Interactional competence in L2 learning: Is it taught or activated?

John Campbell-Larsen

Abstract

It has long been understood that learning a foreign/second language involves much more than simply acquiring vocabulary and grammar to a certain level. Language learners also need interactional competence (IC) to be able to successfully participate in spoken interactions in the target language (L2). IC is comprised of a wide range of components, such as turn-taking and repair procedures, use of discourse markers and the ability to carry out speech acts and recognize when others are carrying them out. Some of these components will be the same in both the L1 and L2 and can be transferred into the L2 in an unconscious fashion. Thus, IC may develop over time as knowledge of the L2 increases and opportunities to interact in the L2 accumulate. IC can also be explicitly taught, especially where opportunities to interact in the L2 are limited and where there may be subtle differences between L1 and L2 interactional practices. The development of IC can be seen as falling along a spectrum, from unconscious application of universal interactional modes from the very outset of learning to automatic emergence of competence as knowledge and opportunity to interact increases, to specifically taught interactional practices incorporated in the teaching program.

Interactional competence and language learning

Learning a foreign/second language is often conceived of as primarily a

mental activity. That is, the learner's epistemic state concerning the lexis and grammar of the target language changes from an epistemic minus（K−）to epistemic plus（K＋）status. This change from K− to K＋ may come about by formal, institutionalized instruction, by self-study, or by participating in （officially）non-pedagogically focused 'real world' interactions in the target language（L2）. It is clear that even if the purpose of the interaction is not officially language learning, it is still possible for language learning to take place. Whatever the case, it is understood that the change is brought about by external input. That is, no amount of cogitation, starting from a zero base, will allow a learner to come up with the L2 item. If an English speaker doesn't know the word for *dog* in Arabic, Japanese, Thai or Quechua, then the only way to gain such knowledge is by having access to an external source- a teacher, textbook, website, dictionary or speaker of the L2. Similarly, grammatical structures such as plural noun morphology, passive constructions, causatives and the like will remain in the K− domain until the learner has access to some external source.

To be sure, once the initial zero state has been passed, some amount of internalized cognitive work may be undertaken by the learner to add items to the repertoire of lexis and grammar. Knowledge of the word 'unhappy' may be sufficient grounds for the learner to productively intuit 'unfriendly', 'unkind' and so on, although external sources must be consulted to confirm the legitimacy of the cogitated form. The words 'unsad', 'undangerous' and 'undirty' will not pass muster as legitimate English words, despite the existence of 'unhappy', 'unsafe' and 'unclean' in the language.

In sum, the language learning process has at its heart the notion that in the leaner's initial epistemic state the stuff of the L2 is entirely head external. Transfer of this stuff to a head internal state is the main business of language learning. Any solo hypothesis formation, word coining or intuitive

morphological patterning can only be undertaken tentatively and in an ad hoc way, and must be subject at some point external validation. I will refer to this external to internal pattern as the 'download model' of language learning.

It is assumed that any learner (at least any adult learner who is not in some manner impaired) will have a fully operational L1 in terms of vocabulary and grammar, but it is also assumed that these resources cannot be transferred over piecemeal to the L2 - otherwise the L2 would scarcely count as a foreign language. Of course, loanwords and cognates exist, and typological similarities may be present in cases where the L1 and the L2 are closely related, for example in the cases of Spanish and Italian, Swedish and Norwegian, Ukrainian and Russian. But most languages do not stand in such a position to each other and in these cases simply dropping an L1 word into L2 usage in the hope that it will be a recognizable word in that language is not a strategy that can be much relied on. Likewise, hopeful copying of things like word ordering procedures or auxiliary verb insertion from the grammar system of the L1 into an L2 utterance is liable to achieve many more misses than hits. The download model is the primary method of change in the language learner's epistemic state.

