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Abstract

Reciprocity is a key principle of eTandem, a telecollaborative arrangement where learners of different native languages meet online and use one language during half of the session and then do the same for the other language. While it has been argued that successful implementation of eTandem relies on this principle, the construct of reciprocity has not been operationalized beyond the traditional sense of “equal time, effort, and interest” (Brammerts, 1996). Thus, this study attempts to fill this gap by uncovering (1) what is reciprocity, and how it is enacted and accomplished, (2) what factors may mediate the enactment of reciprocity, and (3) what aspects of reciprocity seem more amenable to change than others.

The context of this study was a semester-long, video-mediated eTandem project between U.S. learners of Japanese and Japanese learners of English who engaged in weekly interactions via Google Hangouts. After operationalizing reciprocity from second language acquisition (SLA), interactional sociolinguistics, and multimodal discourse analysis perspectives, I took a case study approach to examining the social interaction of three focal dyads who exhibited contrasting behaviors and perceptions about the project.

The analysis showed that the participants enacted reciprocity beyond its traditional sense using both linguistic and non-linguistic resources. Specifically, the most successful dyad’s interaction was characterized by a collaborative interactional pattern,
maximization of technological affordances, and various forms of situated reciprocity.

Meanwhile, the least successful dyad’s interaction was characterized by a disproportionate conversational contribution by the U.S. participant and silences by the Japanese participant, mainly due to incompatible conversational styles (Tannen, 2005). Finally, the third dyad, who initially overemphasized the language-learning aspect of eTandem and struggled to establish comity (Aston, 1993), became one of the most successful and invested (Norton Peirce, 1995) dyads after resolving a “critical incident” that occurred when the U.S. participant came out as lesbian and both participants realized the importance of achieving intercultural understanding and fully exploiting each other’s bilingual resources. Based on these findings, I discuss what each form of reciprocity can reveal about participants’ social interaction and propose a new model for analyzing social interactions that take place in eTandem.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Globalization, technologization, and mobility are “forces that exert especially profound and continuous pressure on what it means to learn and use more than one language” (Atkinson et al., 2016, p. 22). The introduction of computer-mediated communication (CMC) tools has changed the way we learn a language, making it possible to connect with people who do not share the same physical space. Accordingly, interacting with speakers of a target language (TL), which used to be achieved via physical mobility (e.g., study abroad), is now possible in a digitally-mediated contact zone (Kern, 2014). Belz (2003) calls such online intercultural communication telecollaboration and defines it as “institutionalized, electronically mediated intercultural communication under the guidance of a languacultural expert (i.e., a teacher) for the purpose of foreign language learning and the development of intercultural competence” (p. 2).

ETandem (also known as online tandem and Teletandem) is one of the most commonly adopted telecollaborative set-ups (Helm, 2015), where learners of different native languages meet online and work together to help learn each other’s language by using and practicing one language during half of the session and then switching and doing the same for the other language (Cziko, 2004). For the interaction to be successful, eTandem participants are expected to observe the two principles of reciprocity and learner autonomy (Little & Brammerts, 1996; Little, Ushioda, Appel, Moran, O’Rourke, & Schwienhorst, 1999). The reciprocity principle basically refers to “dependence and mutual support of the partners” (Brammerts, 1996, p. 11), namely learners’ agreement to work for mutual benefits and achieve a balanced outcome. This reflects eTandem’s unique set-up, where language learners undertake reversed roles when the language of the exchange is switched halfway through the online session. In contrast, the learner autonomy
principle suggests that learners decide and take responsibility for what they do in interaction (Little, 2007). As such, eTandem participants “determine what they want to learn and when, and they can only expect from their partner the support that they themselves have defined and asked for” (Brammerts, 1996, p. 11).

In eTandem research, on the one hand, there is much academic discussion concerning what learner autonomy is and how the construct contributes for a successful eTandem experience (e.g., Little, 2001, 2007; Schwienhorst, 2003). On the other hand, “research on the concept of reciprocity in Tandem is nearly non-existent” (Koch, 2017, p. 117). Indeed, only a few studies have approached reciprocity as the object of empirical investigation, and they have rarely investigated the construct beyond a traditional, pre-theoretical sense of reciprocity, namely equal amounts of time, effort, and interest observed between two cultural groups in each language part of the session (see Appel & Mullen, 2000; Brammerts, 1996 for studies that defined reciprocity that way). Therefore, Koch (2017) argues that the existing literature on reciprocity is not constructed on solid ground due to a “lack of explanation of the term itself, because of a missing definition of reciprocity.” To fill the gap in literature and to advance the study on reciprocity, this study aims to uncover what the construct really means, how the multifaceted definition of reciprocity can be operationalized, and what is the role of reciprocity for the development of social interaction.

Below I will first provide a survey of telecollaboration research and point out the lack of research that examines how a design principle or characteristic (e.g., reciprocity) is enacted in ongoing interaction. Next, the three research questions will be outlined with a brief description of each. Finally, this chapter will be concluded with the structure of the dissertation.
1.1. Telecollaboration Research to Date

Despite telecollaboration, and within it eTandem, being a relatively new field of empirical investigation, the research is rapidly growing, and it has helped us understand what affordances such online intercultural communication provides for two areas of foreign language learning: linguistic and cultural. Recent syntheses of telecollaboration research (e.g., Akiyama & Cunningham, 2018; Lewis & O’Dowd, 2016) have found that telecollaboration researchers have drawn from major theories in second language acquisition (SLA) when language learning is the focus of research, while cultural learning usually finds its theoretical grounding in Byram’s (1997) model of intercultural competence (ICC), which is composed of knowledge, skills of discovery and interaction, critical cultural awareness, intercultural attitudes, and skills of interpreting and relating.

Past research on the language aspects of telecollaboration has often focused on analyzing particular linguistic forms that indicate the development of second language (L2) communicative competence such as address forms (e.g., Belz & Kinginger, 2003; González-Lloret, 2008), modal particles (Belz & Vyatkina, 2005), pronouns (e.g., Belz & Kinginger, 2002), and troubles-talk (González-Lloret, 2011). These are examples of so-called longitudinal development research in that they take a longitudinal approach and trace a few dyads/groups’ development of particular linguistic items.

Another strand of research can be called interactional features research in that the studies investigate interaction for linguistic features that are theorized to facilitate L2 learning. These include incidents of negotiation for meaning (e.g., Reinhardt, 2008; van der Zwaard & Bannink, 2014), linguistic affordances (e.g., Darhower, 2008; Jin, 2013), and corrective feedback (e.g., Bueno-Alastuey, 2013; Bower & Kawaguchi, 2011; Kötter, 2001; Lee, 2006; Vinagre & Muñoz,
2011). Much of this research focuses on text-based telecollaboration and conducts its analysis exclusively on one interaction session. With the popularity of video-based online exchanges (e.g., Skype, Google Hangouts), more recent studies have begun to address oral interactions in the telecollaboration framework (e.g., Cappellini, 2016; Sanchez, 2015); however, there is still a lack of research that examines the shift in these interactional behaviors over time.

Many practice-oriented research measures success by examining participants’ perception of telecollaborative projects. These studies often analyze retrospective data collected via interviews and questionnaires to examine why participants were satisfied vs. dissatisfied, what worked and what did not, and what kind of perceived learning took place. For instance, Darhower (2006) analyzed questionnaire data to reveal how a bilingual chat between university-level Spanish L1 learners of English and English L1 learners of Spanish could promote communicative behaviors as described in the Five Cs of the National Standards (i.e., Communication, Cultures, Comparisons, Connections, and Communities). O’Dowd (2000) examined interview data to assess participants’ reactions to the videoconferencing medium and the project in general. He also collected questionnaire data to reveal participants’ attitudes toward each other’s culture. This type of research that focuses on participants’ perception is certainly valuable for advancing telecollaboration practice. However, participants’ perception does not guarantee the quality of actual interaction. Thus, it seems that we need to triangulate students’ perception and actual interaction data to obtain a multifaceted view of the learning arrangement.

There are also studies that attempt to directly measure the actual linguistic and intercultural gains. These studies have taken the pre- and post-test design to reveal the benefit of telecollaboration for improving pronunciation (Bueno Alastuey, 2011), grammar and vocabulary
(e.g., Chen & Eslami, 2013; Dussias, 2006), fluency (e.g., Canto, Jauregi, & van den Bergh, 2013; Jauregi, de Graaff, van den Bergh, & Kriz, 2012), ICC (Jin & Erben, 2007; Schenker, 2012), and comprehensibility (Akiyama & Saito, 2016; Saito & Akiyama, 2017). For instance, Saito and Akiyama (2017) examined the development of comprehensibility (i.e., ease of understanding, Derwing & Munro, 2009) in a quasi-experimental design. The data came from the same eTandem project analyzed in this study, but it focused on examining the language development of 15 elementary-level Japanese learners of English in comparison with 15 Japanese learners of English who engaged in take-home assignments without any oral practice. It was found that the eTandem group outperformed the comparison group. Although these studies are influential in making curricular change by providing evidence for the effectiveness of telecollaboration projects, they take a product-only approach and thus often fail to link interactional features with the documented language and cultural gains. In this sense, the effectiveness is demonstrated, but what made the telecollaboration experience a success remains unexplained.

Yet another type of research inspects the telecollaborative sessions for evidence that online exchanges engendered positive vs. negative language use and experiences. A common way to do this is via the analysis of discourse looking for critical incidents that resulted in cases of intercultural tensions where the ideal of online successful intercultural communication is not realized (e.g., Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Helm, Guth, & Farrah, 2012; Ryder & Yamagata-Lynch, 2014; Schneider & von der Emde, 2006). In a similar way to how interactional sociolinguists like Gumperz (1982) and Tannen (2005) conceptualize certain misunderstandings as growing out of cultural style differences, this type of telecollaborative research often takes a discursive, microgenetic approach. It provides precautions about people’s tendency to attribute
peculiarities in the way of communicating to their intercultural partners’ personal oddities and psychological state (e.g., aggressive, disinterested), when, in fact, they may be part of the target culture’s communicative style (House, 2010; O’Dowd & Ritter, 2006; Ware, 2005; Ware & Kramsch, 2005). These studies are process-oriented, as they strive to aid our understanding of how interpersonal and intercultural dynamics may help explain the success or failure of any given exchange as a learning experience. It is notable that telecollaboration research, unlike other fields in SLA, is open to reporting failed communication and has considered “conflict as object of research” rather than as “accidental finding of research” (Lamy & Goodfellow, 2010, p. 3).

In contrast to the plethora of studies addressing either linguistic or cultural learning, however, it is rare to find the type of research that incorporates all of these perspectives, namely research that examines what interactional features characterize successful vs. unsuccessful intercultural exchanges and how those features change over time. Accordingly, my study intends to fill in this gap by focusing on reciprocity, which is theorized to be uniquely important in enabling learning in eTandem, and reveal how the construct is enacted and develops over a 10-week video-mediated intercultural project between 30 learners of Japanese in the U.S. and 30 learners of English in Japan.

1.2. Research Questions

This study aims to investigate reciprocity by developing an understanding of the construct in terms of both theory and empirical operationalization and reveal its role in promoting a successful intercultural interaction. It also takes a longitudinal perspective to find how reciprocity changes over the course of a 10-week eTandem experience. The following research questions will guide the study:
1) **What is reciprocity, and how is it enacted and accomplished?**

2) **What factors may impact the enactment of reciprocity in ongoing interaction (e.g., expert/novice roles, cultural content, identity, positioning, conversational style, proficiency, use of technological affordances, etc.)?**

3) **What aspects of reciprocity seem more amenable to change than others in 10 weeks of the eTandem project?**

To answer the first research question, I will attempt to clarify the multiple possible definitions of reciprocity in eTandem and various theoretical understandings, as it is unclear how diverse qualities of interaction relate to the notion of reciprocity that has been assumed to be a principle of eTandem. To do that, I will first identify in Chapter 2 and 3 various ways of defining reciprocity by reviewing previous literature in telecollaboration, SLA, and discourse analysis that dealt with constructs related to reciprocity and that appear to have good potential and be appropriate for analyzing reciprocity in eTandem exchange data. Specifically, the review will include studies that identified interactional patterns of face-to-face communication based on the degree of equality and mutuality (Galaczi, 2008; Sanchez, 2015; Storch, 2002), studies that examined topic shift vis-à-vis conversational engagement and involvement (Barron & Black, 2015; Schwienhorst, 2004; Tannen, 2006), and studies that focused on repair moves such as corrective feedback (Akiyama, 2017a; Bower & Kawaguchi, 2011; O’Rourke, 2005) and resolution of intercultural miscommunication (González-Lloret, 2005; Ware, 2005). In the end, I will propose several indices of reciprocity based on the literature review and reinterpret them according to my analysis of the key characteristics of what unfolds during eTandem sessions and their consequences for our understanding of reciprocity.
The second research question examines what key factors may influence the enactment of reciprocity in video-mediated telecollaborative interaction. As will become clear in my literature review, these factors may include technology mediation (Kern, 2014), expert vs. novice roles reflecting the difference in the level of epistemic access to one’s and other’s culture and language, identity (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005), positioning (Davies & Harré, 1990), or similar/dissimilar conversational style (Tannen, 1987, 2005). Proficiency differences may also affect the quality of interactions and dynamics that go with switching languages and roles in the middle of a session, and hence the language exchange experience as a whole.

Finally, the third research question takes a longitudinal perspective and examines what aspects of reciprocity seem more amenable to change than others in 10 weeks of the eTandem project. Taking a longitudinal perspective to analyzing interactional features is important not only for the advancement of theories in general (e.g., Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015; Ortega & Byrnes, 2008), but also for uncovering the unique affordances of eTandem, where participants are expected to learn to communicate with the same partner as the project progresses. As previous studies in the wider field of CMC have revealed (e.g., Walther, 1994, 1996), conversational participants interact differently depending on whether they expect to interact with the same partner or not (i.e., longitudinal vs. one-shot exchange). It is possible that such “anticipated future interaction” (Walther, 1996, p. 12) influences the enactment of reciprocity, in a similar way to how a few longitudinal studies of online interactions (Basharina, 2007; Belz, 2003) have revealed how personal relationships are forged and maintained over time.
1.3. Structure of the Dissertation

In the next two chapters, I will first examine various bodies of research that can be addressed from the reciprocity perspective. Specifically, in Chapter 2, I will discuss eTandem research that analyzed reciprocity using the traditional definition of “equal time and effort in the two language halves of a session,” introduce other definitions of reciprocity found in the Oxford English Dictionary, and expand the reciprocity idea by relating the various definitions to the past telecollaboration research. In Chapter 3, I will address reciprocity from SLA (e.g., González-Lloret, 2011; Ortega, 2009) and discourse analysis perspectives (e.g., Gordon, 2009; Streeck, Goodwin, & LeBaron, 2011) to bring in new insights from outside telecollaboration research. Specifically, SLA research will inform the study by providing a theoretically-driven way to categorize social interaction based on equality and mutuality (e.g., Storch, 2002). Concepts from interactional sociolinguistics such as framing (Goffman, 1974; Tannen & Wallat, 1987), footing (Goffman, 1981), and conversational style (Tannen, 1987, 2005) will be used to analyze factors that may influence the enactment of reciprocity, while the multimodal discourse analysis framework will help highlight the complexity involved in enacting reciprocity beyond verbal means of communication when the technological affordances and limitations of video-based eTandem are considered.

Following the literature review, I will introduce in Chapter 4 the eTandem project and its data that were analyzed in the current study. I will also discuss in detail the methodological decisions I made regarding how much of the available data had to be used and how many of the various kinds of analyses were to be pursued in order to satisfactorily address the research questions, for the various potential understandings of reciprocity to be well explored from three theoretical perspectives I am interested in drawing from: SLA, interactional sociolinguistics, and
the study of multimodality. Chapter 5-7 will present the results of three case studies and explore the enactment of reciprocity in a multifaceted way. Finally, based on the analysis of interaction, Chapter 8 will evaluate how successful/appropriate each measure is for the purposes of studying reciprocity and discuss the implications of the findings for the greater domains of research.
Chapter 2

Reciprocity in Telecollaboration Research

This chapter synthesizes previous studies on telecollaboration, focusing on various definitions of reciprocity and factors that may influence its enactment. The first section will discuss the traditional definition of reciprocity and review eTandem research that adopted the definition. The second section will explore various definitions of reciprocity that are found in the Oxford English Dictionary and apply them to the eTandem context by exploring studies that addressed related issues. The final section will review past research on intercultural exchanges (particularly eTandem research) to examine factors that may influence the enactment of reciprocity including conversational roles, positioning and identities, conversational topics, and L2 proficiency.

2.1. Examining the Traditional Definition of Reciprocity

As already pointed out in Chapter 1, eTandem’s reciprocity principle originates in its unique set-up, where language learners are learning each other’s language and culture and they undertake reversed roles when the language of the exchange is switched halfway through. As such, the principle offers solutions to a situation where every participant’s maximum use of the TL reduces the chance for the partner to receive authentic input in his/her L2 and a situation where neither of the languages are used long enough for participants to derive sufficient grammatical, semantic and pragmatic information about their L2 due to a completely random approach to language choice (i.e., an approach through which a participant can use any language whenever) (Kötter, 2003).
Of many definitions of reciprocity in eTandem literature, the classic definition is the one by Brammerts (1996) who states that, eTandem participants are supposed to (a) contribute equally to and benefit from their work together to the same degree, (b) do as much for their partner as they themselves expect from their partner, (c) dedicate the same amount of time to each language, and (d) invest the same amount of energy in preparation, in the interest they show in the learning success of their partner, and in their concern for their partner’s success in speaking and understanding their language (p. 11). This detailed description captures what I call is the most traditional understanding of reciprocity in the eTandem literature: reciprocity as the equality in the amount of time, contribution, and interest in two languages.

Reciprocity in the traditional sense has typically been investigated from a quantitative perspective. When the principle of reciprocity means that individuals communicating in pairs should spend the same amount of time communicating in each language and contribute equally in the two language parts of the session, this can be most appropriately investigated via counts of such things as words per minute, number of turns, and frequency of topic initiations. Thus, several quantitative eTandem studies have analyzed reciprocity by focusing on two units of observation: cultural groups (e.g., American vs. German) and the two language parts of each session (e.g., English vs. German). The assumption of these studies is that reciprocity is achieved if a particular counted feature is balanced equally between the two cultural groups and in each language part of the session. For instance, Schwienhorst (2004) examined whether Irish and German eTandem exchanges via MOO text chat were equal in terms of the frequency of topic initiation and types of utterances (e.g., question vs. statement vs. imperative; WH-question vs. yes-no question) used for topic initiation. It was found that the frequency of topic initiation as well as utterance types were relatively balanced between the two groups in both the German and
the English parts of the session. The author thus concluded that the project’s focus on learner autonomy and the text-based medium together led to achieving reciprocity.

The fact that eTandem seeks to be a site for the learning of each other’s language and thus requires switching languages halfway through a given session is viewed as such a unique and important feature that Schwienhorst (2004) suggested that MOO-based eTandem promotes a form of “balanced bilingualism.” Taking this idea further, Schwienhorst and Borgia (2006) examined whether Irish and German groups can balance the amount of utterances produced in English and German with the pedagogical help of Bilingual Tandem Analyser, a tool that automatically analyzes each dyad’s text chat data in a session and provides feedback on the number of utterances (i.e., text chat posts) produced in English vs. German (e.g., 86% in English vs. 14% in German). The authors then implemented the tool in an actual bilingual exchange and examined whether students who saw the statistics on the English-German balance in a chat session would improve reciprocity. The authors revealed that the tool helped the participants improve the balance of English vs. German utterances.

Although the balance of two languages and two participants’ contribution in an interaction session is a useful indicator of reciprocity, some recent eTandem studies have begun to recognize the limitation of this traditional understanding of reciprocity. Sanchez’s dissertation work (2015) on eTandem between 13 Spanish learners in the U.S. and 13 English learners in Mexico investigated reciprocity using a mixed method approach. The quantitative part of her study revealed that, even though more words and interactional resources were used in English than in Spanish (i.e., not reciprocal according to Schwienhorst & Borgia, 2006), their use was balanced within each language half. This indicates that eTandem partners are constantly accommodating to their partner’s linguistic level, so they can establish mutual understanding.
within a language part. Sanchez (2015) thus suggested that the operationalization of reciprocity is more complicated than “a simple equal division of time, turns, and words devoted to each language by each member of the pair” (p. 240).

Koch (2017) provided a historical overview of the term “reciprocity” in sociology, communication studies, and discourse analysis, and defined reciprocity as “the mode and rhythm of the exchange of information and objects in a given historical socio-cultural situation between two or more communicators which bears the obligation to respond to a perceived impulse or gift in a way and time frame that corresponds to an acknowledged conversation” (pp. 126–127). Based on the definition, the author presented five dimensions of reciprocity that future research may examine: (1) organization (i.e., how participants agree on the time, place, goals, topics of discussion, error correction routines), (2) language learning (i.e., how participants provide linguistic scaffolding and error correction), (3) exchange of information (i.e., how participants talk about intercultural differences), (4) communication (i.e., what discursive moves participants employ, for example, to adapt a message to the level of language proficiency), and (5) semantic aspects (i.e., to what extent participants use words that indicate a reciprocal exchange, such as personal, possessive, or reflexive pronouns). Although Koch’s work is a first step to operationalizing reciprocity, his work did not provide a clear idea of how to examine reciprocity empirically.

In sum, what is common in eTandem studies that embrace the traditional notion of reciprocity is that they examine reciprocity with the assumption that reciprocity means equality such that the same counted features should be exchanged between two language parts or between two participants. In other words, if A is given, then the same amount of A should be given in return to make the exchange equal. These studies are also similar methodologically in that
reciprocity is evaluated based on the group average (e.g., German group’s contribution vs. American group’s contribution) rather than focusing on reciprocity that is enacted within each dyad (e.g., within a German-American dyad). Although group averages may be useful for characterizing groups, it lacks the perspective that reciprocity can be and is indeed observed in an emergent fashion within a dyad and within the same language half of a session. Recent studies on reciprocity (e.g., Koch, 2017; Sanchez, 2015) have started to explore the construct of reciprocity, but these studies have not operationalized and empirically examined the construct within a single study, making it difficult to conclude what the construct means and how we can observe it in interaction. Thus, in the next section, I will attempt to expand the traditional definition by first introducing some basic definitions of reciprocity found in the Oxford English Dictionary and then exploring how various definitions of reciprocity have been studied in pre-existing research.

2.2. Expanding the Definition of Reciprocity

As reviewed in the previous section, eTandem studies often focus on the equality meaning of reciprocity. However, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, there are various definitions of reciprocity that transcend the equality meaning. For the entry for “reciprocal,” the Oxford English Dictionary lists the following definitions (“reciprocal,” 2016):

1) (a) Of the nature of, or relating to, a return (in kind); made, given, etc., in response; answering, corresponding; (b) relating to, or of the nature of, a mutual or simultaneous exchange; given and received mutually; traded, exchanged; (c) of a person or thing: sent or given by each party to the other, esp. as a formal exchange

2) Existing on both sides; felt or shared by both parties; mutual
3) Moving backwards and forwards alternately; characterized by movement of this type
4) Interacting with, referring to, or depending on each other mutually; interdependent; complementary; correlative
5) Opposed or opposing, contrary; inversely corresponding, converse

Some of the keywords from these definitions include mutuality, return/response, trade/exchange, alteration, complementarity, and sharedness. As such, it is possible and indeed desirable to view reciprocity in a multifaceted way by analyzing the concept beyond the equality sense, as eTandem researchers like Sanchez (2015) have very recently begun to realize. Below I address two definitions of reciprocity that I consider are particularly useful for the current study: (1) participants’ exchanged behavior and (2) compatibility/sharedness. Note that I will also focus on reciprocity in the (3) mutuality sense in Chapter 3 by discussing Storch (2004) and her colleagues’ work.

2.2.1. Exchanged Behavior

Reciprocity can refer to the relationship between a participant’s performance and his/her partner’s performance that is exchanged in return. That is, another way of defining reciprocity is “A that is given in response to/in exchange for B indicates the successful/unsuccesful transaction of reciprocity.” Here, A and B can be the same conversational feature or different. I would like to argue that research on listenership can be conceptualized via the reciprocity lens in that listeners’ responses to speakers’ conversational moves shape a conversation. For instance, Barron and Black (2015) examined one successful and one unsuccessful German and Irish eTandem dyads’ English interaction via Skype focusing on topic shifts (i.e., topic change and development), topic replies, and verbal listenership behavior. The study found that in the
unsuccessful dyad, the non-native speaker (NNS) engaged in a limited number of topic shifts, used few backchannels/backchannel forms, and mostly responded to her partner’s topic shift with equivocal short-form topic replies (e.g., Yes) rather than long forms (e.g., Yes, it was very nice). In contrast, the NNS in the successful dyad demonstrated a high level of interactional competence by showing active participation via frequent topic shifts and a wide range of backchannel behaviors. From the reciprocity perspective, we can attribute the successful vs. unsuccessful dyad’s performance to the presence vs. lack of reciprocity in these exchanged behaviors.

Similarly, we can examine corrective feedback research (see Mackey, 2012 for a review) from the reciprocity perspective. For instance, we can conceptualize the exchange of corrective feedback and subsequent uptake as an indicator of participants’ effort to reciprocate the conversation. Uptake refers to the response immediately following an error correction move and by which the corrected speaker attempts to repeat the corrected utterance or self-correct after being prompted to do so (see Mackey, 2012). Bower and Kawaguchi (2011), for instance, examined Japanese and Australian eTandem dyads’ provision of corrective feedback and responses to them during text chats. The study found that, although provision of corrective feedback was rare, its uptake (e.g., acknowledgment, modified output, self-correct) was mostly successful when participants were actually corrected by native speakers (NSs). From the reciprocity perspective, this finding means that NNSs demonstrated appreciation of their linguistic help and reciprocated the favor by working out the linguistic problems.

Furthermore, we can conceptualize conversational repair as a form of social action and consider it a sign of successful enactment of reciprocity. Taking such a perspective, Tudini (2016) examined “reciprocal corrective activity” (p. 16), namely exchange of other-initiated
repair that is performed when eTandem participants demonstrate their bilingual identity and avail themselves of code-switching possibilities. Code-switching, namely alternation of two or more languages within a single conversation, has been reported to be a useful tool for language learning in formal face-to-face contexts (e.g., Kasper, 2004). Tudini revealed that the potential of code-switching “extends to other informal naturalistic contexts, where there is no teacher presence, and where the conversation is written” (p. 24). Specifically, Tudini, from the Conversation Analysis (CA) perspective (reviewed in Chapter 3), examined how the knowledge of the same two languages helped an Italian and English dyad achieve the pedagogical objective of language learning and how these participants used code-switching for the purpose of socialization during provision of corrective feedback. For instance, Tudini analyzed a conversational sequence where the Italian learner of English recalled her partner’s erroneous utterance in Italian and provided correction only after her erroneous utterance in English was corrected by the English partner. This reciprocation of corrective feedback, often performed via code-switching, allowed the participants to overcome linguistic asymmetries and manage the face-threatening nature of corrective feedback, and consequently led to achieving both learning as well as social objectives of eTandem. The study thus concluded that online language learning partnerships with multilingual intercultural speakers of the TL should be appreciated more in language pedagogy, because this arrangement allows participants to access their identities of NS and NNS, or expert and novice, unlike monolingual participants for whom such shifts between two languages and identities are not possible.
2.2.2. Compatibility/Sharedness

If an action in response to another action does not show the expected reciprocity, that is, the exchanged behaviors do not seem reciprocal (e.g., NNSs do not engage with NSs’ corrective feedback), we may be able to explain this by asking whether participants’ not sharing expectations, styles, or resources consequently resulted in the lack of reciprocity in the performative sense. Accordingly, we can define reciprocity as \textit{compatibility} (i.e., sharing the same expectations, resources, etc.).

In Akiyama (2017a), I highlighted the reciprocal nature of corrective feedback practices in eTandem by focusing on the compatibility of beliefs between NSs and NNSs. Specifically, I sought to illuminate how 12 Japanese-American eTandem dyads provided and responded to corrective feedback according to their beliefs about error correction. The study revealed that the rate of successful uptake increased when NSs provided corrective feedback in the way NNSs preferred to receive it. That is, when NNSs’ preference matched the type of feedback given by NSs, it was more likely that NNSs showed a deeper engagement with the feedback. This finding thus indicates that reciprocity in the form of compatibility can increase the potential for language learning. Despite the extensive body of research on error correction in eTandem (e.g., Kötter, 2003; O’Rourke, 2005; Vinagre & Muñoz, 2011), Akiyama (2017a) is the only study that has investigated this issue, and little is known about the reciprocity in the form of compatibility between one’s own error correction practice and belief and his/her partner’s.

Conceptualizing reciprocity as compatibility allows us to examine the causes of intercultural tensions as well. Indeed, studies on intercultural communication have often attributed the lack of \textit{corresponding expectations, language styles, and institutional support} between two cultural groups and two interactants to the deterioration of rapport and consequently
to mutual attribution of negative personal traits to each other (House, 2010; O’Dowd & Ritter, 2006). For example, Ware (2005) explained the causes of “missed communication” (p. 64) in a German-American telecollaboration. Based on the analysis of interaction, interview, and survey data, she revealed three types of intercultural tensions that occurred as a result of two cultural groups’ incompatibility in terms of (1) expectations and norms (e.g., what one expects from the project, linguistic conventions), (2) social and institutional resources (e.g., degree of curriculum integration, grading, status of the TL), and (3) individual differences in motivation and use of time. Ryder and Yamagata-Lynch (2014) used Activity Systems analysis to compare high vs. low functionality pairs. The study concluded that low functionality was caused by participants’ failure to resolve the incompatibility of knowledge in the TL, level of ICC, and expectations of a partner. Accordingly, the findings of these studies on intercultural tensions suggest that the lack of compatibility in the corresponding interactional systems may prevent conversational participants from achieving reciprocity during an ongoing interaction.

This section developed the notion of reciprocity beyond its traditional definition of equality in time, turns, and words. These additional dimensions of reciprocity include exchanged behaviors and compatibility, or the degree to which the corresponding expectations/styles/resources between partners are shared during the interaction. These concepts certainly overlap with each other, and it is not my intention to choose the most suitable definition for analyzing reciprocity in eTandem. Rather, the purpose of introducing these different ideas here is to shed light on the complexity involved in discussing reciprocity and to pave the way forward for analyzing reciprocity beyond the traditional, simplified definition.
2.3. Factors That May Influence the Enactment of Reciprocity

Any understanding of reciprocity needs to consider various factors that may influence its enactment in an ongoing interaction. For example, conversational roles may influence reciprocity because, by design, the role-taking configuration of eTandem enables participants to become aware of their shared, alternating roles as a NS and a NNS and such awareness provides opportunities for engaging in mutual or reciprocal scaffolding. The alternating roles of a NS and a NNS are also important, in the context of eTandem, because, in principle at least, they enable shifts of linguistic expertise. Namely, during a given half of the session the NS of the language being practiced is likely to be in the expert role because of assumed ownership of linguistic knowledge, while the NNS is in the novice role, with a reversal midway through the session. Moreover, in eTandem exchanges such as the one that will be investigated in this study, training may also explicitly encourage students to assume the role (and with it, the moral responsibilities) of the tutor or learner in the respective halves of the session. Furthermore, topics of discussion change who assumes ownership of cultural knowledge and thus influence the role-taking configuration. Finally, eTandem participants’ cognitive individual differences (e.g., proficiency level, motivation) may influence what they do during interaction. Below, I will highlight some of these factors that will inform my analysis: conversational roles, positioning and identities, conversational topics, and L2 proficiency.

2.3.1. Conversational Roles

It is important to remember that, while some studies consider roles to be fixed and pre-given by the eTandem design, other studies consider them co-constructed in a dialogue and change depending on how participants position themselves in ongoing interaction. For instance,
Priego (2011), who conceptualized NS vs. NNS status as pre-determined conversational roles, quantitatively analyzed email tandem exchanges between secondary English as a Second Language (ESL) and L2 French students using Villamil and Guerrero’s (1996) taxonomy of scaffolding substrategies (e.g., comprehension check, giving explicit vs. implicit feedback). The study found that, while there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of the variety of strategies used to scaffold one another, their strategy use was different when they were assuming different conversational roles. When they were taking the role as a NS (i.e., a tutor), the participants often used strategies like advising, eliciting, clarifying, restating, and checking comprehension. In contrast, when they were taking the role as a NNS (i.e., a learner), they used strategies like responding to advice and elicitation, asking for feedback, saving face regarding their lack of linguistic competence, thanking, and responding to apologies. The author concluded that shared, alternating roles as a NS and a NNS in the eTandem set-up increased awareness of conversational roles and provided opportunities for engaging in reciprocal scaffolding. While Priego (2011) is similar to earlier quantitative studies presented above that used cultural groups and language parts of sessions as units of analysis, this study is different in that the focus is on participants performing a conversational role (i.e., doing speech acts) as a tutor vs. learner in accordance with their NS vs. NNS status.

Assuming NS and NNS roles and asking learners to approach tandem learning by playing these assumed roles, such as in Priego’s study, may not allow for an open exploration of the way the participants demonstrate reciprocation at different moments in the chat. For example, Lazaraton and Davis (2008) caution that assigning NS and NNS roles can obscure the way that researchers should approach tandem interactions. Accordingly, a few studies on tandem learning have started to regard conversational roles as dynamic and situated constructs that change even
within a language part of a session. In exploring face-to-face tandem learning between Korean learners and English learners, Ahn (2011, 2016) demonstrated how language/cultural expert vs. novice roles are not inherent properties that are associated with a certain part of a session, but rather negotiated in interaction moment by moment and invoked only when they become relevant in situated conversational practices. For instance, Ahn (2016) found that a Korean student’s production of a “side sequence” (Jefferson, 1972, p. 294), namely an episode that is relevant to the ongoing activity but occurs aside from it, about American life in the English part of the conversation led to his American partner’s opening a side sequence about Korean culture, which created opportunities for “two-way learning” (p. 176) or “a mutual learning partnership” (p. 177). Hence, the author argued that participants’ conversational roles as a learner and an expert are not pre-determined but rather invoked via their conscious efforts to reciprocate learning opportunities.

2.3.2. Positioning and Identities

Sanchez (2015) took a similar view that NS/NNS roles are not pre-defined but are co-constructed in a dialogue and can change depending on how participants position themselves in ongoing interaction. Positioning is a concept that is often used by discourse analysts to examine identity construction and defined as “the discursive process whereby selves are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced story lines” (Davies & Harré, 1990, p. 48). According to Davies and Harré (1990), positioning “focuses attention on the dynamic aspects of encounters” in contrast to the concept of role, which highlights “static, formal, and ritualistic aspects” (p. 43). Sanchez explained that she chose positioning as the analysis method after realizing that her original attempt to use Storch’s (2002,
24 (2004) pair interaction framework (studies which will be reviewed in Chapter 3) was not fruitful. This is because Storch’s method of characterizing interaction was too rigid for the context of eTandem, where participants often resist adopting inherent roles as NS-as-expert and NNS-as-learner/novice. As an example, she noted that her participants often resisted adopting inherent roles as NS-as-expert and NNS-as-learner. For instance, when a Mexican student positioned herself as a struggling learner of English, her American partner positioned herself as a fellow L2 learner who struggles in a similar way rather than as an English expert. This example demonstrates, as Sanchez argued, that, in order to maintain human relationships, participants may prioritize reciprocation of their positions over adopting inherent NS vs. NNS roles. In sum, Sanchez concluded that the expert-learner/novice model of reciprocity may be too static and thus need to be revised when examining the dynamic context of telecollaborative tandem learning, and positioning may prove to be a useful analysis method in order to do so.

Identity refers to “how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future” (Norton, 2000, p. 5). As such, identity is a dynamic and discursive process through which individuals continuously present and perform who they are in relation to others. Lam (2004) examined a Chinese/English bilingual chat room to examine what affordances it provides to support two teenage Chinese immigrants’ language socialization. The study found that the focal youth and their peers developed a mixed-code variety of English to construct their relationships as bilingual speakers of English and Cantonese and to create a “collective ethnic identity.” Since this language variety followed the social categories of neither English-speaking Americans nor Cantonese-speaking Chinese, the author argued that the participants were
navigating across contexts of socialization in the locality of the nation-state and the virtual environments of the Internet to constitute their bilingual identities.

Yi (2009) explored literacy practices of two Korean-American adolescents to examine how they constructed their transnational identities on the Internet. Transnational individuals are those who make two-way back-and-forth movements in terms of the flow of information, resources, capital, locations, and commodities they experience (p. 101), thus differentiating themselves from immigrants whose journey tends to be permanent and one-directional. The study found that these transnational participants engaged in online activities with people in Korea and the U.S. to maintain their sense of being transnational, because the online community functioned as a safe space that let them demonstrate their bilingual and biliterate identity.

Yang and Yi (2017) examined how eTandem experience influenced the identity construction of two Korean-American dyads. The study, which analyzed various data such as participants’ text chat interaction, interviews, and reflective diaries, found that L2 learners gained confidence as language learners and started to appreciate their learner identity, rather than considering themselves as deficient L2 learners. This change was thanks to their teaching experience of L1. The eTandem partnership of teaching and learning (i.e., the reciprocity principle) enabled the participants to accept their learning struggles as a natural process, given that even NSs struggle in providing explanations. The study concluded that eTandem helped develop a sense of community and provided a safe space where participants could negotiate, perform, and contest multiple identities.
2.3.3. Conversational Topics

A related but slightly different way to think about factors that may modulate reciprocity in eTandem is the language spoken and the topics discussed, which in turn are in principle given by the eTandem configuration and pedagogical design that aims to promote balanced bilingualism and biculturalism. Below I will present two studies that attempted to establish analytical tools to systematically investigate the impact of these two factors on role-taking configurations.

Cappellini and Mompean (2015) aimed to construct methodological tools to study expert-novice configurations in an eTandem exchange. They did so by examining how communicational roles (i.e., concepts similar to speech acts like explaining, eliciting, and evaluating), which they view as related to social roles (e.g., learner vs. expert, NS vs. NNS, nationality), are influenced by the language spoken and topics discussed. The authors first examined French interaction and identified four configurations on the basis of topics discussed: (1) when participants were talking about French culture (i.e., when the French NS can claim cultural expertise), (2) when participants were talking about Chinese culture (i.e., when the Chinese NS can claim cultural expertise), (3) when they were talking about something not relevant to each other’s culture (e.g., when talking about food in Brazil), and (4) when the topic was on something personal (e.g., when talking about friends, family). The authors then focused on the first two configurations that differ in terms of participants’ social roles: one that assigns a French individual the expert role of language and culture (e.g., a French NS talking about French culture in French), namely a unilateral expertise configuration, and the other that assigns a French individual the expert role of language but a novice role of culture (e.g., a French NS talking about his/her partner’s culture in French), namely a crossed expertise configuration. The
study additionally created sub-categories for the two configurations based on whether the set of rights and duties of a speaker in a certain configuration is “respected” or “questioned” (p. 249) by the interlocutor, meaning whether the expected speech act as an expert vs. learner of language/culture was performed or not. It was found that language spoken (i.e., French in this study) designated didactic roles to NSs of French such that a Chinese learner of French questioning what his/her French partner said about China was much less frequent than a French learner of Chinese questioning what his/her Chinese partner said about France. The findings of the study thus highlighted the possibility that asymmetrical power relations, which are attributed to the social role of a language expert vs. novice, influence the enactment of communicational roles and what topics participants can question.

Based on Cappellini and Mompean (2015), Cappellini (2016) conducted a quantitative study to investigate the impact of role configurations on language learning potential by examining the relationship between role configurations and scaffolding side sequences, namely off-task episodes that function as linguistic scaffolding. First, he identified 13 major types of role-taking configurations in eTandem, including unilateral expertise and crossed expertise configurations. As mentioned above, in unilateral expertise configuration, for instance, conversational participants take the role of a learner/expert in terms of both language and cultural knowledge. In contrast, the already mentioned configuration of crossed expertise may allow a language learner to be novice in his or her linguistic knowledge and yet enact the role of an expert of the cultural content at hand. Secondly, scaffolding side sequences were analyzed using four categories: (1) lexical acquisition sequences (i.e., scaffolding provided on vocabulary items), (2) morphosyntactic acquisition sequences (i.e., scaffolding provided on morphology and syntax), (3) error correction sequences (i.e., corrective feedback from an expert user of the
language), and (4) explanatory sequences (i.e., negotiation for meaning due to a learner’s not being able to understand the meaning). Based on a statistical analysis, Cappellini argued that, the category of unilateral expertise was related to additional exposure of learners to words or expressions that are unfamiliar to them (i.e., explanatory sequences that are comprehension-based), while crossed expertise configuration allowed them to develop active vocabulary (i.e., lexical acquisition sequences that are production-based). The study highlighted the great potential of crossed expertise in producing “collective scaffolding,” a scaffolding that takes place between participants who do not know the right answer, as opposed to scaffolding that takes place between a tutor (who knows the answer) and a novice.

In sum, Cappellini and Mompean (2015) and Cappellini (2016) have created the new analytical categories of unilateral expertise and crossed expertise based on what language and what culture is talked about by whom in one or the other half of an eTandem session. This brings to the fore issues of ownership of language and culture, namely claims to legitimacy of linguistic knowledge and cultural knowledge, which can be quite complex to negotiate and give rise to power asymmetries and new realignments of expertise in a much more interactionally emergent/enacted fashion than appreciated by the two studies or other past research. In order to untangle various issues surrounding the ownership of language and of culture, I will search for appropriate ways to address them by drawing on insights from interactional sociolinguistics and multimodal discourse analysis in Chapter 3.

2.3.4. L2 Proficiency and Differences in L2 Proficiency Between Members of a Dyad

L2 learners’ initial proficiency has been identified as a crucial affecting variable for various dimensions of instructed SLA (Shintani, Li, & Ellis, 2013) as well as the effectiveness of
telecollaborative interaction. Ryder and Yamagata-Lynch (2014), for example, examined the synchronous (videoconferencing) and asynchronous (discussion board) interaction between seven Chinese participants who majored in Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language and seven U.S. participants who were learning Chinese. The study used activity systems analysis (Engeström, 1999) to identify tensions that arose in low vs. high functionality pairs, revealing that the gap in L2 proficiency was one of the commonly observed tensions in the project. In comparing the high vs. low functionality pairs, the study found that high functionality pairs overcame a significant difference in participants’ proficiency levels in L2 (i.e., the Chinese student’s proficiency in English was higher than the U.S. participant’s proficiency in Chinese) and achieved a more balanced teacher-student relationship. They did so by the U.S. participants acting as cultural ambassadors and the Chinese participants showing interest in U.S. culture and regarding the U.S. participants as cultural experts. In contrast, in the low functionality pairs, the U.S. participants who had substantially lower TL proficiency than the Chinese partners felt incapable and settled on their role as students, missing opportunities to play the role of an English teacher, despite the design feature of eTandem promoting reciprocity by making participants switch roles. Sanchez (2015) also demonstrated how a Mexican learner of English, who thought her American partner’s proficiency in Spanish was higher than her L2, worked hard at reciprocating the tandem exchange by demonstrating a high level of engagement in her native language part of the session (i.e., Spanish).

These findings suggest that, depending on how participants tackle the gap in the TL proficiency, they may be able to achieve successful interaction. In the present study, I collected an independent L2 proficiency measure from 30 Japanese learners in the U.S. and 20 English learners in Japan via the Elicited Imitation Test (EIT) (Ortega, Iwashita, Norris, & Rabie, 2002),
so I can inspect potential proficiency influences, both in terms of how proficient each learner is within their peers studying the same L2 and in relation to their partner’s proficiency in the other L2.

2.4. Conclusion

In summary, in this chapter I reviewed existing understandings of reciprocity in the eTandem literature and recent research that has begun to open up the space for needed conceptual expansions. I then introduced factors that may influence the enactment of reciprocity, including conversational roles, positioning and identities, conversational topics that change the owner of language and cultural expertise, and TL proficiency. These studies have often focused on analyzing conversational topics and side sequences as the points of interaction where participants’ role configurations shift or get invoked. In that respect, unlike the more traditional studies that focus on the dichotomy of cultural groups and language parts of a session, these studies look inside each language part and investigate what is influencing the enactment of reciprocity and why it is so.

What seems to be missing in the current body of research on eTandem, however, is a developmental perspective that examines the change in the enactment of reciprocity over time, the interactional sociolinguistics perspective that allows an in-depth look at the enactment of reciprocity in a discursive manner, and the multimodal discourse analysis perspective that focuses on the influence of technology mediation. It is from this perspective, I will argue in Chapter 3, that it is essential to take an interdisciplinary approach and gain insight from other disciplines outside telecollaboration, as it can offer an advantageous tool which, to the best of my knowledge, has never been used in the study of reciprocity in telecollaboration. The next chapter
provides a survey of theories and conceptual and analytical tools from SLA and discourse analysis literature that can support novel and transdisciplinary work (Atkinson et al., 2016) on reciprocity.
Chapter 3
Exploring Reciprocity from SLA and Discourse Analysis Perspectives

While research in SLA or discourse analysis has not examined the construct of reciprocity per se, there are a number of relevant studies that should be addressed in sorting out the multiple possible definitions of reciprocity in eTandem. Thus, this chapter aims to demonstrate how various qualities of interaction relate to the theoretical notion of reciprocity that has been assumed to be a principle of eTandem by drawing on insights from SLA and discourse analysis research. This chapter also evaluates the usefulness of these insights. The goal is to propose several indices of reciprocity that appear to have good potential for analyzing eTandem data.

