay um: (0.3) we- yeah l- well I can try and help I don't know if I can but
Hikaru: a:h
M: I need to finish this first (. ) and then maybe like (. ) I don't know (0.3) in an hour
Hikaru: hmm (. ) thank you
M: is that alright (. ) I'll come and find you and then take a look
Hikaru: that's okay ((thumbs up))
M: a::h great (. ) okay
Hikaru: yes thank you (. ) in (. ) half an hour
M: about- about an hour
Hikaru: about an hour
M: yeah
Hikaru: okay (.) so (.) I got (.) u:h (0.3) I go back my home- (.) gu- I go back my room
M: ahuh
Hikaru: see you later
M: okay ((ext arm towards Hikaru)) so:: (.) ju- um ((looks down; arm ext on desk)) (0.5) I'll go back to my room ((est mut gaze))
Hikaru: ahum
M: a:nd what is- what is that ((maintains gaze))
Hikaru: ((looks up)) just u:h (1.5) f::ake- (0.5) fake ((moves index finger in air)) nan dake ((Japanese)) fa- fake- (0.3) fake ((leans back; arms crossed)) (1) wait a minute ((looks down))
M: mm ((maintains gaze))
Hikaru: (7) I'm sorry I can't remember ((est mut gaze))
M: ((laughs)) arrangement,
Hikaru: yeah (.) fake arrangement
M: a::h (.) mm: ((looks up; leans back; arms crossed)) is that- I don't know if it's a fake arrangement (.) fake arrangement's a little different
Hikaru: o:h
M: a fake arrangement is like um (.) okay I'll see you soon ((ext arm over desk; mut gaze))
Hikaru: mm ((mut gaze))
M: or I'll call you sometime
Hikaru: mm ((nods head))
M: it's like (.) arranging to (.) meet but not really it's fake
Hikaru: mm: ((maintains gaze))
M: your is um: I'll go back to my room
Hikaru: a::h (.) so this could be a announcement of the end of the ta- (.) conversation
M: ((nods head; looks down)) yeah (.) exactly exactly and that is a type of what
Hikaru: type of ((looks away))
M: (1) you've got fake arrangement ((taps fingers counting)) announcing the end of the conversation (. ) what are they (. ) what stage of the conversation
Hikaru: yes ((looks down)) (. ) u::h (6.5) it's not leave-taking, ((est mut gaze))
M: before that yea:h ((maintains gaze))
Hikaru: (0.7) uh (0.5) br- (3.5) nan dake ((Japanese; leans back; hands on head))
(2) pre-en- no:: (0.5) how can I say ((looks straight ahead))
M: ((laughs)) (2) ((shifts gaze to Hikaru)) you can describe it if you can't remember the- the name (. ) just describe (. ) what is it
Hikaru: u:h yes ((looks down)) (. ) what is u:h (. ) it's kind of preparing ((est mut
gaze)) (. ) to finish the conversation
M: ((nods head)) okay yeah yeah
Hikaru: so (. ) often use u:h (. ) hi- uh well- uh no- alright. okay. and intonation goes down ((moves hand down in air))
M: mm
Hikaru: (0.7) announcement of the (. ) end of the conversation
M: mm
Hikaru: the::n (. ) fake arrangement
M: mm ((nods head; looks down))
Hikaru: then finish
M: cool yeah so it's like a pre-closing
Hikaru: yeah ((mut gaze))
M: ah okay (. ) excellent. ((looks down; nods head; hands down)) (0.5) okay good yeah (. ) so: one more time can you:: pre-close ((ext arm towards Hikaru)) for me
Hikaru: okay ((looks away)) (0.5) ((looks up)) (1) in about an hour
M: mm: about an hour yeah
Hikaru: okay: (. ) so (. ) I go back my room
M: alright I'll uh: (. ) I'll catch you later
Hikaru: see you later
M: alright see ya.
[00:15:50.16]