Interactional competence

Language in the world is, of course, much more than a list of words and a set of rules that can be applied to these words in order to produce sentences or utterances whose meaning is decodable by some recipient. The business of the researcher who perceives of linguistics as a 'serious discipline' (Chomsky, 1965, p.4) may be the investigation of the abstract patterns in language(s) and the mental operations of language users. These formal, abstract aspects of language are of little aid in the actual business of learning a language. The learner is, ideally, engaged in the study of the L2 in order to be able to use the

language to participate in social interactions and achieve real world goals in concert with others. Despite the view from some quarters that language is primarily a mentalistic phenomenon（Chomsky, 1965, p.4）and only incidentally concerned with communicating with others, the centrality of talk in social organization is hard to overstate. Quotidian, multi-party spoken interaction is "a/ the primordial locus of human sociality and social life". （Schegloff, 1987, p.101.）For second/foreign language it has been long recognized that a thorough knowledge of the lexis and grammar of the L2 is not sufficient to be able to participate in spontaneous spoken interactions in the L2. Further to the ability to create formally 'correct' utterances in the L2, learners also need to have communicative competence. This communicative competence was summarized by（Hymes, 1972）as a knowledge of

> ...when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about and with whom, when, where, in what manner. In short, a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to evaluate their accomplishments by others.（p.277）.

   The notion of communicative competence was given a more structured description by Canale and Swain（1980）, outlining socio-cultural competence and strategic competence as key components of communicative competence. Discourse competence was subsequently added by Canale（1983）. These models of the multi-component construct of communicative competence led to the widespread introduction of the teaching methodology commonly referred to as Communicative Language Teaching（CLT）, which is broadly focused on having students work towards the goal of interacting in the L2 instead of just being able to read, understand and translate written examples of the L2, or prove declarative knowledge of the grammar and vocabulary of the L2 in

formal written tests.

The raised awareness of the components that comprise communicative competence helped move language teaching towards a broader approach, and away from a narrow focus on declarative knowledge of lexis and grammar. However, these notions of communicative competence described by Hymes and Canale and Swain had, in common with the Chomskyan notion of linguistic competence, an underlying sense that competence resided in the individual. Young (2014, para. 2) noted that, "communicative competence was thought of as a characteristic of a single individual, a complex construct with a number of component parts that differentiated one individual from another." Thus, in the same way that a learner had a level of grammar and vocabulary that was testable and quantifiable, so they also had a 'level' of communicative competence that was similarly testable and quantifiable. This assumption was at odds with the insights from the field of conversation analysis (CA) that saw interaction as jointly constructed by participants. This viewpoint is the background to the concept of interactional competence (IC), a view of language in use that takes as its starting point the observations that interaction is multi-party and that all participants contribute to the interaction as it unfolds. Participants' contributions are delicately shaped both in response to prior turns at talk and are also instrumental in shaping upcoming turns. As described by Young (2011, p.428), "IC is not the knowledge or the possession of an individual person, but is co-constructed by all participants in a discursive practice, and IC varies with the practice and with the participants."

This description gives a coherent basis for IC in abstract, theoretical terms. Young (2008) detailed the components of IC as more concrete items that are observable in the talk of interactants in mundane daily spoken interactions:

- Identity resources

  Participation framework: the identities of all participants in an interaction, present or not, official or unofficial, ratified or unratified, and their footing or identities in the interaction

- Linguistic resources

  Register: the features of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar that typify a practice

  Modes of meaning: the ways in which participants construct interpersonal, experiential, and textual meanings in a practice

- Interactional resources

  Speech acts: the selection of acts in a practice and their sequential organization

  Turn-taking: how participants select the next speaker and how participants know when to end one turn and when to begin the next

  Repair: the ways in which participants respond to interactional trouble in a given practice

  Boundaries: the opening and closing acts of a practice that serve to distinguish a given practice from adjacent talk（p.71）

For language learners it would seem to be a commonsense observation that these resources are not fully available for use in the initial state when there is an insufficient amount of lexical and grammatical knowledge. Learners who can construct only simple sentences from an extremely limited menu of words are in no position to vary register appropriately, achieve nuanced discourse coherence across multiple extended turns, engage in other-initiated repair beyond simple open class repair initiators（"What?", "Pardon?", "I don't understand."）or other interactional actions described in Young's list. Logically, it would seem that these interactional resources become more available as the

store of words and knowledge of the grammar system goes beyond the initial, paucal state. But, unlike the areas of lexis and grammar, when transfer from the L1 is not a viable proposition in most cases, there is an aspect of IC that sits in an intermediate position vis-à-vis learner uptake, differing in kind from the K − to K+ download model described above. Unlike the grammar and vocabulary of the L1 which is usually not transferable to the L2 in any meaningful sense, the extant IC of the L1 may be transferable, if not in whole, then in some large part. In short, the fully functioning lexical grammatical system of the L1 is usually not a resource that can be much drawn on by the learner, while the IC of the L1 is such a resource.