3.1. Reciprocity as a Descriptor of Interactional Patterns: Research on Equality and Mutuality

SLA researchers who are interested in language learners’ social interaction have identified patterns of face-to-face interaction based on the concepts that are related to reciprocity. In a widely cited study, Storch (2002) used equality and mutuality to investigate the nature of peer interactions during task-based collaborative writing tasks in an adult ESL classroom. Equality was defined as “the degree of control or authority over the task” (Storch, 2002, p. 127). Accordingly, interaction where both participants take directions from each other is considered high in equality. On the other hand, mutuality was defined as “the level of engagement with each other’s contribution” (p. 127). Hence, an interaction with frequent exchange of ideas and reciprocal feedback is considered high in mutuality. Based on these two indices, the study examined discourse features that indicated cohesion (e.g., presence of repetition, incorporation of
each other’s utterance, collaboratively finishing a sentence), engagement (e.g., confirmations, explicit vs. implicit peer correction), requests and provision of information, and negotiation and reaching for consensus. Storch found that participants’ dyadic interaction could be categorized into four patterns based on the two continuum scales of equality and mutuality: collaborative (+equality, +mutuality), dominant/dominant (+equality, –mutuality), dominant/passive (–equality, –mutuality), and expert/novice (–equality, +mutuality). Collaborative pairs are characterized by participants’ willingness to offer and engage with each other’s ideas and work out problems together to complete a task. In contrast, dominant/dominant pairs are unwilling or unable to fully engage with each other’s contribution, although they both contribute to the task equally. In dominant/passive pairs’ interaction, there is little negotiation or exchange of ideas, because one of the participants takes an authoritarian stance and the other adopts a more subservient role. Finally, in expert/novice pairs, one of the participants (expert) takes more control over the task but encourages the other participant (novice) to participate in the task. Storch also revealed that there was a relationship between the four interactional patterns and language learning potential, concluding that the collaborative and expert/novice pairs were more likely to transfer knowledge than dominant/dominant or dominant/passive pairs. In contrast, the dominant/passive pattern resulted in the highest number of missed opportunities for learning, and the dominant/dominant pairs showed more instances of no transfer. Since collaborative and expert/novice pairs were high in mutuality, this result suggested that mutuality played an important role for language learning.

Based on Storch (2002), Tan, Wigglesworth, and Storch (2011) examined dyadic interaction of six pairs who engaged in a text chat and face-to-face conversation. The purpose of the study was to identify interactional patterns on the basis of equality and mutuality and use the
patterns to characterize the two modes of communication. The study found five patterns, adding the fifth to Storch (2002), namely *cooperative* (+equality, –mutuality) that is characterized by a division of labor, as neither participants attempts to take control of the task unlike dominant/dominant pairs. Figure 1 shows the five patterns graphically.

Figure 1. Interactional Patterns (Adopted from Tan et al., 2011)

The major finding of the study is that the mode of communication (i.e., chat vs. face-to-face) influenced participants’ interactional patterns such that the greater participation was observed in CMC than in face to face. Hence, this study highlighted the significant role of technology mediation on interactional patterns.

Similarly, Galaczi (2008) examined face-to-face dyadic interaction of participants who took part in a two-way collaborative task as part of the First Certificate in English speaking test. The purpose of the study was to identify interactional patterns and to see if those patterns impact
participants’ test scores. In a similar way to how Storch (2002) analyzed oral interaction, Galaczi (2008) used equality and mutuality as the two indices for analyzing discourse features. She defined equality as “the work distribution among the participants” and mutuality as “the creation of shared meaning from one turn to the next” (p. 97). Equality was operationalized as the balance in the quantity of talk and balance in the use of topic initiation and extension moves, while mutuality was measured by interactional moves such as topic initiation, expansion of self- vs. other-initiated topics, uptake of the other speaker’s interactional contribution, multi-turn topic development, cohesion and coherence between turns, and listener support. On the basis of these two sets of indices, the author identified three interactional patterns that are reminiscent of Storch’s (2002) model: collaborative (i.e., high equality and high mutuality), parallel (high equality and low mutuality), and asymmetric (low equality and moderate mutuality). Following Itakura (2002), each of the three patterns was further divided into ±conversational dominance that is characterized by the “quantity of talk (quantitative dominance), interruptions (participatory dominance), and questions (sequential dominance)” (Galaczi, 2008, p. 98). For instance, a collaborative dyad that is low in conversational dominance is characterized by showing listenership via acknowledgement tokens, while a collaborative dyad that is high in conversational dominance is characterized by the frequent use of follow-up questions, overlaps and latches, and collaborative finishes (i.e., finishing a sentence collaboratively). Thus, collaborative dyads’ conversational dominance was focused on sequential dominance (i.e., controlling the direction of the interaction through questions and next-speaker selection), facilitative of interaction, and other-centered. In contrast, parallel dyads’ conversational dominance was mostly participatory and self-centered. As such, a parallel dyad with high conversational dominance competed for the floor using frequent overlaps and interruptions,
while a parallel dyad with low conversational dominance used hesitations, fillers, and pauses. Finally, asymmetric dyads’ conversational dominance was mostly quantitative, with one participant talking significantly more than the other by holding the floor. Although preliminary, this study discovered a linkage between interactional patterns and test scores by revealing that raters judged peer interaction most positively when it was collaborative and most negatively when it was parallel.

These three studies are similar in that they (1) analyzed interaction focusing on discourse features such as topic management, cohesion devices, types of questions, turn-taking, listener feedback, and amount of talk, (2) categorized interaction using the two indices of mutuality and equality, and (3) revealed the relationship between the interactional patterns and quantitative measures of language learning potential/test performance (e.g., evidence of knowledge transfer, raters’ positive/negative judgment of a test score). The implication of these three studies for the study of reciprocity in eTandem is that examining equality and mutuality may be useful for characterizing NS-NNS dyads’ reciprocity configurations and that these configurations may be related to learning potential. It is important to remember, however, that these studies categorize interaction into a few fixed interactional patterns rather than considering them as dynamic, situated, and changeable with time. In addition, these studies take a non-relativistic approach, equating certain discourse features (e.g., overlaps, pauses, repetition, collaborative finishes) with the two indices of equality and mutuality (see Tannen (1993) who took a relativistic view in interpreting interactional patterns and considered linguistic strategies as potentially ambiguous and polysemous). Finally, as already argued in Chapter 2, considering reciprocity as a product of joint construction rather than a principle that dictates interaction provides a new insight into the
study of reciprocity in eTandem. In the next section, I turn to other SLA studies that deal with negotiation of expert vs. novice roles as negotiated rather than pre-given.

3.2. Reciprocity as Negotiation of Identities: The CA-for-SLA Perspective

Reciprocity can be regarded as something that conversational participants negotiate rather than something that defines their interaction. Discourse-based SLA research has examined how conversational roles are negotiated in peer and NS-NNS interaction. This type of research differs from the studies that explore interactional patterns (e.g., Storch, 2002) in that it does not take it for granted that there are universal labels like “expert” vs. “novice.” As Ohta (2001) argues, although descriptors like expert-novice imply a general trait of a participant being more able than the other participant, learner abilities are dynamic and thus should not be considered fixed. Indeed, “peer assistance is often mutual, with peers helping each other, rather than expert helping novice” (Ohta, 2001, p. 76). Since each individual engages in learning with an array of strengths and weaknesses, working together in the end creates a greater expertise than any of the individuals working alone. In other words, negotiation of conversational roles can increase learning potential.

Conversation Analysis (CA) (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974) is an approach to discourse analysis that takes the perspective that conversation is a locally situated practice. CA has generated great interest in SLA researchers over the last two decades and has been applied to various L2 learning contexts (Kasper & Wagner, 2011), including CA research in the service of language learning and technology (e.g., González-Lloret, 2011, 2015). From this CA-for-SLA perspective, Reichert and Liebscher (2012) investigated how German learners’ negotiation of expert positions created learning opportunities within the context of word searches. The study
collected data from a group of three German learners who were creating a script for their role play task. The analysis focused on how these learners negotiated expert identities when looking for an appropriate word to use by positioning themselves as a learner with knowledge, experience, and expertise. The authors suggested that, unlike teacher-student/NS-NNS interaction, participants in peer interaction need to negotiate expertise because they cannot be treated as an expert of the L2 unless they present evidence for claiming their right as an expert.

Although Reichert and Liebscher (2012) argued that negotiation of expertise is rare in NS-NNS configuration compared to NNS-NNS configuration (cf. Kurhila, 2006), previous research has revealed that such negotiation is frequent in NS-NNS interaction as well. For instance, Park (2007) examined how participants negotiated and co-constructed NS/NNS identities in naturally occurring cross-cultural conversations. She avoided the use of pre-defined labels of NS/NNS that she considers is “a type of relational pair composed of ‘positioned’ categories which are asymmetrical with respect to each other” (p. 342) and are “externally imposed on the participants” (p. 340). The analysis revealed that participants incidentally invoked NS/NNS identities in the middle of a word search when they assume requestor-requestee identities and that such identities are often sustained and renegotiated. For instance, NSs and NNSs sustain invoked identities by NSs finding fault with NNSs’ pronunciation, NNSs making an excuse for linguistic deficiency, and NNSs’ affirming their partner’s native pronunciation. The study thus demonstrated that an asymmetrical alignment between NSs and NNSs in interaction was not inherent but instead “locally occasioned and prone to negotiation” (p. 354).

In summary, this section introduced studies that conceptualize expert vs. novice roles as *identities* that conversational participants negotiate. This new insight allows us to consider
reciprocity as a product of negotiation, or joint construction, rather than a principle that dictates interaction or indices that characterize reciprocity. Especially for eTandem, we may ask how the switching of languages may influence the negotiation and reciprocation of expertise in a way that is different from peer and NS-NNS interaction, what invokes such negotiation other than the switching of languages, and how such negotiation may impact opportunities for mutual learning. For instance, this new concept of reciprocity may enable us to uncover the complex nature of error correction in eTandem, such as the frequently reported finding that NSs avoid error correction.

It is also possible to consider that intercultural misunderstandings result from unsuccessful negotiation of expert-novice identities (e.g., avoidance of taking on an expert role regarding one’s own culture, over-claiming expertise in his/her partner’s culture). To the best of my knowledge, however, no SLA study has addressed this issue from a conversation-sensitive perspective, using discourse analytical tools. One exception is Akiyama (2017b), which can be considered a precursor to the present study. I will therefore first offer a précis of the interactional sociolinguistics framework that I used in Akiyama (2017b). I will then present the precursor study and spend the remainder of the chapter to discuss the multimodal discourse framework, which, combined with interactional sociolinguistics, will be employed in order to address the research questions.

3.3. Reciprocity as a Situated Practice: The Interactional Sociolinguistics’ Perspective

Interactional sociolinguistics is an approach to discourse analysis that “has its origin in the search for replicable methods of qualitative analysis that account for our ability to interpret what participants intend to convey in everyday communicative practice” (Gumperz, 2001, p.
Its research often concentrates on situations of speaking or speech events, analyzing how participants deliver and interpret a message in a given situation. Studies from the interactional sociolinguistics perspective also emphasize the role of socially-constructed individual differences, such as conversational style (Tannen, 1987, 2005), that influence what conversational participants do in a situated manner. These insights from interactional sociolinguistics are valuable in considering reciprocity in eTandem, because such an approach allows us to not only focus on situations that result in the enactment of reciprocity but also identify individual factors that mediate it. Below, I provide an overview of key concepts that emerged and/or are used in interactional sociolinguistics: listenership and speakership (Erickson, 1986), framing (Goffman, 1974; Tannen & Wallat, 1987) and footing (Goffman, 1981), reframing and rekeying (Tannen, 2006), intertextuality (Becker, 1995; Kristeva, 1980), and epistemics (Raymond & Heritage, 2006), namely a CA concept that is often utilized in the analysis of interactional sociolinguistics researchers (e.g., Sierra, 2016). I will then introduce a few studies on conversational style (Tannen, 1987, 2005), which shaped my precursor study (Akiyama, 2017b) and which I employ again in the current study.

3.3.1. Listenership and Speakership

Listenership is a term used by Erickson (1986), who argues that the role of listeners should not be neglected, as listeners influence people’s conversation as much as speakers do. For example, verbal and non-verbal feedback from a listener can encourage or discourage a conversational contribution from the speaker. Following theorizing by Sacks et al. (1974), Erickson also observes that speakers in turn adapt their utterances to the moment-by-moment reactions of their audience and recipient design their talk (Erickson, 1986, p. 297). There are two
types of recipient design: prospective and retrospective. Prospective design ‘arises through the speaker’s anticipation of some specific reaction from the listener in the next moment,’ whereas retrospective design ‘arises as the speaker notices in the present moment some reaction in the listener’ (Erickson, 1986, p. 300). For instance, lack of listener response (e.g. uh huh, hmm) may influence the way speakers talk and cause what Erickson (1986) and Erickson and Shultz (1982) call hyperexplanation (i.e., provision of unnecessary details in a lengthy explanation).

Speakers also use what Gumperz (1982) calls contextualization cues to indicate how they mean what they say; these can be prosodic (e.g. intonation, stress, and pitch register), paralinguistic (e.g. tempo, pausing, and hesitation), and non-verbal (e.g. laughter) (Gordon, 2011). For instance, in a foundational interactional sociolinguistics study, Gumperz (1982) observed interaction between native British customers and Indian and Pakistani staff cafeteria workers and found that the Indian and Pakistani staff’s use of falling intonation in offering food (e.g. Gravy \n) offended the native British customers who expected a rising intonation. In fact, the staff were exhibiting politeness within their own contextualization system. His study thus demonstrated how intercultural tensions can arise due to the differences in how contextualization cues are interpreted.

3.3.2. Framing and Footing

Framing or frame(s) theory is an analytical concept that is often used in interactional sociolinguistics. Frame, which traces to theorizing by Bateson (1972) and Goffman (1974), is defined as the “definition of a situation” that interlocutors establish in interaction (Goffman, 1974, p. 10). In other words, a frame is “what people think they are doing when they talk to each other” (Tannen, 1993, p. 6), or “participants’ sense of what is being done” upon which our
interactive interpretation is based (Tannen & Wallat, 1987, p. 215). Frames help us understand why the same utterance (e.g., “That’s great”) can be interpreted in various ways (e.g., a compliment, sarcasm) depending on how a situation is defined (e.g., a teaching frame, a play frame) via contextualization cues and other aspects of context. Indeed, creating mutual understanding of individual utterances as well as activities in general requires interlocutors’ shared sense of this definition. For example, Tannen and Wallat (1987) investigated an interaction between a pediatrician, a child, and her mother. They found that incompatibility of what they call knowledge schemas (i.e., a knowledge structure that represents people’s expectations and prior assumptions about people, objects, events, and settings in the world) between the pediatrician and the mother regarding health and cerebral palsy prompted the mother to ask questions, which, in turn, made the pediatrician switch between the examination frame and the consultation frame. They also revealed that frames and knowledge schemas together accounted for good/bad practices of medical consultation/examination. It is suggested that, while some doctors acknowledged three frames (i.e., social encounter, examination, and consultation) and switched registers back and forth between different frames, others only acknowledged one frame –examination– in order to avoid the extra cognitive burden of juggling frames.

A relevant concept is footing because it is “another way of talking about a change in our frame for events” (Goffman, 1981, p. 128). Footing is similar to the notion of positioning and is defined as alignments between interlocutors “as well as between themselves and what is said” (Gordon, 2015, p. 325). Taking the example of an undercover officer who is acting like a young person interested in buying illegal drugs for a party, Gordon (2015) explains that this person may assume various footings toward what is said and toward his/her interlocutor (e.g., as a student interested in buying drugs for fun, as an officer collecting information). Goffman (1981) thus
describes the ability to shift footings as “the capacity of a dexterous speaker to jump back and forth, keeping different circles in play” (p. 156). Numerous studies in interactional sociolinguistics have demonstrated how framing and footing are negotiated in discourse, in contexts that include family interaction, classroom small group discussions, medical encounters, and conversations among friends (e.g., Gordon, 2009; contributors to Tannen’s 1993 edited volume).

3.3.3. Reframing and Rekeying

Relevant to the concepts of framing and footing are reframing and rekeying. Reframing is defined as “a change in what the discussion is about” (Tannen, 2006, p. 601). For instance, Tannen’s analysis of one couple’s argument, which was audio-recorded by the couple and occurred over the course of one day, demonstrated that one topic could thread itself through multiple conversations and be treated differently each time with the shift of frames. Specifically, the study found that reframing occurred when discussion about whether the husband could take a box to a post office was shifted to a discussion about who is in charge of other household chores and even to discussion about whether a spouse can provide emotional support when needed.

Tannen (2006) also provided an example where the couple rekeyed their conversation from a serious, argumentative tone to a humorous, parenting tone, when their son made a small comment on their argument. This is an example of rekeying, which is defined as “a change in the tone or tenor of an interaction” (Tannen, 2006, p. 601). Rekeying often occurs with such qualities of speech that indicate a change of emotional stance, such as the speaker’s change in the tone of voice, amplitude, lexical emphasis, rhythm, and intonational contours.
3.3.4. Intertextuality

Repetition of words, phrases, syntactic structures, and ideas is common in any type of conversation. The role of repetition is to generate links not only within texts (i.e., intratextual repetition) but also across texts (i.e., intertextual repetition, Hamilton, 1996; Johnstone, 1994). Intertextuality refers to the idea that any text is “constructed as a mosaic of quotations” and that “any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (Kristeva, 1980, p. 66). It usually means repeating vocabulary, grammar, and ideas across various contexts and time, namely recontextualization and “reshaping” of “prior text” (Becker, 1995). Summarizing theorizing by Becker (1995), Tannen (2007), and others, Gordon (2009) observes that, even when speakers quote words of another person verbatim, they are reshaping the words in new contexts using a wide range of linguistic features (e.g., prosody, voice quality, volume, and gesture) to achieve their own purposes.

A pioneer in this theorizing, Tannen (2007) calls what many researchers call “reported speech” constructed dialogue; this reflects the creative, poetic, and evaluative nature of using another person’s words. While there are various functions of constructed dialogue such as agreement, admiration, joking, mocking, showing rapport, and clarifying, Gordon (2009) argued that “on an underlying level, repetition, especially intertextual repetition, functions as a means of binding people together” (p. 10). This is because repetition directs a hearer or reader back into their shared memory, affirms conversational participants’ mutual access to prior texts, and confirms membership to the same group (Gordon, 2009). This observation builds on Tannen’s (2007) argument that repetition creates connection between interlocutors in immediate interaction and corroborates Becker’s observation that “social groups seem to be bound primarily by a shared repertoire of prior texts” (1994, p. 165). In other words, shared access to previous
language experiences aids in the creation of involvement, namely “an internal, even emotional connection individuals feel which binds them to other people as well as to places, things, activities, ideas, memories, and words” (Tannen, 2007, p. 12) and helps create a social group as well as group identity (Gordon, 2009; Sierra, 2016). Gordon (2009) also argues that intertextuality is a fundamental resource for accomplishing framing in discourse, namely for constructing and negotiating situated definitions and relational meanings.

3.3.5. Epistemics

Epistemic Discourse Analysis (Raymond & Heritage, 2006; van Dijk, 2013) is a line of research that originates in CA and that examines the role of epistemics, or management of knowledge, in participants’ construction of interactional identities. It examines the “systematicity of turns-at-talk and sequences that include claims, assertions, contesting, and defending of knowledge in order for participants to display their own and converge with the co-participants’ knowledgeability” (Balaman & Sert, 2017, p. 604). Specifically, this type of research analyzes linguistic resources that are deployed to manage epistemic access (i.e., whether a conversational participant has access to the domain of knowledge), epistemic rights (i.e., what we know and how we establish our rights to that knowledge), and epistemic status (i.e., conversational participants’ relative access to the domain of knowledge) and how these epistemic symmetries/asymmetries impact social interaction (Heritage, 2012). For instance, Raymond and Heritage (2006) analyzed a phone conversation between two female friends, Vera and Jenny, about Vera’s grandchildren, to demonstrate how these two conversational participants negotiated and managed their access and rights to knowledge. For example, in an ongoing collaboration, Jenny interactionally created opportunities for Vera to sustain epistemic privileges and validate
her identity as a grandparent, while also showing engagement by providing her own assessment using a tag question that afforded Vera the opportunity to downgrade her assessment. That is, the participants deployed linguistic resources to manage the twin risks of appearing disengaged from the affairs of the other and appearing over-involved with them (i.e., distance-involvement dilemma) (Raymond & Heritage, 2006, p. 701).

Piirainen-Marsh and Tainio (2014) is a CA-for-SLA study that investigated how knowledge asymmetries and changing epistemic statuses impacted the organization of social interaction between two L2 English Finish boys who engaged in a series of video-recorded gaming interactions. Pete is the owner of the game and an experienced gamer, while Kapa is new to playing the game. Since the language of the game was English, the participants had to negotiate epistemic access and positions in consideration of the knowledge of the video game, the authority over the task (e.g., who held the controller), and the ability to read and interpret textual information in English. The study found that, although both Pete and Kapa initially agreed that Pete has better epistemic access to the game (i.e., epistemic congruence), Kapa made increasing interactional efforts in later interactions to negotiate a more symmetrical relationship. For instance, Kapa displayed independent access to knowledge of some aspects of the unfolding situation to claim epistemic primacy. The study concluded that this change in epistemic positions impacted the social organization of the gaming activities and created more equal opportunities to participate.

Sierra (2016) presents on an interactional sociolinguistic examination of how epistemic resources and intertextuality were used to shift frames. Specifically, she analyzed how her gaming friends created a play frame via intertextual ties when interactional dilemmas occurred. The study demonstrated that the use of videogame language that was shared by the
conversational participants (i.e., prior text) allowed them to rekey the conversation by moving the speakers further into a game frame that is “overlapping” (Gordon, 2007) with the original real-life frame to which not all the participants had epistemic access. The author thus argued that the specific reference to a videogame text shifted the epistemic access and enabled speakers of various backgrounds to demonstrate shared group identity.

3.3.6. Conversational Style

Conversational style is a concept developed by Tannen (1987, 2005) to refer to a set of basic tools with which people communicate. These devices include paralinguistic features (e.g., loudness, pitch, pauses, voice quality and tone), use of questions, pacing (e.g., overlaps, rate of speech), repetition, laughter, and topic selection. Tannen (2005) argues that there are patterns according to which certain devices cluster (p. 183). For example, faster rate of speech, faster exchange of turns, avoiding interturn pauses, cooperative overlaps, machine-gun questions (i.e., questions with respect to preceding comments in reduced syntactic forms with high pitch, rapid rate, fast pacing), use of images and details, and mutual revelation (i.e., use of a personal statement to elicit a similar personal statement from the other) often co-occur, and they generally characterize a high-involvement style. In contrast, limited use of overlaps and latching, use of low amplitude and relatively monotonous pitch, less exaggerated contours, and tolerance for silence over noise often co-occur and characterize a high-considerateness style. These two styles are “not a matter of polar distinctions” and exit on a continuum (Tannen, 2005, p. 183). Rather, each person uses a unique mix of conversational devices to serve the “human needs for interpersonal involvement and independence” (p. 185). High-involvement strategies tend to serve
needs for connection, whereas high-considerateness style strategies focus on needs for autonomy; both styles are equally valid.

Conversational styles are shaped by participants’ cultures, and tend to be shared by people from similar backgrounds. For instance, while silence is evaluated negatively in the Western cultures, it does not indicate a communication breakdown in Japan (Watanabe, 1993), because the Japanese read meaning into silences and make decisions based on them. Erickson and Shultz (1982) analyzed academic advising sessions in junior colleges to demonstrate that different conventions for signaling listenership between Americans of European descent and those of African descent resulted in European-American school counselors talking down to African American students. Another example of incompatible conversational styles is given by Yamada (1997) who analyzed conversational data between American and Japanese business people. She states that Americans think Japanese people cannot be fully trusted because Japanese people have the reputation of constantly agreeing but then not keeping their promises. She ascribes this phenomenon to the difference between Americans and the Japanese, with the former distinguishing between listener responses of the “Yes, I am following you” variety and those of “Yes, I agree with you” variety, while the latter do not make this distinction. Consequently, on the one hand, frequent use of aizuchi (i.e., a Japanese word for listener responses) by the Japanese threatens Americans, who consider interjections an encroachment on their right to talk unimpeded; on the other hand, the lack of listener responses by Americans makes Japanese people think that Americans are inattentive. As these examples show, the degree to which one’s message is understood successfully depends on the degree to which conversational styles are similar (including how uses and interpretations of contextualization cues are shared). Thus, incompatibility of conversational styles poses serious challenges to intercultural communication.
The extreme case of this is *complementary schismogenesis*, a term coined by Bateson (1972) to describe what can happen when people with different norms interact. Erickson (1986) provides an example of a job interview where the job applicant and the interviewer from different cultural backgrounds misunderstood each other, as their speaking was influenced by their culturally learned listenership styles. Using the metaphor of “climbing a tree that climbs back,” he describes this situation, saying “their actions together were reciprocal but not complementary. In their mutual tree climbing, the interactional partners did not appear to be climbing each other, but someone else. What happened was jointly produced, to be sure, but the conjoint action was not cybernetically calibrated so that the attempts at repair by one party matched the attempts at repair by the other part” (p. 306). For instance, when people of high-involvement style and high-considerateness style interact, they each react to the other’s differing patterns of behavior by doing more of the opposing behavior. As such, if one person has a conversational style of leaving only a short pause to indicate turns, while the other person has a style of waiting longer, it is likely that the first person increasingly dominates the conversation as s/he tries to encourage the other’s participation. On the other hand, the other person has trouble contributing to the conversation and eventually gives up. This may result in the former thinking that the interlocutor has nothing to say, while the latter perceiving his/her interlocutor as an assertive person who does not let him/her say anything.

**3.3.7. Summary: Insights from Interactional Sociolinguistics**

I hope to have suggested how interactional sociolinguistics, in general, and the key concepts and studies introduced in this section in particular can provide unique insights into the study of reciprocity in eTandem. This perspective enables us to consider conversation as being
layered, multifaceted, and shifting as the definition of a situation changes. Accordingly, the study of reciprocity may focus not only on the linear development of conversational topics (as in the studies reviewed in Chapter 2 such as Cappellini, 2015, 2016 and Schwienhorst, 2004) but also the layers of meanings within a conversational topic, situational definitions that are formed by conversational participants (i.e., framing), and participants’ alignment with what is said (i.e., footing).

Interactional sociolinguistics’ focus on listeners and paralinguistic cues (as contextualization cues) also provides a new insight into the study of discourse in eTandem literature that has often focused on speakers’ linguistic contributions. The epistemic discourse analysis framework provides a dynamic and situated perspective to analyzing the expert and novice relationship in eTandem without making roles and expertise into fixed entities. The study of intertextuality highlights the importance of employing a longitudinal perspective in examining reciprocity, as “the meaning-making process extends beyond individual conversations or texts” (Gordon, 2009, p. 8). Conversational style (Tannen, 1987, 2005) reminds us that cultures influence people’s use of linguistic devices, because different cultural groups show interpersonal engagement and independence to different degrees and by using different sets of linguistic devices. Accordingly, incompatibility of conversational styles may result in intercultural tensions, an interest of telecollaboration scholars (e.g., Ryder & Yamagata-Lynch, 2014; Ware, 2005, reviewed in Chapter 2). The notion of high-involvement and high-considerateness styles (Tannen, 1987, 2005) makes it possible to take a relativistic approach to analyzing interactional patterns that are observed within a dyad and across dyads. The next section briefly summarizes Akiyama (2017b), a precursor study which took an interactional sociolinguistics approach to analyzing the discourse of two of the three dyads that are analyzed in the current study.
3.4. Reciprocity as a Process and Result of Negotiating Culturally-shaped Conversational Styles

Taking an interactional sociolinguistics approach, Akiyama (2017b) analyzed one successful and one unsuccessful eTandem dyad in English, sampled from the same data base that will form the data for the present study. These participants’ success and lack thereof was determined empirically based on (a) degree of satisfaction (as assessed by weekly reflection journal writings and the post-project interview), (b) continuity of interaction beyond the curricular requirement, and (c) the necessity of the coordinator’s intervention. The goal of the study was to discover to what extent the two dyads’ different intercultural experiences could be attributed to their culturally-shaped conversational style (Tannen, 1987, 2005) of turn-taking. The study found that the unsuccessful dyad suffered from the incompatibility of conversational styles in that their different turn-taking systems led to complementary schismogenesis (Bateson, 1972). Specifically, the Japanese participant was a high-considerateness communicator who followed the Japanese listenership style and used silence as a contextualization cue (Gumperz, 1982) for linguistic help. In contrast, his American partner was a high-involvement communicator who considered silence as a lack of involvement. As a result, in response to his Japanese partner’s silences, the American NS attempted to show involvement by speaking more and faster and engaged in hyperexplanation (Erickson, 1986). This led to providing fewer opportunities for the Japanese participant to contribute to the conversation, and he indeed became increasingly silent. In the end, this vicious cycle only aggravated the lack of co-construction of talk and contributed to this dyad’s sense of lack of success over the duration of the eTandem experience. Figure 2 visually represents the unsuccessful dyad’s turn negotiation cycle. It shows that the dyad’s unsuccessful turn negotiation, which was influenced by individual
and cultural differences such as their L2 proficiency, culturally-shaped conversational style, and intercultural experience, led to reducing the chance for them to get to know each other and share knowledge schema about each other’s language and culture. As a result, they could not effectively recipient design their talk, which exacerbated their problem with turn-taking even further.

Figure 2. Vicious Cycle of Turn Negotiation

In contrast to the vicious cycle, the successful dyad’s interaction was marked by the lack of silence as a contextualization cue. In fact, their conversation contained no pauses that were longer than one second. This is because, despite the possibility of risking face, the NNS in the successful dyad actively negotiated for meaning when communication breakdowns occurred, instead of expecting his American interlocutor to interpret the meaning behind his silence. This successful dyad’s turn negotiation led to sharing a knowledge schema about each other’s
language and culture, improving recipient design, and adjusting their speech accordingly. Such personalized speech, in turn, led to the co-construction of turns (i.e., virtuous cycle). Based on these observations, the study concluded that the lack of awareness regarding differences in conversational style would make it difficult to achieve mutual understanding and result in attribution of negative personal traits. Table 1 compares the successful vs. unsuccessful dyads in Akiyama (2017b).

Table 1. Comparison Between a Successful vs. an Unsuccessful Dyads (Akiyama, 2017b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsuccessful Dyad</th>
<th>Successful Dyad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>There is a lack of high-involvement conversational strategies. The conversation</td>
<td>There are frequent repetitions, expressive responses, and listener responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement</td>
<td>is characterized by frequent silences and pauses, lack of overlaps, and relatively</td>
<td>The conversation is characterized by the lack of pauses, frequent change of pitch,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style</td>
<td>monotonous, slow-paced conversation.</td>
<td>amplitude, and voice qualities, and frequent interturn listener responses that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>overlap with the speaker’s utterances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient design</td>
<td>Most contextualization cues are misinterpreted. As a result, recipient design</td>
<td>Most contextualization cues are picked up successfully. Both prospective and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>malfunctions, which leads to complementary schismogenesis where the NNS uses</td>
<td>retrospective recipient design is in action, and both NS and NNS adapt their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more silences and the NS resorts to overexploration.</td>
<td>utterances moment by moment according to listener’s (expected) reactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-construction of</td>
<td>There is a lack of shared turns. Both NS and NNS follow their own culture-specific</td>
<td>Participatory listentship is commonly observed. Both NS and NNS are ready to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talk</td>
<td>way of conversation and expect the other to understand and adjust to his</td>
<td>adjust their conversational style to each other’s and improve recipient design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conversational pattern, rather than trying to find a good balance.</td>
<td>(i.e., accommodation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of</td>
<td>The NNS rarely initiates questions. Instead, he uses silence to avoid the face-</td>
<td>The NNS asks the NS partner questions to confirm his understanding despite the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status and power</td>
<td>threatening act of questioning and expects the NS to pick up the silence cue for</td>
<td>disadvantaged position as a NNS and the potential of risking face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference</td>
<td>linguistic help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5. Reciprocity and Technology Mediation: A Multimodal Discourse Perspective

The eTandem exchanges that will be the focus of this study took place in a video-mediated technological environment. While such online communication that simulates face-to-face interaction has become a part of our daily life, the role of video mediation has yet to undergo broad formal investigation for effective foreign language instruction (Petersen & Sachs, 2015). Indeed, although video technology brings face-to-face communication to the internet, video-mediated interactions poses specific challenges that are distinct from “normal” face-to-face co-present interactions (Manstead, Lea, & Goh, 2011). Thus, I argue that video mediation is one of the design features in need of addressing when investigating reciprocity, as multimodal resources that are deployed in virtual (physically displaced) space may greatly influence the enactment of reciprocity in eTandem interaction. In this section, I review key concepts from the study of multimodality which will inform my study.

3.5.1. Language and Bodily Conduct

The privileged treatment of verbal communication as well as the technical complications in analyzing multimodal data has led to the current state of research that overlooks much of the complexity of human communication. Taking a multimodal perspective in the study of reciprocity is important because “if we do not attend to non-verbal behavior, we may be missing important aspects of the communication, especially in situations where language competency is an issue” (Seo & Koshik, 2010, p. 2238). Indeed, past research has found that not-yet-fluent learners employ various embodied actions to complete their turns (Olsher, 2004; Seo & Koshik, 2010).
Mutual contextualization is a notion that states that turns are jointly constructed through language and body and they together enhance the projectability of human conduct (Hayashi, 2005). One relevant notion is message abundancy (Gibbons, 2003; Sharpe, 2006), which suggests that duplicating the same message via multiple cues (e.g., oral and gestural cues) provides additional support for the interlocutor. For example, Aoki (2011) found that head nods are used together with eye gaze by Japanese speakers. Speakers not only look at but also nod at recipients when they expect recipients to respond. Alternatively, when speakers are not ready to receive responses from them, for example during a word search, or what M. H. Goodwin and C. Goodwin (1986) calls a solitary word search, or near turn-entry points, speakers look away and do not engage in mutual gaze to forestall responses from recipients (Kendon, 1967). Delivery of a message using multiple cues can also be considered a compensatory device in that one supplements the other (Goodwin, 2011; Gullberg, 2011). As such, language learners use all means at their disposal to match communicative intentions with expressive means (Gullberg, 2011).

3.5.2. Bodily Conduct and the Surrounding Environment

Bodily conduct can be used independently from speech. Seo and Koshik (2010) found that two types of gestures are used as an indicator of trouble in understanding, namely as an other-initiated repair initiator. One gesture consists of a sharp head turn or head tilt to the side, with continued eye gaze on the recipient, sometimes accompanied by a widening of the eyes. The other is a head poke forward, accompanied with a movement of the upper body forward toward the recipient. These gestures are used both by NSs and NNSs and are initiated in the turn transition space after the trouble source and held through the following turn(s) of talk until the
problem is resolved. Another example is Japanese speakers’ use of a specific type of head nods (e.g., regular vs. stretched nods) in a particular location of an utterance to elicit particular recipient responses from interlocutors. Aoki (2011) found that, while a head nod placed in the turn-final position is intended to elicit recipients’ immediate reactions that are relevant to speakers’ prior turns, a head nod in the midst of prosodic units is used to increase prominence and draw recipients’ attention to a certain piece of information in the utterance.

In the analysis of multimodal communication, it is also important to consider the material surround and its effect on how people communicate. Mehus (2011) found that caregivers skillfully accomplish their communicative objective and regulate children’s behavior via multimodal bricolage, namely innovative and improvisational use of resources that are afforded by the local environment. These resources range from verbal and gestural routines to toys, one’s bodies, and furniture (e.g., use of a chair to create a boundary in space). In language learning, the presence of a dictionary also changes the dynamics of interaction. Barrow (2008) analyzed the use of an electronic dictionary in a dyadic conversation between English learners in Japan from the multimodal CA perspective. The study found that learners used an electronic dictionary collaboratively, utilizing both vocal and nonvocal resources to co-construct the meaning of look-up words, and achieved mutual understanding. As these examples suggest, people are constantly assessing the affordances of available materials and using them in an innovative and locally-situated manner, while being influenced by the surrounding environment.

3.5.3. Physical vs. Social Presence

As mentioned above, although video technology brings face-to-face communication to the internet, there are important differences between “normal” face-to-face co-present
interactions and video-mediated interactions over the internet (Manstead et al., 2011). For instance, while participants in face-to-face communication are co-present and are aware of the capacity to relate to another participant in the physical space, videoconferencing is characterized by the absence of physical presence. Thus, researchers differentiate physical presence from social presence, which is defined as the degree of salience of the other person in the interaction and the consequent salience of the interpersonal relationship (Short, Williams, & Christie, 1976), namely the perceived proximity to real time communication in face-to-face settings. Short et al. (1976) suggested that there are two factors that promote social presence: “intimacy,” namely the psychological proximity of the interlocutors, and “immediacy,” namely the perceived familiarity caused by social behavior such as eye gazing, nodding, and smiling. If conversational participants maximize interactional potential by utilizing affordances of video mediation, it is possible to achieve high social presence even without participants’ sharing the physical space (e.g., Wang, 2006).

Indeed, social presence is an important factor for promoting learning in distance learning (McIsaac & Gunawardena, 1996) and is considered to be emotionally effective, as it enhances learners’ satisfaction with learning (Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997). Thus, as suggested by Kern (2014), it is essential to examine the role of technological mediation, which is often invisible in SLA research, so that pedagogy can reflect and enhance the relationship between medium, language use, and learning (i.e., relational pedagogy).

3.5.4. Summary: Insights from Multimodal Discourse Analysis

Drawing on insights from these multimodal discourse studies above, I argue that the study of reciprocity on eTandem should analyze multimodal data as such, rather than stripping
the data from their multimodality and inspecting written transcripts only or language only. For one, this is because multimodal resources are often utilized to increase message abundancy (Gibbons, 2003; Sharpe, 2006) when participants’ language competency is limited, such as in the case of NS-NNS interaction. Secondly, our communication is multimodal in nature in that both verbal and non-verbal means contextualize each other for increasing projectability. Lastly, especially in video-mediated eTandem research, where social presence can be limited due to the lack of physical presence, the surrounding environment may greatly influence the enactment of reciprocity. Thus, the study of reciprocity should focus not only on the verbal channel but also non-verbal channel and affordances of a particular technology tool (e.g., Google Hangouts).

3.6. Conclusion

In this chapter, I attempted to demonstrate how SLA and discourse analysis research may add new insights to the study of reciprocity, uncover its various definitions, and provide methodological tools for analyzing the construct. The studies presented in this chapter are contrastive from those in Chapter 2, the majority of which has never gone beyond the traditional sense of reciprocity (i.e., equal contribution). Specifically, this chapter has introduced four major insights from SLA and discourse analysis research. The first viewpoint comes from SLA and focuses on reciprocity that is observed in interactional patterns of mutuality and equality, two features of reciprocity (e.g., Storch, 2002; Tan et al., 2010). Although these studies did not trace how each dyad changed or did not change these interactional patterns over time, taking such a longitudinal perspective may be useful for examining whether and how reciprocity configurations change in each dyad. In addition, it will be interesting to take this perspective and compare how interactional patterns may differ within a dyad depending on the language spoken,
the degree of cultural expertise, or both that is negotiated between the partners. Such analysis will enable us to examine both language parts in the two halves of the eTandem sessions, unlike many of the previous eTandem studies that tend to focus only on one language in a study.

The second perspective comes from CA-for-SLA and assumes that conversational roles are dynamically constructed and negotiated in a situated manner. The first and second perspectives are similar in that they focus on conversational roles such as expert vs. novice, but this latter perspective enables us to move away from the previous eTandem research, which has focused on languages spoken and topics discussed, from the traditional notion of reciprocity as equality, or equality and mutuality at best, to a new area of research that focuses on what invokes such roles, how participants negotiate conversational roles (e.g., expert vs. novice), and how these are related to the enactment of reciprocity in interaction.

The third perspective was drawn from the interactional sociolinguistics approach to discourse analysis. The chapter provided an overview of several major concepts used in interactional sociolinguistics including listenership, contextualization cues, framing, footing, reframing and rekeying, epistemics, and conversational style. The interactional sociolinguistics perspective is useful especially when reciprocity is examined as a multifaceted construct that shifts its form as the definition of a situation changes. It also allows us to examine reciprocity as a co-constructed product because it takes it at the heart of its analysis that speakers and listeners influence each other. The idea of intertextuality also advances the study of reciprocity in eTandem, because it provides a longitudinal perspective to the analysis of interaction history.

Finally, employing a multimodal discourse approach advances the study of reciprocity to the next level where the construct is studied as the joint construction of both verbal and non-verbal means. The multimodal discourse perspective also reminds us that participants’
interactional behavior and sense of social presence are influenced by how they use the material surround and technological affordances.
Chapter 4

The Current Study

This chapter introduces the eTandem project based on which the current study is written. The data I analyzed in the current study were approved by Georgetown University’s IRB 2014-0921 and were collected as part of a funded research project with Michael Ferreira of Georgetown University as Principal Investigator in the U.S. site (Georgetown University’s Initiative on Technology-Enhanced Learning Grants) and Kazuya Saito of Birbeck College, formerly of Waseda University, as Principal Investigator in the Japan site (Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research No. 26770202 from the Ministry of Education in Japan). Note that other studies stemming from this project and data have been published or are forthcoming in several venues including Akiyama (2017b), Akiyama and Saito (2016), and Saito and Akiyama (2017), although they do not address reciprocity as a research question. Below, I will first provide the details of the project (participants and partner matching, project schedule, technology environment, corrective feedback training, and interaction sessions). I will then describe the various types of data analyzed in this study and illustrate how I selected a portion of interactional data for focal analyses. Finally, I will conclude the section by proposing several ways of analyzing reciprocity based on the previous telecollaboration and SLA/discourse analysis literature (see Chapter 2 and 3).

4.1. Participants and Partner Matching

A total of 30 learners of Japanese in six American universities and 30 learners of English in three Japanese universities participated in this eTandem project, either as students enrolled in a one-credit course or as volunteer exchange partners aside from their regular classroom
instruction. This study carefully selected participants with various demographic backgrounds in order to represent a wide range of proficiency levels in their respective L2. Thus, the 60 participants ranged from beginners (those who had just completed their first-year Japanese course as the project was launched and those who had never used English outside the classroom context) to advanced learners (e.g., heritage speakers who may pass for a NS of Japanese and those who had intensive training in English instruction and had some overseas experience).

The U.S. group was rather diverse. Of the 30 participants, 19 came from an institution where the author (and the coordinator of the project) was based and the other students came from five other American universities. The group comprised of 21 students whose L1 is English, four students who are heritage speakers of English and Japanese, three students who are native bilingual speakers of English and Chinese, and two students whose L1 is Chinese yet possess native-like proficiency in English. All of the participants were recruited via an email flyer sent via the author’s personal network (e.g., Japanese instructors whom the author had met at a conference/workshop). According to the participants’ accounts, the quality of Japanese instruction in these six universities was similar in that the curriculum focused on form over meaning and that it rarely provided opportunities for the students to use the language with NSs outside the classroom context.

In contrast, all 30 participants in the Japanese group were rather similar in experiences and backgrounds. All were L1 speakers of Japanese. 19 participants were freshmen and sophomores majoring in commerce at a university in Japan, while the other students were volunteer participants who were studying English at two universities where the author used to work. The analysis of the language background questionnaire showed that all of the participants had studied English in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms for at least six years.
prior to the project, typically through grammar-translation methods. While some of them had little experience abroad except for family and school trips, others had a relatively significant amount of experience using English such as engaging in face-to-face/online language exchange and receiving intensive English instruction. The quality of EFL instruction in these three universities was similar in that the curriculum focused on reading/writing over speaking and that it rarely provided opportunities for the students to use the language with NSs outside the classroom context.

The coordinator of the project (and the author of this study) created 30 dyads based on their available times of a week, their proficiency level in the TL, sex, academic major, hobbies, and self-introduction messages written in the TL. To the extent possible, the coordinator attempted to match participants of similar background, so their TL proficiency, sex, and academic and personal interests would be similar to each other’s. In particular, being of the same sex was prioritized because (1) many of the participants stated in a pre-project questionnaire that they wanted to be with a partner of the same sex and (2) the coordinator wanted to remove the possibility of dyads forming a romantic relationship, as past research (e.g., Belz & Kinginger, 2002) has suggested that different-sex partners sometimes bond in a romantic way. Thus, of the 30 dyads, only four dyads were co-ed. As will become relevant in the analysis of Amy and Yoko’s interaction in Chapter 7, however, this matching procedure itself reflected the heteronormative view of the coordinator, who assumed that participants would be heterosexual.