[00:17:57.23]
Hikaru: hi dad
M: ah hey (. ) morning
Hikaru: morning how's going
M: yeah yeah u:h good (. ) just watching some TV relaxing (. ) how about you
Hikaru: yeah (. ) I'm good
M: a:h good
Hikaru: now (. ) u:h (0.5) can you talk to me now,
M: u:h yeah sure (. ) hang on ((turns off TV))
Hikaru: than[k you
M: [why] what's up
Hikaru: u:m (. ) as you know (. ) I'll go to the concert tomorrow
M: ((nods head))
Hikaru: so: (. ) I have a favour (. ) if you could- (0.3) u:h I was wondering if you could pick me up from the concert (. ) after finish
M: so (. ) I was wondering if you could ((est mut gaze; tilts head)) (. ) why: why did you choose (0.3) that language ((hands down; maintains gaze))
Hikaru: u::h (0.5) I don't know the phrase is (. ) politest ((raises hand in air above head; est mut gaze))
M: mm ((nods head))
Hikaru: then (. ) the re- the content of the request is (. ) bit hard to do because it's so late ((shifts gaze to M))
M: mm ((looks down; nods head))
Hikaru: and (. ) I'm gonna say (. ) midnight
M: mm ((nods head))
Hikaru: then maybe (. ) father has work tomorrow
M: right
Hikaru: so (. ) this could be a big one- (. ) big (. ) request ((est mut gaze; moves hands in air)) (. ) for (. ) for us
M: [right
Hikaru: [so] I choose one
M: okay ((looks down; nods head)) (. ) alright
Hikaru: ahum ((maintains gaze))
M: u::m (. ) good (. ) let's continue ((ext arm towards Hikaru)) (. ) fro:m (. ) one more time sorry from the- the: request
Hikaru: okay (. ) u:h (. ) if you could (. ) u::h (0.3) I was wondering if you could pick me up from the concert after finish,

M: okay and how about you:r (0.3) so how do you feel ((est mut gaze)) (0.3) asking this request

Hikaru: um feel sorry, ((mut gaze))

M: sorry okay (. ) and comfortable or uncomfortable or- (. ) um:

Hikaru: uncomfortable

M: mm ((nods head; looks down)) so: in often in English language

Hikaru: mm

M: what happens to people's voices ((est mut gaze)) or their body language or their face (. ) or eye contact ((tilts head slightly))

Hikaru: u:::h lost eye contact and voice (0.3) the tone of the voice is down

M: mm

Hikaru: and also speed (. ) going down

M: mm ((maintains gaze; nods head slowly))

Hikaru: then ((looks up)) (0.3) sometimes having a pausing ((moves hand chopping motion in air; mut gaze))

M: mm (. ) okay ((mut gaze)) (0.3) so::: ((mut gaze))

Hikaru: so ((mut gaze))

M: what do you think about your when you requested

Hikaru: yes (. ) too fas ((looks straight ahead)) (0.3) and also (. ) u:h (1) many problems ((looks down)) (0.3) to fix it ((shifts gaze to M))

M: mm ((looks down)) problems I wouldn't say problems it's just that um (. ) just yeah in (. ) typically if it's an uncomfortable (. ) u:h kind of feeling ((mut gaze)) (0.3) just ot be aware that sometimes the voice changes (. ) or body language or (. ) you can use your face ((moves hand near face))

Hikaru: ahum ((maintains gaze))

M: so like (. ) kind of like screw it up or anything you like (. ) um: so yeah (. ) it's (. ) the: ((looks down; arms extended on desk)) (0.3) the words are one half

Hikaru: yes

M: of the message (. ) the other half is the (. ) kind of (. ) body language and (. ) intonation stress that kind of thing ((leaning back; maintains gaze))