Transferability of interactional competence from L1 to L2

The search for language universals has a long and extensive history, with investigations into structural aspects (Chomsky, 1965, Greenberg, 1963), general semantics (Wierzbicka, 1996) and specific areas such as body-part terminology (Brown, 1976), color terms (Berlin & Kay, 1969) and so on. There remains much discussion about whether such linguistic universals truly exist or whether there are only strong tendencies in the grammatical systems and lexical inventories of the world's languages. (For discussion, see Evans and Levinson, 2009.) For language learners, these proposed universals are often described at a level of abstraction that are beyond the grasp of non-specialists and of no real or immediate use in the language learning endeavor. By contrast, the ways in which participants in talk-in-interaction locally manage the interaction are, or would seem to be, intuitively much more accessible to learners. In fact, the ready accessibility of the means of conducting interaction, the assumed universality of these practices, may mean that they are not addressed at all in teaching and are assumed to be common sense, something left to the learners to transfer over from their L1 once sufficient lexis and

grammar are in place.

　To take a concrete example, a study by Stivers et al.（2009）investigated the turn taking systems across a diverse group of languages. The authors noted that, "The anthropological literature reports significant cultural differences in the timing of turn-taking in ordinary conversation."（p.10587）However, upon examination it was found that the amount of variation was very slight, so slight in fact for the authors to conclude, "These results offer systematic cross-linguistic support for the view that turn-taking in informal conversation is universally organized so as to minimize gap and overlap, and that consequently, there is a universal semiotics of delayed response."（p.10591）

　The need, in conversation, to take a turn（whether other-nominated or self-selected at a transition relevance point - TRP）in a timely manner is a universal, but for learners of lower levels of proficiency this may be hard to achieve. Time may be needed for the learner to work through a mental process that constructs the desired utterance before that utterance is made, and this may lead to multi-second pauses between turns. In any formal language instruction setting it is probably the case that the teacher will provide a space for a struggling student to work through this internal utterance formulation before responding. This may acclimatize learners to unfeasibly patient interlocutors. This tendency to precede turn onset with a pause, sometimes several seconds in duration, is a not uncommon feature in Japanese learner data collected by the author, especially lower level learners. The data from Stivers et al.（2009）includes Japanese turn transition timings and it is clear that the preference for turn transitions to be carried out with minimal gap or overlap applies to both English and Japanese conversation. Non-alignment with the turn-taking system of the L2 may be based on the marginal knowledge and control of the lexis and grammar of the L2. Once a threshold of knowledge and control has been reached, the IC of the L1 concerning turn transition can be applied

directly to the L2. There would seem to be little use in 'teaching' turn-taking in any explicit manner. If students have the wherewithal to produce a turn in a timely manner, it is assumed they will do so.

It is probably the case that all of the items in Young's list above are descriptive at some level of both the L1 and the L2. It must be assumed that both languages have some system of speech acts, notions of participation framework, repair systems and so on. In some cases, the L1 and the L2 may be virtually indistinguishable (as in the 'no gap, no overlap turn-transition system outlined above). In other cases, the interactional practices of the L1 and the L2 may be strikingly different. For example, Iwata (2010) reports very different ideas about the appropriate level of self-disclosure between American and Japanese interactants, which can lead to pragmatic failure. A further small-scale example is the retail staff encounter in Japanese versus English. In Japanese, retail staff will commonly greet the incoming customer with the greeting phrase '*irashimase*', usually translated as 'welcome' in English. However, this phrase is not the first pair part of an adjacency pair. In Japanese society, no verbal response is expected to this greeting; there is no second pair part. By contrast, the typical greeting 'Hi, how are you today?' in American retail encounters is not parallel with the Japanese retail staff greeting. This is the first part of an adjacency pair and a response is expected. Failure to respond will be seen as a violation of the system.