4.2. Project Schedule

Although the 60 participants were required to complete nine sessions, some of them missed the last session. Thus, the participants in this study engaged in an eTandem experience
spanning at least eight *Google Hangouts* sessions over the span of 10 weeks. Each *Hangouts* session lasted for an hour and was equally divided into 30 minutes in English and 30 minutes in Japanese. For weeks 2, 5, and 8, conversational themes related to daily life and culture were designated by the coordinator and counter-balanced for comparison purposes (see Figure 3). For the other six weeks (weeks 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 9), the participants were provided with a list of themes that they could discuss, and they were allowed to choose a theme of their choice if approved by the researcher.

Additionally, the current project included a pre-tandem orientation, which spanned over four weeks in the U.S. and over one week in Japan, and two reflection sessions, one in the middle and one at the end of 10 weeks. Some of the participants who were studying at universities where neither the coordinator nor her collaborator were present took part in online training and reflection sessions offered by the coordinator on an individual or small group basis. The pre-tandem training included instruction on how to use *Google Hangouts*, how to write a weekly reflection journal after each interaction session, and how to provide corrective feedback in the form of recasts (Goo & Mackey, 2013; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Figure 3 shows the overall schedule of the current project.
*n represents the number of dyads who discussed the theme

Figure 3. Project Timeline

### 4.3. Technology Environment

The main tool for communication was *Google Hangouts*, a video-conferencing tool that is equipped with various multimodal functions such as text chatting and screen sharing. To allow flexibility in the way participants carry out a CMC-based conversation, no specific instructions were given regarding how to use the multimodal affordances of *Google Hangouts*. Thus, the main channel of communication was audio-visual. Due to the time difference between Japan and the east coast of the U.S. (12 to 13 hours depending on the time of year), each dyad set up the date/time for each session according to their individual schedules and engaged in the activities using their own computers at home. To keep track of their attendance and participation, the participants were required to video-record their interaction and submit the recording upon completion of every session using a function of *Google Hangouts on Air*. Note also that the
participants were asked not to use a dictionary to the extent possible, so they could engage in negotiation opportunities and receive corrective feedback from their partner. However, as we will see in the Results chapters (Chapter 5-7), consulting an electronic or online dictionary was very common among the 30 dyads, and it indeed provided positive and negative affordances depending on how they used it.

4.4. Corrective Feedback Training

Akiyama (2017a), a precursor study to the current project, investigated the relationship between learner beliefs and actual error correction behavior in eTandem. In the study, participants were trained to provide six types of corrective feedback on their partner’s erroneous utterances based on Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) corrective feedback taxonomy. Examination of the interaction data revealed that the participants used only three types of corrective feedback: recasts (i.e., reformulation of erroneous L2 speech; e.g., “Oh you went shopping” in response to an erroneous utterance, “I went to shopping”), explicit correction (i.e., stating explicitly that the learner has made an error; e.g., “No, you don’t say ‘to shopping.’ You can say you ‘went shopping’”), and clarification requests (i.e., asking for clarification of what the learner has said; e.g., “What do you mean?”), with recasts consisting of more than half of error correction instances. Participants’ perception data, which were collected three times throughout the semester, also revealed that the majority of the participants chose to provide recasts by the middle of the semester because they reported recasts were the most intuitive, easiest, and least intrusive way to provide correction.

Accordingly, informed by Akiyama (2017a), this project trained participants to provide recasts on errors that they thought would hinder successful delivery of a message. In other
words, they were trained to reformulate errors that may decrease *comprehensibility* (Derwing & Munro, 2009), so they would mainly attend to meaningful interaction with selected attention to serious errors (negotiation for comprehensibility, Saito & Akiyama, 2017). In keeping with similar L2 interaction studies (Mackey, 1999; Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000), the training procedure was operationalized as follows:

1. NSs were asked to focus on completing conversational tasks successfully and provide interactional feedback only when natural and appropriate.

2. NSs were introduced to two essentially different constructs of L2 speech learning – improving comprehensibility (easier to understand) vs. reducing accentedness (more nativelike).

3. NSs were explicitly instructed to provide recasts when they found their NNS partners’ linguistic errors to impair the comprehensibility (but not necessarily accentedness) of their speech.

4. To familiarize themselves with the procedure, NSs watched a series of video clips on example recast episodes. For each episode, they discussed with the coordinator what kinds of errors were made (i.e., triggers), and what kinds of corrective feedback were provided to retrieve impaired comprehensibility (e.g., recasts, confirmation requests, clarification requests).

After each session, participants recorded the approximate frequency and types of errors that they and their partner produced, and submitted the data as part of the reflection journal (see Appendix A for the corrective feedback sheet that was based on Mackey’s (2006) notion of a learning journal).
4.5. Interaction Sessions

In each Google Hangouts session, participants started the conversation in English with a five-minute free conversation (i.e., talking about random things such as their highlight of the week and things they did at school) followed by a 25-minute task-based conversation using visuals (see visual-based conversation below). After the 30 minutes, they took a few minutes to complete the reflection journal, and switched languages and followed the same sequence in Japanese. After the whole session, they submitted the reflection journal and interaction data to the coordinator. The order of languages (i.e., English → Japanese) was kept constant in each session in order not to create another variable that may influence the participants’ interaction. Figure 4 shows the overview of each interaction session.

Figure 4. Google Hangouts Session Overview
A type of information exchange task (O’Dowd & Ware, 2009) called *visual-based conversation* on themes related to daily life and culture was used in this project. This is to follow a suggestion by Lee (2002), who found that two-way exchange of information on real-life topics that are theme-based and minimally structured helped students recycle ideas and reinforce language skills. This type of open-ended yet authentic task requires various functional skills such as describing, narrating, and expressing opinions (Lee, 2002), and prompts negotiation for meaning (Doughty & Pica, 1986). As a preparation for the visual-based conversation task, each participant chose two visuals (e.g., Google images) that they thought would represent the culture of Japan and the U.S. and came up with two discussion questions for each visual in their TL. They could choose to send the visuals in advance via email or share the visual via the file transfer and/or screen sharing function of *Google Hangouts* when they interact via *Google Hangouts*.

For instance, if the theme of the week was pop culture (which is the designated theme in week 5 for 10 dyads in Group B), a participant may choose a Japanese singer for the Japanese visual and a Hollywood movie for the American visual and prepare two questions for each visual in their respective TL. This way, NNS participants were responsible for leading the conversation in their TL. This task arrangement also afforded an opportunity for the language learner to be the expert of a cultural topic for one of the visuals (i.e., crossed expertise configuration, Cappellini, 2016; Cappellini & Mompean, 2015).

Note that the visuals that each participant used varied although the topics of interaction were controlled and counter-balanced in weeks 2, 5, and 8. For instance, for the theme of school life, one participant chose a visual of his college dining hall, while another student chose a visual of college graduation. Therefore, it is possible that participants’ oral performance was influenced
by the learners’ choice of visuals. However, the coordinator and her collaborating teacher in Japan decided not to distribute the same visual to all the learners because controlling participants’ conversational topics would be neither ecologically valid nor ideal for carrying out an autonomous, longitudinal learning project like eTandem. In addition, based on the principle of autonomy in eTandem and emphasis on intercultural learning, it was considered crucial for the participants to take responsibility for their own learning by selecting visuals they thought would represent each other’s cultures.

4.6. Data Collected

4.6.1. Interaction Data

The participants video-recorded and submitted their sessions to the author using a function of Google Hangouts on Air upon completion of each session. Since each dyad interacted for an hour, eight to nine times during the 10-week project, the author collected approximately 300 hours of interaction data for the 30 dyads. The technical affordance of Google Hangouts allows only one speaker to be video-recorded. That is, in using Google Hangouts, it is impossible to capture the simultaneous movement of two participants. Accordingly, Google Hangouts users need to choose to whether they (1) let Google Hangouts capture only one speaker (e.g., recording Participant A the whole interaction session, recording Participant A in the English part and Participant B in the Japanese part) or (2) allow the tool to decide which participant to capture via automatic voice detection. If the second setting is chosen, the recording device switches between different speakers, recording whoever is talking louder. Although the participants in the current study were asked to choose the second option, a few of the participants decided to only record their partner’s face because they felt self-conscious about recording their
own image. Thus, the current study purposefully selected three dyads who let the videoconferencing tool capture both participants’ multimodal behavior via automatic voice detection (for more details on how the three dyads were chosen, see *Selection of Dyads and Video Interaction Data for Focal Analysis* below).

4.6.2. Other Types of Data

To supplement the interaction data, the current study collected various types of data from both the American and Japanese participants. Here I will describe the types of data and explain how each piece of data were used in this study.

4.6.2.1. Background survey. All of the participants took a survey, providing their personal information and describing their academic and linguistic background, experience abroad, and personal interests (e.g., hobbies). The survey data were mainly used for matching participants, but this study also utilized the data to provide a rich description of the focal dyads. The survey included questions about their age, school year, academic major as well as their linguistic background (e.g., years of L2 learning experience, most advanced course taken, L1/L2/L3…) and experience abroad. It also asked questions about their language teaching experience and how confident they felt about doing a form of teaching in eTandem. Proficiency in different linguistic domains (e.g., speaking, writing, listening, reading) and participants’ main source of L2 input (e.g., TV, homework, instruction) were also reported in the survey. Additionally, participants described their motivation for taking part in this exchange (e.g., to study abroad, to make friends) in a paragraph. They also stated their preference for conversational topics (e.g., sports, politics) and stated their preferences for a particular type of partner (if any) (e.g., same sex, similar interests).
4.6.2.2. Individual difference survey. Prior to the initiation of the project, all the participants completed a survey on their ICC and motivation profiles. For the former, the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen & Starosta, 2000) was used, and for the latter, Papi’s (2010) motivation survey was used to assess their L2 ideal self (Dörnyei, 2009). These two indexes were chosen because past research on eTandem has revealed a crucial role of ICC (O’Dowd & Ritter, 2006) and motivation (Little & Ushioda, 1998) in implementing an eTandem project.

4.6.2.3. L2 proficiency scores. In order to compare the two cultural groups on a comparable measure of proficiency, the current study measured participants’ English and Japanese proficiency using the Elicited Imitation Test (EIT) developed and validated by Ortega et al. (2002). The EIT is a quick and convenient estimate of learners’ global L2 proficiency (Bley-Vroman & Chaudron, 1994) that is expected to provide a solution to inconsistent reporting practices of proficiency in SLA research. While SLA research has mostly relied on labeling proficiency by the institutional status (e.g., 3rd semester class) and impressionistic definitions of L2 proficiency (e.g., beginners, advanced), as described in Thomas (1994, 2006), these estimates are variable across different studies, making it difficult to reach a conclusion about the impact of proficiency on language learning (Wu & Ortega, 2014). In contrast, the EIT, which has been proven to highly correlate with other criterion measures such as the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (Ortega et al., 2002), enables SLA researchers to quickly assess participants’ proficiency and use the data for grouping participants and as a strategy to minimize the possibility that proficiency, if unmeasured, may become a confounding variable in a study. In addition, since the EIT has been developed in various languages (e.g., Chinese, English, Japanese, Russian, Spanish), it is possible to compare the relative proficiency of participants within a group and within a dyad for both Japanese and English. The test consists of 30 sentences
that range from 7 to 19 syllables, and the participants repeat exactly what they hear after a short pause. Each sentence is scored on a scale of 0 to 4 according to how much of a sentence a participant can repeat accurately, so the score range is from 0 to 120. The test takes approximately eight minutes to complete. In the current study, the EIT was administered before the first interaction session. All of the 30 participants in the U.S. took the EIT, while only 20 participants in Japan did so because it was not a requirement on the Japanese side.

4.6.2.4. Pre- and post-project interviews. Interviews were conducted with all of the American participants before and after the eTandem project. The pre-project interview lasted for about 30 minutes with each participant, and the coordinator asked questions regarding (1) participants’ academic and linguistic background, (2) motivation for and expectation about participating in the project, (3) beliefs about error correction, and (4) experience with intercultural communication. The post-project interview lasted for about 50 minutes, and the questions were regarding (1) their project experience, (2) error correction practices, and (3) reflection on their eTandem experience especially regarding conversational themes, discussion questions, and intercultural tensions, if any, that arose in their eTandem interaction, by looking at the reflection journal (i.e., think-aloud).

As for the Japanese participants, since taking part in interviews was not a requirement on the Japanese side, the coordinator emailed the 30 Japanese participants after the project ended to ask if they could take part in the interview voluntarily. 10 participants agreed to be in the post-project interview. The interview data presented here was used as a supplementary material in understanding participants’ eTandem experiences that may have formed their reciprocity practices.
4.6.2.5. Pre-session preparation log. Before each Hangouts session, participants emailed each other to set up a time to talk, prepared two visuals, and came up with two questions for each visual (see Interaction Sessions above). The pre-session preparation log (see Appendix B) asked participants to indicate the time of a Google Hangouts session and the theme of the week and share visuals they chose and discussion questions. The pre-session preparation information was useful for identifying side sequences (Jefferson, 1972), participants’ (often stereotypical) image of Japanese vs. American culture, and familiarity with the topic.

4.6.2.6. Reflection journal. All of the participants filled out their weekly reflection journal during and after an interaction session. A sample reflection journal entry is included in Appendix A. The journal consisted of two parts: a corrective feedback sheet and reflection questions. The corrective feedback sheet consisted of (1) a section where NSs took notes of NNSs’ errors (i.e., feedback provision) and (2) a section where NNSs reported on their own errors in their L2 (i.e., error report, which is based on Mackey’s (2006) learning journal). While the former was completed after interacting in one’s L1 (i.e., NS as a feedback provider), the latter was completed after interacting in the L2 (i.e., NNS’s reflection of their own errors). For instance, U.S. learners of Japanese completed the feedback provision sheet after the English part and the error report after the Japanese part (see Figure 4 for the session overview).

4.7. Data Analysis

4.7.1. Selection of Dyads and Video Interaction Data for Focal Analysis

A methodological decision had to be made regarding how much of the available data of various kinds should be analyzed in order to satisfactorily address the research questions, for the
various potential indices of reciprocity. I decided how much data to analyze by taking purposive selected samples in the following steps:

1. I examined 60 reflection journals and interview data and categorized the 30 dyads into (1) dyads who were satisfied/successful throughout the project and continued their partnership beyond the curricular requirement (i.e., successful and sustainable partnership, $n = 8$), (2) dyads who were dissatisfied/unsuccessful throughout the project and stopped contacting each other after the 10-week project (i.e., unsuccessful partnership, $n = 4$), (3) dyads who changed their perception over time and became one of the most successful dyads (i.e., transformation, $n = 2$), and (4) dyads who do not belong to any of the three categories and were neither extremely satisfied nor dissatisfied with the project and did not continue their partnership beyond the curricular requirement (i.e., neutral partnership, $n = 16$). This process allowed me to ascribe success or failure to particular instances of eTandem experiences independently from the interaction data themselves.

2. In order to choose a few focal dyads, I first checked the availability and quality of the video interaction data of all the participants in the four groups that were formed in Step #1 (e.g., whether video recordings showed both participants’ images, whether there were any missing data). Next, I examined the comments in the reflection journal and interviews to see if there were particularly interesting comments that indicated the presence and lack of reciprocity (e.g., linguistic/cultural language-related episodes, repair instances). Based on these two inclusion/exclusion criteria, three dyads were selected: Benjamin and Tomoya from the “successful and sustainable partnership” group, Edwin and Hiroyuki from the “unsuccessful partnership” group, and Amy and Yoko from the “transformation” group (pseudonyms used; for more details about each of these three dyads, see Chapter 5-7).
3. The three dyads’ reflection and interview data were analyzed again to make a collection of critical incidents/episodes that seemed particularly relevant to the analysis of reciprocity (e.g., linguistic/cultural language-related episodes, repair instances, code-switching) and to identify factors that seem to influence its enactment (e.g., conversational topics, identity, TL proficiency).

4. Informed by theories of SLA, CA-for-SLA, interactional sociolinguistics, and multimodal discourse analysis, I took a case study approach to analyzing the interaction of the three dyads. Specifically, I did an in-depth qualitative analysis of the interaction data identified in Step #3 (i.e., critical incidents/episodes) and examined their interaction in Session 2 and 8, whenever possible, to uncover any changes in the enactment of reciprocity over time, in any of the examined dimensions or sources of evidence of reciprocity. Session 2 and 8 were chosen because these sessions were counter-balanced in terms of the themes and representative of the dyads’ change in discussing a similar topic (see Figure 3 for the project timeline).

4.7.2. Data Presentation

The video data were transcribed using discourse analysis conventions (Appendix C) in the column style. Column style was chosen because it was considered most appropriate for visualizing the amount of talk following Ochs (1979). Parallel transcription was considered suitable for this particular data also because it resembled the camera configuration of Google Hangouts recordings where only one speaker was captured via automatic detection. Multimodal moves that seemed important for analysis were captured via a sequence of screen shots and inserted into each turn. Japanese utterances were translated into English and placed in
parenthesis. In case of mixed utterances, words in italics were produced in Japanese and words in the Roman alphabet were produced in English.

This study analyzed a total of 26 excerpts, nine in Chapter 5, eight in Chapter 6, and nine in Chapter 7. The excerpts are analyzed and presented in a chronological order; thus, the analysis of English excerpts precedes that of Japanese excerpts. In addition to the interaction data, participants’ reflection and interview data were included throughout the analysis of conversational excerpts, whenever they were considered appropriate.

4.7.3. Structure of the Results Chapters

The next three chapters present the results of the three focal dyads: Benjamin and Tomoya in Chapter 5, Edwin and Hiroyuki in Chapter 6, and Amy and Yoko in Chapter 7. Each Results chapter starts with a summary of what happened to the focal dyad throughout the 10-week interaction. It then describes participants’ background including their academic major, foreign language learning experience, and intercultural experience. The quantitative data on their proficiency in the TL, ICC, and motivation are presented to compare the two participants with each other and with the other two focal dyads as well as with the whole group of 30 participants in the project. Following the introduction of the participants, each chapter provides a preview of the dyad’s discourse features regarding their turn-taking, conversational repair, listenership, conversational roles and identities, conversational style, and L1 vs. L2 use.

The chapter then delves into the analysis of interaction that took place toward the beginning of the project (i.e., Session 1-4). It then presents the analysis of interaction that took place in Session 5-9 to examine how, if any, the enactment of reciprocity changed over time. The chapter then examines a dyad’s use of technological affordances to reveal how the use (and non-
use) of technological affordances mediated the enactment of reciprocity. Although this study did not collect data on participants’ digital literacies per se, I will provide a retrospective account of their technology skills based on the interactional evidence. This is because, as González-Lloret (2014) argues, we need to consider participants’ digital knowledge and technological needs when setting up a technology-mediated project. Finally, each chapter summarizes the main findings regarding the enactment of reciprocity based on the analysis of conversational excerpts as well as reflection and interview data. It analyzes reciprocity in the form of (1) quantitative equality (i.e., number of turns and topic shifts, Schwienhorst, 2004; Schwienhorst and Borgia, 2006), (2) interactional patterns based on equality (i.e., degree of task control) and mutuality (i.e., involvement with each other’s contribution) (cf. Storch, 2002), (3) various forms of exchanged behavior, and (4) compatibility.

4.8. Conclusion: Answering the Research Questions

Before moving onto the Results chapters next, I will recapitulate how I will answer the three research questions. To answer the first research question: “What is reciprocity, and how is it enacted and accomplished?” I will expand and redefine the traditional definition of reciprocity in cTandem by drawing on insights from SLA, CA-for-SLA, interactional sociolinguistics, and multimodal discourse analysis. The definitions of reciprocity analyzed in this study are equality, mutuality, exchanged behavior, and compatibility/sharedness, and these were operationalized as “equal turn distribution,” “interactional patterns based on mutuality and equality,” “mutual revelation” (Tannen, 2005), “speakership and listenership,” and “compatibility in conversational expectations” among others. In the end, I will compare the various definitions and
operationalization of reciprocity in eTandem and discuss what each of them can reveal about participants’ enactment of reciprocity.

The second research question “What factors may impact the enactment of reciprocity in ongoing interaction?” will be answered by exploring the key variables that seem to influence each dyad’s reciprocity configuration. I intend to reveal as many variables as possible by exploring various definitions and operationalizations of reciprocity. These variables may include expert/novice roles, cultural content, identity, positioning, conversational style (Tannen, 1987, 2005), use of technological affordances (e.g., use of text chat, use of an online dictionary), use of the non-verbal channel (e.g., hand gestures, head nods, eye gaze), and proficiency differences between partners.

The third research question “What aspects of reciprocity seem more amenable to change than others in 10 weeks of the eTandem project?” will be answered by tracing dyads’ reciprocity practices over time focusing on Session 2 and 8 and by uncovering the impact of critical incidents on participants’ interaction.
Chapter 5

Benjamin and Tomoya: Reciprocity Success as Collaborative Meaning Making

5.1. Introduction

Benjamin and Tomoya, also analyzed in Akiyama (2017b), were the most successful dyad of the project. This can be gleaned from several facts. They demonstrated the greatest satisfaction and decided to continue the exchange beyond the curricular requirement of nine sessions over 10 weeks; they completed 22 sessions over the 13-month-long partnership, and they still keep in touch via Facebook and email, occasionally updating each other on their lives. Moreover, they actually met in Tokyo and travelled together in Japan when Benjamin visited Japan over a summer break about seven months after the eTandem project ended. As such, this dyad shows a sustainable and autonomous form of the eTandem exchange, and analysis of their reciprocity may reveal the key to its successful implementation.

Below I will first provide more details about the two participants. I will then analyze Session 1, as the first session demonstrated various interactional features that contributed to and predicted their successful implementation of eTandem. I will then revisit the one English excerpt from Session 2 that was analyzed in Akiyama (2017b) and conduct a focal analysis on the enactment of reciprocity. Following the analysis of the English data, I will analyze one Japanese excerpt from Session 2. Finally, I will spend the rest of the chapter analyzing how the dyad maximized the technological affordances of Google Hangouts over time to increase the sense of reciprocity, as this dyad’s interaction was particularly interesting regarding the use of technology.
5.1.1. Participants

Benjamin is a 21-year-old learner of Japanese who majored in biology at his university in the U.S. He had studied Japanese for two years before this project started. He also spent a summer studying Japanese in Japan, and he had the intention to go back there for graduate school. He considered himself an intermediate-level learner and listed listening as his weakness. His father is American and his mother is a third-generation Japanese-American who does not speak any Japanese. Thus, following Valdés (2001), he is considered a heritage speaker in the broad sense (i.e., a learner of his own ancestral language) but not so when narrowly defined, because he is not an individual who “is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken” or who “speaks or at least understands the language and who is to some degree bilingual in that language and in English” (p. 38). He participated in this project because he wanted to improve his speaking and listening skills, so he could communicate with his grandfather who is a second-generation Japanese-American who was born in Hawaii during World War II and does not speak much English.

Tomoya is a 26-year-old learner of English in Japan who majored in engineering for his bachelor’s degree and technology management for his master’s degree. He had studied English for 13 years as part of the Japanese compulsory English education and considered himself an intermediate learner of Japanese. He listed listening and speaking as his weaknesses. Tomoya had participated in language exchange projects on campus and online before this project started; thus he had many international friends on campus and on the Internet. Unlike the majority of other participants whose motivation was language-focused, Tomoya participated in the project because he “wanted to get to know America via English conversation.” In addition, in his self-introduction email that he shared with his partner, he said,
“I was born in Osaka prefecture, which is the second largest city in Japan, so I am familiar with Osaka dialect and mindset... I can share Osaka culture with you if you are interested in it. Also, I have traveled in more than 10 countries, most of which are in Asia, so I would like to share some backpacking experiences with you. Anyway, I hope to enjoy talking with you using Japanese or English.”

This paragraph illustrates that he was focused on sharing who he was, whether it was in English or Japanese. It also highlights Tomoya’s international posture (Yashima, 2009), namely a tendency to relate himself not only to the TL community but also to the international community at large, as exemplified by the fact that Tomoya had backpacked in more than 10 countries.

Table 2 summarizes the results of the pre-project proficiency test and survey regarding participants’ individual profiles. The EIT (Ortega et al., 2002) was used for measuring proficiency; the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen & Starosta, 2000) was used for assessing ICC; and Papi’s (2010) motivation survey was used to assess their L2 ideal self (see Data Collected in Chapter 4). As the table shows, the dyad’s initial proficiency, measured by the EIT, is similar to each other’s and to the group average. As for their age, Tomoya was one of the oldest learners in the Japanese group and was five years older than Benjamin, as Tomoya was a graduate student, while Benjamin was an undergraduate student. Tomoya scored higher in the ICC and motivation scale than Benjamin and in comparison with the group average. This shows that Tomoya was a learner of English with the average proficiency level but with readiness to engage in intercultural communication and determination to learn the English language.
Table 2. Summary of Participants: Benjamin and Tomoya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries of residence</th>
<th>Benjamin</th>
<th>Tomoya</th>
<th>Group Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$M = 20.73$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$SD = 1.87$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency (EIT)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$M = 88.67$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 120 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$SD = 20.95$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>$M = 4.03$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$SD = .48$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation: L2 ideal</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>$M = 4.63$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self (out of 6 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$SD = .73$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Experience abroad      | Has spent one summer in Japan for an intensive Japanese language program; has been exposed to Japanese culture (but not the language) through his mother (a third-generation Japanese American); has travelled to China twice as a child | Has travelled to more than 10 countries | Varies | Varies

5.1.2. Preview of Benjamin and Tomoya’s Typical Discourse Features

Before delving into the analysis of excerpts, it is helpful to preview the qualities that characterized Benjamin and Tomoya’s discourse as a whole and that ultimately were shown (through the more detailed analyses of excerpts below) to contribute to the enactment of reciprocity. Table 3 summarizes such discourse features in Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction. The left column lists the dyad’s interactional features in Session 1 and the right column lists theirs in Session 2 and beyond. The table is categorized by the five features: management of
turns, repairing communication issues, listenership, management of conversational roles and identities, conversational styles, and L1 vs. L2 use. Since, as we will see later, Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction did not differ between languages, the table is not divided by the two languages. The fact that their interaction was similar between the two language parts suggests that their discourse features were reciprocated between the two languages, whether Benjamin or Tomoya held the language expert position (i.e., who was the language expert vs. novice in English/Japanese for a given half of each eTandem session).
Table 3. Summary of Benjamin and Tomoya’s Discourse Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management of turns</th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 2 and Beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The conversation was characterized by the lack of intra-turn and inter-turn pauses. Change of pitch, amplitude, and voice qualities were often observed. Repetition of a word between the two participants was frequent. Participants’ utterances often overlapped.</td>
<td>Tomoya’s intra-turn pauses were observed (Excerpts 6). This may indicate that he was making an effort to simplify his Japanese, as he was determined to do so (see Tomoya’s reflection of Session 1 on p. 101). In contrast, the conversation was characterized by the lack of inter-turn pauses, frequent latching, and collaborative finishes (Excerpt 5). Change of pitch, amplitude, and voice qualities were often observed. Repetition was frequent, especially that of a trouble source (Excerpts 5). Participants’ utterances often overlapped. They redirected a question asked by an interlocutor about their own culture back to the interlocutor who asked the question (Excerpt 6). Turns were equally distributed between the two participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Repairing communication issues | The conversation was characterized by frequent negotiation for meaning when language items (Excerpts 5 and 8) and cultural concepts (Excerpt 7) posed communication difficulties. In negotiating for meaning, the dyad benefited from using the screen sharing function of Google Hangouts, as they could search for a definition of a word, images, videos, etc., in a collaborative manner (e.g., Excerpt 7). The dyad also used a signal delay as an opportunity to switch languages and show their bilingual identities (Excerpt 2). In contrast, they rarely code-switched to negotiate meaning; rather, they used other multimodal affordances (e.g., technology) to resolve communication issues in a designated language. Error correction was sometimes observed in the form of recasts, but the dyad mostly focused on meaning as long as they could understand each other. |

| Listenership | Participatory listenership in the form of cooperative overlaps was commonly observed. In addition, quite a lot of aizuchi (i.e., short listener responses, Maynard, 1986) was observed in both the Japanese and English parts for both participants. A speaker’s ability to recipient design talk prospectively and retrospectively (i.e., adaptation of utterances moment by moment according to listener’s expected reactions) helped the listener contribute to the conversation. |

| Management of conversational | Even in their first interaction session via Google Hangouts, Benjamin and Tomoya used intertextual references (i.e., recontextualization of a prior text) to | Their role assignment was found to be dynamic, as the two participants were able to reciprocate cultural expertise positions via “redirection of questions” and shift between similar patterns in subsequent sessions. |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>roles and identities</th>
<th>position themselves not only as a Japanese/American individual but also as a cosmopolitan, well-travelled individual from Osaka (Tomoya) and an American individual with a Japanese heritage and experience of studying in Japan (Benjamin).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>multiple footings in accordance with a topic of discussion (Excerpt 6). Their use of code-switching demonstrates that the participants felt comfortable demonstrating their bilingual identity and considered each other a bilingual resource (Excerpt 5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational style</td>
<td>Benjamin demonstrated more “high-considerateness” features than Tomoya, who was a very “high-involvement” communicator (Tannen, 1987, 2005). However, they did not suffer from the incompatibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 vs. L2 use</td>
<td>Both Benjamin and Tomoya used code-switching as part of listener responses (Excerpt 1), to indicate a shift of frame (i.e., to indicate an “information processing” frame; Excerpt 5), and to show bilingual identities (Excerpts 2 and 5). In general, the shift of languages was smooth and occurred at the lexical level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2. Session 1: Establishing Friendship and Reciprocity from the Get-go

I will analyze four excerpts that are representative of the dyad’s interaction in Session 1. The theme of Session 1 was self-introduction. The participants were asked to familiarize themselves with each other using visuals that represent themselves. When Session 1 took place, Tomoya was in the Czech Republic travelling with his mother. For that reason, he did not have time to prepare the visuals for this session. However, the analysis of Excerpts 1-4 shows that the dyad was able to carry out the conversation spontaneously and successfully thanks to their use of cross-modal resources (i.e., communication that takes place across different modalities), intertextual resources (i.e., use of a prior text), bilingual resources (i.e., use of both languages), and technological affordances of Google Hangouts.

5.2.1. “Are You Interested in Osaka?”: Use of Intertextual Reference for Positioning

The following conversation in English unfolded approximately 11 minutes into Session 1. Prior to Excerpt 1, the participants engaged in small talk, asking what time it is at each other’s location, and introduced themselves briefly. Benjamin then asked Hiroyuki what he would like to do later in life. Tomoya responded saying that he would volunteer as a teacher in Rwanda and would like to travel the world. In the following conversation, the dyad first talks about Tomoya’s travel history and his intention to work outside Japan for a few years. They then change the topic to talk about Tomoya’s origin (e.g., where he is from) and Benjamin’s experience in Japan when he went there one summer ago.

To analyze the data, I will bring together the concepts of positioning (i.e., a discursive process whereby selves are located in interaction, Davies & Harré, 1990) and intertextual repetition (i.e., reshaping of prior text by the same interlocutors interacting through time...
primarily to create connection between the conversational participants, Gordon, 2009; see also Hamilton, 1996 for a similar view). While intertextual and intratextual repetition exist on a continuum (Johnstone, 1994), intertextual repetition in this study is understood to occur not only through time but also in various modalities such as face-to-face, email, and video interaction. Below I demonstrate how the dyad’s cross-modal intertextual reference to a prior text helped the dyad position themselves in the interaction. Specifically, I argue that the dyad used intertextual resources that they acquired via email exchanges prior to their first Google Hangouts session to negotiate their identities and to familiarize themselves with each other.

Excerpt 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benjamin</th>
<th>Tomoya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 You travel a lot it seems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 [@@]@@</td>
<td>Yeah yeah yeah yeah I like travel’ the world’ so [@]@@@@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (inhaling)) I don’t wanna stay in the same same area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 You don’t wanna live in Japan? or…</td>
<td>@@@ yeah yeah まあと in five years? ten years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (@@@ yeah yeah like in five years? ten years?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 うん。 (Yeah.)</td>
<td>It’s um I don’t I think I don’t need to stay in Japan? @@@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 So xxx now travel and later’ live in Japan? or…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Ah yeah after traveling around the world う ん I will move back to Japan maybe. う ん。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 And you’re from Osaka right?</td>
<td>Yeah yeah yeah yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ok.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are you interested in Osaka?

Uh huh.

うんうん。

(Yeah yeah.)

Ah I wen-went to Tokyo during the summer for a month and a half. So but @@@@@ I’m sure Osaka is kinda different.

In Excerpt 1, the word Osaka created an intertextual link between Benjamin and Tomoya, allowing them to negotiate positioning. In line 10, Benjamin said, “And you’re from Osaka right?” He did so based on the knowledge that he gained via email exchanges with Tomoya (see Tomoya’s introduction email on p. 82). In line 13, Tomoya asked Benjamin, “Are you interested in Osaka?” which is a recontextualized version of Tomoya’s self-introduction email where he said, “I can share Osaka culture with you if you are interested in it.” Here, Tomoya used the intertextual reference to indicate that he could position himself as a proud Osaka-ji, namely a person from Osaka, if Benjamin was interested in his regional identity, although he did not mind being a generic Nihon-ji, namely a person from Japan, if Tomoya was not particularly interested in the region. In response, Benjamin said, “Ah I-I wen-went to Tokyo during the summer for a month and a half. So but @@@@@ I’m sure Osaka is kinda different.” Here, Benjamin positioned himself as somebody who is familiar with Japan, although he does not know enough about Osaka to take a stance on the issue. As this example shows, the dyad’s interaction went beyond the Google Hangouts environment (i.e., to email exchanges) and created a cross-modal intertextual link between the two participants. This way, the dyad could negotiate positioning in a deeper and meaningful way, and this facilitated their friendship building from the very first Google Hangouts session.
5.2.2. Using a Signal Delay as an Opportunity to Show Rapport and a Bilingual Identity

The following exchange is the continuation of Excerpt 1 and unfolded approximately 12 minutes into Session 1. In Excerpt 2, the dyad experiences a temporary signal delay. To resolve it, Benjamin code-switches from English to Japanese, and Tomoya aligns with the shift of languages and used Japanese in response. I argue that the dyad’s shift of languages here indicates that they considered each other a bilingual speaker and utilized it as a resource to show rapport and solidarity, in a similar way to how Tudini’s (2016) eTandem participants used code-switching to correct their partner’s errors in a socially contingent manner.

Excerpt 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benjamin</th>
<th>Tomoya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>(experiencing a signal delay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Oh the delay is going? あ、大丈夫ですか。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Oh the delay is going? *Ah is everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ok.*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Yes. 大丈夫、大丈夫。はい。聞こえる？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<em>Ok ok. Yes, can you hear me?</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>はい。あ～、夏休みは日本に行きました。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Yes. <em>U</em>h the summer break I went to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan. Yes. Um.*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>あ、そうだね。なんか、写真見たよ、写真。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Ah right. You know I saw the photos the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>photos.*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line 17, the dyad experienced a signal delay, which cut off what Tomoya was saying, “Oh you already xxx.” In line 18, Benjamin asked if the delay is going in English and asked how Tomoya was doing in Japanese by saying, “あ、大丈夫ですか。” (*Is everything ok*). Benjamin’s use of Tomoya’s L1 indicates that he used code-switching as a way to establish “group identity and
solidarity” and “rapport” (Tay, 1989, p. 413). It can also mean that Benjamin highlighted the bilingual speaker identity that is shared by both Benjamin and Tomoya. In response to Benjamin’s use of Japanese, Tomoya also switched to Japanese, showing his bilingual identity and rapport in the form of indirectly signaling “I can speak the language you are learning” (line 19). In line 20, Benjamin restated what he said in line 16 of Excerpt 1 but this time in Japanese. Tomoya continued to use Japanese in line 21, demonstrating that he aligned with Benjamin’s language choice. In summary, as the analysis of Excerpt 2 shows, Benjamin and Tomoya used their bilingual repertoire to facilitate their social interaction.

5.2.3. Connected via Facebook: Increased Involvement via Imagery

The following conversation in Japanese is the continuation of Excerpt 2 and unfolded approximately 12.5 minutes into Session 1. In Excerpt 3, the dyad talks about places that Benjamin visited while in Japan. To analyze the conversation, I will extend Tannen’s (2007) idea of imagery as a conversational strategy that creates involvement. Tannen states, “a major form of mutual participation in sensemaking is creating images” (p. 134), as the particularity and familiarity of details make it possible for both speakers and hearers to refer to their memories, talk about recognizable activities, and show involvement. I argue that creating involvement via imagery is possible even without describing an image if the image is shared in conversational participants’ mind. Specifically, I demonstrate how the dyad’s relationship established via Facebook (i.e., a social networking site) increased imagery of the conversation and thus involvement, as mental images of a conversational topic helped the dyad create scenes and spark emotions.
Benjamin: Huh?

Tomoya: 写真。あの Facebook の写真。
(The photos. The Facebook photos.)

23 お、はい、はい。見ましたか。
(Oh yes. You saw.)

Tomoya: 見た見た。見ました。
(I saw I saw (casual register). I saw (formal register).)

24 [お、はい]、はい。見ましたか。
(Oh yes yes. You saw.)

Tomoya: 見た見た。見ました。
(I saw I saw (casual register). I saw (formal register).)

25 あ、はい、はい、ちょっと楽しかったです。
(Ah yes yes. It was a bit fun.)

Tomoya: あ、そうなんだね。どのぐらい？期間。
(Ah I see. How long? Period.)

27 京都と東京に行きました。はい。
(I went to Kyoto and Tokyo. Yes.)

Tomoya: あ、そうなんだね。どのぐらい？期間。
(Ah I see. How long? Period.)

29 う～ん=
(U:n=)

Tomoya: =何日ぐらい?= (=How many days approximately?=)

30 二ヶ月？あ=
(=Two months? Ah=)

Tomoya: =あ、[結構長いね]。
(=Ah [that’s quite long].)

32 二ヶ月ぐらいい。
(Two months approximate.)

Tomoya: =あ、[結構長いね]。
(=Ah [that’s quite long].)

33 う～ん。はい。ちょっと長い。
(U:n. Yes it’s a bit long.)

Tomoya: 長いね。
(It’s long.)

34 あ～、東京で、あ～、日本語を勉強しましたけど=
(A::h in Tokyo a::h I studied Japanese but=)

Tomoya: うんうん。
(=Yeah yeah.)

36 あ～、京都はちょっと旅行しました。
(A::h in Kyoto I travelled a bit.)

Although images are normally created by the speaker who uses words to describe an object and by the hearer who creates an image based on the description, in the case of Benjamin and Tomoya, Tomoya was able to access and visualize what Benjamin was talking about without his
description, because the dyad had been connected via Facebook and Tomoya had seen the actual images before they met via Google Hangouts. Specifically, in line 21 in Excerpt 2, Tomoya said that he had seen “the photos” but without specifying what photos. In line 22, Tomoya asked a clarification request “Huh?” with the trouble source being “the photos” (see line 21 of Excerpt 2). Tomoya clarified himself in line 23, saying that he meant that he saw the photos on Benjamin’s Facebook page. The dyad demonstrated various high-involvement strategies after understanding what the cross-modal inter“textual” referent was (i.e., Facebook photos). For example, latching, which is indicative of participants’ engagement with the ongoing conversation, was frequently observed between line 29 and 32. Their overlaps in line 32 and 33 were collaborative, as the incoming speaker attempted to assist the current speaker by repeating his and his partner’s utterances, such as らーむ月 (two months) and ながい (long).

5.2.4. Collaboratively Exploring a Hometown: Virtual Joint Attention via Screen Sharing

The next excerpt unfolded approximately 25 minutes into Session 1, and about 12 minutes after Excerpt 3. Prior to the conversation in Excerpt 4, Benjamin talked about his hometown in the U.S. and shared his screen, so he could show a few pictures of his house and his family in the U.S., which were stored in his computer. In Excerpt 4, Tomoya reciprocates this move by talking about his hometown in Osaka, where his family used to live, and by using Google Maps. The analysis shows that, despite Tomoya’s failure to prepare visuals for the task in advance, the dyad was able to engage in a highly engaging conversation, as they used screen sharing to create virtual joint attention, which I define as the shared focus of two individuals who are not physically co-present on an object that exists in a virtual space. I argue that this
virtual joint attention afforded by screen sharing allowed the dyad to collaboratively explore a conversational topic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benjamin</th>
<th>Tomoya</th>
<th>Shared Screen (Tomoya's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wait. You can see the my page?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can see your page.</td>
<td>((zooming to Japan))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ok. ((3.44)) My hometown is wait ちょっと待って。</td>
<td>(Ok. ((3.44)) My hometown is wait <em>wait a sec.</em>)</td>
<td>((typing “東大阪” (<em>Higashi-Osaka</em>)))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here’s Osaka? ((moving the cursor around “大阪” (Osaka)))

4 Uh huh.

5 Mmm umm my city is eh 東大阪. (Mmm umm my city is eh Higashi-Osaka.) ((moving the cursor around “東大阪” (Higashi-Osaka)))

6 East [Osaka]? [East O]saka yes. ((moving the cursor around “東大阪” (Higashi-Osaka)))

And then east of Osaka is Nara? Nara= ((moving the cursor around “奈良” (Nara)))

7 =Un
So my hometown is between Osaka and Nara. ((moving the cursor back and forth between “大阪” (Osaka) and “奈良” (Nara)))

Oh ok. Nara has all the deer right?

Yeah yeah yeah. So many deers. ((moving the cursor around “奈良” (Nara)))

They’re adable (ˈædəbl/).

うん very cute.  
(Yeah very cute.)

((showing the streets of his city))
Umm my hometown is actually my hometown is apartment? ((moving the cursor around his apartment))

Ok. ((switching to the satellite view))

This. ((zooming to his apartment and moving the cursor around it))

Oh it’s big. Yeah yeah yeah. Very ordinary apartment.

It LOOKS big. You might be able to go on the street?
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|18| ((switching to the street view))
On the street this is highway. ((moving the cursor around the highway)) |
|19| Ah huh. |
|20| This one. ((pointing at his apartment)) |
|21| You have a video store next to you? |
|22| This shop is for business man. Only business man watch dirty video for pleasure. ((pointing at the video shop next to the apartment)) |
|23| Hahaha ok. |
Excerpt 4 demonstrates the dyad uses screen sharing to create virtual joint attention where the “process” of sensemaking could be monitored. Such joint attention was further facilitated by the use of a cursor as a pointing device in a similar way to how conversational participants in a face-to-face conversation use finger pointing, eye-gazing, and head movement to facilitate joint attention. For example, in line 17, Benjamin suggested that Tomoya switch to the street view, so they could go on the street for a closer look. In line 18, Tomoya switched to the street view and showed the surrounding of his apartment. In line 20, Tomoya pointed at his apartment building with a square pointer, and in line 21, Benjamin noticed that there is a video shop near the apartment, as he could read the Japanese signboard in the shared screen. As demonstrated by this example, having the shared object between the two participants helped them explore Tomoya’s hometown together as opposed to Tomoya providing a one-way explanation. In other words, the dyad’s equal access to the visual information created a chance to contribute to the conversation equally (i.e., reciprocation of conversational contribution). Moreover, the repetition of words uttered by the other speaker (e.g., “East Osaka” in line 6, “on the street” in line 17 and 18) contributed to the collaborative spirit of the exchange.

5.2.5. Summary of Session 1 Interaction

The conversational excerpts in Session 1 revealed that the dyad had engaged in sensemaking via other means of communication than Google Hangouts even before their first encounter in video interaction (Excerpts 1 and 3). Such prior knowledge, acquired via email exchanges and being friends on Facebook, allowed them to not only resort to intertextual resources to negotiate positioning but also helped the dyad visualize the conversation and show
involvement. This way, the dyad’s relationship went beyond the videoconferencing environment, which in turn strengthened their video-mediated interaction.

It is also important to emphasize that the dyad’s interaction was not confined within the video chat environment. Rather, their interactional resources were multimodal, ranging from the email exchange and Facebook (which created cross-modal intertextual links) to video-mediated interaction where the dyad explored each other’s hometown via Google Maps. Thanks to the construction of virtual joint attention, the dyad could attend to the same object even when they were not co-present physically and feel as if they were sitting next to each other looking at the same computer screen, as visually represented in Figure 5. This way, members of the dyad could explore their hometowns collaboratively and reciprocate conversational contributions, as opposed to a topical expert providing a one-way explanation. As a result, their social presence (i.e., the degree of salience of the other person in the interaction and the consequent salience of the interpersonal relationship, Short et al., 1976) increased, and so did their conversational involvement.