Hikaru: okay
M: intonation and stress are quite important in English ((est mut gaze, then looks
down; nods head)) (0.3) u:m okay so: let's continue
Hikaru: ahum ((looks down))
M: u::h re- let's rewind one more time ((rewind gesture; est mut gaze; ext arm
towards Hikaru)) and from the request. ((looks down))
Hikaru: okay (.). u:h u:::m okay (.). as you know (.). I'll go to the concert tomorrow
M: a:h right yes
Hikaru: yes so (.). uh (.). I have a favour (.). uh (.). if you could (.). uh (.). I was
wondering if you could pick me up from the concert after finish
M: u::h what time does the concert finish Hikaru
Hikaru: maybe after (.). twelve,
M: after twelve, (.). Sunday night,
Hikaru: yes:
M: u::h so I've got work on Monday morning I have to get up early
Hikaru: yeah I know (.). I know
M: a:::h Hikaru (1) uh how are your friends getting home
Hikaru: u:h they are my friends (.). made a reservation for hotel
M: a::h it's difficult (.). u:m (0.3) okay well (0.5) I guess I don't have a choice 80.3)
s[o::
Hikaru: [ah]
M: there are no buses
Hikaru: no buses
M: (1) okay I'll pick you up (0.3) um: (.). send me a (.). text message
Hikaru: yes:
M: like an hour before the end of the concert
Hikaru: okay
M: and I'll come and- (0.3) and I'll drive and I'll pick you up
Hikaru: okay (.). so (0.3) u:h (.). I'll send a text message before (0.3) one hour
M: mm
Hikaru: finish
M: yea:h (.). so- yeah it takes about an hour
Hikaru: [yeah
M: [to] get to the concert place
Hikaru: yes
M: so text me about an hour before
Hikaru: (0.7) definitely I'll do it
M: mm:
Hikaru: oka:y
M: don't be late
Hikaru: (0.3) I promise
M: mm
Hikaru: thank you
M: okay
Hikaru: a:h
M: stop you there ((est mut gaze; ext arm; lowers volume; leaning back))
Hikaru: ah
M: so: (0.3) u:m after the: ((gaze down)) request (.) so you've got a pre-request (.)
and a request ((arm ext on desk)) (0.3) and then there's sometimes like a post-
request, ((est mut gaze)) stage
Hikaru: hm, ((mut gaze))
M: so if I: (0.3) did I grant or re- or did I refuse ((shifts gaze to Hikaru))
Hikaru: (0.5) you grant ((gaze to M))
M: ((nods head; gaze down)) so ho- so: (.) after someone grants a request ((mut
gaze)) usually (.) how does the (0.3) other person reply
Hikaru: ((looks up))
M: after granting
Hikaru: (2.3) say thank you, ((mut gaze))
M: right right right (.) and you said thank you
Hikaru: mm
M: u:m ((gaze straight ahead)) (0.5) there's- there's called like ((hands raised,
palms facing)) a post-request stage ((mut gaze)) (.) where you respond to my
granting or refusing ((gaze straight ahead)) (0.3) and you said thank you it was
quite short ((mut gaze)) (.) u:m that's okay ((shrugs)) but if you wanted to make it
longer
Hikaru: mm
M: what could you ((widens gap between hands)) say
Hikaru: (3.7) oh thank you so much, ((looked straight ahead, then reest mut gaze))
M: thank you so much ye- anything else ((mut gaze))
Hikaru: (0.7) u::h ((looks straight ahead)) (5) I appreciate it, ((est mut gaze))
M: okay yeah ((nods)) I really appreciate it something like that (. ) okay alright
thanks ((nods; gaze down, then mut gaze)) just wanted to know ((ext arm towards
Hikaru))
Hikaru: yes
M: just wanted to ask you ((gaze down)) (0.3) u::m (. ) a:h yep that's okay no
problem but yeah (. ) yeah (. ) don't be late
Hikaru: thank you
M: mm: ((gaze down))
Hikaru: yeah thank you so much I really appreciate it
M: a:h okay yeah (. ) don't worry about it ((est mut gaze; smiles))
Hikaru: (0.3) o:h (. ) I gotta go
M: ah right okay (. ) you got to:- (. ) you're meeting a friend,
Hikaru: yes
M: okyay (. ) alright (. ) well I'll see you later on
Hikaru: mm see you later
M: alright (0.5) okay thank you
[00:25:00.22]
Appendix Q