There is a parallel here with the lexical system as encountered by language learners during their learning. Loanwords and cognates may be transferred to the L2 with no problem, while other words may be conceptually opaque and require explicit and repeated teaching. Likewise, for the interaction system some aspects of the L1 IC may be readily transferable to the L2 and may be transferred over to the L2 unconsciously and automatically by the learner. On the other hand, some aspects of IC may have to be explicitly taught and practiced.

Developing interactional competence

Traditionally, the foundation of formal language learning is that as a result of purposeful actions by the teacher some change in the knowledge base of the learner is brought about. Following a period of instruction, it is hoped that the language learner will have increased their knowledge of vocabulary and grammar - that they will be able to understand more input than was the case beforehand. Not only will they be able to understand more input, but it is also assumed that they will be able to produce more output than was the case prior to the instruction, based on this increase in knowledge of the L2. This epistemic change is the underlying project of much formal language teaching. Systematized written tests will give a quantitative value of the learner's epistemic states before and after instruction. The interactional abilities are often sidelined completely in such systems - popular standardized test tend to be written and the participants complete them in mental isolation. Silence during such tests is a strictly enforced norm. If interactional concerns are attended to at all, it is often limited to the narrow format of the Language Proficiency Interview (LPI), which in, interactional terms, is a very particular form of talk where participants orient to a very rigid system of turn-taking and fixed participant roles. (See Van Compernolle, 2011 for a discussion of question-and-answer sequences in LPIs and Johnson, 2008 for a general critique of these kinds of interviews in SLA teaching.)

The IC aspect of language learning poses a problem to the canonical concept of what language teaching and learning is, and what actually constitutes the legitimate content of a formal language learning course (Firth & Wagner, 1997). For the traditional, 'download model' of teaching there may be the underlying sense that many of the basics of IC are universal and therefore naturally transferable from the Ll to the L2. Thus, there is no need to spend valuable class time on things like turn-taking and repair and so on. In this view

of learning, perturbations to the interactional system are primarily result of insufficient grammar and lexis and are to be remedied by explicitly teaching more grammar and lexis.

I take the view that IC is not a tag-along epiphenomenon to the traditional download model, and that it shouldn't be entirely left to emerge on its own once the learners have reached some kind of threshold in their accumulation of lexical and grammatical knowledge. Neither do I take the view that language learners, even very low-level learners, are devoid of any IC resources. As pointed out by Firth and Wagner (1997), and by Kecskes et al. (2018), learners do indeed apply IC to their L2 interactions and by doing so, achieve success in their interactional projects, often with very sparse linguistic resources. There is a balance to be struck here between recognizing the very real aspects of IC that learners have at their disposal and also recognizing the ways in which the IC is not yet a fully realized system and seeing the potential that exists for learners to add to their stock of IC knowledge and practices in the L2. There are a number of different ways that IC can be addressed in language teaching and they will be to a large extent context dependent. These ways will be outlined in the following section.

The matrix of IC in language learning

The language learner has a variety of ways in which IC can be developed, and the path that any individual learner may follow in this development will be different from any other individual. At one end of the spectrum are aspects that seem to be fundamental to any and all languages and cultures. In discussing repair strategies used by learners, Hellermann (2011, p.166) noted, "even self-identified language learners are engaged in practice that is panlinguistic and part of human interactional culture." At the other end of the spectrum there are language and culture-specific interactional practices that

will probably need to be the subject of explicit instruction. Some of the varied ways in which the learner can develop IC are described below.