Figure 5. Virtual Joint Attention via Screen Sharing in the Video-mediated Context
Lastly, compared to the other dyads of the project, Benjamin and Tomoya often switched languages as a communicative, social, and linguistic strategy (see the analysis of Excerpt 5 for another example of their code-switching). In Excerpt 2, the unexpected signal delay afforded an opportunity for them to switch languages to show rapport and reaffirm the social objectives of eTandem (cf. Tudini, 2016). This communicative strategy available to bilingual speakers not only helped the dyad to appreciate each other as a resource but also confirmed their “group identity and solidarity” (Tay, 1989, p. 413).

In summary, Benjamin and Tomoya utilized various communicative strategies for successful interaction including the use of cross-modal resources (i.e., communication that takes place across different modalities), intertextual resources (i.e., use of a prior text), bilingual resources (i.e., use of both languages), and technological affordances. Their first encounter started out very well, and such successful interaction facilitated the establishment of their friendship and conversational rapport and predicted their success in eTandem.
5.3. Session 2: Establishing and Sustaining a Virtuous Cycle

When we are speaking in Japanese, I feel like I am speaking Japanese too long. (I wonder if my mind is subconsciously trying to answer my partner’s questions to the best of my abilities.) I will make sure to simplify my answers a little bit more and redirect questions to him, so I can create more opportunities for my partner to speak.

(Tomoya, from his reflection of Session 1)

This is a comment that Tomoya wrote in his reflection journal after Session 1. It reveals that, although the dyad started out very well in Session 1 (especially when compared with many other dyads in the project), Tomoya was not satisfied with his performance as a language expert; he engaged in reflective practice and made an effort to improve his performance. One solution he came up with was “再質問” (sai + shitsumon, which literally means “again + questions”), by which he meant “redirection of questions,” or changing the direction of a question and asking the same question to the person who asked it. Although such a phrase does not exist in the Japanese language, Tomoya was metacognitively aware of this communicative strategy and thought it would be useful for creating more learning opportunities for his partner. As the analysis of Excerpt 6 reveals,
members of this dyad redirected questions to each other and switched cultural expertise positions in a dynamic manner, and this maximized the potential of the eTandem arrangement.

Below I will analyze two excerpts from Session 2. The theme of Session 2 was lifestyles. In the English part of the session, Benjamin and Tomoya talked about the custom of wearing or not wearing shoes in the house. In the Japanese part of the interaction, they talked about safety of children who go to school without the presence of guardians. Akiyama (2017b) analyzed Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction in the English part of Session 2, focusing on their turn-taking practices. The study found that the dyad’s successful turn negotiation allowed for the exchange of linguistically appropriate input and output, and this further improved their collaborative turn-taking (i.e., a virtuous cycle). Below I will revisit one of the two excerpts analyzed in Akiyama (2017b), this time focusing on the enactment of reciprocity. Following the analysis of the English data, I will analyze one Japanese excerpt. The analysis of the two excerpts (Excerpts 5 and 6) demonstrates how the dyad engaged in a successful conversation by adopting various situated identities instead of remaining in one conversational role and by appreciating their shared bilingual identity. Note that the analysis below is based on audio data because Benjamin, who was video-recording the conversation, did not enable automatic voice detection and only recorded Tomoya’s shared screen.

5.3.1. Juggling Multiple Frames to Tackle Incompatible Knowledge Schemas

The following conversation, which was analyzed in Akiyama (2017b), unfolded about 18 minutes into Session 2. In Excerpt 5, Benjamin and Tomoya are discussing when American people do not have their shoes on in their house. To analyze the data, I will bring together the
concepts of *frames* and *knowledge schemas* (Tannen & Wallat, 1987). These two concepts both refer to “structures of expectation” (p. 206); frame, or what they call interactive frame, is defined as “participants’ sense of what is being done” (p. 215) upon which our interactive interpretation is based and without which no utterance can be interpreted, and knowledge schemas are as a knowledge structure that represents people’s expectations and assumptions about “people, objects, events and settings in the world” (p. 207). Tannen and Wallat described a pediatrician who juggled three frames (examination, consultation, and social encounter frames) to tackle the incompatibility of knowledge schemas between the doctor and a child’s mother regarding health and cerebral palsy, calling it a good medical practice. Using these two concepts, I demonstrate how Benjiamin and Tomoya juggled different frames to make their knowledge schemas about each other’s language and culture compatible. Specifically, I show how the dyad shifted between the “cultural teaching and learning” frame (i.e., a frame where one of the participants functions as an expert of his own culture and teaches it to the other participant who functions as a novice of the culture), the “language teaching and learning” frame (i.e., a frame where one of the participants functions as an expert of his L1 and teaches it to the other participant who functions as a novice of the language), and the “information processing” frame (i.e., a frame where the participants disengage from the ongoing interaction momentarily to process newly acquired information) to achieve mutual understanding.

Excerpt 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benjamin</th>
<th>Tomoya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I think most people when they wake up would I don’t know they might be wearing socks or just be without socks or shoes.</td>
<td>Ah huh huh huh huh huh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | Barefoot?=
| 3 *Barefoot* is what we call it. I don’t know. Do you know? that word? barefoot? |=
| 4 |
=Ye(h)[ah].
It means no s- no s- shoes or socks.
[So] just just your foot. @@@

[I don’t know] barefoot.
Ah huh huh huh [huh huh].
Just your feet ね?= (Just your feet right?=)

Barefoot [barefoot] is=
=comfortable comfortable right?

そうだね。Uh huh なるほどね。I see.
So ah huh ah huh なるほどね。
(Right. Uh huh. I see. I see. So ah huh ah huh. I see.)

Ok ok I understand. Ah so your ah your house is a mix in tha ah your mom your mom have some ah Japanese culture so.

Yeah. @@@@@

So so I’m used to taking off my shoes.

@@@@@

Un un un un un un un.

But I know other Americans probably when they get home don’t take off their shoes=

=Oh really.

In Excerpt 5, I suggest that the two participants tried to make their knowledge schemas about each other’s language and culture compatible by juggling multiple frames in a similar way to how the skillful doctor in Tannen and Wallat’s (1987) study did. As for Benjamin, he skillfully switched between the “cultural teaching and learning” frame and the “language teaching and learning” frame. In line 1, Benjamin was in the “cultural teaching and learning” frame, as demonstrated by the relatively lengthy sentences about American culture, “I think most people when they wake up would I don’t know they might be wearing socks or just be without socks or shoes.” In line 3, Benjamin shifted to the “language teaching and learning” frame, as
demonstrated by the use of the metalinguistic term “word,” “the frequent use of rising intonation (e.g., Do you know? the word? barefoot?), the use of relatively shorter sentences, and the repetition of the target word “barefoot.” Benjamin’s explanation of the word in line 6 and 7 also demonstrated that Benjamin not only assessed Tomoya’s English proficiency level accurately but also selected level-appropriate vocabulary and grammar to explain “barefoot.” It is notable here that Benjamin did not correct Tomoya’s error in line 9 when he said “foots” instead of “feet.” This exemplifies how members of this dyad approached error correction, namely selective focus on errors that would reduce comprehensibility (see Chapter 7 for a contrastive pattern of error correction by Amy and Yoko).

As for Tomoya, he also juggled frames dexterously. What is particularly interesting is his use of code-switching. For instance, in line 8, Tomoya said, “Just your foots ね?” (Just your foots right?) and used the sentence-final particle ね (ne) to make a confirmation check. Note that ね (ne) is a sentence-final particle that indexes cooperativeness, intimacy, and solidarity (Cook, 1992) and is often used to elicit agreement or confirmation from the hearer (Yoshimi, 1999). Here, Tomoya code-switched to Japanese, so he could process and internalize the newly acquired knowledge in his own pace. Thus, this code-switching marked the shift from the “language teaching and learning” frame to the “information processing” frame, where Tomoya could take some time to reflect on the TL. After Benjamin also code-switched to Japanese and confirmed the meaning of the word “barefoot” in line 9, Tomoya again shifted to the “language teaching and learning” frame to test his hypothesis about the word “barefoot.” He did so by using the word in a newly created sentence, “Barefoot [barefoot] is comfortable comfortable right?” (line 10, 12). As Benjamin and Tomoya’s laughing in line 14 and 15 indicates, the two participants had fun learning and teaching the language.
Finally understanding the meaning and usage of the word “barefoot” (line 16), Tomoya then shifted to the “cultural teaching and learning” frame in line 18 and engaged in a confirmation check, saying “Ah so your ah your house is a mix in tha ah your mom your mom have some ah Japanese culture so.” Here, it is interesting that Tomoya left his sentence incomplete (see Taguchi, 2014 for more detailed explanation of incomplete sentences in Japanese), and this incompleteness invited for a “collaborative finish” (Lerner, 1989, 1991) by Benjamin, who completed the previous speaker’s utterance by saying, “So so I’m used to taking off my shoes.” In summary, as this collaborative exchange of turns shows, the two participants achieved the compatibility of their knowledge schemas about each other’s language and culture by dynamically shifting frames and aligning with each other in accordance with the changing definitions of a situation.

5.3.2. Reciprocating Cultural Expertise Positions by Shifting Footings

Excerpt 6, which took place in the Japanese part of Session 2, unfolded about 48 minutes into the session, and about 24 minutes after Excerpt 5. Prior to the excerpt below, Benjamin showed a picture of school children that he took when he visited Japan. He explained that he was surprised that Japanese children were walking alone without their parents. In Excerpt 6, the dyad is talking about the difference between Japan and the U.S. regarding the presence of guardians when children go to school. To analyze the data, I will use Goffman’s (1981) concept of footing, namely alignments between people “as well as between themselves and what is said” (Gordon, 2015, p. 325). I argue that the dyad maximized the affordances of the eTandem setting by shifting between multiple footings in accordance with a topic of discussion and by changing the
direction of a question (i.e., subsequently asking the interlocutor who asked the question about his/her culture).

**Excerpt 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benjamin</th>
<th>Tomoya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 一つ目の質問は子供さんは一人で歩きますね。危ないと思いますか。  
(My first question is children walk alone. Do you think it is dangerous.) | あ～、まあ、確かに、女の子、が、子供が一人で歩くことはあるね。  
(A::h Yeah certainly there are times when girls or kids walk alone.) |
| 2 | | |
| 3 うん。  
(Yeah.) | | |
| 4 [はい]。  
(/Yes.) | あの～、特に、(1.19) えっと～、(1.23)学校に行く時、[と] 帰る時。  
(We::ll especially (1.19) u:mm (1.23) when they go to school [and] when they go home.) |
| 5 はい。  
(Yes.) | | |
| 6 [はい、はい]。  
(/Yeah yeah.) | そう。だから、危ない、[けど～]、(1.00) そうだね～、普通だね、日本だと。アメリカは？  
(Yeah so it is dangerous [bu::t] (1.00) we::ll it is normal in Japan. How about America?) |
| 7 ＠＠＠＠ アメリカには、本当に危ないと思います。  
(@@ In America I think it is really dangerous.) | あ～、そうなんだ。  
(A::h is that so.) |
| 8 | | |
| 9 うん。あ～、悪い人は、[が、を]、が多いいと思いま(h)す＝  
(Yes. A::h bad people are [are are] are many.) | う～ん]。  
([Umm].) |
| 10 | =え！アメリカは、(1.28) え～、学校に行く時は～= |
Between line 1 and 6 when Tomoya answered Benjamin’s question about Japanese school children, Benjamin took up a footing of a novice of Japanese culture/interviewer by producing listener feedback such as うん (yeah) and はい (yes), while Tomoya took up a footing of an expert of Japanese culture/interviewee. In line 6, Tomoya asked Benjamin “アメリカは？” (How about America?) and took up a footing of a novice of American culture/interviewer. In response, Benjamin stated his opinion with “思います” (I think), saying “@@@ アメリカに
は、本当に危ないと思います。” (@@@ In America I think it is really dangerous) and took up the footing of a cultural expert/interviewee (line 7). In line 8, Tomoya acknowledged receipt of this information by saying “あ～、そうなんだ” (A::h is that so), and in line 10, he took up a footing of a novice of American culture/interviewer by self-nominating for a turn via a turn-insertion device, “え” (Eh), and asking how people in the U.S. go to school (line 11 and 13). Frequent repetition of words (e.g., bus, car) between line 14 and 19 indicates that Benjamin and Tomoya achieved mutual understanding. Finally, in line 20, Tomoya made an evaluative comment, saying “え？ベンジャミンさん、めっちゃVIPだね @@@” (Eh? Benjamin you’re freaking VIP @@@) regarding Benjamin’s provision of information that American parents often drive their children to school. The word choice of “めっちゃ” (meccha, an intensifier in Japanese, which is equivalent of “freaking”) and “VIP” (bippu, Very Important Person) as well as his laughing indicated that Tomoya rekeyed (Tannen, 2006) the conversation and shifted to the joking frame. In response, Benjamin aligned with Tomoya and said, “@@@ そうですね。” (@@@ That is so), which indicated that Benjamin took up a footing of a co-joker. Immediately after his co-joking, Benjamin took up a footing of a novice of Japanese culture/interviewer and asked, “日本で車でバスで両親が学校に連れてってくれますか。” (@@@ That is so. In Japan do parents take their children to school by car and by bus?), which again changed the cultural expertise status of the two participants.

As these examples show, the dyad shifted between multiple footings in a dynamic and situated manner. In fact, this dyad was particularly skillful at moving back and forth between topics of Japan vs. the U.S., whether the initiator of the topic was Benjamin or Tomoya and whichever individual possessed the visual prompt, because the dyad possessed the ability to reciprocate cultural expertise positions. Specifically, Benjamin and Tomoya asked
questions/made comments that changed the cultural expertise positions of the participants and averted staying in one “role” (e.g., expert vs. novice of a language and culture) that was assigned depending on the language spoken and topic of the conversation. This demonstrates that the ability to shift multiple footings in accordance with a topic of discussion, namely a discursive practice of a “dexterous speaker” (Goffman, 1981, p. 156), and in particular the ability to redirect questions, contributed to their successful, reciprocal conversation.

5.3.3. Summary of Session 2 Interaction

Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction was characterized by various linguistic devices that show high-involvement style such as fast-paced exchange of short turns, lack of silences, collaborative finishes, expressive responses, and laughter. Their highly engaging conversation was a result of their juggling multiple frames to resolve incompatibility of knowledge schemas about each other’s language and culture (Excerpt 5) and shifting between various footings to maximize the affordances of the eTandem context (Excerpt 6).

First, this dyad was particularly adept at managing the incompatibility of knowledge schemas by interacting in accordance with the dynamically changing definition of a situation. Specifically, Benjamin left the “cultural teaching and learning” frame to provide linguistic scaffolding as an expert of English in anticipation of Tomoya’s comprehension difficulty. His explanation of the trouble source was appropriate to Tomoya’s English proficiency level, showing he was capable of providing appropriate scaffolding. In response, Tomoya signaled to Benjamin his intention to learn English as a language novice in the “language teaching and learning” frame, used code-switching to indicate that he was processing the newly acquired information and reflecting upon language use, and engaged in a confirmation check about
Benjamin’s culture using the newly acquired vocabulary. Tomoya’s use of code-switching probably suggests that the atmosphere of their conversation allowed their bilingual identities to reveal themselves, given that their identity as a bilingual speaker was considered a resource (cf. Tudini, 2016).

Secondly, the analysis of the Japanese interaction revealed that Benjamin and Tomoya benefited from the eTandem set-up because they were adept at shifting between various footings. This dynamic shift of footings was achieved by making a comment about each other’s utterances and by asking a follow-up question about each other’s culture. This linguistic strategy is reflective of a “dexterous speaker” (Goffman, 1981, p. 156), and it also led to the reciprocation of conversational topics and cultural expertise positions; and contributed to obscuring the clear boundary between the speaker vs. listener, expert vs. novice, and interviewer vs. interviewee.

5.3.4. Interaction After Session 2

The virtuous cycle (Akiyama, 2017b) and reciprocity configuration observed in Session 1 and 2 became a part of regular interaction and continued until the end of their partnership. This indicates that, once their friendship and reciprocity were established, we can speculate that their partnership will only improve through regular interaction.

As the next section of this chapter on the use of technological affordances will reveal, what changed over time about Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction was not so much the way they enacted reciprocity, as they had established a reciprocal pattern of interaction in Session 1 and 2 and continued to demonstrate the same reciprocity pattern for the whole duration of the project. Rather, a significant change was observed in the way they utilized their bilingual and technology resources to create language and cultural learning opportunities.
5.4. Benjamin and Tomoya’s Use of Technological Affordances

I think we didn’t quite know each other’s skill levels at the language, so both he and I probably used language that was too complex for each other. However, I think as we get to know each other, it will become easier. I will say though, Screen sharing through hangouts is pretty neat!

(Benjamin, from his reflection of Session 1)

This is a part of Benjamin’s reflection on Session 1. As the analysis of Session 1 demonstrated, the dyad was adept at utilizing the affordances of the video-mediated environment even from the first interaction session. Benjamin and Tomoya created cross-modal intertextual links (i.e., the use of a prior text across different modalities) via email exchanges (Excerpt 1) and via being friends on Facebook (Excerpt 3), and used the screen sharing function of Google Hangouts in combination with Google Maps to explore Tomoya’s hometown (Excerpt 4). Such technology-enhanced interaction characterized the dyad’s interaction throughout their 13-month-long partnership that took place not only via Google Hangouts but also via Facebook, Facebook Messenger, and email exchanges.

It is important to note that Tomoya was one of the most proficient users of technology in the entire eTandem project. This is because he majored in engineering for his bachelor’s degree and technology management for his master’s degree. In addition, he often used videoconferencing tools like Skype to talk with his parents in Osaka. As such, Tomoya figured out how to use the screen sharing function of Google Hangouts in Session 1, even though he had never used Google Hangouts per se. The technology resources that Tomoya used ranged from an
electronic and online dictionary and screen sharing to *Google Search*, including *Google Maps* and *Google Images*. As for Benjamin, he was also one of the most proficient users of technology in the project. This is because, as he stated in the pre-project interview, he “really like[s] playing video games.” The technology resources that Benjamin used ranged from an online dictionary and screen sharing to various *Google services*. In addition, as shown in the analysis of Session 8 interaction, Benjamin used screen sharing to play a computer game with Tomoya.

Below I will analyze three more excerpts that demonstrate their technology use. The dyad opted out of sharing their interaction history of *Facebook Messenger*, as it was too personal to be analyzed for research. Thus, my analysis in this section is limited to the interaction that took place via *Google Hangouts* (cf. Amy and Yoko’s interaction via *Facebook Messenger* in Chapter 7). These excerpts (Excerpts 7, 8, and 9) demonstrate how the dyad created language and cultural learning opportunities and how reciprocity was mediated by their technology use.

5.4.1. *Use of Multimodal Bricolage Strategies to Tackle the Trouble Source (and to Play)*

The first excerpt to be analyzed about the dyad’s technology use is Excerpt 7. The conversation unfolded about 49 minutes into Session 4 (around the fourth week of the exchange), when the dyad was talking in Japanese. The theme of the session was K-12 education. Prior to the following conversation, Benjamin showed a visual of American kids playing basketball and explained that American kids usually spend the first 20 minutes of lunchtime eating lunch and the remaining time for playing outside. Benjamin asked Tomoya what Japanese school kids do during a lunch break. Tomoya answered that Japanese kids do the same thing as American kids. Benjamin then asked what sports Japanese school kids play. In response, Tomoya answered that they usually play basketball and soccer. The following conversation (Excerpt 7) took place when
Benjamin asked if Tomoya knew tetherball. Note that Tomoya is the one screen sharing in the following conversation. Here, the dyad tackles the trouble source (i.e., what tetherball is) using various *multimodal bricolage* strategies (Mehus, 2011), namely multimodal resources afforded by the local environment, such as hand gestures, screen sharing, *Google search, Google images,* and a *YouTube* video. I also demonstrate how the dyad played with *Google Hangouts* by shifting between the “language and cultural learning” frame, the “technology exploration” frame, and the “play” frame.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benjamin</th>
<th>Tomoya</th>
<th>Shared Screen (Tomoya’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 テ、テザボール知っていますか。</td>
<td>え？テザボール？</td>
<td>(Tezaball (/tɛzabɔ:l/))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Do you know tezaball (/tezabɔːl/).)</td>
<td>(Eh? Tezaball (/tezabɔːl/)?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 テザボール、テザボール。</td>
<td>え？知らない。知らないです。</td>
<td>(Eh? Tezaball tezaball (/tɛzabɔːl tɛzabɔːl/)). (Tezaball /tɛzabɔːl/)?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Tezaball tezaball (/tezabɔːl tezabɔːl/).)</td>
<td>(Eh? Don’t know. I don’t know.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 あ、そうですか @@@</td>
<td>何ですか、それ、@@@@</td>
<td>(Ah I see @@@) (What is that @@@)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 調べてみて下さい @@@</td>
<td>それ、ちょっと。え？ちょっと、待って。なんてなんて？テザボール？</td>
<td>(Please check it out @@@) (That what eh? Hold on. What what did you say? Tezaball (/tezabɔːl/)?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Tezaball (/tezabɔːl/).)</td>
<td>(Te (/teː/))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ザー（Za（/aː/））
ボール（ball（/bɔːl/））
テザ。（Teza（/teːza/））
11 Oh no. テザーボール。  
(Oh no. Teza::ball (/teza:bo:lɯ/).  
((moving the hand rightwards to show vowel lengthening of the second syllable ザ (za)))

12 テザーボール。  
(Teza::ball (/teza:bo:lɯ/).  
((typing テザーボール (tetherball) in Google))

13 はい=  
(Yes=)

14 =待って。おー、出た。  
(=Hold on. O::h it came out.)  
((being surprised that the keyword appeared in the list of suggested keywords))
15 はい。[@@@] それです。そうです。 
(Yes. [@@@] That's it. That’s right.)

えー？
([E::h]?)
((scrolling down the page))

16 ((clicking the link on top of the page))
これでしょう？テザーボール。ちょっと待って、ちょっと待って、何これ。初めて見た。
(This is it? Tetherball. Hold on a sec. What’s this? I saw this for the first time.)
((scrolling down the page))

17 @@
((moving the cursor to “画像” (images) to see Google images))

18 ((looking at the images for テザーボール (tetherball)))
え？これ、どうやって遊ぶの？これ。何これ。だって、犬じゃん、犬。犬でしょ、犬。
(Eh? This how do you play? This. What’s this? Cuz it’s a dog a dog. It is a dog a dog isn’t it.)
19 犬？(@@)
(A dog? @@@)
((scrolling down Google images))

20 @@@

21 ちょっと待って。
(Hold on a sec.)

22 うん。
(Yeah.)

23 テザーボールの play ビデオを探しましたけど @@@
(I looked for a play video of tetherball, but @@@)

24 [xxx]
([xxx])

25 シェアできるかな？どうすればいいのかな？
(@@@ [シェアできるかな]? (@@@ [I wonder if we can share it]?)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>大丈夫ですか。[聞こえます]か。</td>
<td>Are you ok? [Can you hear] me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>@@@ there’re many buttons. [本当に]</td>
<td>@@@ there’re many buttons. [Really]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ボトンが多くですね。</td>
<td>There’re many buttons aren’t there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>え？なんかー、ボタン多い。そう。</td>
<td>Eh? Wai::t there’re many buttons. Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Google effects? @@@</td>
<td>Google effects? @@@</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
これ何これ。
(This what is this.)
((waiting for application to start))

あ！
(AH!)

これ何これ。
(@@@ This what is this.)

グーグルエフェクツが起きたん
だけど。
(@@@@ Google Effects happened. @@@@@)

あっ。
(Ah.)
これってさ、なんか楽しいね。@@@
(This is like fun isn’t it. @@@)

でも、怖いですね。@[[@@]
(But it is [scary] @[[@@])

Alright.
グーグルエフェクツすごいね。

（Google Effects are cool.）

Ok. So テザー[ボール知っていませんね。知らない]。

（OK. So tether[ball you are not knowing. You don’t know].）

はいはいはい。

（Yes yes yes.）

あ、これね？

（Ah this?）

はい。

（Yes.）
In Excerpt 7, the dyad compensated for the lack of physical presence in the video-mediated environment by using various multimodal bricolage strategies available online. First, Benjamin used a hand gesture to visualize the pronunciation of tetherball and tackled the trouble source. Specifically, in line 9, Benjamin repeated テザボール /tezabo:l/ once as a whole word and the second time by dividing the word into three sound segments, テ /te:, ザ /za:, ボール /bo:l/.

When he repeated the word the second time, he moved his hand rightward to let Tomoya visualize the spelling of the word. Despite Benjamin’s effort to indicate the trouble source, Tomoya did not understand the specific location of the trouble source because Benjamin’s hand gesture emphasized the whole word. Thus, Benjamin applied the gesture selectively to emphasize the second syllable. Thanks to Benjamin’s repairing his gesture in line 11, Tomoya could spell out the word correctly for Google search (line 12).

Secondly, this dyad used Internet resources and screen shared the process of using them to collaboratively tackle the trouble source. For instance, Tomoya searched tetherball on the Internet (line 12-17), found Google images (line 18-19), and played a YouTube video (line 41-44), and made this search process visible to Benjamin. This way, Benjamin could monitor Tomoya’s exploration of the word and provide scaffolding as it seemed necessary. This configuration led to a learner-centered environment in which the novice could take the initiative in learning and receive feedback from the expert when needed. What is especially remarkable here is that this learner-centered learning was possible only because the shared screen allowed Benjamin to monitor what Tomoya was typing in the Google search, check which websites and images Tomoya was looking at, and provide appropriate feedback in a spontaneous manner. Without the creation of such a shared space where the two participants could share the same visual information, Tomoya would have experienced great difficulties searching tetherball or
Benjamin would have taken a teacher-centered approach and provided an answer without taking into account Tomoya’s situated practice.

Finally, the dyad not only used the multimodal bricolage strategies to tackle the trouble source but also played with it. Specifically, as demonstrated by the exploration of *Google Effects*, they shifted between various frames to explore the potential of technology mediation. For instance, between line 1-23, the participants were largely in the “language and cultural teaching and learning” frame, where Benjamin was explaining and Tomoya was learning the word tetherball and its concept. In line 24, however, Tomoya moved to the “technology exploration” frame, so he could find a way to share Benjamin’s screen. This is demonstrated by his use of self-directed speech in line 24, “シェアできるかな？” (*I wonder if we can share it*) and in line 25, “シェアできるかな？どうすればいいのかな？” (*I wonder if we can share it. I wonder how we do so*) as well as his silence in line 25 as a result of experimenting with the *Google Hangouts*. Not knowing that Tomoya was already in the “technology exploration” frame, Benjamin asked if Tomoya could hear him (line 26), as Benjamin was still in the “language and cultural teaching and learning” frame where silence meant a communication or technology trouble. In line 26, in response to Tomoya’s utterance, “Google Hangout すごいな、なんか” (*Google Hangout is like cool*), Benjamin aligned himself with Tomoya and moved to the “technology exploration” frame. After exploring various buttons of *Google Hangouts*, the dyad engaged in play between line 32 and 38 – Bateson’s (1972) “play frame” – as demonstrated by the increased amplitude and laughter when the two participants were playing with *Google Effects*. In line 39, 40 and 41, the dyad prepared to shift from the “play” frame back to the “language and cultural teaching and learning” frame by making a summary comment, “ダーグルイフェクツ
すこいね” (*Google Effects are cool*) and by using transition phrases such as “Alright,” “Ok,” and “So.” From line 41 and following, they return to the topic of tetherball.

In summary, the dyad used various multimodal bricolage strategies to tackle the trouble source and play with the technological environment. Specifically, hand gestures were used to resolve a pronunciation issue; Internet resources were used to teach and learn what tetherball is; and screen sharing was used to create learner-centered learning. During the process of tackling the trouble source, the dyad also shifted between various frames to explore the affordances of the *Google Hangouts* environment and engage in play. This humorous ambience of the conversation, I suggest, strengthened their interpersonal relationship and contributed to the enactment of reciprocity.

5.4.2. Achieving Epistemic Symmetries: Shift of Frames in Collaborative Reading of Bilingual Texts

The next two excerpts (Excerpt 8, analyzed here, and Excerpt 9, analyzed next) unfolded in Session 8, approximately nine weeks into the eTandem project. The theme of the session was pop culture. The dyad spent 20 minutes engaging in the visual-based conversation in English; however, the dyad had five more minutes to spare before moving onto the Japanese part of Session 8. This is when Benjamin suggested that they play a game called *Go! Go! Nippon! My First Trip to Japan* (“Go! Go! Nippon!,” 2017), so the dyad could discuss the foreign perspective on Japanese culture.

*Go! Go! Nippon! My First Trip to Japan* (“Go! Go! Nippon!,” 2017) is a visual novel, namely a computer-based interactive novel that features static graphics, sound, and options that change the ending of the story. This game is available in both English and Japanese, and the
version Benjamin had was the English version. In the English version, when the game characters speak Japanese, the sentences are translated into English under the Japanese texts (see Figure 6 for a sample screen). The main character of the game is a male fan of Japan, who makes friends with Japanese girls on the Internet and decides to visit them in Japan. The protagonist and the girls go around Japanese cities to explore the beauty and history of Japanese culture in a dating style. As the protagonist, the player of the game makes decisions that will change the development of the story.

Figure 6. Sample Screen of *Go! Go! Nippon! My First Trip to Japan*

Having finished the initial set-up (e.g., setting up the currency, typing the name of the protagonist), the dyad delved into the game, playing the role of the protagonist who went to Japan and met two girls at the airport. The characters in the story are Makoto (the girl on the left), Akira (the girl on the right), and the protagonist, whom the dyad named “Tomoya.” When the protagonist met the two girls, he said he thought he was meeting two *guys* because both Makoto and Akira are typically male names in Japan. The protagonist then apologized for not
having a proper self-introduction, and this is when Excerpt 8 started. Excerpt 8 unfolded about 32 minutes into Session 8, and about 12 minutes after Benjamin and Tomoya decided to play the game. In the excerpt, the dyad is playing a scene in which the three characters introduce themselves. After their brief self-introduction, the protagonist gets confused because Akira is “giving him cold shoulder,” and Makoto tries to find out why Akira is acting that way.

Before proceeding to the analysis, it is important to consider Benjamin and Tomoya’s background and contextual factors that may impact the epistemic organization of the situation. First, the participants’ epistemic status (i.e., relative access to the domain of knowledge, Raymond & Heritage, 2006) regarding the game is asymmetrical because Benjamin is the owner of the game and the more experienced player. Secondly, although the two participants share visual access to information as Benjamin’s screen is shared, Benjamin is the only player who can physically press the keyboard button to advance the game (i.e., Benjamin has the controller, namely a device that provides input to a game to control an object or character in the game). Thirdly, Benjamin named the protagonist of the game “Tomoya,” which ultimately gave Tomoya the authority to decide what to do with the development of the story. Finally, although the game is available in both English and Japanese, the dyad was playing the version whose default language was English. Thus, the texts were always available in English whereas Japanese texts appeared occasionally. This made Benjamin the party with more linguistic advantage. Overall, it can be said that the dyad faced “asymmetries of knowledge” in social gaming interaction (Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2014). However, as I demonstrate below, the dyad resolved the epistemic asymmetries by juggling frames.

To analyze the conversation, I will use the concepts of frames (as discussed by Tannen & Wallat, 1987; see also the analysis of Excerpt 5) and Goffman’s (1981) notion of footing (see
also the analysis of Excerpt 6). I demonstrate that, in reading the bilingual story texts together, the dyad organically moved back and forth between the “interaction through gaming” frame (i.e., a frame in which the participants play and talk about the game) and the “language teaching and learning” frame to resolve existing epistemic asymmetries.

The transcript of Excerpt 8 has three major columns: Benjamin as the speaker, Tomoya as the speaker, and the shared screen that shows the display language(s). Under the column for Benjamin and Tomoya, respectively, there is a column for real-life interaction where Benjamin and Tomoya interact with each other (highlighted in gray), and one for the gaming/virtual world where the three characters (Makoto, Akira, and the protagonist, “Tomoya”) interact with each other in the story of the game. When Benjamin reads out what Makoto said in the game, for example, the utterance is placed under Benjamin \( \rightarrow \) Gaming/Virtual \( \rightarrow \) Makoto. In contrast, when Benjamin talks to Tomoya, the utterances is located under Benjamin \( \rightarrow \) Real-life. There are two possibilities of display language: “E” = English only, and “E + J” = bilingual texts in English and Japanese.
My name is Misaki Makoto. I am studying English literature at a university in the city. I look forward to getting to know you.

I'm Tomoya.

Hehehe I know that much.

Ah that’s right. I look forward to getting to know you.

Yes indeed. And this is my little sister, Akira. Aki-chan…
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They’re sister ね？  (They’re sisters right?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uh nice to meet you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>うん。  (Yeah.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wh-what the… She seemed so happy a minute ago. Why’s she giving me the cold shoulder now. ((here the protagonist is thinking to himself))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>You know what the cold shoulder is?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
((moving the cursor back and forth highlighting "cold shoulder"))

12 Cold shoulder?

13 Uh huh.

14 No no no.

15 It’s like um when someone ignores you?

16 Ah huuuh huh ignores me?

17 That’s an American phrase?

18 Ah huuuh huh [cold shoulder].

((writing down the phrase in a notebook to the right of Tomoya))
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>19</th>
<th>Gives you cold shoulder.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Uh huh huh. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>どうしたの、あきちゃん。何＝(What’s wrong Aki-chan. What＝)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>=怒ってるの。 (=“are you angry about.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>怒って(h)るの。 (are you a(h)ngry about.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>@@@@@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>あきちゃん、怒ってる。 (Aki-chan is angry.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Text (Japanese)</td>
<td>Translation (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>怒って別に怒ってなんかない。</td>
<td>Not angry at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>そんなこと言って思われて思われた男の子だと思われたのが気になった</td>
<td>Even if you say so=That he thought of you as a boy made you upset=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>そんなこと言って=</td>
<td>(Even if you say so=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>思われて=</td>
<td>That he thought of you as a boy made you upset=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=本当はまった男の子だと思われたのが気に障った=</td>
<td>=didn’t it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>=でしょう。</td>
<td>(Chigau-mon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>違うもん</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is もん。 (What is "Chigau-mon." What is "mon.") ((placing the cursor near "mon"))
Between line 1-5, Benjamin was the only one reading the text, as it appeared only in English, and Tomoya had barely learned how to play the game. In line 6, however, the dyad was exposed to the bilingual text for the first time. This is when Tomoya jumped in and contributed to the conversation by saying “ナイス トゥー ミー च्यू।” (naisu tuu mii chuu, a Japanese way of pronouncing “nice to meet you”). Tomoya then talked to Benjamin in the “interaction through gaming” frame, confirming that the two characters in the game (Makoto and Akira) are sisters (line 7). Benjamin kept reading the English texts in line 8 and 10, playing the role of the protagonist. Then, in line 11, Benjamin realized that there was a phrase that Tomoya may not know and asked “You know what the cold sho-shoulder is?” This comprehension check in line 11 marked the shift to the “language teaching and learning” frame and created a language learning opportunity for Tomoya. Benjamin provided an explanation of the phrase saying “It’s like um when someone ignores you?” (line 15) and “That’s an American phrase?” (line 17). Tomoya responds to the explanation by confirming the meaning of the phrase (i.e., “ignores me?” in line 16), repeating the key term “cold shoulder” and writing it down (line 18), and acknowledging and showing appreciation for new information (line 20). Although Benjamin had an epistemic superiority in terms of both language and the computer game between line 10-20, as the text was available only in English, starting line 21, however, the bilingual text became available again, and this time, Benjamin also read the Japanese text as a learner of the Japanese language. This configuration changed the epistemic positions between the participants, giving Tomoya a chance to contribute as an expert of the Japanese language.

The analysis of Excerpt 8 after line 21 revealed that the dyad managed to engage in collaborative gaming activities and compensate for the asymmetries of knowledge in social gaming interaction. Specifically, the frequent shift of frames contributed to the change in
epistemic positions (i.e., who has better epistemic access to the topic of discussion than whom), and this contributed to more equal opportunities to participate and helped the dyad achieve “interactional synchrony” (Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2014, p. 1035), namely shared and mutually known rhythmic pattern that enables closely coordinated collaborative action, as observed in Benjamin and Tomoya’s exchange of collaborative overlaps in line 26 and 29 and frequent latched turns between line 21 and 22 and between 28-30. Below, I highlight two factors that led to the dynamic shift of frames.

First, frequent frame shift was afforded by the bilingual game itself. To advance the game, the dyad read aloud the story written in English or in both English and Japanese. The latter, namely the bilingual text, allowed Tomoya to take the expert status when the dyad was reading Japanese and the novice status when they were reading in English. For example, in line 32, Benjamin asked Tomoya what is the meaning of もん (-mon, a sentence-final grammatical structure that is used to justify oneself) in 違うもん (chigau-mon, which means “definitely wrong”). While the goal of the activity was to advance the game, the dyad occasionally interacted in the “language teaching and learning” frame, because understanding the language was a prerequisite to proceeding with the game. Accordingly, the dyad moved back and forth between the “interaction through gaming” frame, where the two participants talked to each other to advance the game, and the “language teaching and learning” frame, where Benjamin took up a footing of a novice of the Japanese language and an expert of the English language and Tomoya took up a footing of a novice of the English language and an expert of the Japanese language. In other words, the two participants shifted footings as an expert vs. novice in accordance with the language of the texts, and this helped the dyad resolve the existing epistemic asymmetries.
Secondly, frame shift was possible thanks to the shared screen because the two participants could access the same visual information and align with each other in a situated manner. For example, the dyad collaboratively finished Makoto’s utterance in line 21 and 22 by Benjamin saying, “何=” (*What=*) and Tomoya saying, “怒ってるの。” (*are you angry about*). Benjamin and Tomoya also overlapped with each other to read Akira’s utterance together in line 26, “別に[怒って]なんかいない。” (*I’m not [angry] at all.*). Furthermore, the dyad collaboratively read Makoto’s utterance between line 28-30 where Benjamin said, “そんなことを言って=” (*Even if you say so=), Tomoya then said, “=本当はまた男の子だと思[われたの]が気に障った=” (*That he [thought of] you as a boy made you upset=), and Benjamin completed the sentence by saying, “=でしょう。” (*didn’t it.*). As these examples demonstrate, sharing the same visual information enabled the dyad to resolve linguistic issues by enacting the “language teaching and learning” frame in a situated manner.

In summary, the analysis of Excerpt 8 showed that playing the bilingual game via screen sharing afforded the dyad mutually beneficial learning opportunities. What is remarkable here is that Benjamin, who had better epistemic access to the game and the English language, reciprocated the conversation, rather than dominating it, and Tomoya also contributed to the co-construction of the conversation despite his limited epistemic access to the game and the English language. In reading English and Japanese texts collaboratively via *virtual joint attention*, the epistemic positions of the two participants changed in accordance with the change of frames, and the dyad benefited from such frequent reversal of footings as an expert vs. novice, making the conversation dynamic and reciprocal.
5.4.3. Mutual Revelation “Through” the Game: Comparing the Virtual and Real-life Worlds

Excerpt 9 unfolded about 37 minutes into Session 8, and about five minutes after Excerpt 8. In the game, the three characters decided to go to the sisters’ house. The first scene of Excerpt 9 is where the protagonist enters the sisters’ house for the first time. The second scene is where Makoto, the older sister, takes the protagonist to the tatami room, a traditional Japanese-style room. In both scenes, the dyad uses the game as a prompt to talk about each other and bring real life into the virtual world of gaming.

Below, I will bring together the concepts of frames and mutual revelation (Tannen, 2005), namely a rapport strategy to show understanding and concern for each other by offering comparable personal statements. I demonstrate that the dyad moved back and forth between the “interaction through gaming” frame and the “real-life” frame (i.e., a frame where they interact via videoconferencing to talk about real life) to make a parallel comparison between the stereotypical image of Japan depicted in the game and real life in Japan, and this exploration of the culture beyond the virtual environment led to their mutual revelation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Benjamin</strong></th>
<th><strong>Tomoya</strong></th>
<th><strong>Shared Screen (Benjamin’s)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oh is that what your house looks like?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yeah yeah yeah.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Actually?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1.41) Yeah. Maybe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yeah. No?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maybe Japanese house is like-looks like that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This is tatami room.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>((fast-forwarding the story by clicking the enter key))</td>
<td>U::n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You don’t sleep on-do you sleep on the floor do yo(h)u?

I sleep on the-I sleep on yeah I sleep on the floor.

Oh you do?

[Even] in your room right now? [Yeah].

Right now.

Really.

Do you-do you want to watch [my]... ((shifting his upper body to the left))

Do I wanna see your bed?

Yeah [like that]... ((lifting and moving the computer to his left to show where he sleeps))
18 Oh huh.
19 So I don’t have the bed.
20 Wow.
21 @@@
22 ((standing up to clean the bed))  ((moving the computer back and changes the camera angle))
23 ((moving the computer to his left to show where he sleeps))  @@@
It's really messy you know?

No no. Thank you for showing the room and introducing the Japanese game.
The analysis revealed that the dyad maximized the affordances of technology mediation by combining the advantages of videoconferencing and gaming. While the former virtually connects geographically distant conversational participants, the latter is used to bring a virtual world into real life. The combination of these two modalities would normally result in increasing the level of *virtuality* (i.e., the quality of not physically existing), as gaming adds another layer of virtuality to the videoconferencing environment. However, the dyad managed to increase social presence (Short et al., 1976) and successfully explored each other’s culture via a frame shift and mutual revelation.

First, the dyad went back and forth between the “interaction through gaming” frame and the “real-life” frame to compare stereotypical culture depicted in the game and the real-life culture that Tomoya was in. For instance, Benjamin, who was prompted by the gaming scene in line 1, asked Tomoya “Oh is that what your house looks like?” This marked the shift from the “interaction through gaming” frame to the “real-life” frame where the participants compared the house in the game and the one in which Tomoya lived. Another example of frame shift is found in line 9, when Benjamin, who remembered that Japanese people traditionally sleep on tatami floors, asked Tomoya if Tomoya also slept on the floor. This prompted the dyad to shift from the “interaction through gaming” frame to the “real-life” frame and make a parallel comparison between what they are seeing in the game (i.e., tatami room) and the actual life of Tomoya. Furthermore, the dyad changed the camera angle and literally shifted the “frames” when Benjamin asked Tomoya if he slept on the floor “even in your room right now” (line 12). This “right now” moved Tomoya further away from the “interaction through gaming” frame and further into the “real-life” frame, where Tomoya went outside the computer screen to reveal his life in Japan.
Secondly, the dyad’s exploration of the culture in the “real-life” frame beyond the virtual environment led to the dyad showing each other’s room and bed, in a similar way to how Tomoya showed his hometown using Google Maps in exchange for Benjamin’s showing his family photos. This process involved various expressions that indicate closeness such as Benjamin’s casual apology for the room being messy, Tomoya’s thanking Benjamin for showing his room, and laughter. I argue that this is a form of mutual revelation in that the dyad offered comparable personal “statements” or images to show conversational rapport, and that this reciprocation strengthened the overarching objective of eTandem, namely the exchange of language and culture.

5.4.4. Summary of Benjamin and Tomoya’s Use of Technological Affordances

Benjamin and Tomoya were one of the most technologically-advanced dyads of the project. Indeed, Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction was characterized by the use of various technological affordances from the first interaction session, and such technology use only increased in frequency and variety toward the end of the project. These ranged from tools that were used to communicate outside the video interaction (e.g., email, Facebook, and Facebook Messenger) to tools that were used to facilitate the video interaction in situ (e.g., various Google services such as Google Maps, Google Images, and YouTube, and an online dictionary).

First, using the former type of technology tools, the dyad went beyond the Google Hangouts environment. This extracurricular interaction facilitated the establishment of friendship even from the first video session and allowed them to sustain their 13-month-long partnership (22 interaction sessions in total). For instance, through the dyad’s interaction via the exchange of emails and being friends on Facebook, they shared their personal information (i.e., information
about who they were), made themselves available for other-positioning (i.e., being positioned by the other), and positioned themselves in relation to the other (see Excerpt 1). The participants’ being connected outside the video environment also helped them visualize each other’s life, increased imagery and thus conversational involvement (see Excerpt 3 in which Benjamin’s photos on Facebook helped Tomoya visualize Benjamin’s trips in Japan). Although the dyad’s interaction via Facebook Messenger was not analyzed in this study, due to their exchange containing personal information, the fact that their interaction continued for 13 months not only via Google Hangouts but also in other modalities suggests the important role of cross-modal intertextual links in forming a strong partnership and engaging in a reciprocal conversation.

Secondly, Benjamin and Tomoya used technological affordances to enhance their Google Hangouts interactions. For instance, the dyad engaged in the collaborative teaching and learning of the word “tetherball” using various online tools such as Google search, Google Images, and YouTube. In doing so, they also played with Google Effects, a special feature of Google Hangouts, to explore the potential of the videoconferencing tool and engage in a humorous conversation (Excerpt 7). This demonstrates that the dyad used technology to repair a trouble source instead of simply relying on audio/linguistic cues and that the dyad was capable of appreciating and utilizing affordances of various technology devices.