Nvivo Screenshot 1 Showing Coding Nodes
## Appendix R

**Nvivo Screenshot 2: Node Codings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Created On</th>
<th>Created By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object type</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>10 Mar 2015, 09:49</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openings, closings, orienting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>14 Mar 2015, 14:14</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:38</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal resources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:41</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment body position</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:42</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief pause after object resolution</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:42</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extends arm towards P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:43</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaze (down, up)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:43</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaze (mut gaze)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:42</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head movement-nodding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:42</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewind gesture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 13:34</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thumbs up</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7 Sep 2015, 09:46</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task sequence initiated without closing moves</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6 Sep 2015, 10:30</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal resources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:40</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative utterances</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:40</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit verbal Ding of task initiation point</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:40</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:41</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:36</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-initiated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>14 Mar 2015, 14:16</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit verbal initiation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:14</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit initiation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 08:18</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-initiated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14 Mar 2015, 14:16</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit verbal initiation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:21</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit initiation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1 Sep 2015, 09:21</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix S
Enrichment Programme Sample Teaching Materials

Part One: speech act role-play cards

Partner A (apologising)
Yesterday you borrowed your partner’s iPad to do your English homework. Unfortunately, you dropped it on the floor, and now it’s broken... :-(
tell your partner what happened;
apologise

Partner A (inviting)
You having a party at you home next weekend.
Invite your partner.

Partner A (thankng)
Your partner helped you with your homework last week, and you got a grade A from your teacher.
Thank your partner.

Partner A (requesting)
You need to take some notes in class, but you’ve forgotten t bring any pens or pencils with you (you woke up late and had to rush to KUIS :/-)
Ask your partner to lend you a pen

Partner A (ordering)
You’re in a restaurant and have finished looking at the menu. You’re ready to order some food!
Your partner is the waiter/waitress- order some food and drink.

Partner A (reporting)
Yesterday, a really interesting thing happened to you, and you want to tell your partner the story :-)
Tell your partner what happened.
### Responding to a Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMFORTABLE RESPONSE</th>
<th>UNCOMFORTABLE RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• it comes quickly after the first part,</td>
<td>• there is often silence and hesitation before the second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• it sometimes overlaps with the first part,</td>
<td>part,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• it is short and simple</td>
<td>• participants usually explain why they can’t do it,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• it is complicated and long</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples from videos 1 and 2**

(Speaker A)

**FIRST PART**

 pled

(Conversation 1)

“Photocopy this page and this page.”

(Conversation 2)

“Can you cover for me tonight?”

(Speaker B)

**SECOND PART**

 pled

“okay done!”

• 1.5 seconds (silence)

• “tsk” (hesitation)

• “sorry mate” (apology)

• “I’m- I’m teaching tonight. 5.30 til 8” (explanation)

*Adapted from Barraja-Rohan and Pritchard (1997)*
Appendix U
Sample Enrichment Programme Materials

Closing a Conversation

1. Begin to wind down the conversation
   - Listener turns get shorter;
   - Listener uses feedback tokens- alright, yeah, okay etc
     - falling intonation↓

2. Begin to close the conversation
   - Make a "fake" arrangement "I'll call you" "speak soon" (often used with friends or family-
     people you know well)
   - Repeating an arrangement you made earlier in the conversation- "So, 6pm tomorrow evening, 
     right?" "Okay, so see you at the bar later tonight"
   - Use assessments- "sounds good" "great" "brilliant"
   - Use feedback tokens- "alright" "okay" "I see"
   - Announcing the end of the conversation- looking at your watch, "I should go" "I've got to go"
     "I'll let you go"

3. Finish the conversation
   - "bye" "see you later" "see ya"
   - "goodbye" "see you next week" "goodnight"

Adapted from Barraja-Rohan and Pritchard, (1997)
Appendix V:
Example model generated by one of the study participants. Request model one was drawn near the beginning of the course, at the end of the first learning session.

REQUEST MODEL ONE

Draw/write your basic model for requesting below, based on the information we’ve talked about in today’s session.