Baseline IC

All language learners, even those in the initial stages of learning will be able to unconsciously apply some aspects of L1 IC to their use of the L2. That is, some aspects of their L1 IC will be appropriate to L2 interactions and manifest themselves in L2 exchanges. These IC resources may be emergent, fragmentary and inconsistent. Interaction at this stage will be of a different nature to L1 interaction, partially due to shortage of concrete linguistic resources and partly for other reasons, including the personal attitude toward the L2 and temperament of the learner, the particular context of the exchange and the influence of the other interlocutor(s). Nevertheless, basic interactional practices such as responding to a greeting or responding to any utterance at a perceived TRP (whether the response is made linguistically or through gesture) will be applicable. This baseline IC deployment is most clearly demonstrated in situations such as first contact, where previously isolated tribes come into contact with outsiders and some interaction takes place even though the parties are starting from a zero baseline of cultural and linguistic knowledge of the other. The parties are dealing with the panhuman bedrock of IC in these situations.

Applying emergent IC practices

The IC that initial-state learners will be able to utilize in interactions will likely be individuated. Some learners will be able to apply available L1 IC practices and make good use of even sparse linguistic resources to participate to some degree of effectiveness in spoken interaction. Others will struggle to participate in anything other than the most anodyne and formulaic short

exchanges, in highly structured, teacher-led, textbook supported situations. That is, they will be able to perform the role of language learner in the institutional activity of a language lesson, with the explicit goal of learning some aspect of the L2. In a 'glass half full' outlook, this is in itself proof that the learner has some IC relevant to understanding how to participate in the activity known as a language lesson, but they may be unable to expand on this understanding in any significant manner. They may remain limited to using the L2 in the role of language learner and have no other L2 identity, using the L2 in a formal language learning situation and no other context.

Noticing IC practices and adopting them

Learners may notice interactional practices during learning. That is, in textbook dialogues, classroom activities, teacher or peer talk, IC components may feature, purely incidentally to the actual learning task at hand. There may be some practice that the learner notices and subsequently adds to their own repertoire of interactional practices. The uptake of these practices may be unconscious or semi-conscious. An example from the author's experience as an English-speaking learner of Japanese is the unconscious uptake of Japanese response behavior (*aizuchi* – see Maynard, 1986). No formal or explicit instruction of this key interactional resource was ever given and the adoption of *aizuchi* occurred through a process of incidental noticing and unconscious mimicry. A related practice is the noticing of IC practices in situations that are wholly unconnected with overt teaching/learning. Any interaction in the L2 is an opportunity for learning but the opportunity to interact in these ways may be extremely limited in some contexts such as non-English major students enrolled in mandatory general English EFL classes at Japanese universities. Learners who are engaging in a study abroad program will inevitably take part in interactions that are not primarily structured as learning based interactions

and the opportunities to notice IC practices will be increased as will the variety of IC practices encountered.

IC as a target of instruction

Learners may need to be explicitly taught aspects of the L2 interactional system. Some aspects of interaction may not be at all apparent to learners and, even when exposed to multiple instances of the practice, noticing and subsequent uptake may not occur. An example is the case of discourse markers (DM) in English. In research carried out by Lindsay and O'Connell, (1995) it was found that even native speakers of English were unlikely to consciously orient to the use of common DM such as 'well', 'you know', 'I mean' in spoken English, and these words were very likely to be omitted from transcription exercises. Campbell-Larsen (2017) also found that DM are also highly likely to be omitted from subtitles of spoken video interactions and reported speech. This minimal awareness by native English speakers of DM usage may be mirrored in the case of learners.

DM are very frequent in spoken discourse (McCarthy 2010), and they also serve key interactional functions (e.g. Hasselgreen, 2005; Heritage, 2015; Schiffrin, 1987.) In data collected by the author, the talk of learners is almost completely devoid of these markers (Campbell-Larsen, 2017, 2019). It is highly likely that learners progressing beyond the initial K− state will have been exposed to these items. They appear regularly in learner materials as well as non-pedagogic language that may be encountered outside the classroom, but even quite proficient learners may make sparse use of this interactional resource. Mere exposure to these particular items seems to be no guarantee that they will be noticed and subsequently added to the repertoire of the learner.