The dyad also played the computer game in Session 8 via screen sharing. This collaborative gaming activity afforded them the opportunities to teach and learn the two languages as a bilingual speaker (Excerpt 8) and engage in a cultural comparison between the stereotypical image of Japan and the real life of Tomoya through mutual revelation (Excerpt 9).
In summary, as these examples of their technology use suggest, the dyad’s interaction was digitally enriched and technologically enhanced, and this facilitated not only rapport-building and language and cultural learning.
5.5. Enactment of Reciprocity: Main Findings for Benjamin and Tomoya

How then did Benjamin and Tomoya enact reciprocity, and how successful was that enactment? Did it change over time? If so, what factors or events may have been related to those changes? In this section, I return to these main questions in the study, and I distill what we may want to answer based on the analyses I just presented. I inspect the various senses of reciprocity found in the extant literature: (1) equality in the quantitative sense (i.e., number of turns and topic shifts, Schwienhorst, 2004; Schwienhorst and Borgia, 2006), (2) interactional patterns based on equality (i.e., degree of task control) and mutuality (i.e., involvement with each other’s contribution) (cf. Storch, 2002), (3) various forms of exchanged behavior, and (4) compatibility.

5.5.1. Equality

While turns were not counted in this study, a cursory perusal of the transcripts and my impressionistic account of the dyad’s interaction patterns suggests that Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction, when it was analyzed as a session overall, was equal in the quantitative sense (i.e., balance in the number of turns and topic shifts). In other words, the number of turns and topic shifts was balanced between the two participants in both the English and the Japanese parts of a session. When we look into each language part, it was also found that, whether the cultural expertise belonged to Benjamin or Tomoya during a given interaction, the two participants equally distributed turns. This is contrastive with the case of Amy and Yoko, who will be analyzed in Chapter 7, because their interaction was characterized by a disproportionately greater conversational contribution by a participant who owned the cultural expertise. Their equal turn distribution was observed in Session 1, but it further improved in Session 2 and continued until
the end of the 10-week project thanks to their use of 再質問 (saishitsumon), namely redirection of a question back to the person who asked it.

Furthermore, regardless of the language of choice, namely whether the dyad was talking in English or Japanese, their turns were equally distributed. This indicates that Benjamin and Tomoya both possessed the ability to reciprocate a conversational contribution, whether it was in their L1 or in TL. In summary, a bird’s eye view of the transcripts suggests that their interaction achieved quantitative equality across the two language parts, within a topic, and in both language parts, and they continued to demonstrate the same degree of equality throughout the duration of the project.

5.5.2. Interactional Patterns

Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction was characterized by high equality and high mutuality (i.e., “collaborative” in Storch’s 2002 framework) throughout the duration of the 10-week project. They were able to achieve high equality (i.e., balance in the degree of task control) because a speaker was not the only one who took responsibility for developing topics; rather, it was both a speaker and a listener who together constructed the conversation. Indeed, what distinguished this dyad from the rest of the dyads in the project was the dynamic shift of speakership and listenership. Instead of following the general tendency of eTandem where an expert of language and culture contributes more as a speaker and a novice of language and culture absorbs the information as a listener, this dyad let the flow of the conversation decide who to contribute and when to change the speakership. In other words, Benjamin and Tomoya freed themselves from a static conversational role that was assigned to them depending on the language being spoken and the content of discussion.
Benjamin and Tomoya also achieved mutuality (i.e., involvement with each other’s contribution). For instance, as revealed in Akiyama (2017b), Benjamin and Tomoya’s successful turn negotiation improved their recipient design (i.e., the speaker’s ability to design his or her talk in ways that display an orientation and sensitivity to the particular recipient in areas such as word selection, topic selection, the ordering of sequences, and the timing of starting and terminating conversations, Sacks et al., 1974), and such listener-oriented utterances allowed the listener to contribute to the conversation (i.e., a virtuous cycle). As such, Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction was characterized by participatory listenership in the form of cooperative overlaps, insertion of short questions, and aizuchi (a Japanese word for short listener responses, Maynard, 1986) in both Japanese and English for both participants.

Furthermore, the dyad achieved mutuality not only in the Google Hangouts environment alone but also in conjunction with other technology platforms such as email (Excerpt 1) and being friends on Facebook (Excerpt 3). Specifically, they exchanged emails and saw each other’s photos on Facebook to learn about each other before the first Google Hangouts session and used the information in the video-mediated conversation. This cross-modal intertextual links helped the dyad position themselves in relation to each other, increase imagery and involvement, and establish friendship. In other words, cross-modal intertextuality facilitated the enactment of mutuality in the video interaction, indicating that participants’ interaction outside the video-mediated environment can be a powerful resource for achieving mutuality.

5.5.3. Exchanged Behavior

Benjamin and Tomoya demonstrated various forms of exchanged behavior. One significant feature of this dyad was the way they introduced their hometown via Google Maps
(Excerpt 4) and each other’s living room when prompted by the story of the computer game (Excerpt 9). First, when Benjamin used the screen sharing function of Google Hangouts to show a few pictures of his family and house in the U.S., Tomoya in return used the screen sharing function to show his hometown via Google Maps. The dyad also explored each other’s culture in the “real-life” frame, when they were prompted by the game, to engage in the comparison between the virtual world and real life. These two incidents represent a form of reciprocity in that one’s behavior is exchanged in return. They can also be called mutual revelation (Tannen, 2005) in that one’s personal provision of information elicited a similar provision of information from the other. In the case of Benjamin and Tomoya, revelation of their life not only afforded a sense of reciprocity but also a chance to co-construct the conversation, establish friendship, and engage in a cultural comparison between the stereotypical image of Japan and real life in Japan as well as the life of Benjamin (U.S.) and Tomoya (Japan). In other words, this reciprocation in the sense of exchanged behavior facilitated and strengthened the overarching objective of eTandem, namely the exchange of language and culture.

Although I did not analyze an excerpt that focused on Benjamin and Tomoya’s error correction routines, throughout the duration of the eTandem project, the dyad mostly provided recasts when they thought the errors would hinder comprehensibility (see Corrective Feedback Training in Chapter 4). As for the participant who took a footing of a language novice, he occasionally repaired his erroneous utterances (i.e., uptake, Lyster & Ranta, 1997) but mostly focused on carrying on with the rhythm of the conversation. Thus, in contrast to the case of Amy and Yoko, who were overtly focused on the language learning side of eTandem and thanked the language expert for providing corrective feedback (see Chapter 7), Tomoya and Benjamin benefited from the eTandem setting where participants could take on various situated identities.
as the topic of a discussion changed. Specifically, as revealed in the analysis of Excerpt 5 in Session 2, Benjamin and Tomoya juggled multiple frames skillfully, acting as a linguistic expert and novice, cultural expert and novice, speaker and listener, interviewer and interviewee, and joker and co-joker. Indeed, their linguistic expert vs. novice identities were invoked only when they became relevant in situated conversational practices, such as when the dyad dealt with linguistic issues in the “language teaching and learning” frame to make knowledge schemas compatible (see Ahn, 2016 for a similar argument).

Finally, Benjamin and Tomoya were particularly skillful at reverting a question back to the one who asked the question. This 再質問 (saishitsumon), the word coined by Tomoya to describe this exchange behavior (see Tomoya’s comment in his reflection on Session 1 on p. 103), can be considered a form of reciprocity in that the same question was asked in return. As revealed in the analysis of Excerpt 6 (when they discussed children walking alone and how children get to school), a participant who took up a footing of a cultural expert subsequently asked a question about the other participant’s culture and thereby took up a footing of a cultural novice. This led to frequent shift of footings, which then contributed to the reciprocation of conversational roles, namely the exchange of each other’s conversational roles. Such a dynamic shift of conversational roles allowed members of the dyad to free themselves from continuing to take one static role designated by the language and topic of discussion.

5.5.4. Compatibility/Sharedness

Benjamin demonstrated more “high-considerateness” features than Tomoya, who was a very “high-involvement” communicator (Tannen, 1987, 2005). However, the degree of incompatibility was minimal and resolvable, compared to the case of Edwin and Hiroyuki
(analyzed in Chapter 6). In addition, both Benjamin and Tomoya probably knew how to adjust their styles in intercultural communication, because they were exposed to various other cultures and languages growing up (e.g., Benjamin’s grandfather speaks Japanese and Benjamin studied in Japan for two months; Tomoya had been to more than 10 countries and had many international friends at his university). As such, despite the somewhat different conversational styles, the dyad was able to achieve equality in turns and topic shifts and did not have to suffer from complementary schismogenesis as in the case of Edwin and Hiroyuki (see Chapter 6).

Members of this dyad also shared a bilingual identity, considered each other a bilingual resource, and created language and cultural learning opportunities. For instance, as revealed in the analysis of Excerpt 2, the dyad used a signal delay as an opportunity to switch languages and show bilingual identity. This language shift, which was used in the very first interaction session, helped Benjamin and Tomoya appreciate each other as a bilingual resource and strengthened their bilingual identities. Later in the project, as the analysis of Excerpt 8 demonstrated, the dyad used their bilingual resources to create language learning opportunities. Specifically, through the collaborative reading of the bilingual texts, the dyad shifted epistemic positions in a situated manner, giving an epistemic superiority not only to Benjamin, who was the expert of the default language (i.e., English) and the computer game, but also to Tomoya, who had limited access to the game but was able to help Benjamin as an expert of the Japanese language. Accordingly, we can speculate that the collaborative reading activity helped Benjamin and Tomoya confirm the benefit of having the shared bilingual identity.

Why did this dyad achieve a seemingly ideal conversational configuration even in the very first interaction session? The key seems to be the sense of reciprocity in the form of sharedness. Indeed, what distinguished Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction most from the rest of
the dyads in the project was the use of the screen sharing function of Google Hangouts, which created virtual joint attention, namely the shared focus of two individuals who are not physically co-present on an object that exists in a virtual space. I argue that this virtual joint attention allowed the dyad to collaboratively explore a conversational topic, so they could share the responsibility for carrying out the conversational task. This sense of sharedness was enhanced also because the dyad used intertextual resources acquired via email exchanges and Facebook to get to know each other even before the first interaction session (Excerpts 1 and 3). This prior knowledge acquired by going beyond the Google Hangouts interaction increased involvement in the form of imagery and also helped the dyad demonstrate their positioning to get to know each other and form a strong partnership/friendship.
5.6. Conclusion

The analysis of the most successful dyad’s interaction revealed some of the key ingredients for achieving a reciprocal interaction. These include the effective use of technological affordances, reciprocation of conversational roles and production of listener-oriented utterances, and emphasis of their bilingual speakership. First, Benjamin and Tomoya used technology to create cross-modal intertextual links via email, being friends on Facebook, and Facebook Messenger (although not analyzed in this chapter). The use of these technology tools outside the video-mediated environment helped them position themselves and each other, increased imagery and thus involvement, and led to the formation of a strong friendship and partnership. In addition, the dyad used technology for fun in the play frame (e.g., use of Google Effects) and for visualizing and bringing real life into the virtually occurring interaction via mutual revelation (e.g., revealing each other’s real life via Google Maps and using the computer game as a jumping-off point for showing each other their rooms). Accordingly, it seems that the dyad was neither restrained by the tasks nor constrained by the lack of physical presence. That is, the dyad knew how to go beyond the default eTandem learning set-up to create a “socially contingent” learning environment, or an interaction in which the presence of an interlocutor is considered relevant and important thanks to its appropriate content and intensity (Roseberry, Hirsh-Pasek, & Golinkoff, 2014).

Furthermore, Benjamin and Tomoya used the screen sharing function of Google Hangouts and together watched YouTube, Google Images, and Google Search for conversational repair. The presence of virtual joint attention allowed them to rely not only on audio cues and each other’s video images but also other means of communication at their disposal. In other words, the dyad created a collaborative space, via screen sharing, where they could match their
communicative intentions with their expressive means (cf. Gullberg, 2011). For instance, their word look-up behavior stands in opposition to what M. H. Goodwin and C. Goodwin (1986) calls a solitary word search, as Benjamin and Tomoya looked up a word in a collaborative manner and increased social presence as a result.

Secondly, Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction was characterized by the frequent shift of speakership and listenership. For one, this is due to the speaker’s effort to reciprocate conversational roles and increase the interlocutor’s contribution by redirecting questions. For another, it is through the speaker’s production of recipient-designed utterances (Erickson, 1986) that facilitated listener’s contribution. Erickson categorizes the concept of recipient design into prospective recipient design (i.e., designing talk based on the speaker’s anticipation of some specific reaction from the listener in the next moment) and retrospective recipient design (i.e., designing talk based on the reaction that the listener makes in the present moment). The analysis of Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction reveals that their prospective recipient design was particularly effective for reciprocating the conversation. For instance, when a language expert was talking, he often asked comprehension check questions to a language novice, and this listener-oriented utterance afforded a chance for the language learner to contribute to the conversation. Moreover, the language expert’s utterances were usually appropriate for the language novice’s proficiency level. This helped the language novice to participate in meaning making in the form of collaborative overlaps, collaborative finishes, and aizuchi (i.e., short listener responses, Maynard, 1986). Consequently, their turns were equally distributed, and their interaction was organically evolving in a situated manner, as if they were tossing the conversational ball back and forth.
Finally, Benjamin and Tomoya used code-switching not only to repair communication breakdowns like other dyads did but to mainly to create language learning opportunities. For instance, Tomoya used code-switching to indicate a frame shift and to take time to process newly acquired information. The dyad also read the bilingual texts of the computer game together and tackled linguistic epistemic asymmetries (e.g., unknown vocabulary and grammar) along with the story to proceed with the game. As these examples demonstrate, the dyad considered their bilingual speakership as a resource for creating more language learning opportunities.
Chapter 6

Edwin and Hiroyuki: Reciprocity Troubles as Incompatibilities

Coordinator: “Would you want to do this exchange project again?”

Edwin: “Well... I would participate if I could get another partner.”

Coordinator: “So, even after our meeting, your interaction with your partner didn’t go well?”

Edwin: “It did improve. Definitely. But, I didn’t feel comfortable with my partner because he didn’t use aizuchi. Although I got used to it in the end, I felt very bad in the first couple of sessions because of that.”

(Edwin, from the post-project interview)

6.1. Introduction

The second dyad I analyze is Edwin and Hiroyuki, who were also analyzed in Akiyama (2017b). Edwin and Hiroyuki were the least successful dyad of the project who expressed the greatest frustration and stopped contacting each other after the ninth session ended. Moreover, they were the only dyad who explicitly told the coordinator (i.e., the author of this study) that they did not want to continue the project because of incompatibility with their partner. Furthermore, they were the only participants with whom the coordinator had to intervene; that decision was made upon watching the video interaction data sent after the second session (see Appendix D for the timeline of the coordinator’s exchanges and intervention with Edwin).
Edwin and Hiroyuki’s weekly reflection often included comments that expressed their frustration with the project, and they mainly attributed it to a lack of vocabulary and grammar. However, the analysis of their conversational excerpts reveals that there were other and indeed more crucial factors that may have prevented them from achieving a successful and reciprocal interaction. Below I will first provide more details about the two participants. I will then revisit three English excerpts in Session 2 that were analyzed in Akiyama (2017b), this time using multimodal discourse analysis techniques. Next, I will analyze one English excerpt in Session 2 to examine the impact of cultural expertise on their interaction. Following the analysis of English interaction, I will analyze one Japanese excerpt in Session 2 to compare the two language parts. I will then move onto analyzing two English excerpts in Session 8 to examine how their interactional patterns changed and discuss what the change meant for the enactment of reciprocity. I will then revisit the dyad’s conversation in Session 2 and 8 focusing on the use of technological affordances. I will conclude the section by discussing the implications of the findings regarding the enactment of reciprocity.

6.1.1. Participants

Edwin is a 20-year-old learner of Japanese who majored in linguistics at his American university. He had studied Japanese for two years before this project started, and he considered himself an intermediate-level learner. He had never been abroad or interacted with “pure Japanese people” who grew up solely in Japan and were considered mono-cultural and monolingual. During an interview at the beginning of the semester, he said he was not confident about intercultural communication because “I don’t want to make a baka (a fool) of myself. I want to know exactly what each sign means, and I am worried about missing subtle linguistic and gestural cues.” This comment of Edwin indicates that he was a somewhat anxious learner.
who was very observant and analytical about language. He attributed his lack of proficiency in
Japanese as the major reason for his uneasiness in intercultural settings. His motivation for
participating in this project was to improve his fluency and to practice his casual speech by
“making a friend in Japan,” suggesting that he had a very high hope for the project.

Hiroyuki is a 19-year-old learner of English in Japan who majored in commerce at his
Japanese university. He had studied English for seven years as part of the Japanese compulsory
English education and considered himself an intermediate learner of English. However, as he
stated in his self-introduction, he considered himself “good at writing and reading English but
poor at listening to and speaking.” Just like Edwin, Hiroyuki had little experience in intercultural
communication. Indeed, he had never used English outside the classroom instruction, and he had
never been abroad. His motivation for participating in this project was to “improve his English,”
an ambiguous goal that may signal his limited capability to imagine his future L2 self (Dörnyei
& Chan, 2013).

Table 4 summarizes the results of the pre-project survey regarding the individual profiles
of the dyad as well as the group averages. As Table 4 shows, the dyad’s initial proficiency, ICC,
and motivation are similar to the group average. In comparison with the Benjamin-Tomoya dyad,
however, we find that Edwin and Hiroyuki’s proficiency was slightly lower, and so was their
ICC. What is strikingly different between the two dyads was their experience abroad; while
Benjamin and Tomoya had been abroad and used their respective TL, Edwin and Hiroyuki had
never been abroad and had no international friends with whom they could use the TL.
Combining the information gleaned from the survey (i.e., quantitative data) and interview (i.e.,
qualitative data), we can speculate that this dyad’s members were not significantly different from
the rest of the dyads in the project in terms of their cognitive profiles; however, they were considered intercultural novices in that they did not have any interactional experience abroad.

Table 4. Summary of Participants: Edwin and Hiroyuki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries of residence</th>
<th>Edwin</th>
<th>Hiroyuki</th>
<th>Group Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mean (M) 20.73 SD (SD) 1.87     Mean (M) 21.02 SD (SD) 1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency (EIT)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Mean (M) 88.67 SD (SD) 20.95    Mean (M) 78.75 SD (SD) 16.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>Mean (M) 4.03 SD (SD) .48       Mean (M) 3.90 SD (SD) .52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation: L2 ideal self</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>Mean (M) 4.63 SD (SD) .73       Mean (M) 4.57 SD (SD) .66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience abroad</td>
<td>Has never been abroad; does not have any Japanese friends Has never been abroad; has never used English with people outside the English classroom Varies Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.2. Preview of Edwin and Hiroyuki’s Typical Discourse Features

Before delving into the analysis of excerpts, it is useful to preview the qualities that characterized Edwin and Hiroyuki’s discourse as a whole and that ultimately were shown (through the more detailed analyses of excerpts below) to contribute to or to hinder the enactment of reciprocity. Table 5 summarizes such discourse features in Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction. Unlike the table in Benjamin and Tomoya’s chapter (Table 3), Edwin and Hiroyuki’s table is divided not only by the sessions but also by the languages because their interactional features were different between languages as well. The table is categorized by the five features like that of Benjamin and Tomoya: management of turns, repairing communication issues, listenership, management of conversational roles and identities, conversational style, and L1 vs. L2 use.
Table 5. Summary of Edwin and Hiroyuki’s Discourse Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management of turns</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Session 8 (during a crossed expertise configuration)</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The conversation was characterized by frequent inter-turn pauses (i.e., silences), lack of overlaps, and relatively monotonous, slow-paced conversation. Edwin held the floor most of the time.</td>
<td>The conversation was characterized by Edwin’s “broken starts” (Gardner, 2007), overlaps between Edwin’s broken starts and Hiroyuki’s listener responses, inter-turn pauses, and relatively monotonous, slow-paced conversation. Edwin held the floor most of the time.</td>
<td>The conversation was characterized by many intra-turn pauses produced when Hiroyuki was looking up a word in his electronic dictionary in addition to many inter-turn pauses. The conversation was less monotonous than that of Session 2 mainly thanks to Hiroyuki’s use of bodily conduct to engage in conversational repair and Edwin’s use of exaggerated responses (both verbal and non-verbal) to show understanding.</td>
<td>No change from Session 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repairing communication issues</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Session 8 (during a crossed expertise configuration)</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dyad was able to repair communication breakdowns and achieve conversational synchrony if both of them employed speech and bodily conduct together (i.e., if they resorted to mutual contextualization) (Excerpt 10) and if they were in the “language teaching and learning” frame and understood what the trouble source was (Excerpt 12). However, they could not engage in conversational repair when Edwin provided an</td>
<td>It was rare for Edwin to not understand Hiroyuki because Edwin did most of the talking, while Hiroyuki did most of the listening. It was when Edwin was expressing his thought in Japanese that he had to engage in conversational repair. Instead of looking up a word in a dictionary, Edwin asked Hiroyuki to translate it and involved him</td>
<td>Hiroyuki used bodily conduct to indicate comprehension difficulties and to emphasize and repair the trouble source (Excerpt 15). He also used his electronic dictionary to perform his duty as a cultural expert (Excerpts 15 and 16). As for Edwin, he also used his bodily conduct to negotiate meaning and show understanding and lack thereof. Edwin’s participation in Hiroyuki’s solitary word search</td>
<td>No change from Session 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
explanation about American culture and Hiroyuki used silences to indicate comprehension difficulties (Excerpts 11 and 12) as well as when Edwin rapidly asked many questions about Japan (i.e., machine-gun questions, Tannen, 2005) (Excerpt 13).

| Listenership | Edwin failed to appropriately recipient design his talk unless the dyad was interacting in the “language teaching and learning” frame. The malfunction of both prospective and retrospective recipient design did not afford many chances for Hiroyuki to contribute to the conversation, and this led to complementary schismogenesis (Bateson, 1972). | Hiroyuki’s listenership was demonstrated in the form of very short listener responses and head nods. He rarely engaged in salient listenership moves such as asking follow-up questions and providing evaluative comments. For that reason, Edwin, who held an essentialized idea about Japanese people’s *aizuchi*, was emotionally hurt when Hiroyuki did not produce salient types of listenership moves (see Edwin’s interview data). Thus, Edwin kept holding the floor via broken starts, making it even more difficult for Hiroyuki to contribute to the conversation as a listener (Excerpt 14). | Edwin changed his listenership behavior and showed understanding and lack thereof using his bodily conduct (e.g., head nods, his look away from the camera) instead of simply relying on linguistic cues. | No change from Session 2 |
| Management of conversational roles and identities | In a unilateral expertise configuration (Cappellini, 2016; Cappellini & Mompean, 2015), Hiroyuki took up a footing of a language learner and expected Edwin to pick up his silence as a request for linguistic help. Edwin, on the other hand, took up a footing of a language and cultural expert and used silence to elicit listener feedback from Hiroyuki (Excerpt 11). Neither of them used salient linguistic cues to save each other’s face when initiating conversational repair. In a crossed expertise configuration in English (i.e., when Hiroyuki was talking about Japan in English, Cappellini, 2016; Cappellini & Mompean, 2015), Edwin took up a footing of a cultural novice and interviewer, while Hiroyuki took up a footing of a language novice and, to a lesser extent, that of a cultural expert because he did not understand many questions that Edwin asked rapidly in English (i.e., machine-gun questions, Tannen, 2005). |
| Hiroyuki provided language assistance and considered himself a language teacher only when he was explicitly prompted to take up a footing of a language expert. When he took up a footing of a language expert, Hiroyuki found the purpose of the interaction and felt comfortable and qualified enough to stop being a listener and make a conversational contribution. Otherwise, however, Hiroyuki, who felt inadequate when speaking English, continued to settle on his role as a novice/student even in the Japanese part of the interaction and did not contribute as a language expert. |
| Edwin and Hiroyuki used multimodal resources to dutifully perform their role as a cultural novice and expert, respectively. These resources ranged from bodily conduct to the use of the material surround (i.e., an electronic and online dictionary). In a similar way to how Hiroyuki contributed to conversation when explicitly prompted to take up a footing of a language expert in Session 2, Hiroyuki stopped being a listener and contributed to the conversation when he was explicitly asked to explain a Japanese concept. |
| No change from Session 2 |

| Conversational style | When comparing the two participants, Edwin is more high-involvement, while Hiroyuki is more high-considerateness. Both Edwin and Hiroyuki communicated based on their own conversational style and expected the other to understand and adjust to his conversational pattern, rather than trying to find a good balance between their styles. Their incompatible conversational styles affected the dyad’s interaction over the span of 10 weeks, |

resulting in complementary schismogenesis. The dyad could temporarily break away from the vicious cycle when they took up a footing of an expert vs. a novice and performed a duty as such by recipient designing the talk.

| L1 vs. L2 use | Code-switching was observed when Edwin used Google Translate to provide a Japanese translation of an English word that Hiroyuki was having trouble understanding. Hiroyuki did not switch to Japanese but resorted to silence when he was having trouble expressing his thought. This shows that Hiroyuki did not see the use of his L1 as a tool for communication and learning and thus did not use the affordance of having a bilingual partner who knew his L1 (Japanese). | Edwin code-switched to ask Hiroyuki to translate an English sentence into Japanese. Hiroyuki, as a language expert, attempted to explain a Japanese word using English (i.e., Edwin’s L1 and Hiroyuki’s L2). Hiroyuki did not use a dictionary to provide an English translation of a Japanese word that Edwin was having trouble understanding. Since Hiroyuki could not provide a good explanation in his limited proficiency in English, his effort to help Edwin was not fruitful for resolving a communication breakdown. | Code-switching was observed when Edwin used Google Translate to provide a Japanese translation of an English word that Hiroyuki produced and that Edwin had trouble understanding. As for Hiroyuki, he did not see the use of his L1 (Japanese) as a tool for expressing his thought. Instead, he used his electronic dictionary to provide an English translation of the Japanese concept he wanted to explain (i.e., object mediation rather than relying on his bilingual partner). | No change from Session 2 |
6.2. Session 2: The Vicious Cycle

Akiyama (2017b) analyzed Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction in the English part of Session 2. The study, which was solely based on audio data, found that Edwin’s hyperexplanation (Erickson, 1986) was triggered by Hiroyuki’s use of silences as a contextualization cue (Gumperz, 1982) for linguistic help. It also argued that Edwin’s hyperexplanation led to even fewer opportunities for Hiroyuki to contribute to the conversation, which made it even more difficult for Edwin to assess Hiroyuki’s knowledge schema (Tannen & Wallat, 1987) regarding what he knew about the English language and American culture. The study concluded that Edwin’s misinterpretation of silence as a lack of involvement and Hiroyuki’s use of silence as a conversational strategy to seek linguistic help resulted in complementary schismogenesis (Bateson, 1972), namely “a dynamic in which two interactants exercise clashing behavior, such that each one’s behavior drives the other into increasingly exaggerated expressions of the incongruent behavior in a mutually aggravating spiral” (Tannen, 2005, p. 31), given pre-existing differences in their conversational styles (Tannen, 1987, 2005).

While the analysis of audio data in Akiyama (2017b) certainly helped identify what triggered the intercultural tensions, analysis of video-mediated discourse will supplement it by providing a multimodal perspective. Here, I revisit the same conversational data analyzed in Akiyama (2017b) to gain insight into the multimodal nature of technology-mediated interaction. The data are divided into three parts and sequenced chronologically. Following the reinterpretation of the precursor study, I will analyze new data (two excerpts) to examine the impact of cultural expertise and language proficiency level on their interaction.
6.2.1. Three-part Analysis of the Vicious Cycle: A Multimodal Account

Before presenting the three-part analysis of the vicious cycle, it is useful to highlight Edwin’s comment from the post-project interview to reveal how the vicious cycle impacted the dyad emotionally. The interview data below (a part of which also appeared at the beginning of this chapter) shows how the lack of aizuchi (i.e., a Japanese word that refers to listeners’ short responses that are used to indicate their listenership, Maynard, 1986) made such a negative impact on Edwin’s appreciation of the project.

Coordinator:  “Would you want to do this exchange project again?”

Edwin:  “Well... I would participate if I could get another partner.”

Coordinator:  “So, even after our meeting, your interaction with your partner didn’t go well?”

Edwin:  “It did improve. Definitely. But, I didn’t feel comfortable with my partner because he didn’t use aizuchi. Although I got used to it in the end, I felt very bad in the first couple of sessions because of that.”

Coordinator:  “Why is it that aizuchi so important to you?”

Edwin:  “Umm... because we learned that Japanese people use aizuchi a lot in conversation. I lost confidence in my communicative ability, because I thought my partner didn’t use aizuchi because he wasn’t interested in me.”

As the interview data above shows, Edwin thought that the frequency of aizuchi was positively correlated with Hiroyuki’s interest in the conversation. It is interesting that Edwin had such a strong idea of aizuchi as being a necessary part of a Japanese person’s communication. It is possible that Edwin paid more attention to this conversational move than other participants in the project because he was a linguistic major who was analytical about language. Whatever the
reason may be, what happened was that Edwin’s essentialized idea of Japanese listenership made him feel uneasy during the interaction and accelerated his hyperexplanation.

As for Hiroyuki, he made no comment about Edwin’s behavior in his reflection journal throughout the 10-week project (note that Hiroyuki did not participate in the voluntary post-project interview). His comments were mostly about his frustration with his English ability. For instance, he said in his reflection of Session 2, “うまく会話に参加できなかった。いつも何を言ったりいいのかわからない。英語が出てこない。” (I couldn’t participate in the conversation well. I don’t know what to say and when to say it. English doesn’t come out.) This comment shows that he attributed his incapability to have a successful interaction to his limited ability in English. Be that as it may, the analysis below reveals that the vicious cycle of turn negotiation was a result of their incompatible social, situated practices (i.e., how they co-constructed meaning during actual interaction).

6.2.1.1. Achieving conversational synchrony: Mutual contextualization of speech and bodily conduct. In Excerpt 10, which unfolded about 14 minutes into Session 2 in the second week of the project, Edwin and Hiroyuki are talking about parties in the U.S. based on the visual Hiroyuki chose. In the excerpt, Hiroyuki asks Edwin, “How often do you have a party?” and the dyad exchanges several turns to negotiate meaning. To analyze the excerpt, I will use two relevant concepts from multimodal discourse analysis: mutual contextualization, namely the idea that language and bodily conduct jointly construct turns and together enhance the projectability of human conduct (Hayashi, 2005), and message abundancy, namely the idea that duplicating the same message via multiple cues (e.g., oral and gestural cues) provides additional support for the interlocutor (Gibbons, 2003; Sharpe, 2006). I demonstrate how the dyad achieved conversational synchrony (i.e., coordination of rhythmic and iconic moves, Tannen, 2007) and
mutual understanding by adopting appropriate linguistic and non-linguistic means. Specifically, I show how Hiroyuki used speech and bodily conduct together to compensate for his limited proficiency in English and how Edwin repaired language and bodily conduct to tackle the trouble source.

Excerpt 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edwin</th>
<th>Hiroyuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ah um a party umm picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>um Americ=in America umm (1.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>how often do you have a party?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>((a shallow nod + widening of eyes + tilting his head slightly))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.39) Um (1.00) how often do I ah (1.34) gee it guess I guess it depends on the week um generally? (1.39) Umm (1.49) generally I would say (1.07) I’m partying on the weekends? Two [times] two times every week. [Yeah].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excerpt 10 shows that even the most unsuccessful dyad could achieve conversational synchrony and mutual understanding (at least momentarily) by using the available linguistic and non-linguistic resources appropriately. Conversational synchrony was observed in the form of a cooperative overlap in line 5, repetition of the key term “two times,” as well as the mirroring gesture of “two” in line 4 and 7 (i.e., one person subconsciously imitating the gesture of another,
Iacoboni, 2009). Although Edwin and Hiroyuki’s turn exchange was not as fast as that of Benjamin and Tomoya (Chapter 5) and Edwin produced lengthy intra-turn pauses when thinking of how to answer Hiroyuki’s question in line 2, the two participants exchanged turns at a somewhat fast pace between line 4 and 7. These interactional features indicate that the dyad’s turn negotiation and repair work were facilitated by the effective use of linguistic and non-linguistic behaviors.

First, Hiroyuki used message abundancy as a “compensatory device” (Gullberg, 2011) to match his communicative intentions with expressive means at his disposal. Specifically, Hiroyuki’s lack of English proficiency was compensated for via bodily conduct such as head nods, head tilts, and eye contact. For instance, after reading aloud the question he prepared for the session, he looked at the webcam to establish mutual eye contact. As it is known that mutual eye contact invites listener responses (Kendon, 1967), Hiroyuki was trying to indicate a turn boundary and increase the saliency of a turn relevance place (TRP, Sacks et al., 1974), namely a point of potential end of an utterance where speaker change is expected. Moreover, as shown in the 3rd visual in line 1, his indication of the TRP was enhanced by the use of a head nod, widened eyes, and a head tilt to the side (i.e., message abundancy). Similarly, in line 3, Hiroyuki used a head nod not only to indicate a TRP but also to request for Edwin to repair, as he was confused with the conflicting information between what he heard Edwin said (i.e., two times) and what he saw in the screen (i.e., Edwin’s three fingers in line 2).

Secondly, Edwin repaired not only linguistic but also non-linguistic cues to make himself understood by Hiroyuki. For example, when Hiroyuki asked if Edwin said, “three times,” Edwin repaired his gesture (i.e., an ambiguous third finger in the screen image of line 2 that could be indexical of “three”), clarified it with a loud speech (line 4), and repeated it two additional times.
(line 5, 6). This way, Edwin used message abundancy to make the trouble source more salient, so Hiroyuki could easily perceive it. As these examples show, Edwin and Hiroyuki could engage in mutual sensemaking before the vicious cycle started, as long as they used speech and bodily conduct effectively.

**6.2.1.2. Beginning of the vicious cycle: Silence and face negotiation.** Excerpt 11 took place immediately after Excerpt 10. In contrast to Excerpt 10, where the dyad’s language and bodily conduct together led to a felicitous conversational outcome, Excerpt 11 marks the beginning of the vicious cycle that was revealed in Akiyama (2017b). In the following conversation, Edwin and Hiroyuki are talking about what American college students do at a party. To analyze the data, I will bring together the concepts of *conversational style*, namely a set of basic tools with which people communicate (Tannen, 1987, 2005), complementary schismogenesis, and face work (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Using these concepts, I demonstrate how complementary schismogenesis resulted from silences that both Hiroyuki and Edwin used to save face. Specifically, on the one hand, Hiroyuki used silence to seek linguistic help, instead of verbally asking for clarification and expressing comprehension difficulty. On the other hand, Edwin used silence to elicit listener responses from Hiroyuki and to promote Hiroyuki’s initiation of repair. In the end, when the two failed to engage in repair using silence, they resorted to different conversational moves due to their incompatible conversational styles: hyperexplanation by Edwin and more silence by Hiroyuki.

**Excerpt 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edwin</th>
<th>Hiroyuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Does does does that sound like a lot?</td>
<td>Yeah yeah. In Japan there have no party? Gene[rally].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 [Real]ly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11  (1.50) But if if if you don’t work a lot I would I
would think that parties would take its place.

12  Uh party. Umm (1.12) do do you umm
enjoy party? very well? xxx=

13  =Do I enjoy partying? Yeah I do I do like
partying.

14  @@@

15  It’s it’s not my my most favorite thing? but it’s
a fun way to pass the time.

16  Um yeah (1.30) ok.

17  ((changing his body position))

Like um (1.49) the thing about the partying that
I don’t like as much is that (1.12) it’s not very
personal.
You just go inside the house? (1.16)

You um like you drink a little bit. (1.25)

Um and then I guess you just hit on people. (1.22)
In Excerpt 11, the dyad co-constructed turns successfully between line 8 and 16, as demonstrated by the relatively fast exchange of turns and somewhat equal engagement with each other’s contribution. However, line 17 marked the beginning of the vicious cycle of turns. In line 17, Edwin repositioned himself, which marks a change from one major unit of communicative activity to another (Scheflen, 1964). Edwin then made a structurally complex sentence, “the thing about the partying that I don’t like as much is that it’s not very personal,” which consisted of three clauses, as Edwin’s prospective recipient design (Erickson, 1986) did not function well enough to take Hiroyuki’s English proficiency level into account. Consequently, this sentence triggered a 2.83 second silence of Hiroyuki (line 18), who used silence as a contextualization cue for indicating comprehension difficulties. Edwin, however, continued to describe the American party scene and provided unnecessary details in line 19 (i.e., hyperexplanation). Edwin’s numerous hesitations (e.g., um), false starts (e.g., “you you you”), pauses as well as effort to achieve mutual eye gaze demonstrate that he was aware the turn negotiation was not functioning. However, he neither checked Hiroyuki’s comprehension nor initiated repair work. Instead, he simply stared at Hiroyuki motionlessly and waited for Hiroyuki’s listener feedback and initiation of repair (e.g., line 20, 22).

Akiyama (2017b) concluded that Edwin “misinterpreted” Hiroyuki’s contextualization cue of silence as the lack of engagement and initiated hyperexplanation, as Edwin is a relatively high-involvement communicator. However, what this multimodal analysis revealed was that Edwin was also using silence but for a different purpose, namely to elicit Hiroyuki’s listener feedback and initiation. Silence was chosen over other options, as initiating a comprehension check (e.g., “Do you understand?”) may potentially threaten Hiroyuki’s negative face, and because non-verbal actions, when compared with verbal actions, do not expose the actual nature
of the trouble source and are thus less face-threatening (Svennevig, 2008). That is, Edwin tried the most “innocuous” solution first. As for Hiroyuki, he used silence and waited for Edwin to repair his own utterances (i.e., self-initiated self-repair), because clarification requests (e.g., “What do you mean?”) and expression of comprehension difficulties (e.g., “I don’t understand.”) may threaten a speaker’s face, as they display a potential lack of competence in the speaker (Svennevig, 2008). What usually happens when the most innocuous method of repair fails to solve a communication problem is that a speaker tries another more socially sensitive solution. In the case of Excerpt 11, however, what happened was that Edwin, who is a relatively high-involvement communicator, used hyperexplanation to fill in silences, while Hiroyuki, who is a more high-considerateness communicator, resorted to even more silences (i.e., complementary schismogenesis, Bateson, 1972). Thus, as Erickson (1986) well put it, Edwin and Hiroyuki’s actions were “reciprocal” but not “complementary” (p. 306), as the silences were jointly constructed by the two participants to save face, but the actions were not calibrated; attempts at repair by one party did not match the attempts at repair by the other party.

6.2.1.3. Breaking away from the vicious cycle (momentarily): Language vs. culture-focused frames. The next excerpt is the continuation of Excerpt 11 and the final part of the data analyzed in the precursor study. In Excerpt 12, the dyad is still talking about what American college students do at a party. To analyze the data, I will draw on Tannen and Wallat’s (1987) concepts of frames and knowledge schemas (see the analysis of Excerpt 5 that used these concepts to examine Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction). Using these two concepts, I demonstrate how the dyad recipient designed their talk when interacting in the “language teaching and learning” frame (i.e., a frame where one of the participants functions as an expert of his L1 and teaches it to the other participant who functions as a novice of the language), but not
in the “cultural teaching and learning” frame (i.e., a frame where one of the participants functions as an expert of his own culture and teaches it to the other participant who functions as a novice of the culture). Specifically, in the language-focused frame, the dyad could momentarily break away from the vicious cycle of turns and achieve mutual understanding using gestures, an online translator, and code-switching. However, in the culture-focused frame, they could not recipient design their talk, as the focus on the content over the form made it difficult to identify and tackle the trouble source together.

Excerpt 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edwin</th>
<th>Hiroyuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 Um and then I mean (1.22) I guess you just hit on people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Do you do you do you know what “hit on” means?</td>
<td>(1.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 HIT ON?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Ok ok cuz it it doesn’t mean like it’s not like like that. ((showing a punching gesture))</td>
<td>(2.60) hidon? ((tilting his head to the side))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 It’s like.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Do you know the word “flirt”?</td>
<td>(1.81) No no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you know the word “flirt”?

((leaning forward and changing the seating position))

(1.58) No(h), ((embarrassed laughing))

Ok. Um, let me try to find the Japanese word for it then really quickly ((checking online translator))

Um (2.23) 彼、彼女になりたいことだ。
(Um (2.23) It is to want to become a girlfriend.)

(1.72) Mmm huh ((nodding deeply))

Yeah like words you say when you want someone to be your girlfriend.

(1.02) Umm ((nodding deeply))
Yeah so that (1.12) that happens a lot of um (1.02) parties.

Umm yeah ((nodding deeply))

But I don’t I don’t think it’s a good way to like find out about who the other person really is.

It’s just a way to have like shallow fun with another person.

What what do you what do you think of parties. [Do you] enjoy them? [umm].

I I I don’t um (2.83) have par(h)ty? @@@

Ok.

In Excerpt 12, the dyad shifted between the “cultural teaching and learning” frame and the “language teaching and learning” frame, unlike the interaction in Excerpt 11, in which the dyad
did not engage in any language-focused activities. Specifically, Edwin’s comprehension check in line 23, “Do you know do you know what ‘hit on’ means?” allowed Edwin to engage in “teaching” and Hiroyuki to express comprehension difficulties as a language learner. In other words, Edwin’s comprehension check marked the beginning of the “language teaching and learning” frame. In the frame, Edwin demonstrated a number of listener-oriented linguistic and non-linguistic behaviors such as checking Hiroyuki’s comprehension repeatedly (line 23, 29, and 31), repeating and exaggerating the trouble source “hit on” (line 23, 25), rephrasing the trouble source from “hit on” (a phrasal verb) to “flirt” (a regular verb) (line 29), using Google Translate to look up a word (line 32), translating the trouble source into Hiroyuki’s L1 (line 33), paraphrasing and simplifying the trouble source (line 35), and using gestures (punching gesture in line 27). As for Hiroyuki, although he occasionally used silences (line 22, 30, 40, and 42) just like in Excerpt 11, in Excerpt 12, he actively expressed comprehension difficulty by trying to repeat the trouble source, saying “hidon” (line 24), by tilting his head to the side (line 24), and by explicitly saying “no” (line 26). He also used deep head nodding to show he understood what “hit on” and “flirt” meant (line 34, 36, and 38). As these examples show, in the “language teaching and learning” frame, both Edwin and Hiroyuki produced listener-oriented utterances using gestures, an online translator, and code-switching, so they could tackle the trouble source and achieve the compatibility of knowledge schemas.

However, once the dyad shifted to the “cultural teaching and learning” frame in line 39, they again faced communication difficulties. This is mainly because Edwin could not design his talk in ways that displayed an orientation and sensitivity to Hiroyuki, who is a learner of English with only emerging proficiency. Indeed, after Edwin’s utterance did not receive any listener feedback, Edwin talked even faster (line 41) in a similar way to how he engaged in
hyperexplanation in Excerpt 11. Here, to recipient design his talk, Edwin could have simplified the sentence structure, spoken slowly, and used rising intonation to invite Hiroyuki’s listener responses in the middle and at the end of a sentence. This way, Hiroyuki could have indicated comprehension difficulty more actively than simply relying on silence. Nonetheless, Hiroyuki was also responsible for not allowing Edwin to assess his English proficiency level. Without any linguistic input from Hiroyuki, Edwin could not assess what Hiroyuki knew in English, which led to Edwin’s failure to calibrate his talk (i.e., malfunction of prospective recipient design). As a result of this vicious cycle, what happened in the end was that Edwin, in response to the 5.67 second pause in line 42, decided to drop the topic of flirtation and asked Hiroyuki to talk about Japanese parties (line 43).

In sum, although the interaction in Excerpt 12 showed some sign of mutual understanding and their ability to recipient design their talk, it was only limited to their interaction in the “language teaching and learning” frame, where the trouble source was made more salient and negotiable. In contrast, the same interactional behavior was not observed in the “cultural teaching and learning” frame, as the focus of the talk was on content rather than the language, which made it difficult for the dyad to identify and tackle the trouble source and break away from the vicious cycle.

6.2.2. The Vicious Cycle Continues: Machine-gun Questions About Japan

The first three excerpts, analyzed thus far and also in Akiyama (2017b), dealt with topics related to America, thus giving Edwin the ownership of both the language and cultural content (i.e., unilateral expertise configuration). The following English conversation (Excerpt 13) is different in that the dyad is mainly talking about Hiroyuki and his college life (i.e., crossed
expertise configuration). Analyzing this excerpt allows us to find out whether the vicious cycle observed in Excerpts 11 and 12 held true when Hiroyuki took the cultural expert position.