A further case where explicit teaching of IC may need to take place is the

culture-specific sphere. As mentioned above, some interactional practices may be different in the L2 and the L1. （See Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 2018 for an extensive cross-linguistic overview.） The scripts that are appropriate to accomplish speech act such as compliments, requests, refusals and apologies may need to be taught in detail. One issue that arises here is that teachers may rely on intuition rather than research to inform their teaching of these points. As noted by Cohen （2005）, "Native speakers' intuitions about their own pragmatic use of language may not always be accurate since they often perform speech acts without paying much attention to how they do it." （p.281） If the teacher has a thorough knowledge of research findings concerning speech acts and other cultural aspects of IC in the L2 （whether the teacher is a native speaker of the L2 or the learners' L1, or some other language）, then a solid foundation for teaching these aspects is in place. If the teacher is not a native speaker of the learners' L1 but has and empirically based understanding of the linguistic culture of that language, this can also be utilized to inform teaching practice and identify areas that may need to be addressed explicitly. A complication here is if the learners in a class are from a variety of different L1s. What may seem straightforward and logical to a student from one L1 background, may seem problematical, exotic or face threatening to another student from a different L1 background.

　To sum up, the IC of any language learner does not start at absolute zero （as is the assumed case of the lexical and grammatical competence when novice learners are beginning their study）. Certain IC resources are available to a learner, even those in a completely K－ state of L2 knowledge. As they proceed with their studies there are several avenues open to them regarding IC development.

　　　（1）Learners may disattend to matters of IC and pragmatics and focus on

memorizing vocabulary and grammar rules for assessment purposes, entrance tests and the like. This may not be a conscious choice, but an underlying part of an institutional agenda.

（2）Learners may draw on their L1 IC, either consciously or unconsciously, and try to apply what seems appropriate. This may be dependent on the level of linguistic knowledge acquired by the learner, with more advanced learners having the linguistic wherewithal（and confidence）to attempt more sophisticated interactional practices.

（3）Learners may also develop their L2 IC unconsciously or semi-consciously from exposure to manifestations of particular aspects of IC in the L2, either in pedagogic contexts or elsewhere.

（4）Learners may be explicitly taught aspects of L2 IC as part of their formal instruction.

It is not suggested here that any individual learner will align with one of these IC approaches and no other. The attitudes towards IC described in（1） −（4）above probably all manifest themselves to some extent during any prolonged course of study of the L2. The exact ways in which these points will become relevant are probably complex, individuated, context dependent and affected by institutional agendas, changing personal outlooks, and other variables that come into play over time.

The context of IC development

In moving away from the 'download model' of language learning, it is important to acknowledge that 'knowing about' does not equate to 'can do'. By this I mean that even if learners have been explicitly taught some language that informs their L2 IC, they may not be able to draw on this knowledge in spontaneous interactions where the practice would be appropriate. In the

author's experience, explicitly teaching things like DM usage or repair strategies can have short term results. Structured activities based on handouts, roleplays and the like, carried out after focused instruction, may seem to indicate learner uptake in that the learners use the taught forms to complete the task. But it is often the case that in the next phase of the lesson, and in subsequent lessons, the taught form vanishes from student talk.

For some core parts of IC, such as DM use, L2 backchannel forms, repair strategies and the like, a 'one and done' methodology is usually ineffective. Learners need to be reminded to use these resources in whatever speaking activity they are engaged in. For an example of this, see the transcript in Campbell-Larsen（2019, pp.186－187）where students are reminded to use appropriate DMs in a speaking exercise that is overtly practicing complex questions and using purposefully vague language and vague category markers such as 'something like that'. Repeated teaching and reinforcement of these points is needed if the forms are to move from 'on demand' production in tightly structured activities to more habitual and largely unconscious use in whatever speaking the learner is engaged in.

In addition to this repeated teaching of IC items, and the constant need for the teacher to attend to their use in any and all speaking tasks, a further classroom practice can be utilized to specifically facilitate IC development – the use of class time for what can be termed free conversation. As mentioned above, the opportunities for learners to use the L2 may be very limited. A once weekly lesson with zero opportunity to use the L2 outside the classroom will likely yield only modest IC development. If this once weekly lesson is primarily given over to teacher talk, or if the interactions that do occur are mainly aligned with the initiation, response, feedback（IRF）sequence structure of a）teacher question b）student answer c）teacher evaluation,（Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975）, then further constraints on the development of

IC are in place.

One way to expand the contexts of use for learners who are limited to classroom use of the L2 is to set aside a portion of class time for free conversation. This phase of a lesson is not supported by any handouts, worksheets, tasks or any other overt language learning activity. The students are instructed to engage in conversation with their partners, in the L2 as much as possible, but with no sanction to using the L1. Although this may seem like an abrogation of the teacher's duty, the IC development benefits of this phase are manifold. The students are wholly responsible for group selection, and for other interactional duties that they have little responsibility for in more typical learning tasks. Topic selection, negotiation and management are solely the students' responsibility, as is the fundamental responsibility to pursue progressivity, manage participation and conduct repair. It is in this phase of lesson time that IC practices from the L1 can be applied and also noticing can occur.（See Campbell-Larsen, 2021 for a discussion of free conversation in the language classroom.）

Participating in study abroad programs is another context where IC can come to the fore and significant IC development may occur. In addition to the formal language teaching that learners will experience while studying abroad, they will also have opportunities to use the L2 in other, non-pedagogic contexts to achieve specific actions such as ordering in a restaurant, negotiating quotidian retail encounters, asking for directions and the like. They will also, ideally, use the L2 in the daily interactions they have with others to create, maintain, and develop social bonds. The opportunities for L2 use in the study abroad context are, potentially, much more frequent, prolonged and varied. The opportunities for applying IC resources, both extant and transferred speculatively from the L1, as well as opportunities for noticing IC practices in the L2 interactional environment are ever-present. The attitude and outlook of

the learner will play an important role in how much IC development takes place during a program of studying abroad.

Summary

IC occupies a hybrid place in the language learning program. In some cases, aspects of the IC will be so general and panhuman that there is no difference between the L1 and the L2 and the learner can deploy these interactional resources without issue. For example, even for learners with almost zero ability in the L2, the ability to indicate that you know you are being addressed and are attending to talk addressed to you is not something that needs to be practiced or learned. Other aspects of IC may not be utilizable until a certain amount of lexical and grammatical knowledge has been acquired. Yet other aspects may be culture specific or may be only marginally available to introspection and may need to be taught overtly. Any aspect of IC may be noticed by the learner during pedagogic episodes or elsewhere and pass into the repertoire of interactional resources available to the learner.

Factors that come into play regarding the development of IC are varied and interrelated. The frequency of lessons will almost certainly affect the ways in which learners develop IC, as will the opportunities to use the L2, both inside the lesson context and outside in the so-called 'real-world'. The agenda of the institution may promote or retard IC development, as will the knowledge status and attitude of the teacher regarding IC and language learning. The individual attitude of the learner will also be of relevance. The desire to use the language to engage in interactions will most likely stimulate IC development, whilst the desire to meet the requirements of a formal, standardized written test to gain university entrance or pass a mandatory course requirement may see IC disattended to in large part. In addition to these, the personality of the learner may be of import. Learners who are more outgoing, talkative, and prepared to

take risks will likely draw on L1 IC resources, notice the ways their interlocutors behave and learn by doing interaction in the L2.

IC occupies an interesting place in the language learning process. The learner already has fully functional lexical and grammatical competence in their L1, but this is usually not in any meaningful way transferable to the L2. The learner, it must be assumed, also has a fully functional IC in their L1 and many basic aspects of this competence will be applicable in the L2. The L2 lexis and vocabulary that has been taught and learned may remain as a largely passive aspect of the learner's L2 ability, manifesting itself in declarative knowledge and ability to perform on written tests and in specific pedagogic interactional contexts. IC is much more strongly connected to doing rather than just knowing, and in common with L1 speakers, many of the ways in which IC is manifest in interaction may be opaque, automatic, subconscious and not available to any kind of introspection. IC development is, in this view, partly taught, partly learned and partly activated.