Before the conversation in Excerpt 13, the dyad was talking about club activities. Hiroyuki told Edwin that he belonged to a tennis club at his college. Excerpt 13, which unfolded about 24 minutes into Session 2, begins when Edwin asks whether Hiroyuki plays ping pong, too. To analyze the following conversation, I will again use the concepts of *conversational style* and *complementary schismogenesis* (see the analysis of Excerpt 11) but this time focusing on Edwin’s use of “machine-gun questions” (Tannen, 2005). Machine-gun questions are a series of questions that are produced with “high pitch, rapid rate, fast pacing with respect to preceding comments, and reduced syntactic forms” (p. 82) that show involvement and signal rapport. I argue that Edwin used machine-gun questions to encourage Hiroyuki to show involvement and to tackle the long silences; however, this led to complementary schismogenesis, as it became even more difficult for Hiroyuki to contribute to the conversation.

Excerpt 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edwin</th>
<th>Hiroyuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do you play ping pong at all too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3     | Do you play ping pong? 卓球?  
(Do you play ping pong? *Ping pong?*) |  |
Ah yeah yeah yeah I play ping pong when I go to um game center?

Ah game center ok.

Yeah.

So so-in college? there’s there’s um a room for just playing games? in your college?

Un?

Um is-is game center outside of college?

Yeah=

Ok. How-how far away is it from your college.

(1.07)

How far away is it.

(1.44)

Far far far um far is 遠い.
(Far far far um far is far.)

Ah 遠い. Yeah umm it’s far from my college=
(Ah far. Yeah umm it’s far from my college=)

17 = Oh really. So do you get there by train?
18 Yeah=
19 = So Japanese universities usually don’t have a room for playing ping pong?

20 I’m asking this because in America some colleges have a room just for playing ping pong.

21 Um do you um so um ((silence)) is-is-is your tennis club competitive? Do-do you practice hard?

22 Yes we practice but ah my tennis club is very weak ((moving the hand downwards x 3 to express “weak”))

23 because we are (3.48) sorry.

24 Umm do you want to see my picture now?

In Excerpt 13, the vicious cycle continued even though Hiroyuki was the owner of cultural knowledge. Although it is clear that Edwin made a substantial amount of effort to make himself
understood, for example, by translating “ping pong” (line 3) and “far” (line 15) into Japanese, repeating himself (line 11, 13), and rephrasing his original utterance for the simplification purpose (line 7, 9), Edwin’s use of machine-gun questions, such as “there’s there’s um a room for just playing games? in your college?” “is-is game center outside of college?” “How-how far away is it from your college.” “do you get there by train?”, did not help Hiroyuki hold the floor. That is, Edwin’s effort to show involvement and rapport via asking a series of questions with latching (line 11, 17, and 19) and reduced syntactic forms (line 9, 11, 13, 17, and 23) made it difficult for Hiroyuki to say anything other than “yes” or “no.” This is especially because Edwin’s questions were mostly those questions that only require a “yes” or “no” response. Consequently, the only time Hiroyuki contributed to delivering new information was in line 24, when he said, “yes we practice but ah my tennis club is very weak” using his hand gesture as a supplementary way of saying “weak.” However, Hiroyuki, not knowing how to explain why his team is weak, paused for 3.48 seconds and said “sorry” (line 24). In the end, Edwin decided to ask whether Hiroyuki wanted to see Edwin’s picture and suggested that they drop the topic and move onto the Japanese conversation.

As this example shows, the dyad suffered from complementary schismogenesis as a result of their incompatible conversational styles even when Hiroyuki was the owner of the cultural knowledge in the English part of the session. This indicates that Hiroyuki’s better epistemic access to the content of discussion was not powerful enough to change the dynamics of the conversation and let the dyad break away from the vicious cycle.
6.2.3. The Vicious Cycle in Japanese

Thus far, I have analyzed the English part of Session 2 and demonstrated how the dyad suffered from the vicious cycle, although they could break away from it momentarily depending on their framing of the encounter. I also demonstrated that change in the cultural expertise status (i.e., crossed expertise configuration) was not powerful enough to stop the vicious cycle, although it slightly improved the interaction. Now, I will analyze the Japanese part of Session 2 in order to compare the two language parts. Analyzing the Japanese interaction allows us to find out whether the vicious cycle was dependent on the dyad’s proficiency level or on their conversational styles. If their interaction is different between the two language parts, we can conclude that their NS vs. NNS status was the major determinant of their interaction. In contrast, if their interaction is similar between the two language parts, we can conclude that what governed their interaction was the incompatibility of conversational styles.

For the Japanese part of Session 2, Edwin chose a meme that shows the discrepancy between how other people see what college students do and what they actually do at college. Edwin spent approximately three minutes explaining the visual in a unidirectional way. In the following conversation, which unfolded about 32 minutes into Session 2 and three minutes into the Japanese part, Edwin answers Hiroyuki’s question, “なんで、なんでそう思うの？” (Why do you think so?), which is the very first contribution Hiroyuki made in the Japanese part (other than showing involvement via aizuchi). To analyze Excerpt 14, I will bring together the concepts of conversational style and complementary schismogenesis (see the analysis of Excerpt 11) as well as frames (see the analysis of Excerpt 12) and footing (i.e., alignments between people and those they take up to utterances). I argue that, whether they were interacting in English or Japanese, their interaction was characterized by Edwin’s (unintended) conversational dominance.
and Hiroyuki’s (unintended) reticence. That is, in both language parts, the dyad suffered from the misalignment of conversational styles and could only overcome it when they were interacting in the “language teaching and learning” frame.

Excerpt 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edwin</th>
<th>Hiroyuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>でも、あ～、あ～、写真、この写真にあるパーティーは、あ～、私の大学のパーティーより、あ～、いいと思います。もっと楽しいと思います。あ～、もっと、あ～、more fun? もっと楽しい？楽しい？=</td>
<td>うん。楽しい。うん= (=Yes fun. Yeah=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=はいはい。 (=Yeah yeah.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=なんで、なんでそう、思うの？ (=Why why do you think so?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>あ～、なんでそう思う。あ～、そうですか。えっと～、あ～、う～ん、き、あ、きれいなシャツが、が、あって、</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[あ～]、あ～、え、笑顔が、あ～、たくさん、たくさんあるからです。 (Ah:: why I think so. Ah:: I see. We::ll ah:: umm:: bea–um–beautiful shirt is is there. [Ah::] ah:: smi–smile ah:: a lot of–a lot of it is there.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| |[Ah::] |=はん。
| |Why why do you think so? (=Why why do you think so?) |
| |=はん。
| |Ye[ah].) |
| |オ [nodding] |
| |=はん。
| |(5.46) |
(Yeah.) (5.46)
((staring at the screen motionlessly))

あ～、で、あ～、それから、あ～、
(Ah:: and then ah:: then ah::)

ダンス、ダンスしそうです。あ[～]。
(dance dance they are about to. Ah[:::])

私の大学のパーティーでは、あ、人があまりダンスしない。
(At the parties in my university people don’t dance much.)

ふ～ん。
(I see.)

うん。(3.67)
(Yeah.) (3.67)
((staring at the screen motionlessly))
I wish more people danced って日本語で
何言うんですか。
("I wish more people danced" how do you
say it in Japanese?)

| 11 | Ah は。
   | (Ah I.) |
| 12 | うん。
   | (Uh huh.) |
| 13 | もっと人々がダンスをすることを望む？
   | (I have a longing for more people
dancing?)
   | ((tilting his head)) |
| 14 | あ～、あ～、もっと人々がダンスをすることが望む。
   | (Ah:: ah:: I have a longing to more people
dancing.)
   | ((thumbing up after repeating the sentence
       Hiroyuki translated for Edwin)) |
In Excerpt 14, the dyad’s incompatible conversational styles inadvertently led to Edwin’s dominance of the conversation just like in the English part of Session 2 (see Excerpt 11). Although the interactional outcome was the same in both Excerpts 11 and 14 (i.e., Edwin’s conversational dominance and Hiroyuki’s reticence), how they reached the stage of complementary schismogenesis was different between the two language parts. In the English interaction, on the one hand, Hiroyuki, as a novice of English and American culture, used silence to seek linguistic help, and this led to Edwin’s hyperexplanation that met Edwin’s relatively more high-involvement style. In the Japanese interaction, on the other hand, Hiroyuki did not contribute much to the conversation, despite his being a NS of Japanese. Indeed, Hiroyuki mostly demonstrated engagement via aizuchi throughout the Japanese part of Session 2, and this led to Edwin’s floor holding using “broken starts,” a strategy that is often used by L2 speakers to
launch a turn, grapple with, and increase language production (Gardner, 2007), as well as stretched intra-turn fillers to give himself extra time to think.

For instance, when Edwin explained why the party in the meme looked more fun than parties at his university (line 5), Hiroyuki did not actively engage with what Edwin said. Instead, he simply demonstrated his understanding using a stretched head nod (line 6). Thus, Edwin, who was expecting more salient listener contribution from Hiroyuki, did not know what to do for 5.46 seconds (line 7). Being a high-involvement communicator who generally does not appreciate long silences, Edwin used a broken start, “ألوه (Ah::), to hold the floor and decided to carry on with the conversation. Similarly, after Edwin provided another reason why the party in the meme looked more fun (line 7, 8), Hiroyuki simply said, “hoge,” which is a somewhat indifferent way of saying “I see” (line 9). Subsequently, the dyad again experienced a long silence of 3.67 seconds in line 10, during which time Edwin stared at the screen motionlessly, expecting Hiroyuki to say something. However, receiving no listener contribution from Hiroyuki, Edwin again used a broken start, “ألوه (Ah::), to provide an additional explanation. As these examples show, Hiroyuki’s limited contribution in the “cultural teaching and learning” frame influenced Edwin, making him use more broken starts. However, this high-involvement strategy made it even more difficult for Hiroyuki to contribute to the conversation especially because Edwin made no eye contact and “forestalled listener responses” (Kendon, 1967) from Hiroyuki when he used intra-turn fillers such as “ألوه (Ah::) and “ووه (umm) to grapple with language production.

In contrast, when Edwin shifted from the “cultural teaching and learning” frame to the “language teaching and learning” frame to explicitly seek linguistic support, Hiroyuki aligned with Edwin and contributed to the conversation as a language expert. For example, when Edwin
asked Hiroyuki what the equivalent of “I wish more people danced” is in Japanese (line 10), Hiroyuki responded to Edwin’s request by translating the sentence into Japanese (line 11, 13). Moreover, Hiroyuki corrected Edwin’s use of a wrong particle が (ga, a subject marker) and suggested that he use を (wo, an object marker) (line 15). As these examples show, Hiroyuki could find his role as a Japanese language expert during the “language teaching and learning” frame and contribute to the conversation in the form of translation and error correction. However, it is important to note that Hiroyuki’s translation was not appropriate for Edwin to use, because the translation was not suitable for the oral register and resembled a translation done by a language teacher who uses the grammar translation method. It is also important to highlight that Hiroyuki’s error correction might not have been sensitive to Edwin’s emotion, as Edwin thumbed up to show his accomplishment for having repeated the long sentence in line 14. To sum, although Hiroyuki’s behavior might not have been the most appropriate given the nature of eTandem interaction, Hiroyuki found the reason or purpose of the interaction when he was taking up a footing of a language teacher. This means that Hiroyuki, when prompted to take up a footing of a language expert, felt comfortable and qualified enough to stop being a listener and contribute to the conversation.

In summary, the analysis of the Japanese interaction revealed that Edwin’s conversational dominance and Hiroyuki’s reticence was triggered in both language parts of Session 2 mainly due to the incompatible conversational styles. The only time when the dyad could break away from the vicious cycle of complementary schismogenesis was when they were interacting in the “language teaching and learning” frame. In the English interaction, the language-focused frame adequately allowed the dyad to recipient design their talk, as Edwin could identify and tackle the trouble source and Hiroyuki could indicate the location of trouble source. In the Japanese
interaction, Hiroyuki, who took up a footing of a language expert in the “language teaching and learning frame,” felt qualified enough to become more involved in the conversation than simply participating via aizuchi. Thus, this dyad’s interaction was more successful in the “language teaching and learning” frame than in the “cultural teaching and learning” frame, whether the language of interaction was English or Japanese.

6.2.4. Summary of Session 2 Interaction

The multimodal analysis of the three English excerpts examined in Akiyama (2017b) partly corroborated and partly changed the interpretation of the precursor study. First, as revealed in the precursor study, it was found that Hiroyuki avoided clarification requests using verbal action (e.g., “Sorry?”) and bodily action (e.g., a head tilt) and instead used silence to seek linguistic help. It was also revealed that a chain of Hiroyuki’s silences triggered Edwin’s hyperexplanation, which reduced Hiroyuki’s chances to contribute to the conversation and made it difficult for Edwin to assess Hiroyuki’s current English proficiency level, as silence did not give Edwin enough language samples of Hiroyuki to recipient design his talk. What the audio-based analysis did not discover in the precursor study, however, was that Edwin also used silence with a motionless facial expression to negotiate turns. That is, what seemed like Edwin’s failure to pick up/misinterpret Hiroyuki’s contextualization cue of silence in the audio analysis actually represented Edwin’s conscious effort to avoid the face-threatening act of comprehension checks and repair initiation. This means that it was both Edwin and Hiroyuki who used the most innocuous method to engage in repair. However, they did so to achieve different communicative goals, namely for Edwin to elicit listener feedback from Hiroyuki and for Hiroyuki to seek linguistic help from Edwin. However, what happened when the silence method did not work as a
repair strategy was the conversational dominance by Edwin and even more silence by Hiroyuki as a result of their inability to negotiate incompatible conversational styles.

The incompatibility of conversational styles led Edwin, who is a high-involvement communicator, talking more and Hiroyuki, who is a high-considerateness communicator, talking less. This complementary schismogenesis was observed whether the owner of cultural knowledge was Edwin or Hiroyuki (Excerpt 13) and whether the language of interaction was English or Japanese (Excerpt 14). The only time when the two participants could break away from the vicious cycle was when they were interacting in the “language teaching and learning” frame, where a person who took up a footing of a language expert provided appropriate scaffolding and where a person who took up a footing of a language novice explicitly indicated where the trouble source was. For instance, the analysis of English interaction revealed that the dyad maintained turns successfully when Hiroyuki admitted he did not know the word “hit on,” for which Edwin used the online translator to provide the Japanese translation. The analysis of Japanese interaction, on the other hand, revealed that Hiroyuki contributed to the conversation as a language expert when Edwin asked for linguistic help. This indicates that the dyad could construct the conversation collaboratively as long as they were focused on identifying and tackling communicative issues. However, the dyad did not benefit from the cTandem setting where participants can dynamically change their situated identities depending on how they align themselves with each other and with what the talk is about.
6.3. Session 8: Practicing Multimodal Bricolage

The longitudinal analysis of Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction enables us to find out what happened to their enactment of reciprocity. Did their reciprocity improve, worsen, or go through no change? In this section, I will analyze conversational data from Session 8 that took place seven weeks after Session 2 on the theme of lifestyles. My analysis will focus on the English part of Session 8, especially when the dyad was interacting in the crossed expertise configuration, namely when Edwin was a language expert but a cultural novice, while Hiroyuki was a language novice but a cultural expert. This section was chosen for analysis because it was the only section of Session 8 that demonstrated a significantly different behavior from Session 2. In the following analysis of two English excerpts, I will demonstrate how the dyad used resources that are afforded by the local environment (i.e., multimodal bricolage, Mehus, 2011) to achieve a relatively equal turn distribution.

6.3.1. Using Bodily Conduct to Engage in Repair

The following conversation (Excerpt 15), which unfolded about six minutes into Session 8, took place immediately after the free conversation in English. Hiroyuki chose a photo of a western bed as the visual for American culture, based on which he wanted to ask Edwin if American people use *tatami* in their bedroom. However, after saying, “Un umm ah (1.02) in America umm (2.04) bedroom and (1.90) and” (line 1), he realized that Edwin might not know *tatami* (a traditional Japanese floor mat). Thus, Hiroyuki changed his utterance in the middle of the sentence and asked, “do you know *tatami*?” (line 1). This created a crossed expertise configuration where Hiroyuki had to explain what *tatami* is in English. To analyze the following conversation, I will use the concept of *multimodal bricolage* strategies (Mehus, 2011), namely
participants’ use of resources afforded by the local environment, and footing to demonstrate how Edwin and Hiroyuki performed their duty as a cultural novice and expert using their body and material surround.

Excerpt 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edwin</th>
<th>Hiroyuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Un umm ah (1.02) in America umm (2.04) bedroom and (1.90) and-do you know tatami? tatami.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ah I think so. Like the it’s it’s like a it’s it’s square and you umm (1.30) is-it is-it a heated a heated bed? is that right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1.63) Un? ((leaning forward to listen carefully or to show he is listening carefully))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Umm can you can you explain it? I think I know it but I don’t know it very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1.21) Ah tatami ((checking dictionary for 2.37 seconds))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>umm ((checking dictionary for 6.69 seconds)) tatami umm ((checking dictionary for 1.76 seconds)) tat(h)ami a::h ((checking dictionary for 4.97 seconds)) tatami is um ((dictionary - 2.55)) made by umm (1.67) straw? straw.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uh huh ((nodding deeply))

So and the combination of straw. So (1.44) umm un in Japan umm tatami is very popular.

Uh huh ((nodding deeply)) al[right].

[Umm] umm (1.63) un (2.09) tatami and umm

[Umm] room(/lum/) (1.02) in Japan un almost all of house have the roo(/lu/) (1.49) room(/lum/) of tatami?

(1.12) Ah I’m-I’m sorry I didn’t catch the last thing you said.

(1.35) Un? ((leaning forward to listen carefully or to show he is listening carefully))

Can you-can you say it last thing one more time?

Ah almost all of Japanese house (1.21) umm have umm (4.74) the room(/lum/)?

((thrusting the head forward to emphasize “r”))
13 Have of ha-have jeloom (/jeˈlum/)? Sorry=

14 [Of] Have have the ROOm(/lum/) un. ((thrusting the body forward to emphasize the “R”))

15 (2.97) Umm. ((awkward smile and looking away))

16 (1.12) ah have ROOm(/lum/) of tatam- ([tatami]?) ((leaning forward to indicate his turn is over))
In Excerpt 15, Hiroyuki used bodily conduct and the material surround to engage in repair and turn-taking, unlike the interaction in Session 2. First, Hiroyuki tried to compensate for his inability to produce the /r/ sound by using his upper body. Specifically, in line 8, his pronunciation of *room* as /lum/, which is a common mistake by Japanese learners of English (Saito & Lyster, 2012), became the trouble source. In line 12, Hiroyuki repeated a similar sentence to that of line 8, but this time with a head thrust forward precisely when he said, “room” (/lum/). Edwin, however, did not understand what Hiroyuki said and indicated his comprehension difficulty by saying what he thought he had heard (i.e., /jeˈlum/) (line 13). In line 14, Hiroyuki tried to repair his utterance once again, but this time with a much shorter, targeted utterance, “have have the ROOm (/lum/),” adding emphasis on the /r/ sound (i.e., ROOm) with a swift push of his upper body forward. However, even after Hiroyuki’s attempts to repair his utterance twice, Edwin did not understand Hiroyuki, as indicated by “umm,” an awkward smile, and a look-away (line 15). In line 16, Hiroyuki repaired his pronunciation one more time by
emphasizing the /r/ sound. He also leaned forward near the TRP to mark the end of his turn, concluding it by saying “yeah” as if he gave up and wanted to abandon the floor.

As this analysis reveals, Hiroyuki used bodily conduct to actively repair his utterances and prompt Edwin to repair his utterances. It is important to highlight the fact that Hiroyuki’s conversational contribution is much greater in Excerpt 15 than in Excerpt 13 (regarding ping pong), although both excerpts unfolded during a crossed expertise configuration in English. The difference between the two excerpts seems to be what footing Hiroyuki took in explaining his culture. In Excerpt 13, although Hiroyuki held a cultural expert status, he did not take up a footing of a “teacher.” In Excerpt 15, in response to the explicit request from Edwin to explain tatami (a traditional Japanese floor mat), Hiroyuki dutifully tried to “teach” it as a cultural expert. This is similar to the case where the dyad momentarily broke away from the vicious cycle in the Japanese part of Session 2 when Hiroyuki performed his duty as a language expert (see the analysis of Excerpt 14). This indicates that, when Hiroyuki took up a footing of a language and cultural expert or more specifically “teacher,” he performed his duty and made a greater conversational contribution using whatever resources were available. In Session 2, Hiroyuki could only resort to silence, but in Session 8, he developed a multimodal bricolage strategy to use his electronic dictionary to provide an explanation in English and to use his body to indicate turn boundaries and engage in conversational repair.

As for Edwin, he took up a footing of a cultural novice (and a language expert) and used various verbal and gestural resources to show involvement as well as understanding and lack thereof. For instance, he nodded deeply when he understood (line 6, 8) and looked away from the webcam when he did not understand (line 15). When Edwin pretended that he understood what Hiroyuki said, he used both deep nodding and a look away (line 16). His saying, “oh oh ok ok I
gotcha,” as well as his stretched head nod and look-away indicate that Edwin avoided asking Hiroyuki to repair any further, as he probably thought it was face-threatening.

In sum, the analysis of Excerpt 15 revealed that the dyad used a wider variety of bricolage strategies in Session 8 than in Session 2, so they could highlight the trouble source, work on resolving the communication issue, and achieve mutual understanding. One major factor that contributed to this change was Hiroyuki’s developing a multimodal bricolage strategy of using his electronic dictionary. Another major factor was the footings Edwin and Hiroyuki took up in discussing a cultural concept. When the epistemic position of one participant is significantly higher than that of the other, the one who knew more (in this case Hiroyuki) took up a footing of an expert and performed the “teaching” duty. This finding, in combination with the findings in Session 2 (see the analysis of Excerpt 14), suggests that the dyad’s interaction was relatively successful if they took up a footing of a language or cultural expert and performed the “teaching” duty and if they utilized the material surround as a bricolage strategy.

6.3.2. Cooperative Word Search: The Role of Online vs. Electronic Dictionaries

The next excerpt took place immediately after Excerpt 15. In Excerpt 16, Hiroyuki’s mispronunciation of the /r/ sound, this time in the word hard, triggered a repair sequence of turns. I will again use the concept of multimodal bricolage strategies to analyze the data. The analysis demonstrates that Hiroyuki’s use of his electronic dictionary helped him maintain the floor, although its “solitary word search” (M. H. Goodwin & C. Goodwin, 1986, p. 63) led to turn monopoly, which I define as the exclusive control of turns by one of the participants. I will also argue that Edwin’s joining Hiroyuki’s word search with an online translator changed the
solitary word search into *cooperative* word search, re-established the stage for turn negotiation, and led to mutual understanding.

Excerpt 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edwin</th>
<th>Hiroyuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ah (1.44) umm (2.32) tatami is umm (1.49) very umm ((checking dictionary for 4.46 seconds))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1.16) Oh **ok**

like like-like temperature? or like **hard** sorry ((knocking gesture x 3))
19  Did you say hot like hot as in temperature?

20  (1.72) Ah um? ((tilting his head))

21  (2.32) Ah no no no. Ah (1.72) ah tatami-tatami is very ((taking a deep breath in and laughing out of embarrassment)) um ((checking dictionary for 2.88 seconds))

        sorry umm=
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>=ah it’s ok=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>=is very umm ((checking dictionary for 2.14 seconds))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Umm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>(1.07) Ah I Japanese umm ((laughing out of embarrassment and checking dictionary for 2.42 seconds))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ah one [moment].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Un]. ((awkward laughing))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>[Ah::]=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese umm bed ah [umm] ((checking dictionary for 1.58 seconds))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>=They are make the bed on the tatami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>(1.02) Ah ok so um ((checking the translation of “hard” in Japanese using Google Translate for 2.46 seconds))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it’s it’s hard as in 固い? (it’s it’s hard as in hard?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of Excerpt 16 revealed how Edwin’s participation in the word search broke
Hiroyuki’s turn monopoly and led to mutual understanding. In line 17, Hiroyuki consulted his
electronic dictionary and produced the word “hard” but with the “r” dropped. Edwin
acknowledged the delivery of speech with “oh ok” but initiated a clarification request by asking
“like like-like temperature? Or like hard sorry” with a hand pounding as a sign of “hard” to
check if Hiroyuki meant “hot” or “hard” (line 18). After realizing that Edwin did not understand
what Hiroyuki said about tatami (i.e., tatami is hard), Hiroyuki started to look for a better
explanation of tatami using his electronic dictionary, which was placed on his left. Likely feeling
frustrated, as evidenced by his taking a deep breath in, Hiroyuki apologized for his incompetence
(line 21). Edwin comforted Hiroyuki by saying “ah it’s ok” and showed solidarity in line 22, yet
Hiroyuki’s silence (and seeming agony) continued from line 23 to 25 while consulting the dictionary. Hiroyuki’s utterance in line 28, which is an additional description of tatami rather than the reformulation of the actual trouble source (i.e., the word hard), indicated that Hiroyuki was consulting his electronic dictionary to say “make the bed.” Here, it is notable that Hiroyuki did not see his L1 (i.e., Japanese) as a tool to use for communication and for learning, which may reflect his socialization into formal instruction in Japan, where students are often taught to speak only in the TL with NSs and are not encouraged to explore code-switching as a fruitful learning strategy.

In line 26, Edwin decided to join the word search using Google Translate, making the solitary word search into cooperative word search, namely a self-organizing and loosely aligned way of looking up a word for the common goal of mutual understanding. Edwin’s translation of hard into Japanese 固い (hard) in line 29 suggested that he was using the online translator to resolve the original trouble source (i.e., hot or hard). Although the two participants were consulting their electronic dictionary/online translator for a different word, Edwin’s provision of the Japanese translation in line 29 made Hiroyuki understand why Edwin was confused, as indicated by the stretched head nod in line 30. In other words, only when Edwin joined the word search and provided a Japanese translation of the word he was having trouble understanding, did the dyad manage to co-construct turns and achieve mutual understanding, as evidenced by their mirroring behavior (Iacoboni, 2009) in line 34 and 35.

6.3.3. Summary of Session 8 Interaction

While silences constituted a major part of the conversation in both Session 2 and 8, their functions were different between the two sessions. Unlike Session 2 where silence was used as a
contextualization cue for Hiroyuki to indicate a request for linguistic help and for Edwin to elicit listener feedback, silence in Session 8 was used as a turn-holder for word search. The decrease in the number of silences used as a contextualization cue in Session 8 is a result of Hiroyuki’s use of multimodal resources to indicate comprehension difficulty. Specifically, instead of using silences that place “high inferential demands on the addressee” (Sifianou, 1997, p. 73), Hiroyuki expressed his comprehension difficulty by combining speech and bodily conduct (e.g., placing his right ear near the computer screen and saying “Un?”). Thus, it seems that Hiroyuki modified his turn negotiation behavior over time, increasing the saliency of contextualization cues by resorting to both visual and oral channels. This indicates that Hiroyuki developed the multimodal strategy over time to compensate for his limited competency in English.

A major change from Session 2 was observed in the English interaction of Session 8 when Hiroyuki displayed the cultural expertise and took up a footing of a “teacher.” The dyad’s interaction during the crossed expertise configuration was characterized by Edwin’s floor holding via the use of his electronic dictionary. Although Hiroyuki managed to equalize turn distribution, it led to his turn monopoly, as Hiroyuki did not share the trouble source with Edwin and all Edwin could do was to wait for Hiroyuki to find the right word. When Edwin joined Hiroyuki’s word search and provided a Japanese translation for the English word that was the trouble source for Edwin (i.e., collaborative word search), the dyad could finally achieve mutual understanding.

Table 6 summarizes the dyad’s use of multimodal resources in terms of comprehension and production. The table demonstrates how the dyad used the material surround and bodily conduct to facilitate the co-construction of turns and mutual understanding. While Edwin’s change between Session 2 and 8 was minimal, Hiroyuki changed his multimodal turn-taking
behavior to compensate for his lack of English proficiency. For instance, while Hiroyuki was relying mainly on visual cues (e.g., Edwin’s hand gestures) to understand Edwin in Session 2, he started to rely on oral cues and together developed the strategy to ask clarification questions using not only speech (“un?”) but also bodily conduct (e.g., a head tilt, leaning forward). In addition, while his bodily conduct in Session 2 was mainly around the head (e.g., head movement, facial expressions), he additionally used the upper body to exaggerate the movement and increase message abundancy to repair communication breakdowns caused by his pronunciation of the /r/ sound.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Session 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehension</strong></td>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>Hiroyuki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relied on visual + oral cues</td>
<td>Relied mainly on visual cues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production</strong></td>
<td>Non-verbal cues</td>
<td>Non-verbal cues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hand gestures used in the middle of a turn to increase message abundance</td>
<td>• Head tilts to ask a question, to show uncertainty and comprehension difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Head nods rarely used</td>
<td>• Head nods used to indicate turn boundaries and to show comprehension difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material surround</td>
<td>Material surround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Online translator <em>(Google Translate)</em></td>
<td>• Online translator <em>(Google Translate)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye contact (widened eyes) used to indicate turn boundaries and ask questions</td>
<td>Eye contact (widened eyes) used to indicate turn boundaries and ask questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Summary of Multimodal Practices in the English Parts of Session 2 and 8
6.4. Edwin and Hiroyuki’s Use of Technological Affordances

When we compare the interaction of Edwin and Hiroyuki with that of Benjamin and Tomoya, one stark difference between the two dyads is how they used technological affordances in and outside the Google Hangouts environment. While most of the participating dyads did not use the screen sharing function (cf. Benjamin and Tomoya, who screen shared various Google services such as Google Images and YouTube during their video chat), the majority of the participating dyads used text chats when communication breakdowns occurred. Edwin and Hiroyuki, in contrast, did not use either the screen sharing or text chatting functions of Google Hangouts. Thus, they took less advantage of multimodality in that the only technology tool they used during Google Hangouts chats was an online/electronic dictionary. Outside the video chat, Edwin and Hiroyuki only emailed the images they used for the visual-based task, and those emails rarely contained any personal messages. Hiroyuki did not have a Facebook account; thus, the dyad was not connected via social networking sites, either.

Looking at Edwin and Hiroyuki’s individual profiles, however, Edwin was found to be one of the most technologically advanced users in the project, as he was a linguistics major with a concentration in computational linguistics who knew several programming languages. He also stated that he had several years of video conferencing experience in mostly Skype, and thus felt comfortable using Google Hangouts. However, when it came to the actual interaction with Hiroyuki, he was considered an average or less than the average user of technology who looked up a word online but did not use the screen sharing or text chatting function of Google Hangouts. As for Hiroyuki, based on the interactional evidence, I can speculate that he did not possess the technology skills for the purpose of language learning. For instance, the only tool Hiroyuki used
during the 10-week project was his electronic dictionary. Just like Edwin, Hiroyuki never used the text chatting or screen sharing function of *Google Hangouts*.

Below I will revisit the excerpts in Session 2 and 8 that were analyzed in the previous sections of this chapter. In doing so, I will compare how the most successful vs. unsuccessful dyads used technological affordances in order to uncover the role technology mediation played in forming the virtuous vs. vicious cycle of turn negotiation.

### 6.4.1. Session 2: Incompatible Styles in Technology Use

The unsuccessful dyad rarely used technological affordances in Session 2. Indeed, Edwin was the only participant who used technology tools during a *Google Hangouts* interaction, and the only digital tool that Edwin used was *Google Translate*. He exclusively used it in the English part of the interaction when he was looking up a Japanese word for Hiroyuki such as “彼女になりたいことだ” (to want to be a girlfriend) to explain the English phrase “hit on” (Excerpt 12). That is, he used *Google Translate* not to express his own ideas but to help Hiroyuki understand what Edwin was saying, and his strategy was the provision of Japanese translations. As Excerpt 17 (taken from Excerpt 12) shows, the dyad achieved mutual understanding when Edwin looked up a word via *Google Translate* and utilized his being a bilingual speaker of Japanese and English.

Excerpt 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edwin</th>
<th>Hiroyuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 Do you do you know the word “flirt”?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 ((leaning forward and changing the seating position))</td>
<td>(1.58) No(h). ((embarrassed laughing))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Ok. Um. [Let me let me] try to find the Japanese word for it then really quickly ((checking online translator))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Um (2.23) 彼、彼女になりたいことだ。
(Um (2.23) It is to want to become a girlfriend.)

34
(1.72) Mmm huh [nodding deeply]

35 Yeah like words you say when you want someone to be your girlfriend.

36 (1.02) Umm [nodding deeply]

37 Yeah so that (1.12) that happens a lot of um (1.02) parties.

38 Umm yeah [nodding deeply]
In contrast, in the Japanese part of the interaction, Edwin rarely used Google Translate to express his thought. Instead, he asked Hiroyuki to translate English into Japanese. Edwin’s frequent request for linguistic help indicates that he positioned himself as a language novice and Hiroyuki as a language expert. It also suggests that, when he wanted to receive linguistic support, he preferred to receive it from an interlocutor rather than from a technology tool. That is, his preference for repair was “high-involvement” in that he wanted to get Hiroyuki involved in conversational repair. It can also be said that he preferred human mediation rather than object media (Lantolf, 2006). However, Edwin asked Hiroyuki to translate an English sentence into Japanese at such a fast pace that it often resulted in a communication breakdown. That is, although the dyad was mainly speaking in Japanese, Edwin’s request for a translation (e.g., “How do you say xxx in Japanese?”) created an English-speaking environment where Hiroyuki was positioned as an expert of Japanese by Edwin but Hiroyuki positioned himself as a novice of English. Due to this incompatible positioning, the dyad often encountered a situation where they could not resolve a trouble source, gave up a topic, and moved on. Thus, although it is ironic, it is possible that Edwin’s decision to not use Google Translate and instead involve Hiroyuki in the process of conversational repair exacerbated their communication difficulties and Edwin’s conversational dominance. This indicates that, unless a request for a translation is done appropriately, such use of participants’ bilingual resources may do more harm than good.

As for Hiroyuki’s behavior in the English part of Session 2, the analysis revealed that he did not use any technology tool. Instead, Hiroyuki used silences to seek linguistic help from Edwin. That is, Hiroyuki relied on the language expert rather than on the material surround in resolving communication issues. Similarly, Hiroyuki did not use any technological affordances during the Japanese part of the interaction. Edwin, reflecting on their fourth interaction, indeed
commented on the communication difficulty that resulted from Hiroyuki’s not being able to “find the right words in English.” He said,

*Session 4 was interesting for me because in a certain way it was the reverse of the last two weeks. I remember writing that it was hard to talk about vocabulary that my partner did not know because it involved me trying to explain a word in other words that he often did not know either. In this week, I felt as though I had managed to remove most of this difficulty in my first language, but when we switched to Japanese, this week the same situation happened to me because the session relied on many new sorts of vocabulary that I had never heard of and probably could not have known to prepare for. Occasionally, the gap in knowledge became so bad that my partner would switch into English briefly thinking it would help communication, but this often was not the case because he could not find the right words in English.*

(Edwin, from weekly reflection of Session 4)

As reflected in this comment of Edwin, Hiroyuki’s attempt to use his bilingual resources was not fruitful in repairing a communication breakdown mainly due to his limited proficiency in English. Considering how Edwin’s use of *Google Translate* in the English part helped Hiroyuki understand, we may speculate that Hiroyuki’s use of a dictionary in the Japanese part could have facilitated mutual understanding.

In summary, it is interesting to uncover that it was not just their conversational styles but also styles in technology use that were incompatible between the two participants. First, while Edwin used a technology tool during Session 2, Hiroyuki never used any material surround to resolve communication issues. This is contrastive with the case of Benjamin and Tomoya, who
both used the same type of technology tools to a relatively similar degree. Secondly, the two participants differed in the way they attempted to resolve communication breakdowns using bilingual resources. While Edwin, as an expert of English, used a dictionary to provide a Japanese translation of an English word that Hiroyuki did not understand, Hiroyuki did not resort to any material surround. Rather, he used his English skills to provide an English translation. However, Hiroyuki’s translation was not effective for resolving a communication breakdown due to his limited proficiency in English. Benjamin and Tomoya, in contrast, used whatever was available to them in the immediate environment to achieve mutual understanding, and these multimodal bricolage strategies ranged from the use of a dictionary to the use of online resources such as YouTube videos and Google Images. This indicates that Edwin and Hiroyuki mostly resorted to linguistic resources, while Benjamin and Tomoya resorted to not only linguistic but also visual resources to repair communication breakdowns. Finally, Edwin did not use a dictionary when he did not know how to say a word or sentence in Japanese. Instead, Edwin asked Hiroyuki to translate an English word or sentence into Japanese, demonstrating a “high-involvement” strategy in dealing with a communication difficulty. It is ironic but possible that Edwin’s decision to not use technology but to involve Hiroyuki in conversational repair exacerbated Hiroyuki’s silence, as Hiroyuki sometimes could not understand the English sentence that Edwin wanted help with. In summary, the analysis revealed that the dyad suffered from the incompatibility of not only conversational styles but also technology use styles.

6.4.2. Session 8: Achieving Equal Turn Distribution vs. Reducing Social Presence

Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interactional patterns did not show a significant change over the seven weeks between Session 2 and 8. The only significant change was observed in the way the
dyad used their body and the material surround to overcome communication difficulties (i.e., multimodal bricolage). This change was observed especially when the dyad was interacting in the crossed expertise configuration in English, namely when Hiroyuki was a cultural expert but a language novice, while Edwin was a cultural novice but a language expert. This configuration led to increased cognitive and linguistic demand of Hiroyuki, but he managed to hold the floor and perform his conversational role as a cultural expert thanks to the use of his electronic dictionary, unlike in Session 2 when Edwin was the only one who resorted to object mediation via *Google Translate*.

While Edwin used *Google Translate* inside his computer screen, Hiroyuki used his electronic dictionary that is located to the left side of his computer. This led to a small amount of collaboration observed within the “*shared*” space (see Figure 7). While the presence of the *workspace* allowed Hiroyuki to claim the floor and use long silences in the turn-medial position as a planning strategy, it left his partner at a loss because they were not co-present to tackle the common trouble source. That is, the word search was not *projectable* (Barrow, 2008), meaning that Edwin could not figure out which word Hiroyuki was looking for in the dictionary. Furthermore, consulting the electronic dictionary only exacerbated the solitary nature of word search because Hiroyuki looked disengaged, not being able to establish mutual eye contact. Thus, while the use of the dictionary increased the chance for Hiroyuki to hold the floor and contribute more to the conversation, it reduced the sense of social presence (i.e., the degree of salience of the other person in the interaction and the consequent salience of the interpersonal relationship, Short et al., 1976).
Here, it is useful to compare how the two most vs. least successful dyads engaged in word searches. While the successful dyad used the screen sharing function of *Google Hangouts* and visualized the process of conversational repair (e.g., showing which word one was looking up), Edwin and Hiroyuki did not benefit from such *virtual joint attention* (i.e., the shared focus of the two individuals who are not physically co-present on an object that exists in a virtual space), because Hiroyuki worked alone, while Edwin was waiting for Hiroyuki to finish his search. Only when Edwin joined the word search using *Google Translate* and established the common objective of mutual understanding, did the “solitary word search” (M. H. Goodwin & C. Goodwin, 1986, p. 63) become *cooperative*. Although the cooperative word search facilitated mutual understanding, it did not increase the sense of social presence, as the two participants were working independently without sharing the trouble source. In summary, Session 8 was
characterized by the lack of social presence, as Hiroyuki removed access to the turn while interacting with the electronic dictionary. However, the use of the dictionary as well as the cultural expert status, and more specifically, his attempt to perform the duty as a cultural expert, allowed Hiroyuki to hold the floor and produce a greater conversational contribution, making their interaction more reciprocal in the sense of turn distribution.

6.4.3. Summary of Edwin and Hiroyuki’s Use of Technological Affordances

Compared to Benjamin and Tomoya, who used various technological affordances to create a shared space, increase their social presence, and maximize their bilingual resources, Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction was characterized by the limited use of technological affordances and incompatible styles of technology use. Their technology use was limited in terms of the number of tools used and the frequency of use. Specifically, the only technology tool used during the Google Hangouts interaction was a dictionary (Google Translate for Edwin and an electronic dictionary for Hiroyuki), and they used it only in a particular interactional configuration, namely in a unilateral expertise configuration for Edwin and a crossed expertise configuration for Hiroyuki. While Edwin used Google Translate in the English part to provide a Japanese translation for Hiroyuki, Hiroyuki used his electronic dictionary in the English part to explain a Japanese concept in English. Thus, unlike the interaction of Benjamin and Tomoya, whose interaction was constantly mediated by technology, Edwin and Hiroyuki used technology exclusively for tackling communication breakdowns and mostly for the purpose of finding the appropriate word.

Secondly, between Session 1 and 7, Edwin was the only participant who used technological affordances in sense making. In Session 8, Hiroyuki also used his electronic
dictionary to explain a Japanese concept and perform his duty as a cultural expert. Although Hiroyuki’s dictionary use helped him hold the floor, it created a number of intra-turn pauses that Edwin could not do anything about. In order to tackle the long silences, Edwin also joined the word search by looking up a word that he was having trouble understanding. In the end, the cooperative word search led to mutual understanding, but at the same time, it reduced the salience of the other person in the interaction, because they were present in the same interaction but they did not attend to each other while looking up a word.
6.5. Enactment of Reciprocity: Main Findings for Edwin and Hiroyuki

In this section, I return to the main research questions in the study and inspect the various senses of reciprocity found in the extant literature and also analyzed in Chapter 5: (1) quantitative equality (i.e., number of turns and topic shifts, Schwienhorst, 2004; Schwienhorst and Borgia, 2006), (2) interactional patterns based on equality (i.e., degree of task control) and mutuality (i.e., involvement with each other’s contribution) (cf. Storch, 2002), (3) various forms of exchanged behavior, and (4) compatibility.

6.5.1. Equality

A cursory perusal of the transcripts confirmed that Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction was not equal in the number of turns and topic shifts. In both the English and Japanese parts of Session 2, Edwin mostly dominated the conversation, while Hiroyuki made a limited conversational contribution. In the English part, Edwin, a more high-involvement communicator, used hyperexplanation to explain about American culture, so he could get Hiroyuki involved in the conversation. On the other hand, Hiroyuki, a more high-considerateness communicator, used silence to seek linguistic help. The same interactional pattern was observed even during a crossed expertise configuration in English. Edwin, a cultural novice yet a language expert, used a high-involvement conversational strategy of machine-gun questions to ask about Hiroyuki’s culture. However, ironically, the conversational move discouraged Hiroyuki from taking a turn.

In the Japanese part of Session 2, Hiroyuki often showed involvement via aizuchi (i.e., short listener responses) and bodily conduct (e.g., head nods). However, as evidenced in weekly reflection, Edwin did not think such subtle contribution by the listener was sufficient, as he expected Hiroyuki to also show high-involvement moves such as asking follow-up questions and
making evaluative comments. Thus, Edwin, not knowing how to get Hiroyuki involved in the conversation, kept holding the floor via broken starts (Gardner, 2007) in the hope that the more Edwin contributes, the more Hiroyuki would show involvement. However, as evidenced by the fact that Edwin’s broken starts and Hiroyuki’s utterances often overlapped with each other, Edwin’s use of broken starts indeed made it difficult for Hiroyuki to produce utterances, especially because Edwin made no eye contact and forestalled listener responses from Hiroyuki.

Later in the semester, in contrast, Edwin and Hiroyuki’s conversation became relatively equal during a crossed expertise configuration in English. This is mainly because Hiroyuki resorted not only to verbal cues but also non-verbal cues and object mediation, so he could perform his duty as a cultural expert. Specifically, when Edwin asked Hiroyuki to explain what tatami (i.e., a Japanese floor mat) was in Session 8, Hiroyuki used his electronic dictionary to explain the Japanese concept. Thanks to his turn monopoly (i.e., Hiroyuki’s suspending Edwin’s access to the turn while looking up a word in his workspace, see Figure 7), Hiroyuki was able to hold the floor, but Edwin had no choice but to wait until Hiroyuki came up with an explanation in English. After several turns of conversational repair, Edwin decided to join the word search, making it cooperative. This cooperative configuration led to mutual understanding, but their interaction was characterized by low social presence, as they were working for the common goal but doing so within their workspace without relying on each other (i.e., a division of labor).

6.5.2. Interactional Patterns
Edwin and Hiroyuki’s conversation was not reciprocal in terms of equality in the qualitative sense (i.e., control over a task), as it was Edwin who mostly facilitated the conversation. Moreover, both Edwin and Hiroyuki exhibited a minimal level of engagement with
each other’s linguistic contribution in both language parts. This was demonstrated by Edwin’s monologue, Hiroyuki’s listenership that did not go beyond short listener responses, both participants’ use of frequent silences between turns, and lack of linguistic features that show involvement such as repetition, latching, cooperative overlaps, follow-up questions, and evaluative comments. Thus, their interaction was not reciprocal in the sense of mutuality (i.e., involvement with each other’s contribution), either. Combining the findings on equality and mutuality, it seems that this dyad’s interaction in Session 2 was a low equality, low mutuality conversational configuration for both the English and the Japanese parts of a given session (Storch, 2004). As the configuration was similar in both language parts, it can be said that Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction was influenced more by the incompatibility of conversational styles than the proficiency level in English and Japanese.