References

Berlin, B. & Kay, P.（1969）. *Basic color terms: Their universality and evolution.* Cambridge University Press.

Brown, C.H.（1976）. General principles of human anatomical partonomy and speculations on the growth or partonomic nomenclature. *American Ethnologist, 3*(3), 400－424.

Campbell-Larsen, J.（2017）. Discourse markers in the classroom. In P. Clements, A. Krause & H. Brown（Eds.）, *Transformation in language education*（pp.227－234）. JALT.

Campbell-Larsen, J.（2019）. From needs analysis to emergent pragmatic competence: A longitudinal micro analytic study of learner talk in Japanese EFL university classes. In L.U. Takeda & M. Okuguri（Eds.）, *A pragmatic approach to English language teaching and production*（pp.169－197）. Kazama Shobo.

Campbell-Larsen, J.（2021）. Free conversation: A legitimate use of class time? In P. Clements, R. Derrah, & P. Ferguson（Eds.）, *Communities of teachers & learners*（pp.252－258）. JALT. https://doi.org/10.37546/ JALTPCP2020-31

Canale, M.（1983）. From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt（Eds.）, *Language and communication*（pp.2－27）. Routledge.

Canale, M., & Swain, M.（1980）. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second

language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1−47.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.

Cohen, A.D. (2005). Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics 2*(3) 275−301.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (2018). *Interactional linguistics: Studying language in social interaction*. Cambridge University Press.

Evans, N., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and brain sciences, 32*(5), 429−448.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285−300.

Greenberg, J.H. (Ed.). (1963). *Universals of language*. M.I.T. Press

Hasselgreen, A. (2005). *Testing the spoken English of young Norwegians: A study of testing validity and the role of smallwords in contributing to pupils' fluency*. Cambridge University Press.

Hellermann, J. (2011). Members methods, members' competencies: Looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigations of other-initiated repair. In J.K. Hall, J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development*. (pp.147−172). Multilingual Matters.

Heritage, J. (2015). Well-prefaced turns in English conversation: A conversation analytic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics, 88*, 88−104.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings* (pp.269−293). Penguin.

Iwata, Y. (2010). Pragmatic failure in topic choice, topic development, and self-disclosure by Japanese EFL speakers. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 19*(2), 145−158.

Johnson, M. (2008). *The art of non-conversation*. Yale University Press.

Kecskes, I., Sanders, R. E., & Pomerantz, A. (2018). The basic interactional competence of language learners. *Journal of Pragmatics, 124*, 88−105.

Lindsay, J., & O'Connell, D. C. (1995). How do transcribers deal with audio recordings of spoken discourse? *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 24*(2), 101−115.

Maynard, S. K. (1986). On back-channel behavior in Japanese and English casual conversation. *Linguistics 24*(6), 1079−1108. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1986.24.6.1079

McCarthy, M. (2010). Spoken fluency revisited. *English Profile Journal 1*(1). 1−15. doi:10.1017/S2041536210000012

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Analyzing single episodes of interaction: An exercise in conversation analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*(2),101−114.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and students*. Oxford University Press.

Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T., Hoyman G.,

Rossano, F., de Ruiter, J.P., Yoon, K., & Levinson, S. C.（2009）．Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 106*(26), 10587−10592.

www.pnas.orgcgidoi10.1073pnas.0903616106

Van Compernolle, R. A.（2011）．Responding to questions and L2 learner interactional competence during language proficiency interviews: A microanalytic study with pedagogical implications. In J.K. Hall, J. Hellermann & S. Pekarek Doehler,（Eds,）．L2 *interactional competence and development*（pp.117−144）．Multilingual Matters.

Wierzbicka, A.（1996）．*Semantics: Primes and universals*. Oxford University Press.

Young, R. F.（2008）．*Language and interaction: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.

Young, R.F.（2011）．Interactional competence in language learning, teaching and testing. In E. Hinkel.（Ed.）, *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*（pp.426−443）．Routledge.

Young, R.（2014）．What is interactional competence? *AL Forum: The Newsletter of the TESOL Applied Linguistics Interest Section*．Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280720225_What_is_interactional_competence