In Session 8, Hiroyuki engaged in conversational repair by making his requests for linguistic help more salient using linguistic (e.g., “Un?”) and non-linguistic cues (e.g., leaning toward the computer, head tilts). Despite his use of message abundancy as a “compensatory device” (Gullberg, 2011), the dyad’s interaction was characterized by frequent intra-turn silences because Hiroyuki attempted to hold the floor and “teach” about Japan using his electronic dictionary. This solitary word search created a workspace (Figure 7) and only worsened the solitary nature of word search. Indeed, even when Edwin joined the word search using Google Translate, the word search was not collaborative but cooperative, because they had a division of labor and engaged in word search without aligning toward the same trouble source. Thus, although the dyad’s interaction in Session 8 demonstrated a slight improvement in equality, no improvement was made in mutuality, as their interaction continued to lack social presence.
It is also noteworthy that Edwin pretended he understood Hiroyuki after the dyad made several attempts for conversational repair (Excerpt 15). His avoidance of follow-up questions shows that Edwin chose to prioritize face negotiation over achieving mutual understanding. It may also indicate that Edwin did not feel engaged enough to ask follow-up questions, partly because of Hiroyuki’s limited proficiency in English. Combining the findings on equality and mutuality, it seems that this dyad improved equality at least when interacting in the crossed expertise configuration in English; however, their mutuality remained relatively low due to the lack of social presence (i.e., mid equality and low mutuality conversational configuration).

6.5.3. Exchanged Behavior

Unlike Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction, Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction was not characterized by various forms of exchanged behavior. For example, while Edwin asked many questions to Hiroyuki in a rapid manner like a machine gun, Hiroyuki did not ask many questions. His conversational contribution was mostly in the form of aizuchi as a listener, though recall the opening of the chapter, where Edwin attributed the dyad’s failure in part to Hiroyuki’s under-use of aizuchi. Edwin engaged in hyperexplanation and provided many details about his culture and himself, but it did not lead to mutual revelation (Tannen, 2005), as Hiroyuki did not reciprocate it by talking about himself. Furthermore, Edwin used Google Translate throughout the 10-week project, but Hiroyuki used his electronic dictionary and did so only in Session 8 and 9. As these examples demonstrate, the dyad did not exchange similar conversational and technological behaviors, although they did achieve reciprocity in the sense of exchanged behavior in a situated manner, for example, by showing a mirroring behavior when mutual understanding was achieved (Excerpt 10).
Moreover, it is also important to note that, whether in English or Japanese and whether the cultural knowledge belonged to Edwin or Hiroyuki, the two participants assigned a clear, static conversational role to themselves, from which they could not deviate in a situated manner. This is contrastive with the case of Benjamin and Tomoya, who redirected questions and exchanged each other’s conversational roles to free themselves from one static role that is designated by the language and topic of discussion. In contrast, Edwin and Hiroyuki’s role assignment was so static that it changed only with a clear shift of frames when Edwin explicitly asked if Hiroyuki understood him (in English), when Edwin expressed linguistic troubles (in Japanese), and when Edwin asked Hiroyuki to translate English into Japanese and to explain a culture-specific concept about Japan. In other words, the only time when the dyad broke away from a static role assignment was for the purpose of dutifully performing a linguistic/cultural expert vs. novice role. Otherwise, the dyad kept taking on the same conversational role and did not benefit from the eTandem context that affords various situated identities such as linguistic expert and novice, cultural expert and novice, speaker and listener, interviewer and interviewee, and joker and co-joker (see Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction in Chapter 5).

6.5.4. Compatibility/Sharedness

The mismatch of conversational styles greatly influenced the dyad’s enactment of reciprocity. In the English part, having failed to negotiate silences, Edwin engaged in hyperexplanation. In the Japanese part, Edwin’s use of broken starts with shifted eye gaze and Hiroyuki’s lack of turn nomination helped accelerate Edwin’s machine-gun questions. In other words, whether the language of interaction was English or Japanese, complementary schismogenesis was engendered by Edwin’s effort to show involvement by contributing more
and Hiroyuki’s showing involvement by listening more based on their respective conversational styles. What exacerbated this vicious cycle seems to be the mismatch of the two participants’ perception of aizuchi or their expectation of what a listener does. The analysis of Edwin’s post-project interview data revealed that he had a somewhat essentialized idea of aizuchi (i.e., Japanese word for short listener responses) as being a necessary part of Japanese people’s communication. For that reason, although Hiroyuki did make some non-salient aizuchi, Edwin made such a negative interpretation of the lack of salient listener feedback and a number of long silences that were salient. This indicates that the mismatch of expectations about what a listener should do drives the vicious cycle, together with participants’ culture-shaped conversational styles (see Ware, 2005 for a similar finding).

What is also interesting about Edwin and Hiroyuki is that their interaction was influenced not only by the incompatibility of conversational styles but also by that of technology use styles. First, while Edwin used a technology tool, Hiroyuki never used any material surround to resolve communication issues during Session 2. Secondly, the two participants differed in the way they used bilingual resources to resolve communication breakdowns. While Edwin, as an expert of English, used a dictionary to provide a Japanese translation of an English word to facilitate Hiroyuki’s understanding, Hiroyuki did not resort to any material surround in explaining a Japanese word that Edwin did not understand because he used his English skills to provide an English translation for the word. Thirdly, Edwin did not use a dictionary but asked Hiroyuki to translate an English word or sentence into Japanese. That is, Edwin used a “high-involvement” strategy and involved Hiroyuki in conversational repair. It is ironic but possible that Edwin’s decision to ask Hiroyuki to translate an English sentence exacerbated Hiroyuki’s silence, as Hiroyuki sometimes could not understand the English sentence that Edwin wanted translated.
The analysis of the interaction during a crossed expertise configuration in Session 8 also revealed that the dyad suffered from the incompatibility of conversational styles even after seven weeks of interaction. Indeed, except when they were performing a conversational duty as a language or cultural expert using available resources, for example, when Hiroyuki translated an English sentence into Japanese as prompted by Edwin and when Hiroyuki explained *tatami* (a Japanese floor mat) to Edwin using his electronic dictionary, their interaction continued to be influenced by complementary schismogenesis (i.e., Edwin’s conversational dominance and Hiroyuki’s reticence). This means that, although the dyad could not engage in a reciprocal interactional configuration overall throughout the semester, they could achieve reciprocity in a *situated* sense, depending on how they defined the situation, how they aligned themselves with the topic and interlocutor, and how they used available resources for communication.
6.6. Conclusion

Edwin and Hiroyuki suffered from the vicious cycle of complementary schismogenesis throughout the 10-week project. To summarize this chapter, I will highlight three aspects of their interaction that were particularly different from Benjamin and Tomoya, the most successful dyad. First, Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction was characterized by conversational dominance by Edwin and reticence by Hiroyuki mainly due to their incompatible conversational styles. Edwin was a high-involvement communicator, who involved the interlocutor by talking more, while Hiroyuki was a high-considerateness communicator, who showed involvement by closely listening to the interlocutor. Due to the mismatch of perceptions regarding the use of aizuchi between the two participants, Hiroyuki’s limited use of salient listener feedback seemed to upset Edwin, and this made Edwin show even more involvement via hyperexplanation and machine-gun questions (in the English part) and hold the floor via broken starts (in the Japanese part). However, such high-involvement strategies made it more difficult for Hiroyuki to contribute to the conversation (i.e., complementary schismogenesis).

Secondly, the two participants also differed in the way they used technological affordances. Their technology use styles were different regarding what tools to use (Google Translate vs. electronic dictionary), how much technological affordances were utilized (Edwin used more technology than Hiroyuki did), and in which interactional configuration they used technological affordances (crossed vs. unilateral expertise configuration). This is contrastive with Benjamin and Tomoya, who had access to similar tools and used technological affordances in a similar way. Furthermore, although Hiroyuki’s use of his electronic dictionary helped him hold the floor in Session 8, it led to a reduced sense of social presence, as he was working in his workspace to explain a Japanese concept (see Figure 7) and Edwin had no choice but to wait for
Hiroyuki to find an appropriate word for the trouble source. In the end, Edwin joined the word search, making the *solitary* word search into *cooperative*, and the dyad could achieve mutual understanding. However, their interaction still lacked social presence, as their word search was not collaborative, unlike Benjamin and Tomoya’s word search that took place via *virtual joint attention*.

Finally, this dyad’s interaction was not dynamic compared to the interaction of Benjamin and Tomoya because of their static role assignment. Specifically, once they took up a footing of a speaker vs. listener or cultural expert vs. novice, their footings did not change unless there was an explicit trigger, such as when Edwin asked Hiroyuki to explain a Japanese concept or when Hiroyuki indicated explicitly that he did not understand an English word. In other words, only when they performed a duty as a linguistic and cultural expert, did they break away from the static role assignment and recipient design their talk using multimodal bricolage strategies. This indicates that the dyad was able to engage in successful interaction if they were given a specific “instruction” on how to behave in accordance with a particular role.
Chapter 7

Yoko and Amy: Reciprocity Change After “Coming Out”

Thank you SO much for everything, and allowing me to be a part of this! I don’t know whether or not I actually got any better at speaking, but I think I do feel more comfortable using the language, and I hope that carries over into other contexts where I will use it! If nothing else, I have new friends!

(Amy, email sent to the researcher after the completion of the project)

このプロジェクトを始めるまで外国の人と接する機会はほとんどありませんでしたが、おかげで外国へ目を向ける良いきっかけになりました。色々なジャンルの話をしているうちに、興味が湧いてきたことが留学を決意させたのではないかと思います。このような機会を与えて頂き、本当にありがとうございました。

(Until the project started, I had rarely interacted with people from other countries, so this project provided me with a good opportunity to look outside Japan. As we talked about various genres of topics, I became interested in learning about them, and this made me decide to study abroad. Thank you for giving me such an opportunity.)

(Yoko, email sent to the researcher after the completion of the project)
7.1. Introduction

The third case study features Amy and Yoko, who experienced great frustration with the project in the first three sessions but eventually became one of the most successful dyads after a critical turning point in Session 4. This is a dyad who originally focused on the language aspect of the project so much that they failed to establish “comity” (i.e., establishment and maintenance of friendly relationships, Aston, 1993). In the end, however, they learned to focus not only on language learning but also intercultural understanding by positioning each other as equally struggling language learners, equally supportive language experts, transcultural individuals, and bilingual speakers. Through the process, they developed international posture (Yashima, 2009) and established a community of practice (Wenger, 1998), namely a group of people who share a passion for something and learn to do it better through regular interaction, in and outside the Google Hangouts environment. They continued their project beyond one semester, interacting via Google Hangouts five more times (in total 14 sessions) and met in Tokyo when Amy was studying in Kyoto over a summer about six months after the completion of the project. Furthermore, Yoko said eTandem made her decide to study abroad, and she actually studied at a university in the East Coast of the U.S. for a semester approximately a year after the initiation of the project. Thus, this chapter demonstrates how the dyad went through a transformation after the critical incident and how the eTandem experience changed their perspective on what they wanted to do with the TL (i.e., L2 ideal self, Dörnyei, 2009) and as a bilingual speaker.

Below I will first provide more details about the two participants. I will then review their discourse features regarding the enactment of reciprocity. Following the discussion on reciprocity, I will analyze three excerpts from Session 2 when the dyad was frustrated with the project and each other due to their limited language proficiency. I will then analyze three
excerpts in Session 4 when Amy came out as lesbian and when the dyad engaged in a discourse about sexual orientations. Note that most of the dyads were same-sex dyads due to the coordinator’s assumption of participants’ heterosexuality. Amy’s coming out, namely the “critical incident” (Belz & Kinginger, 2002), resulted in a strong bonding experience and drastically changed the way Amy and Yoko interacted for the rest of the project. Finally, drawing on the analysis of three excerpts, I will analyze the dyad’s use of technological affordances mediated enactment of reciprocity.

7.1.1. Participants

Amy is a 20-year-old learner of Japanese who double-majored in cultural anthropology and Japanese language and linguistics at her university in the U.S. She had studied Japanese for two years before this project started, and she considered herself an elementary-level learner. She had been to Japan on a high school exchange program for a week four years before the project started, and she still communicated in Japanese via email with a few friends she made in Japan. Her motivation for participating in this project was to expose herself to “normal language use” in “normal situations.” It is also notable that Amy is openly lesbian and lives with her girlfriend. This information will become relevant in analyzing the dyad’s discourse in Session 4. During an interview at the beginning of the semester, she said, “I hope to become more comfortable with speaking and listening. I also hope to have a correspondent who is patient with me if I have trouble” (italics added). This comment indicated that she focused on the affective side of her language learning and wanted to learn with somebody who could provide emotional support.

Yoko is a 19-year-old learner of English in Japan who majored in commerce at her Japanese university. She had studied English for seven years as part of the Japanese compulsory
English education and considered herself novice in speaking and listening and intermediate in reading and writing. She had little experience in intercultural communication. Indeed, she had never used English outside the classroom instruction or been abroad, especially because she had spent the whole childhood in the countryside of Japan. Her motivation for participating in this project was to “talk with a same-age native speaker of English and learn how to speak, especially because I had little ‘speaking’ practice at school when I was preparing for the college entrance exams” (translated from Japanese). In her self-introduction email to Amy, Yoko said, “I hope that I get along with you,” which only a few participants of the project wrote. This indicated that, somewhat like Amy, she emphasized the personal relationship aspect of the project.

Table 7 summarizes the results of the pre-project survey regarding the individual profiles of the dyad as well as the group averages. As the table shows, the dyad’s initial proficiency in their respective TL was relatively lower than the group average, while their ICC was similar to the group average. As for their motivation in the form of L2 ideal self, Amy exhibited a higher rating than that of Yoko and the group average. Moreover, Amy had more intercultural experience than Yoko, as she had been to Japan and maintained the pen-pal friendships ever since.
Table 7. Summary of Participants: Amy and Yoko

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries of residence</th>
<th>Amy</th>
<th>Yoko</th>
<th>Group Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>M = 20.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency (EIT)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>M = 88.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 120 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 20.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>M = 4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation: L2 ideal</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>M = 4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self (out of 6 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience abroad</td>
<td>Has been to Japan for a week in high school; maintains pen-pal friendships since then</td>
<td>Has been to foreign countries only for short trips</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.2. Preview of Amy and Yoko’s Typical Discourse Features

Before delving into the analysis of excerpts, it is useful to preview the qualities that characterized Amy and Yoko’s discourse as a whole and that ultimately were shown (through the more detailed analyses of excerpts below) to contribute to or to hinder the enactment of reciprocity. Table 8 summarizes such discourse features in Amy and Yoko’s interaction. The left column lists the dyad’s interactional features in Session 2 and the right column lists those during the critical incident in Session 4 and beyond. As with the case of the other two dyads, the table is categorized by the five features: management of turns, repairing communication issues, listenership, management of conversational roles and identities, conversational styles, and L1 vs. L2 use. Since, as we will see later, Amy and Yoko’s interaction did not differ between languages, the table is not divided by the two languages. The fact that their interaction was similar between the two language parts suggests that their discourse features were reciprocated between the two languages, whether Amy or Yoko held the language expert position (i.e., who
was the language expert vs. novice in English/Japanese for a given half of each eTandem session).
Table 8. Summary of Amy and Yoko’s Discourse Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Critical Incident and Beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of turns</td>
<td>The conversation was characterized by intra-turn pauses when a language novice was taking time to think as well as silent pauses when the participants were individually looking up a word online (Excerpts 19 and 20) and when the language expert was taking notes of her partner’s errors in the journal (Excerpts 18 and 19). Overlaps and change of pitch, amplitude, and voice qualities were rarely observed. Repetition between the two participants was rarely observed. Their turns were equally distributed within each language part.</td>
<td>The conversation was characterized by intra-turn pauses when the language novice was taking time to think. The number of silent pauses decreased (cf. Excerpts 19 and 20), as the participants learned to depend on their partner for bilingual support rather than looking up a word individually (Excerpt 22) and because the language expert stopped taking notes of her partner’s errors during an ongoing interaction. Overlaps and change of pitch, amplitude, and voice qualities were observed during the critical incident (Excerpt 23). Repetition of a trouble source was frequently observed (Excerpts 21 and 22).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairing communication issues</td>
<td>In facing epistemic asymmetries during a crossed expertise configuration (i.e., when the language novice had to use her TL to explain a culture-specific concept that her partner is not familiar with), the language novice did not involve the partner in meaning negotiation. Instead, she used a dictionary without letting her partner know what was the trouble source and/or gave up the talking about it and moved onto the next topic (Excerpts 19 and 20). The language expert engaged in frequent error correction (i.e., a type of retrospective recipient design).</td>
<td>The dyad started to mix languages to engage in conversational repair, especially to address lexical issues (Excerpt 22). They also aligned toward the same trouble source by explicitly telling the partner where the trouble source was (Excerpt 22). However, they sometimes looked up a word individually and moved onto the next topic if a concept was too difficult for the language novice to explain. Their error correction was observed much less frequently after the critical incident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listenership</td>
<td>Participatory listenership (Tannen, 2007) was observed in Amy and Yoko’s interaction, but only from a language expert’s side. Specifically, a language expert would show listenership by letting the language novice talk and then repeating a word/phrase. In contrast, a language novice’s listenership was limited to short listener responses, as she was focused on understanding the content of the conversation in the TL.</td>
<td>Not much change was observed with regard to the dyad’s listenership behavior other than the fact that the language expert provided much less error correction when listening to her partner talking about her culture in the TL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of conversational roles and identities</td>
<td>There was a clear, static role assignment between the two participants. The language spoken as well as cultural expertise dictated the role assignment, according to which they positioned each other as either an expert or a novice of language and culture (e.g., Excerpt 18).</td>
<td>Although language and cultural expertise continued to influence their role assignment, they started to develop and utilize their bilingual identities by mixing languages (Excerpts, 22, 23, and 26) and negotiating bilingual practices (e.g., which language to use) (Excerpt 22). Through talking about their struggles as language learners, they learned to position themselves and each other as equally struggling language learners and equally supportive language experts (Excerpts 25 and 26).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational style</td>
<td>The dyad’s conversational styles were compatible. Both of them demonstrated high-considerateness style features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 vs. L2 use</td>
<td>Code-switching rarely occurred. Even when the language novice was attempting to explain a difficult concept during a crossed expertise configuration, she did not involve the language expert in the meaning negotiation process (Excerpts 19 and 20).</td>
<td>During the critical incident in Session 4, they negotiated their bilingual practices (i.e., deciding which language to use in a communication breakdown), tackled lexical issues via code-switching, and realized the value of having a bilingual partner to achieve mutual understanding (Excerpt 22). After Session 4, they started to engage in bilingual practices frequently especially in Facebook Messenger.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2. Session 2: Not “Going with the Flow”

In her reflection after Session 3, Amy said that the dyad “got off track a lot” but thought it was fine, because they had learned to “go with the flow” and tackle communication issues by using “different methods, like switching between languages, looking up words online, looking up pictures, typing out what we were saying –whatever might help!” Amy’s comment, “I think today was a lot about learning about each other’s cultures while also learning how to deal with it if it’s hard to understand” suggests that it took the dyad three sessions to realize that it is fine to spend time dealing with communication difficulties using various strategies.

In Session 2, as analyzed below, the uncovered interactional patterns were indicative of Amy and Yoko’s struggles in co-construction of the conversation. I will analyze three excerpts in order to substantiate this interpretation. The analysis of Excerpt 18 in English exemplifies the dyad’s excessive focus on language learning, and how it prevented them from engaging in cultural exploration. The analysis of Excerpt 19 in English and Excerpt 20 in Japanese illustrates how the language novice (Yoko and Amy in English and Japanese, respectively) failed to involve her partner in the meaning negotiation process when facing epistemic asymmetries (i.e., differences in the level of knowledge, Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2014; Raymond & Heritage, 2006).

7.2.1. Sticking to the Assigned Language Expert vs. Novice Roles: Error Correction Routines

The theme of Session 2 was university life. The following conversation took place immediately after the five-minute free conversation in English (i.e., about five minutes after the session started). In Excerpt 18, Yoko describes a school festival that takes place at her university.
To analyze the data, I will use Goffman’s (1974, 1981) concepts of *frames* and *footing*. I argue that the dyad prioritized the language aspect of interaction over cultural discussion such that they could not make a dynamic shift between the “language teaching and learning” frame (i.e., a frame where one of the participants functions as an expert of his L1 and teaches it to the other participant who functions as a novice of the language) and “cultural teaching and learning” frame (i.e., a frame where one of the participants functions as an expert of his own culture and teaches it to the other participant who functions as a novice of the culture). As a result, the NS took up a footing of a language expert, provided error correction, kept track of her partner’s errors, and focused more on the partner’s language than her cultural contribution, while the NNS took up a footing of a language novice and focused on receiving linguistic support from the expert.

Excerpt 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amy</th>
<th>Yoko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>始めましょう。We talk in English first. (Let’s begin. We talk in English first.)</td>
<td>あ、え～、university life. (A::h e::h university life.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yep.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ah first I talk ah I talk um about univer-school festival?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ok.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>So first I talk um um Sakura Festival? In Japan um=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>=Cool.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Umm Sakura Festival is so big and uh this year um November 1st and 2nd (2.62) so and ah but I’m a freshman so I haven’t participate participate in it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Participated? (tilting her head to the right))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AH yes. I haven’t participated oh ok thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Un. ((typing her mistake in the journal))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Umm uh ah uh there are um a- about 160,000 people come and my-our university’s festival [so]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>[Wow] So that day is so crowded?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ah crowded?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Crowded yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Un. ((typing her mistake in the journal))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>And look at picture one I send you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amy and Yoko’s primary focus of interaction in Excerpt 18 was language learning and teaching. For instance, in line 8, Yoko said, “I’m a freshman so I haven’t participate participate in it.” In response, Amy said, “Participated?” with her head tilted to the right to recast Yoko’s linguistic error (line 9). Yoko said, “AH yes. I haven’t participated oh ok thank you” (line 10). Yoko’s thanking Amy after the successful repair indicates that Yoko considered Amy a teacher of English while considering herself a learner. In line 11, Amy typed Yoko’s mistake in her journal (see Appendix A) and momentarily disengaged from the ongoing discussion about Yoko’s school festival. Amy’s keeping track of Yoko’s English mistakes indicates that she took her teacher role seriously and did her best to help Yoko with learning English.

Another similar episode was observed between line 13 and 16 where Yoko said uncertainly, “cloud crowd? crowd” and Amy recasted by saying “Ah crowded?” Yoko’s uptake (i.e., successful repair, Lyster & Ranta, 1997) in line 15 and Amy’s typing Yoko’s mistake in line 16 again suggests their focus on language learning and teaching. Finally, we can observe one other similar episode where Yoko said, “look at picture one I send you” (line 17) and Amy recasted by saying, “Sent?” (line 18). Yoko’s expression of gratitude in line 19 as well as Amy’s typing Yoko’s mistake exemplifies the same pattern of this dyad’s error correction routines. However, this focus on language learning did not let them focus on the cultural aspect of the interaction. Indeed, the dyad did not benefit from the crossed expertise configuration (Cappellini, 2016; Cappellini & Mompean, 2015) where Yoko was the language novice but cultural expert.
and Amy was the language expert but cultural novice, as Amy was concentrated on providing
linguistic correction and did not ask elaborative questions about Japanese culture.

As these examples demonstrate, the dyad performed their role as a language expert vs.
novice so seriously that it became difficult to engage in an active discussion about each other’s
culture. As a result, they rarely shifted footings in a situated manner, unlike Benjamin and
Tomoya who invoked their language expert vs. novice identity only when necessary (e.g., when
dealing with linguistic issues). In other words, the static role assignment as a language expert vs.
novice dominated Amy and Yoko’s interactional behavior and did not allow the dyad to take up
multiple footings simultaneously. This is similar to the case of Edwin and Hiroyuki. However,
while Edwin and Hiroyuki, or more specifically Edwin, prioritized cultural discussion and paid
little attention to the language aspect of interaction unless there was an overt trigger, Amy and
Yoko focused on the provision of linguistic support so much that they could not pay attention to
the cultural aspect of the exchange. Furthermore, what made this dyad particularly unique among
all the participating dyads was the way they used their journal (see Appendix A). Although
participants in the project were instructed to complete the journal after each language part, this
dyad kept track of their errors during an ongoing interaction. It is certainly helpful to have a
detailed history of linguistic errors for the language learning purpose, as it affords a reflective
practice. However, it inevitably made it difficult for Amy and Yoko to engage in collaborative
meaning making, which consequently reduced social presence (i.e., the degree of salience of the
other person in the interaction and the consequent salience of the interpersonal relationship,
Short et al., 1976).

Finally, it is important to note that the same pattern of error correction routine was
observed in both the English and Japanese parts of the interaction, whether they were talking
about American culture or Japanese culture. This means that their willingness to support the partner via frequent error correction and keeping track of these errors in the journal was reciprocal and mutual and not influenced by the language of interaction or the topic of discussion, most likely due to their commitment to being a language expert and novice.

7.2.2. Trying to Resolve Epistemic Asymmetries Alone: Failure to Co-construct the Conversation

Here I will analyze two excerpts: one in English (Excerpt 19) and the other in Japanese (Excerpt 20) to present the results of a comparative analysis. To analyze both excerpts, I will use the concept of epistemic asymmetries. I will demonstrate how the dyad failed to co-construct the conversation when there was a significant gap in their knowledge levels. Specifically, I argue that they could not resolve epistemic asymmetries because the language novice (Amy in Japanese and Yoko in English) did not use the affordances of having a bilingual partner during a crossed expertise configuration, and instead tried to resolve any communication difficulties on her own.

7.2.2.1. English conversation. I will first analyze the English excerpt. The English conversation unfolded about nine minutes into Session 2, and about two minutes after Excerpt 18. In Excerpt 19, Yoko first introduces a Japanese idol group that her school decided to invite to the festival and then describes how she is involved in the festival. The analysis shows that Yoko either gave up explaining or used a dictionary to explain a concept that only Yoko had epistemic access to, instead of having Amy involved in the meaning negotiation process.
Amy

1. Ah uh ah and every year famous people are invited um in my school? So this year we invite Nogizaka 48.

2. Who are they?

Yoko

3. No gi za ka ((typing のぎざか (Nogizaka) in the chat box)). Look at chat. Nogi-do you know?

4. Uh no.

5. This is idol group. Japanese idol group. AH do you know AKB 48?

6. I think I’ve heard of them but I don’t really know them.

7. Ah do you know similar .ManyToManyField? ((with a puzzled look)) similar じゃない、なんだ、ah にて-にている @@ similar near near? ah so um I-I don’t like explain English.

8. Un? ((leaning forward))

9. I don’t explain in English(h).

10. Ok.
[Um] there’s a lot of garbage?

So(h)rry. Ah uh ah um this this festival is so big so many garbage? [ah]

Ah yes.

((taking a note of her mistake))

And my my club in my club um um my ah-I un? I’m join-[

I ah I ah-I belong to two clubs.

Un.

And one is harmonica club and the other is um Environmental Rodorigesu.

((nodding deeply))

Please-please wait a little.

Ok.

((checking how to say ゴミの分別 (to sort out trash) with electronic dictionary for 10.91 seconds))
Um in uh um at Sakura Festival? um in my club uh eh we collect garbage separately?=

As seen in Excerpt 19, Yoko did not involve Amy in the meaning negotiation process, instead choosing to try to resolve linguistic issues on her own, and Amy chose not to or was unable to participate in meaning negotiation. For instance, in line 7, Yoko tried to explain that Nogizaka 46 (an idol group in Japan) is similar to AKB48 (another famous idol group in Japan). However, Yoko was not sure if “similar” was the appropriate word to use. Thus, she said, “I-I don’t like explain English” (line 7) and “I don’t explain in English” (line 9), apologized for being unable to talk about the idol group (line 11), and gave up talking about it completely. This shows that Yoko did not take advantage of having a bilingual partner, for example, via code-switching when trying to explain a concept that Yoko alone had epistemic access to. It also shows that Amy did not participate in resolving the linguistic issues perhaps because she did not want to interrupt Yoko.
We can observe another similar episode between line 18 and 21 where Yoko said, “Please—please wait a little” (line 18) and spent 10.91 seconds looking up “ゴミの分別” (to sort out trash) in her electronic dictionary followed by 6.88 seconds of doing the same with *Google Translate* (line 20). Although Yoko tried her best to communicate her thought using the material surround, this attempt led to reducing social presence just like in the case of Edwin and Hiroyuki in Session 8, as Amy had nothing to do but wait for Yoko to say something. In other words, Yoko’s effort to resolve linguistic issues on her own, despite having a partner who can provide bilingual support, contributed to preventing the dyad from developing a topic collaboratively.

### 7.2.2.2. Japanese conversation.

For the purpose of comparing English and Japanese excerpts, I will now analyze the Japanese excerpt that unfolded 41 minutes into Session 2, and about 30 minutes after Excerpt 19. Before the interaction in Excerpt 20, Amy and Yoko were talking about Amy’s semester schedule. Amy said that one of the classes she is taking is called “language contact.” Yoko did not understand what the course was like and asked Amy to explain. In the following excerpt, Amy is trying to explain what she is learning from the course. She says that she is studying what happens when two languages are in contact and provides an example of a pidgin. The analysis shows that Amy gave up explaining a concept that only she had epistemic access to, instead of having Yoko involved in the meaning negotiation process.

**Excerpt 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amy</th>
<th>Yoko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. あ～、あ～、pidgin pidgin ということを知ってる？  
 (*A::h a::h do you know a thing called pidgin pidgin?*) | うん？  
 (*Huh?*) |
| 3. pidgin ということを知っている？  
 (*Do you know a thing thing called pidgin?*) | |
In Excerpt 20, in a similar way to how Yoko tried to resolve linguistic issues on her own in the English part of Session 2, Amy also did not involve Yoko in the meaning making process when their epistemic positions are significantly different. Instead, Amy used the material surround (i.e., Google Translate) to express herself, and when the strategy did not work, she gave up the topic completely. In line 1, Amy introduced a concept “pidgin” (i.e., a grammatically simplified form of a language that develops between two or more groups that do not have a language in common) that only she had epistemic access to. After checking the word on Google Hangouts for 22.67 seconds and not finding an appropriate expression to explain the concept, Amy said “あ～、とてもとても面白いけど、あ～、あ～、説明しにく(h)い。” (A::h it is very very interesting a::h a::h it’s ha(h)rd to explain.) (line 7) and moved onto the next topic.

In summary, the analysis of Excerpt 19 (English) and 20 (Japanese) demonstrates that Amy and Yoko failed to negotiate meaning when they faced an extreme case of epistemic asymmetry. Rather than collaboratively constructing meaning, they resorted to the use of a dictionary, and if the compensation strategy did not work, they simply moved onto the next
topic. This is due in part to their limited proficiency level. It may also be because they did not maximize the technological affordances. Be that as it may, they did not utilize the affordances of eTandem where bilingual speakers can help each other. If it is difficult to explain a concept in the TL, participants may choose to use a circumlocution strategy (i.e., describing or defining a concept instead of saying the specific words) or even switch languages momentarily. However, this dyad followed the strict language division rule such that they gave up explaining a concept that was not accessible to the partner. In other words, the dyad failed to “co-construct reciprocity, understanding, affiliation, and learning” (Ortega, 2017, p. 294) by utilizing the community of bilingual language learners and acknowledging the shared languages as a resource. This is in contrast to the Italian-English eTandem participants in Tudini (2016), who used bilingual resources in the form of code-switching not only for language learning but also for achieving the social objective of eTandem. Furthermore, it is likely that the language novice avoided creating opportunities for meaning negotiation, as it is a potentially face-threatening act especially in a video-mediated context (van der Zwaard & Bannink, 2014). Thus, it is possible that Amy and Yoko, who were not close enough yet, prioritized saving face over thorough discussion about each other’s culture.

7.2.3. Summary of Session 2 Interaction

First, Amy and Yoko’s interaction in Session 2 was characterized by the static role assignment as a language expert and novice. Their excessive focus on the language learning aspect of eTandem interaction resulted in undermining the cultural learning aspect and reducing social presence. This was observed by the fact that both Amy and Yoko frequently corrected errors that would not hinder comprehension and they kept track of each other’s errors in
the journal during the ongoing interaction (see Chapter 4 for more details about the corrective feedback training). Their commitment to being a language expert to provide linguistic support was mutual, and the same error correction routines were observed in English and Japanese. This suggests that both Amy and Yoko prioritized language learning and teaching to the extent where they failed to develop a topic collaboratively, for example, by asking follow-up questions about each other’s culture, which would have facilitated reciprocation of conversational roles (cf. Benjamin and Tomoya’s redirection of questions). Secondly, Amy and Yoko failed to co-construct the conversation when they faced an extreme case of epistemic asymmetry during a crossed expertise configuration, as the language novice was reluctance to involve her partner in explaining a difficult concept and instead tried to resolve a communication issue alone. For one, this is likely due to their prioritizing “face-appropriateness” over task-appropriateness” (van der Zwaard & Bannink, 2014), meaning that the language novice did not want to create opportunities for a potentially face-threatening act of meaning negotiation, even if it affected the task performance negatively. For another, this is because of the way the language novice used a dictionary. Unlike Benjamin and Tomoya, who figured out a word collaboratively by identifying a trouble source first, Amy and Yoko disengaged from the ongoing interaction temporarily in a similar way to how Edwin and Hiroyuki did to look up a word in their respective workspaces. In other words, although both dyads had access to the same or similar technology tools, the tools’ designed functionality fused together with the motives and digital skills of the two dyads to form different interactional structures (Thorne, 2016). Most importantly, the dyad failed to utilize the affordances of having a bilingual partner. For instance, circumlocution is facilitated when interacting with a bilingual speaker of English and Japanese who can make an educated guess at what the interlocutor is
trying to say. However, they did not engage in meaning making in a collaborative manner. Rather, they followed the strict language division rule, as many foreign language learners have been socialized to keep the languages strictly separate and pure, and gave up a topic completely if a concept seemed too difficult to explain in the TL.

Last but not least, considering that error correction and negotiation of meaning are both face-threatening, it is interesting that the language expert engaged in error correction, but the language novice was reluctant to involve the language expert in explaining a concept that belonged to the language novice alone. It is assumed that, while the dyad’s commitment to support each other’s language learning (i.e., reciprocal teaching) allowed the language expert to overcome the fear of losing face and provide error correction, such an obligation was not there for their own language learning. As a result, the language novice did not feel like taking a risk by revealing her linguistic incompetency. Bringing these findings together, it seems that Amy and Yoko’s static role assignment as a language expert and novice resulted in linguistic affordances in the form of error correction but resulted in sacrificing opportunities to learn their TL via talking about each other’s culture.
7.3. Session 4: Coming Out

A critical incident of coming out, or revelation of Amy’s sexual preference, occurred during their interaction in Session 4, which changed the trajectory of Amy and Yoko’s interactional experience for the rest of the project and beyond. The theme of Session 4 was dating. Their conversation took an unexpected turn when Amy asked Yoko if she had a boyfriend, and in return, Yoko asked if Amy had a boyfriend. Amy’s answer surprised Yoko, because Amy came out as lesbian. Although the dyad could not delve into the conversation about Amy’s sexual identity at that time, Yoko “recycled” (to bring up a closed topic again later in the same or a different conversation, Tannen, 2006) the topic on homosexuality later when they were about to end the conversation, and this led to a productive discussion about sexual orientations and gayness in Japan and the U.S. It seems that their mutual revelation (Tannen, 2005) about their sexual orientations made their partnership stronger.

Before analyzing the discourse data, it is necessary to theorize the act of coming out. In order to do so, below I will review past studies on coming out in an intercultural context. I will then reflect on the differences between Japan and the U.S. regarding awareness about sexual minorities. After contextualizing the discourse in this way, I will then proceed to the main analysis of this critical incident of coming out, in three parts. The first part features Excerpt 21 in English, which is the critical episode when Amy came out as lesbian about 34 minutes into Session 4, during the English half of the exchange. The second part features Excerpt 22, in an episode where Yoko brought up the topic on homosexuality again after they finished talking in Japanese and completed their leave-taking routines (e.g., deciding when to have the next session). The analysis of this part will demonstrate how the dyad negotiated their positions regarding female same-sex relationships using multiple available resources including code-
switching, use of a dictionary, and text chats. The third analysis looks into Excerpt 23, the last part of the coming out episode. It took place also at the very end of Session 4. The interaction demonstrates how Amy and Yoko’s negotiation of sexual identities through “constructed dialogue” (Tannen, 2007) led to establishing their transcultural identities.

7.3.1. Coming Out in Intercultural Contexts

Coming out is usually defined as a single event in which one identifies him/herself as homosexual for the first time in the presence of another person. In some recent studies, however, coming out is viewed as a performative act where speakers use language to create a new facet of their identity and alter reality for the self and for others (e.g., Chirrey, 2003). In this sense, coming out extends to the hearer and creates a community of gay-aware listeners. In other words, coming out needs to be performed collaboratively, so the speaker and hearer can understand the true nature of its impact. However, those who come out as gay in an intercultural setting often suffer from a “queer chaos of meanings” (Nelson, 2004), namely a discrepancy between how homosexual individuals perform their sexual identities and how their listeners perceive their sexuality. Since language learners’ identity construction and aspirations play an important role in shaping their language learning behaviors (Nguyen & Yang, 2015), it is crucial to examine how the queer chaos of meanings influences marginalized learners’ language learning experiences.

Recently, a growing number of studies have started to shed light on queer language learners’ discourse. For instance, Nelson (2004) examined how three homosexual ESL teachers decided to represent their sexual identities in class and how five of their international students interpreted these choices. Through the analysis of interview and classroom observation data, the author found that there were puzzling conundrums associated with teachers’ revelation of their
sexual identities. Specifically, one teacher (Tony) decided not to come out in class, as he thought his international students, who he considered ignorant of or uncomfortable with queer matters, would not be able to cope with the culture shock. Another teacher (Gina), on the other hand, came out to every single class she was teaching, as she presumed that her students would already have shared knowledge and familiarity of such matters from being in the second language context. From the students’ perspective, however, the teachers’ coming out was not perceived in the way the teachers positioned their sexuality. For instance, one of Tony’s students was knowledgeable about queer matter and suspected that he was gay, while one of Gina’s students had no idea what “lesbian” meant. In other words, the teachers and their students did not fully understand each other due to the discrepancy between how the teachers positioned their sexuality and what the students knew about and thought of it.

Focusing on the behaviors of a listener of coming out, Ellwood (2006) examined an interview between herself and one of her ESL students, who unexpectedly came out as gay, to reveal how her behavior as a listener was implicated in the discourses of heteronormativity, namely the idea that views “structures, institutions, relations and actions that promote and produce heterosexuality as natural, self-evident, desirable, privileged and necessary while non-heterosexuality is contested and marginalised” (Nguyen & Yang, 2015, p. 222). When the interviewer’s questions prompted the student to come out, the actions the interviewer took to show alignment was “voice instead of silence, visibility instead of invisibility, knowledge instead of ignorance” (p. 76). That is, she used frequent back-channeling to demonstrate that she was gay-friendly, supposedly attached gayness to herself by telling the student she has many gay friends, and declared appreciation of his coming out by saying “I feel very honoured.” Although these actions were meant to position herself alongside the student as open to “accepting” his gay
identity, they were essentially based on heteronormativity and actually led to denying the
“uncommonness” of gay identity by not recognizing the student’s struggles around his desire to
be true to himself and come out. This finding indicates that it is important for both the speaker
who comes out and the listener to have a “transcultural” perspective and frame (homo)sexual
identities not as objective facts but as “social relations that are being performed, contested, and
negotiated on an on-going basis through day-to-day interactions” (Nelson, 2004, p. 43).

In a recent study, Nguyen and Yang (2015) examined a discourse of a Korean
transgender individual who was studying English as a second language in Hawai'i. The study
used the concepts of positioning (Davies & Harré, 1990), a community of practice (Wenger,
1998), and a cultural capital (Norton Peirce, 1995) to examine how this transgender learner
performed her gender identity in and outside the classroom and how this is related to language
learning. A community of practice refers to a group of people who share a concern or a passion
for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly. It is an important
concept in discussing cultural capital (i.e., knowledge, skills, and thought that afford higher value
and status in society to those who own them), since learners will invest in increasing the value of
their cultural capital when they aspire to become a member of an imagined and/or experienced
community of practice (Nguyen & Yang, 2015; Norton Peirce, 1995). The study found that the
Korean participant agentively managed her gender identity expression in a heteronormative
classroom by making ongoing efforts to renew and claim her gender identity in interaction. For
example, she played the role of a woman in a murder skit to affiliate with a woman identity,
which led to her heterosexual female peers performing male roles. She also expressed a lack of
interest and rejected classroom materials, activities, and practice, in order to tackle the
disconnection between the heteronormative language classroom, which did not offer her much
social and linguistic capital, and her investment to become a member of queer communities. The finding of this study suggests that alignment between a learner’s self-positioning and a learning environment (including other-positioning) is crucial for language learning, as the degree of investment is influenced by whether learners’ identities, including sexual identities, afford cultural capital in the experienced community of practice.

7.3.2. Status of Sexual Minorities in the U.S. vs. Japan

Unlike in American society, where people often discuss same-sex relationships openly, Japanese society has taken the approach of “let sleeping dogs lie” (O’Mochain, 2006, p. 53). Indeed, Valentine’s (1997) claim that “the predominant image of homosexuality in Japan is Western” (p. 96) somewhat seems to hold true even now. There have certainly been some positive changes to the way homosexuality is discussed in contemporary Japan, including the “gay boom” in the mass media in the 1990s, occurrences of pride parades in Japan, passing the first law that acknowledges same-sex partnerships in two wards in Tokyo, and the overarching tone of sexual minorities being that “things are getting better for the community” (Lunsing, 2001; Welker, 2017). However, queer people’s existence is still underacknowledged by the Japanese society at large.

Indeed, high schools and colleges rarely provide opportunities for discussing issues of sexuality in a classroom context because many parents and teachers and even the Japanese government are reluctant to promote such an awareness-raising movement (e.g., Kumashiro, 2003; Tsuzuki, 2003). More recently, some language teachers started to address issues of sexuality as part of their EFL instruction. Their findings suggest that, although many students
feel uncomfortable initially when sexuality issues are raised, this feeling often gives way to a stronger curiosity in the process of dealing with the culture shock (e.g., O’Mochain, 2006).

Another important sociocultural observation to bear in mind in discussing homosexuality in Japan is that lesbians are often invisible as compared to their male counterparts (O’Mochain, 2006; Welker, 2017). While references to the past discourse on male homosexuality have been commonplace, lesbian relations have gone largely ignored in Japanese social histories. Indeed, this is reflected in language usage; lesbians have fewer labels than their male counterparts (e.g., ホモ (homo), オカマ (okama)), and “gay” in Japanese (spelled as ゲイ and pronounced as /gei/) only refers to male homosexual individuals, as lesbians are treated differently as レズ (/rezu/). This suggests that Japanese people have little awareness and knowledge of women who are in romantic relationships with women.

7.3.3. Three-part Analysis of the Coming Out Episode

7.3.3.1. “I live with my girlfriend”: Negotiation of sexual identities and reframing.
The dyad spent the first 34 minutes of Session 4 in English, talking about activities that couples often do when they are on a date. Excerpt 21 took place when they were making the transition from the English part to the Japanese part of the session. To analyze the conversation, I will use the concepts of reframing, namely “a change in what the discussion is about” (Tannen, 2006, p. 601) and knowledge schemas (i.e., a knowledge structure that represents people’s expectations and assumptions, Tannen & Wallat, 1987). The analysis of Excerpt 21 shows that the dyad could not negotiate their sexual identities because they did not reframe the conversation in such a way that would highlight their stances on same-sex relationships. Specifically, while Yoko avoided a discussion about Amy’s sexual identity due to the culture shock following Amy’s coming out,
Amy also avoided elaborating on her sexual orientation so as to promote normativity of her homosexual identity, as she explained in her post-project interview:

*I’ve been out to most since I was 13, and fully FULLY out since I was 18... So by the time I was talking to my conversation partner, telling people about being gay and having a girlfriend was very normal to me. It’s always a little nerve-wracking though, since you never really know how someone will react. But she seemed super nice, so I wasn’t TOO worried. So I approached it in a very matter-of-fact way, so that she’d know I wasn’t feeling weird about it. And so it wouldn’t come across as some big, secret deal. Just normal... I just wasn’t going to lie, so that was the only thing to do and say, and all I could do after that was hope for the best.*

The finding thus reaffirms the importance of considering coming out as something that is achieved interactively through performing, contesting, and negotiating sexual identities in day-to-day interactions (Nelson, 2004). That is, for one’s gay identity to be acknowledged, the other person has to recognize the act of coming out as intended by the gay individual, and that may require negotiation through an ongoing interaction.

Excerpt 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amy</th>
<th>Yoko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>あ、そう、なんか、あ、あ、彼がいる？ (Ah so like ah ah do you have a boyfriend?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>あ、今？ (Ah now?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>あ~、今。 (Ah~ now.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>今、今はいなくて、今いなくて、えっと、7月？7月に別れた。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Now now I don’t have one I don’t have one now. E::h in July? in July we broke up.)

5 Oh oh that’s sad. ((covering her month with her right hand to show sympathy))

6 @@@

7 悲しい？
(Are you sad?)

8 O-O

9 どうして？どうして忘れた-う-わ-わ=
(Why? Why forgot-uh-for-for=)

10 [別れ]た？
([Broke] up?)

11 う～ん、大学、大学が、違う大学に行ってて、あまり会えなくなかった。
(Umm college college we go to a different college and we saw each other less and less.)

12 大変。大変ね？
(Hard. Hard right?)

13 また新しい人が見つかったと。@@@
(I hope I can find a new person. @@@)

14 頑張って。
(Good luck.)

15 @@@ ありがとう。Amy は？
(@@@ Thanks. What about you Amy?)

16 あ～、はい、今、今、いる。あ、あ～、彼女、彼女と住んでいる。
(A::h yes now now I have one. A::h a::h girlfriend I live with my girlfriend)
((pointing at the ceiling to indicate she is upstairs))

17 [あ]、彼女。
([Ah] GIRLFRIEND.) ((thrusting her head downward to emphasize 女 in 彼女, as the second part of the word means “woman”))

彼女と、う、彼女[と]
(Your girlfriend uh your girlfriend [with her]) ((widening her eyes and staring into the webcam))
あ～。
(A::h.) ((nodding deeply))

え=
(Eh=) ((looking to the left in deep thinking))

あ、えと、高校の時も彼女だ。だけど、違う人。
(=Ah eh in high school it was also a girlfriend. But a different one.)

あ、え、今一緒に住んで？あ、彼女。
(Ah eh now you live with her? ah girlfriend.) ((looking up and scratching her face in thinking))

あ。
(Ah) ((coming back to the conversation and looking at the webcam))
あ～ (1.62) その、昔の彼とどん、どのくらいとデートした？
（A::h (1.62) that the old boyfriend ho-how long did you date?）

どのぐらい付き合ってたか？
（Do you mean how long we were going out?）

うん？
（Huh?）

どのぐらい付き合ってたか？
（How long we were going out?）

タブしてください。
（Can you type?）

((typing “付き合う” (to go out with somebody)))

あ～、はいはい。
（A::h yes yes.）

あんまり長くなくて、7ヶ月？
（It wasn’t that long 7 months.）

あ～OK。
（A::h OK.）

短い、短い。7ヶ月だから。
（It’s short short because it’s seven months.）

In this excerpt, the dyad could not negotiate their sexual orientations because Yoko did not reframe the conversation to tackle her confusion, while Amy continued to frame the conversation to make her coming out sound as normal as possible. In other words, the dyad missed the chance
to negotiate their sexual identities and deepen intercultural understanding regarding homosexuality because of the way they framed the conversation. As her comment in the post-project interview revealed, Amy approached coming out in a “very matter-of-fact way,” so it would not come across as “some big, secret deal.” This “normative path” in revealing her homosexual identity was reflected in the way she handled the discourse. For instance, in line 16, Amy told Yoko that she lived with her *girlfriend* in a very matter-of-fact way. This took Yoko by surprise, because Yoko’s question in line 15, “エイミーは?” (*What about you, Amy?*) was produced with the intention being “Do you have a *boyfriend*, Amy?” since Yoko had assumed that Amy was straight. As indicated by her repetition of the word 彼女 (*girlfriend*), Yoko was confused with what Amy said, not only because Yoko was surprised to find out about Amy’s gay relationship but also because she was not sure if Amy made a mistake with the word choice between 彼女 (*kanojo, girlfriend*) and 彼 (*kare, boyfriend*), as Yoko’s comment in the post-project interview suggests:

レズビアンの存在については聞いたことはありましたが、周りに同性愛者がいた経験がないので、どう接したら良いのだろうかと少し戸惑いました。実際、彼女が彼女と住んでいると言ったので、彼氏と言い間違えたのかと思いました。でも、次第に、あ、本当に彼女なんだと思いました。

*I had heard of lesbians before, but since I had not known any homosexual individuals around me, I was a little at a loss not knowing how to approach her.*

Indeed, when she said SHE lived with her *girlfriend*, I thought Amy said it by mistake and meant to say boyfriend. But gradually I realized oh it IS actually a *girlfriend*.

(Yoko, from the post-project interview)
Yoko’s comment above corroborates Liddicoat’s (2009) finding that language learners’ implicit coming out in a heteronormative language classroom can often be perceived as a problem of linguistic competence rather than as a self-disclosure of a minority sexual identity.

Despite Yoko’s confusion, Amy continued to take her normative approach to coming out by saying, “高校の時も彼女だ。だけど、違う人” (It was also a girlfriend when I was in high school, but now it’s a different person) (line 19). Yoko repeated 彼女 (girlfriend) and pondered on the word for 3.44 seconds, this time with the understanding that Amy actually meant to say girlfriend, not boyfriend. The thought of a woman dating another woman was such a bizarre idea for Yoko that she momentarily forgot that she was talking with Amy (see line 20 when Yoko said, “あ” (Ah) and came back to the conversation). In line 21, Amy laughed at Yoko’s surprised face and then reframed the conversation to talk about Yoko’s boyfriend. As for Yoko, she let Amy reframe the conversation and avoided addressing her own confusion most likely because she did not want to invade Amy’s privacy.

In summary, while Yoko decided not to delve into Amy’s sexual orientation due to her culture shock and because she wanted to protect Amy’s privacy, Amy took her lesbian identity for granted such that she thought it would be better to approach the issue in a normative way, just like when she talks about her sexual orientation to other American friends. However, Amy’s coming out was not interpreted by Yoko in the way she intended mainly because of the pre-existing differences in their knowledge schemas about homosexuality, as she grew up being socialized into the discourse of heteronormativity in Japan (Brutt-Griffler & Kim, 2017). What Amy did not understand was that her coming out required Yoko to make a series of culture-based inferences that depended upon knowledge of homosexuality. In other words, Amy did not attend to what it meant for Yoko to listen to her coming out, as in the case of Gina in Nelson’s (2004)
study, who talked about her sexual orientation to every class she was teaching, without her consideration of what her students knew about gay relationships. Ultimately, the differences of their knowledge schemas on homosexuality prevented them from framing and reframing the conversation in such a way that would allow them to negotiate their sexual identities and interactively achieve the coming out discourse.

### 7.3.3.2. Obstacles to recycling the topic on same-sex relationships: Misalignment of frames

After the dyad finished their conversation in both English and Japanese, they engaged in a leave-taking routine, confirming the date and time of the next interaction session and what topic to discuss. Their conversation about same-sex relationships (which comprises Excerpt 22, analyzed here, and Excerpt 23, analyzed in the next section) took place when they were about to end the conversation (approximately one hour and fifteen minutes after Session 4 started). When Amy asked if Yoko was going to bed after they finished the chat, Yoko said she would go to bed after taking a bath. Then, Yoko took this opportunity to recycle the topic of sexual orientation and ask one more question to Amy, as she was curious about Amy’s sexuality and wanted to talk about it (as she recalled in the post-project interview), despite having felt uncomfortable when she came out before (cf. see a similar finding by O’Mochain, 2006). Although Yoko’s conversational move allowed the dyad to discuss their sexual identities, Amy and Yoko had a difficult time coming to an understanding about what the discussion was about. I argue that this is because they suffered from the misalignment of two frames that characterize the eTandem set-up: the “language teaching and learning” frame and the “cultural teaching and learning” frame (see the definitions of these frames in the analysis of Excerpt 19). Specifically, when one of them was in the “language teaching and learning” frame as a language novice/expert to provide/receive linguistic scaffolding, the other one was in the “cultural teaching and learning”
frame as a cultural novice/expert to ask/answer questions about their culture. This misalignment of frames was resolved only with the mediation of a text chat interaction in which Amy and Yoko visualized Yoko’s question after negotiating their bilingual practices. The analysis suggests that, without the use of the multimodal and bilingual bricolage (i.e., multimodal and bilingual resources that are afforded by the local environment, cf. Mehus, 2011), they might not have been able to engage in the negotiation of sexual identities.

Excerpt 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amy</th>
<th>Yoko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 これ後でこれの後で寝る？ (After this after this are you going to bed?) (tilting her head)</td>
<td>あ～、お風呂入って寝るかな？ (2.72) あ～、あ～、今、えっと、えと (A::h I am probably going to bed after I take a bath? (2.72) A::h a::h now e::h [eh] (with a grim look))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>あともう一個、質問。 ((One more question question)) ((placing the right index finger near the webcam))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 うん？= (Un?=) ((tilting her head))</td>
<td>=Ques- a::h I have one-one more one question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Un. Umm in America’ uh uh um woman (/ɯmən/)? um woman (/ɯmən/) um woman (/ɯmən/)? 女性？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Un. Umm in America’ uh uh um woman (/ɯmən/)? um woman (/ɯmən/) um woman (/ɯmən/)? Woman?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Um, ((with a confused look))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Woman lady (/ˈladi/)? lady (/ˈladi/).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lady (/leidi/)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lady (/leidi/). Ah um many=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>=OH woman (/ˈwʊmən/) woman (/ˈwʊmən/)=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12   | =Woman (/ˈwʊmən/) あ〜、えと (=Woman (/ˈwʊmən/) a::h え ((with a grim look))

付き合う？ う〜ん、付き合う？ How え〜、sorry. (Go out? U::m go out? How umm sorry.)

((checking the word on Google Translate))

付き合う in [English]? (Go out in [English]? ((placing her left ear near the camera))
13 付き合う？ Oh=
(Go out? Oh=)

14 =In English?

15 ちょっと待って。
(Hold on.)

((checking the word on Google Translate))

16 Ah sorry.

17 Oh no! (2.45) Um えっと、um in (3.23)
えっと、ちょっと待って下さい。
(Oh no! (2.45) Um e::h um in (3.23) e::h
hold on a sec please.)

((checking the word on Google Translate
for 20.18))
is in a relationship? to a couple? So when it’s when 付き合う is uh when it’s a couple?
(is in a relationship? to a couple? So when it’s when go out is uh when it’s a couple?
((placing both hands forward))

they are dating.

18 う～ん、a couple?
(Umm a couple?)

19 A couple. So カップル couple.
(A couple. So couple couple)

20 なんだろ～あの、wo-woman (/wʊmən/) ❍ How can I say Umm wo-woman (/wʊmən/) ❍ ((moving her left hand to the left side))

and wo-woman (/wʊmən/)? ((moving her right hand to the right side))

ah=

21 =Woman (/wʊmən/)?

22 Wo-woman (/wʊmən/)? woman (/wʊmən/). Lady (/ˈlædi/)?
Lady (/ɾədi/) and lady (/ɾədi/)? ((moving her left hand to the left and moving her right hand to the right))

uh are? ((having the two hands meet to indicate a couple))

[OH] OH ok=

[couple]? ((head tilt + moving left ear toward the camera))

23 =wakatta. Uh um let’s see. What’s it called-like-like-like GAY? (=I got it. Uh um let’s see. What’s it called-like-like-like GAY?)

24  un? ((widening her eyes))

25  Ah um 何と知りたい。
(Ah um what do you want to know.)

26

27 あ、う～ん、アメリカ、では、女性
(Ah umm in America women) ((moving her right hand to the right))

と女性が・
(and women) ((moving her left hand to the left))
28 はい。
(Yes.)

29 付き合う、のは普通？や～、一般的？
usually?
(Going out is usual? or general? usually?)

30 Uh usually what is it called?

31 Usually what? ((with a confused look))

32 Usually what? ((with a confused look))

33 [@@@] ごめ(h)ん。
([@@@] so(h)rry.)

34 [Ah] [What?] @@@

35 あ～、タイプしてください。
(A::h please type.)

36 あ、う、う、あ、あ、ふ-ふつ-普通？
(Ah uh uh ah u-usu-usual?)

37 Usually あ、でも、あ～、普通、何？
(Usually ah but a::h usually what?)

38 Generally はい。えと、あ、あ、
generally what.
(Generally yeah. Eh ah ah generally what.)

39 I don’t know what I nee(h)d to say.
((cradling her head in her hands))
Uh えと、えと、質問をタイプしてください。xxx はちょっと=
(Uh eh eh please type your question. xxx is a bit=)

=あ、えっと、日本語、英語で?
(=Ah e:h in Japanese or in English?)

ア、どちら。
(Ah which. ((Amy meant to say “either”))

ア、どちらでも。えっと、じゃあ、日本語(h)で。
(Ah either. E::h then in Japanese.)

((typing her question in Japanese))

アメリカでは女の人と女の人が付き合うのは普通ですか。
(=Is it usual for women to date women in America?) ((reading aloud the question sent via text chat))

OH like is it common?

[Ok]

Co-ah common common un un un oh oh

[oh]

[Ah] [Ah] ah you xxx 普通 means common ah.
The dyad faced a communication breakdown due to the misalignment of frames. For instance, between line 6 and 12, Yoko interacted in a culture-focused frame, as she wanted to ask if it is common for women to date women in the U.S. However, her inaccurate pronunciation of “woman” (line 6) and “lady” (line 8, 10) and her having trouble translating “付き合う” (to date somebody) into English (line 12) pulled her away from the culture-focused frame to the “language teaching and learning” frame. Consequently, despite her attempt to stay in the culture-focused frame, both Amy and Yoko interacted in the “language teaching and learning” frame between line 12 and 19 and collaboratively tackled communication difficulties. Here, it is notable that, unlike Session 2, the dyad engaged in meaning negotiation by frequently switching languages and by aligning toward the same trouble source, as shown by Yoko’s request for the word “付き合う” (to date somebody) to be translated into English by Amy.

In line 20, having acquired the necessary vocabulary to express her question, Yoko went back to the “cultural teaching and learning” frame. In line 22, Yoko used “couple,” the word Amy used to express “付き合う” (to date somebody), to again ask her original question. However, the two participants could not figure out what the discussion was about, as Amy was in the language-focused frame, while Yoko was in the culture-focused frame. In line 24, Amy said, “Uh um let’s see. What’s it called-like-like-GAY?” Amy’s utterance here indicated that she was in the “language teaching and learning” frame, assuming that Yoko was asking how to label a woman who is dating a woman in English. However, since Yoko’s question in line 22 was produced in the “cultural teaching and learning” frame, she said, “Un?” to suggest that there was a misunderstanding (line 25). In response, Amy code-switched to Japanese and asked 何と知り
What do you want to know? (line 26). This conversational move of Amy shows her self-initiative to negotiate for meaning as well as her braveness, considering that she used Japanese, the language of her partner.

However, this language change made it even more difficult for the dyad to align frames, as it created a crossed expertise configuration where Amy interacted as a cultural expert and a language novice, while Yoko interacted as a cultural novice and a language expert. For instance, to resolve the communication issue, Amy asked Yoko in Japanese to type what Yoko wanted to know (line 35). However, Yoko thought Amy was asking her to type “普通” (usual, common), because she thought the word prevented Amy from understanding Yoko’s question. This suggests that Yoko was interacting in the “language teaching and learning” frame to help with Amy’s Japanese, when in fact, Amy spoke Japanese in the “cultural teaching and learning” frame, so Yoko would be able to ask her original question in her L1. This misalignment of frames continued between line 37 and 39, when Amy asked Yoko, “Usually あ、でも、あ～、普通、何？” (Usually ah but a::h usually what?) (line 37) and “えと、あ、あ、generally what.” (Eh ah ah generally what.) (line 39) to ask what Yoko’s question was, while Yoko translated “普通” (usual, common) for Amy as the language expert of Japanese. At the end of line 39, Amy asked Yoko to type the question, which prompted the dyad to negotiate their bilingual practices by asking which language to use. Using the text chat function of Google Hangouts allowed the dyad to share the same visual information and evade the misalignment of frames. In line 43, finally understanding the intention of Yoko’s question, Amy said, “OH like is it common?” In response, Yoko figured out what was causing the communication breakdown and said “[Ah] ah you xxx 普通 means common ah.”
As the examples above demonstrate, because of the intricately intertwined relationship of linguistic and cultural expertise of eTandem, the dyad suffered from the misalignment of frames. Indeed, it took them more than eight minutes from the beginning of Excerpt 21 to the end of Excerpt 22 when the dyad finally understood Yoko’s question. However, unlike their interaction in Session 2 when the language novice abandoned explaining a difficult concept (Excerpts 19 and 20), both Amy and Yoko were willing to continue to pursue the topic and demonstrated a relatively comfortable, risk-taking behavior to understand each other using their multimodal and bilingual resources. In the end, the use of the text chat function enabled the dyad to access the shared visual information, overcome the communication trouble, and engage in the negotiation of sexual identities, as revealed below in Excerpt 23.

7.3.3.3. Interactively achieving the negotiation of sexual identities: Reflection of the coming out discourse via constructed dialogue. After Excerpt 22, Amy explained how common it is for women to date women in the U.S. She also explained that people’s awareness and perception of homosexuality often vary depending on where people live, although people across the U.S. are becoming more understanding of gay relationships these days. The next and final excerpt to be analyzed for the coming out episode is Excerpt 23. It begins when Amy asks Yoko, in English, what is the situation of lesbians in Japan. In Excerpt 23, Yoko shared her honest feeling with Amy, saying that she experienced a culture shock when Amy came out. This led to a productive discussion about the cultural differences between Japan and the U.S. and made them realize the greater value of the eTandem project than mere language learning. To analyze the data, I will use the concepts of rekeying (i.e., a change in the tone of an interaction, Tannen, 2006) and intertextuality (i.e., recontextualization of prior text, Becker, 1995) in the form of constructed dialogue, namely a creative, poetic, and evaluative use of another person’s
words framed as quotation. I demonstrate how the dyad finally negotiated each other’s positions regarding sexual identities through reflection of their prior discourse. I also argue that their in-depth, open conversation about their sexual identities functioned as a means of binding the two participants together, helped them form a strong partnership and friendship, and resulted in creating a community of individuals who can take a transcultural perspective (i.e., a perspective that embraces diversity and is derived by distancing oneself from culturally-ingrained notions) in discussing each other’s culture.

Excerpt 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amy</th>
<th>Yoko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How about Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>@@@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>@@@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What do people think about it though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>@@@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ありがとう@[@] (Thank you @[@]/@])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AH 本当に。 (AH really.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
あ、あ、どうして？
(Ah ah why?)

う～ん、なにだろう。う～ん、カルチャーカルチャーショック？カルチャー？=
(Umm what do you call it? umm culture-culture shock? culture? =)

=Ah=

カルチャーショック=
(=Culture shock=)

=はい。
(=Yes.)(nodding deeply)

It’s unusual. [I see]

[Un]

@ @ @ uh in Boston’ especially? There are a LOT of gay people in Bo[ston]

[Un]

So it’s really really normal here=
((tapping the desk to indicate “here”))

@ @ @

@ @ @

I’m sorry if I should have war(h)ned you.

(Ah @ @ @)

Sorry uh one-one more sorry.

Uh if I should have given you a warn(h)ing? @ @ @

[Oh]=

@ @ @

=I’m so(h)rry. (@ @ @) ((waving her hand like a fan))

[Ah @ @ @] ((waving her hand like a fan))
Ah uh I remember

um 覚えた uh 彼女。

(um I remember uh girlfriend)

彼女？

(Girlfriend?) ((higher pitch))

彼女。

(Girlfriend)
彼女。
(Girlfriend) ((higher pitch))

[@[@]

24 あ〜、楽しい朝だ。[@[@]
(//@@ A::h what a fun morning.
//@@)

25 [ごめん]=
(/Sorry)=

26 [Oh]

27 [Oh]
Thank you for answering? m[y]

28 いつも。
(Always.)

29 とても大丈夫。
(It’s totally ok.)

30 [Thank] you for answering MY questions. @@[@]

33 Ah @@@

34 えと、問題だったら、デートを
選べなかった-選べなかった。
(Eh if it is a problem I would not have been
able to choo-choose dating.)

35 あ〜。
(A::h) ((deep nodding))
36 If it is a problem. ((shrugging))

37 =I would not have picked dating. @@@

38 Uh uh uh I want to understand? American culture more? So maybe there are many culture difference.

40 たぶん。
(Probably.)

41 @@@

42 But uh because we do [his] ((moving her left hand back and forth))

43 we can [learn].

44 @@@@@
In Excerpt 23, the dyad took a transcultural stance to negotiate their sexual identities and reflected on the moment of intercultural tension. Specifically, following Amy’s explanation about the perception of lesbians in the U.S. (which took place before Excerpt 23), Yoko told Amy how she had felt when Amy came out—a culture shock (line 12). Yoko explained that she was “a little surprised-surprised” (line 8) because “in Japan it (lesbian relationship) is not not common? yet?” (line 2). Here, Yoko shared the Japanese perspective that lesbians are often “invisible” (O’Mochain, 2006), explaining that this was the reason why she experienced the culture shock. At the same time, Yoko’s saying, “I think it is ok. Uh um different different
people think different things? So um there are various people so um it is ok” (line 6), demonstrated that she positioned herself as somebody who is able to take a transcultural stance and contextualize her judgments without being bound by the Japanese ideology. It is notable here that Yoko stated her opinion about lesbians in response to Amy’s question, “What do people think about it though.” This shows that Yoko shared her opinion as an individual, even if her opinion may differ from Japanese people’s.

As for Amy, when Yoko said she was surprised at Amy’s coming out, Amy displayed astonishment (line 9) and asked why Yoko felt that way (line 11). When Yoko said she experienced a culture shock, Amy normalized her gay identity by saying, “There are a LOT of gay people in Bo[ston]” (line 16) and “So it’s really really normal here=” (line 17). This shows that Amy tried to combat heteronormativity that privileges heterosexuality over homosexuality (Warner, 1993). At the same time, however, Amy said, “It’s really really normal here= [But] I can see uh I can see that it would be surprising (for a Japanese person)” (line 17-18). This comment shows Amy took a transcultural perspective and contextualized her judgement by comparing people’s perception of lesbians in the U.S. and in Japan and acknowledging the normality and abnormality of homosexuality in their respective countries.

In addition, what strengthened their negotiation of sexual identities was Amy’s use of constructed dialogue in line 23, when she re-enacted her own production of the “girlfriend” term and Yoko’s reaction, because shared access to previous language experiences allowed them to feel enough internal and emotional connection (i.e., involvement). Prior to the production of the constructed dialogue, Amy started to reflect on their prior discourse in line 19 and 21 by saying, “I’m sorry if I should have war(h)ned you. @@@” and “I should have given you a warn(h)ing? @[@@].” Her laughter inside and outside the word boundaries, shining smile, and her word
choice of “warning” indicate a rekeying of the conversation, suggesting that Amy made the statement in a play frame, finding their prior discourse amusing. After Amy and Yoko demonstrated a mirroring behavior of hand waving in line 22, which indicated their alignment, Amy said, “Ah uh I remember,” and started to reconstruct their prior text of coming out by repeating 彼女 (girlfriend). Here, the function of repeating the word 彼女 (girlfriend) in Excerpt 23 is different from that of Excerpt 21. While the word 彼女 (girlfriend) in Excerpt 21 was used by Yoko to process Amy’s unexpected coming out and by Amy to confirm her sexual orientation, the same word appeared again in the constructed dialogue of Excerpt 23 to highlight how the dyad performed the interactive achievement of coming out. In other words, the word 彼女 (girlfriend) gained a new meaning for the dyad after overcoming the miscommunication and became the token for achieving intercultural understanding.

Figure 8 shows the details of Amy’s use of constructed dialogue. As it shows, Amy animated both herself and Yoko. She used both linguistic and non-linguistic means to revisit their shared memory of what happened when she came out; she used the higher pitch and head tilts with a confused look to represent Yoko, while using the lower pitch and a straight head position to represent Amy. Although Amy’s constructed dialogue was not a verbatim quote of their prior exchange (cf. Excerpt 21 between line 17-20), it resembled their prior text enough to make the two participants access the shared text and give them a big laugh (line 23, 24). This playful chat, as shown by a lot of laughing and smiling, also helped the dyad feel comfortable enough to talk about what could potentially be a very risky (and often avoided) topic to discuss, especially in an intercultural setting like the eTandem where intercultural tensions often arise.
Following the constructed dialogue, Yoko thanked Amy for answering her question about same-sex relationships in the U.S. (line 27, 28), to which Amy said, “[Thank] you for answering MY questions” (line 32). This exchange showed that their feelings were mutual and that they had achieved the coming out discourse interactively after letting the topic rest for a while. In the end, Amy told Yoko that talking about her sexual identity is not a problem (line 36), and Yoko said she wanted to learn more about American culture and learn the differences between their countries (line 39). They also agreed they could communicate more on Facebook.

Yoko reflected on their Session 4 interaction, saying “I noticed there are so many cultural differences about ‘love.’ I felt culture shock, but I want to understand American culture more. I enjoyed today’s topic more than any other topics!” Her interaction data as well as this comment demonstrates that she took a candid approach to Amy’s coming out by sharing her surprised feeling and lack of familiarity with the concept, stating that a woman’s dating another woman is not normal to her or to most Japanese people, although she is open to the idea. In other words, she positioned herself as a normal Japanese person who is not used to the concept but who is
willing to explore the new idea, rather than attaching gayness to herself by positioning herself as accepting of Amy’s gay identity (cf. the case of the interviewer in Ellwood, 2006). As for Amy, she also appreciated their interaction in Session 4 and said in her reflection:

> It’s amazing how much people can teach each other in a short amount of time, even if they have to stop frequently to explain things to one another. Today’s session was very stop and start because there were a lot of words or concepts that one or another of us did not understand. But it was still a really good learning atmosphere, and we both felt comfortable, which I could tell because at the end of our session, Yoko felt comfortable enough to ask me about how common gay relationships are here, and even told me she was surprised (though not bothered) when I said I had a girlfriend. It’s entertaining and sweet because I think this was the first time she had a culture shock from these communications, because I suppose she wasn’t expecting that. But I think that the main things I learned today are that taking time to explain things doesn’t disrupt the flow of communication, and these conversations are meaningful enough that culture shock can even be conveyed through them.

(Amy, from her reflection of Session 4)

These comments of Yoko and Amy show that talking about the sensitive topic of sexual identities allowed the two participants to not only learn about each other’s culture but also learn to position themselves as transcultural individuals who can show empathy and understand each other beyond the cultural differences that exist between the U.S. and Japan. In other words, they went outside the comfort zone and “learned from the miscommunication” (Ware & Kramsch,
by transforming “culture shock” into a moment of self and other discovery and by using it as an opportunity to deepen their friendship and intercultural partnership.

7.3.4. Summary of Session 4 Interaction

The dyad not only demonstrated their transcultural stance through the discourse about same-sex relationships and sexual minorities but also transformed “culture shock” into a moment of self and other discovery using constructed dialogue. However, to make this interactive achievement, the dyad faced a number of challenges. First, coming out in the intercultural context posed a serious issue to the dyad, as there was a significant difference in their knowledge schemas regarding homosexuality. While Amy had been telling people about being gay and thinking having a girlfriend was very normal to her, Yoko had never met anybody gay in her life and, being raised in Japan in a social milieu where she has had little relevant life experience of these issues, being gay, especially being lesbian, was not a familiar concept to her. As such, when Amy came out during the task-based conversation, Yoko initially thought of Amy’s implicit coming out as a linguistic failure (cf. Liddicoat, 2009) based on her heteronormative view. After realizing that Amy actually is a lesbian, Yoko did not know how to approach Amy (see Yoko’s post-project interview on p. 259). What Yoko did in response was to opt out of talking about it, namely using silence instead of voice (cf. Nguyen & Yang, 2015, p. 222). Amy also opted out of talking about her gay identity, because she decided to take a normative path and treat her identity as a matter of fact. Accordingly, both participants decided not to negotiate sexual identities and left the issue unresolved for 48 minutes, until the end of the task-based conversation.

Having finished both the English and Japanese parts of the conversation, Yoko gathered the nerve to recycle the topic on same-sex relationships and asked Amy if it was common for
women to date women in America. However, due to the misalignment of language vs. culture-focused frames, Amy and Yoko took a long time to understand each other. Once they identified the trouble source and understood Yoko’s question, Amy produced the constructed dialogue and they together engaged in the reflective practice in a playful manner. In the end, the dyad found the greater meaning of eTandem than simple language learning, namely intercultural and interpersonal understanding, establishing friendship as transcultural individuals, and even experiencing culture shocks to learn about each other.

7.3.5. Interaction After Session 4

In one of the post-project interview questions, I asked the participants if anything changed during a semester of eTandem project. In answering the question, both Yoko and Amy brought up the coming out discourse and explained how it impacted their interaction after Session 4. For instance, Yoko said, “エイミーさんがとてもプライベートなことを打ち明けてくれたので、あの後、信頼関係は深まったのではないかかなと思っています。” (I think Amy’s revealing such a private matter deepened our trusting relationship afterwards.). This comment shows how the critical incident helped the dyad develop mutual trust and form a strong partnership. Yoko also mentioned that she increased her curiosity about American culture and became more invested in the project, as the coming out discourse opened up a new world for Yoko to explore beyond what she was accustomed to. As for Amy, she said in the post-project interview,

Perhaps once something so personal had been shared, we probably got a bit closer. We’d gone beyond some of the superficial stuff, you know? Actually getting to know each other. Even if for her it might have been out of her normal
comfort zone, we were both engaging in a cross-cultural exchange, and I think that having different experiences like that added to the legitimacy!

This comment of Amy shows how the critical incident changed the purpose of the eTandem project. In contrast to their language-focused discourse, as revealed in the analysis of their interaction in Session 2, the dyad started to emphasize the “cross-cultural exchange” through which they could go outside their “normal comfort zone” to learn about each other (including their cultures).

Amy also mentioned in the post-project interview that she could “more candidly talk about what I was doing during the day, or anything related to it” because the critical incident gave Amy an idea of how Yoko would react when Amy talked about her girlfriend. Amy said in the post-project interview, “even if she’d have reacted poorly [in Session 4], I wouldn’t have stopped talking about what I was doing during the day, since it’s the truth of my day to day experience. But, I probably would have changed my wording or mentioned things like that less.” This comment illustrates how the coming out discourse in Session 4 allowed Amy to realize that she did not have to make any more efforts to renew and claim her sexual orientation in the eTandem exchange, as her gay identity was respected and her resources and competences were valued (cf. the Korean ESL student in Nguyen and Yang’s (2015) study). That is, the eTandem context and activities offered much social and linguistic capital such that she felt like investing in it.

In accordance with Amy and Yoko’s comments above, the dyad’s interaction after Session 4 became more reciprocal than their first four Google Hangouts sessions, and it continued until the end of their partnership (i.e., about nine months after the end of the project). Their interaction became more reciprocal in that the dyad established a community of practice, in
which members were equally invested in working toward the common goal and improving their practice through regular interaction. What is particularly interesting about this dyad was that the community of practice emerged thanks to their interaction via Facebook Messenger that started following the critical incident, as revealed in the next section on the use of technological affordances.
7.4. Amy and Yoko’s Use of Technological Affordances

Both Amy and Yoko were average uses of digital technologies. Neither Amy nor Yoko majored in technology-related fields of study; Amy double-majored in cultural anthropology and Japanese language and linguistics, while Yoko majored in commerce. However, the analysis of Google Hangouts interaction over the whole duration of the project revealed that Amy knew from the very first session various ways of using online tools for language learning and teaching, including the use of Google Translate to look up a word (Excerpt 20), use of Google images to explain a concept that is specific to American culture, screen sharing to show Google images, and text chatting functions of Google Hangouts to spell out words/sentences that were considered the trouble source. Based on this evidence, I can speculate that Amy possessed a wider range of digital skills than Yoko.

As for Yoko, the only technology tool that she used in Session 1 was an electronic dictionary that translates words between English and Japanese. Note that an electronic dictionary is something most Japanese high school students use when preparing for college entrance exams and thus a tool that Yoko was comfortable using. In Session 2, as shown in the analysis of Excerpt 19, Yoko also used an online dictionary to look up a word. She also started to use the text chat function of Google Hangouts in Session 2 to spell out a Japanese concept that Amy did not have access to. This suggests that Yoko learned to use the affordances of Google Hangouts via interaction with Amy, although her use of technology did not reach the level of Tomoya even after interacting via Google Hangouts for 10 weeks. Indeed, Yoko never used screen sharing throughout the duration of their year-long partnership.

What is particularly interesting in terms of understanding this dyad’s use of technological affordances during eTandem is that the impact of Session 4 was so
significant that the dyad not only changed how they participated in *Google Hangouts* interactions but also what medium of communication they used to communicate with each other. Prior to Session 4, the dyad used email to set up a time to talk, as was designated in the project design, and that was the only interaction taking place outside the *Google Hangouts* environment. However, as prompted by Amy’s suggestion in line 49-52 of Excerpt 23, the dyad started to use *Facebook Messenger* to communicate with each other in addition to their *Google Hangouts* interaction. While a few other dyads reported that they had used instant messaging devices such as *Facebook Messenger* and *LINE*, these dyads used the tools mostly to set up a time to meet on *Google Hangouts*. In contrast, Amy and Yoko’s community of practice emerged through their interaction via *Facebook Messenger*, which helped them strengthen their relationship, enhance *Google Hangouts* interaction, and create opportunities for language and cultural learning. This section analyzes their discourse that took place via *Facebook Messenger* in conjunction with *Google Hangouts* interaction, as Amy and Yoko agreed to share their interaction via *Facebook Messenger*. See Figure 9 for a sample screen shot of their interaction on *Facebook Messenger*. Yoko’s text is on the left and Amy’s is on the right.
The uses of technology by Amy and Yoko merit some additional analysis of discourse excerpts. Before I analyze their interaction, however, I will review studies that compared video-based interaction and interaction via instant messaging to highlight the role that instant messaging played in Amy and Yoko’s interaction. Having established this theoretical context, I will then analyze three excerpts, two of which took via Facebook Messenger and one via Google Hangouts. The first excerpt (Excerpt 24) took place immediately after the coming out discourse in Session 4 via Facebook Messenger. I demonstrate how their interaction outside the video-mediated environment helped them expand their Google Hangouts interaction. Next, I will analyze an interaction that took place between Session 5 and 6 via Facebook Messenger and their 6th Google Hangouts interaction focusing on cross-modal intertextuality (i.e., recontextualization of a prior text across different modalities).
7.4.1. Impact of Digital Medium on Interaction: Video vs. Text Chats

Video and text chats are both one-to-one synchronous computer-mediated communication, but they are different in various ways. One of the major differences is whether the message is delivered via text or orally. While text messages can be reviewed and edited before it is sent off, video interaction is instantaneous. This potentially makes learners suffer from “tyranny of succession” (Leech & Short, 2007), namely the idea that words or sentences that have been uttered can be modified but never erased. Another major difference is the types of visual information available to conversational participants. While text chats via instant messaging applications like Facebook Messenger do not involve a visual image of conversational participants, the platform allows participants to use other visual cues such as emoticons and GIFs. On the other hand, video interaction provides conversational participants access to non-verbal actions such as eye gaze, hand gestures, and head nodding that are used with or without the verbal language.

Past research examining the similarities and differences between video and text chats reveals that the two modes of communication are beneficial in different ways. For instance, many studies have reported that benefits of instant messaging include its relative anonymity, which facilitates a non-threatening exchange of messages, and decreased communicative pressure, which leads to learners’ higher and equal participation. Van der Zwaard and Bannink (2014) evaluated the influence of digital medium (video calling vs. instant chat-messaging) on telecollaborative interaction focusing on negotiation of meaning, revealing that NS-NNS task performance through video calling tended to be more “face-appropriate” than “task-appropriate,” meaning that participants in video chats tended not to resolve trouble sources to avoid face-threatening moves. The authors argued that this is because “intrusive webcam, registering, and
transmitting image as well as sound” (p. 146) prompted L2 learners to pretend to understand, in contrast to text chats whose relative anonymity allowed them to communicate more freely and be less concerned about the loss of face. Indeed, NNSs’ fear of loss of face and the degree of NSs’ politeness and solidarity was such that the participants left nearly half the tasks unresolved or inconclusive.

As for the benefits of video-mediated interaction, a few studies have reported that video interaction increases social presence and enhances a more active and effective communication (Ko, 2012; Yamada, 2009). For instance, Yamada (2009) compared four types of synchronous CMC: videoconferencing (image and voice), audioconferencing (voice but no image), text chat with image (image but no voice), and plain text chat (no image and no voice). Based on the results of path analysis, the study concluded that the communication tool used (voice vs. text) influenced the degree of consciousness of learning such as grammatical accuracy, while interlocutor’s image and voice together positively affected both learners’ affective side and output production. In other words, Yamada’s findings suggest that text chats via Facebook Messenger increase learners’ awareness of grammatical accuracy, while video chats help learners reduce anxiety and produce more output.

To summarize the contradictory and indeed paradoxical findings above, while anonymity of instant messaging can remove the fear of losing face and facilitate equal participation, it may reduce the sense of social presence and thus lead to limited participation. In contrast, the moving image and sound transmission of video-mediated interaction may increase social presence and facilitate natural communication. However, such dynamic interaction may be so face-threatening that L2 learners may avoid negotiation of meaning. While the benefits of each modality are not conclusive yet, what is clear is that these two modalities influence the amount of output and the
degree to which participants engage in potentially face-threatening moves. Below, I will use the insights from these findings to analyze Amy and Yoko’s exchange of messages via Facebook Messenger.

7.4.2. Going Beyond the Google Hangouts Environment: Interaction via Facebook Messenger

Yoko and Amy’s interaction via Facebook instant messaging started one day after their fourth Google Hangouts session. The analysis of Excerpt 24 that took place between Session 4 and 5 revealed that the dyad’s interaction via Facebook Messenger functioned in four ways: (1) to familiarize themselves with each other (i.e., socializing), (2) to further discuss what they talked about during the Google Hangouts interaction (i.e., discussing a topic that started on Google Hangouts interaction and enhancing the prior discourse), (3) to teach and learn a language (i.e., L2), and (4) to manage the next Google Hangouts session (i.e., logistics management). The discourse data also shows how they mixed the two languages to achieve these four functions, or “strands” of meaning making.

The transcript is divided into two columns. Amy’s messages are displayed on the left, while Yoko’s messages are displayed on the right. Each message is divided into a few lines, and each line is given a line number (the number in the leftmost column) and a code that indicates one of the four functions: (1) SOC for socializing, (2) ENH for enhancement of Google Hangouts, (3) L2 for teaching and learning of a language, and (4) LOG for logistics management. For instance, the sample message in Figure 10 indicates that it was Amy’s second message that was delivered on October 27th at 3:05PM. This message is divided into three lines (from line 10-12). SOC in line 10 and 11 indicates that these two lines functioned as socializing,
while LOG in line 12 indicates that it functioned as logistics management. Finally, a dotted line between messages indicates a time lapse in the delivery of messages.

Amy 2 (10/27 3:05PM)

10 SOC That sounds delicious! I hope it was fun!
11 SOC Hahaha, well, I have to bleach my hair before I can dye it, so I understand 😊 It's a lot of fun! My favorite color is blue so I often dye my hair blue!
12 LOG And yes, I saw Akiyama-sensei’s email. We will talk about pop culture for session 5. Let’s talk about stereotypes for session 6!

Figure 10. Transcribing a Sample Message Sent via Facebook Messenger

Excerpt 24 begins with greetings, and, as it develops, it accomplishes multiple functions. Here, Amy and Yoko talk about various topics including the ones they had discussed in the previous sessions, those they had never discussed before, and those that are relevant to their prior discourse.
Yoko 1 (10/27 1:35AM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Hi! How are you today?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>So, I have a question! I have thought since I saw you for the first time, why do you color your hair Rainbow?? Your hair is so cool! Please tell me:)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amy 1 (10/27 11:17AM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>おはよう！今日はとてもいい日だと思う。元気？ (Good morning! I think it is a nice day today. How are you?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>ありがとうございます！私はとても楽しいと思うから、かみがにじにする。私のかみはいつもにじじゃないけど、いつも色々な色がある。次の色は青いかピンクだと思う。 (Thank you! I dye my hair rainbow because I think it is very fun. Although my hair is not always rainbow, there are various colors. I think the next color will be blue or pink.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yoko 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>元気(^-^) 今日は友達とカレー屋に行ったよ。おいしかった！Yammy!! (I am doing well(^-^) Today I went to a curry restaurant with my friend. It was delicious! Yammy!!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>次は青かピンクか！びっくり！ (The next color is blue or pink! I’m surprised!)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
私はまだ
(I have not)

髪(かみ)を
(髪(kami)) ((indicating the pronunciation of the
Chinese character for hair (髪) in parenthesis))

染めたことないな～でも、もし染めるとしたら
茶色かな～
(dyed mine~ but if I do I want to dye it brown~)

Oh, I forgot saying about next session! We decided to
talk about stereotype in session 5, but we have to talk
about POP CULTURE!! So, let’s talk about it♫

That sounds delicious! I hope it was fun!

Hahaha, well, I have to bleach my hair before I can
dye it, so I understand 😊 It's a lot of fun! My
favorite color is blue so I often dye my hair blue!

And yes, I saw Akiyama-sensei’s email. We will
talk about pop culture for session 5. Let’s talk about
stereotypes for session 6!

Today, I bought a new harmonica, and after that I
practiced it for 4 hours. I am sleepy now…😴

Wow you often dye your hair blue! That’s nice!

OK, the topic of session 6 is stereotypes😊
| 16 | SOC | すごいね！長い時間に練習した！たくさん寝られるといいね～
(Wow! You practiced a long time! I hope you can sleep a lot～) |
| 17 | SOC | 明日、かみを染めるつもりよ！楽しい😊
(Tomorrow I am planning on dying my hair! Enjoyable😊) |

Yoko 4

| 18 | SOC | https://m.youtube.com/watch?xxxxxxx これは私たちの
(https://m.youtube.com/watch?xxxxxxx This is our) |
| 19 | L2  | サークル(クラブ)が
(circle(club)) |
| 20 | SOC | 6月に演奏した曲だよ！「Top of the world」はエイミーも知ってるよね?
(a piece that our circle played in June! “Top of the world” you also know it right, Amy?) |
| 21 | L2  | そうなんだ！青色？
(Oh I see! Blue?)
(※「楽しい」→「楽しみ」)
(※“Enjoyable”→“Looking forward to it”) |

Amy 4

| 22 | SOC | あっ！本当にすごい！洋子のサークルはとってもよかった！難しいと思う。うん、私も知ってる😊
(AH! It really awesome! Yoko’s circle was so good! I think it’s hard. Yes, I also know it😊) |
<p>| 23 | SOC | 明日、青色かピンクを決まる。でも、青色かもしれない！:P |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>L2</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Tomorrow I will decide blue or pink. But it may be blue! :p)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>(あっ、ありがとう！)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>(Ah thank you!))</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thank you so much!!!!! すごく嬉しいよ～😊 練習頑張るね (^O^)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>(Thank you so much!!!!! I am really happy~😊 I will practice hard (^O^))</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOC</strong></td>
<td><strong>次回のセッションでエイミーの</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>(Next session Amy's)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>L2</strong></td>
<td><strong>髪(かみ)を</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>(髪(kami)) ((indicating the pronunciation of the Chinese character for hair (髪) in parenthesis))</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOC</strong></td>
<td><strong>見るのを楽しみにしてる！</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>(I am looking forward to seeing it!)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOC</strong></td>
<td><strong>It sounds like you are having a great time with it, too, which is awesome 😊</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Haha, thanks! I am always excited for our sessions 😊</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>ENH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oh, I also learned something recently! I was wrong about homecoming. A lot of colleges do homecoming, but because mine does not have a football team, we don’t do homecoming. So I didn't realize that other colleges DO do homecoming!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thank you!😊 I hope I play it to you sometime:)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENH</td>
<td>Oh, your college doesn't have fur ball team?! Really? I am so surprised because your college is so big…!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ENH</td>
<td>We have Sakura FESTIVAL 4 days later! I am SO excited!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>That would be great!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ENH</td>
<td>That’s sooooo exciting! I’m sure your group is ready 😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ENH</td>
<td>I know! It’s strange. I think that a long time ago (15 or 20 years ago) the football team was so bad that it was stopped. But at my school, hockey is the very popular sport! If people want to go to a sports game, they go see the hockey team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yoko 7**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>ENH</td>
<td>I see… That’s too bad:( Wow! In Japan, hokey is not so popular. So I’m interested in it!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>ENH</td>
<td>“your group” means my harmonica club? If so, we will not participate 😢 But next year, we will participate!!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sakura is used to replace Yoko’s school name.*
As shown in Excerpt 24, Amy and Yoko’s interaction outside the Google Hangouts environment helped them not only manage logistics issues (i.e., logistics management) but also get to know each other by making statements and asking questions that they might have been too hesitant to do during their video interaction (i.e., socializing), elaborate on what they talked about during the previous Google Hangouts interactions (i.e., enhancement), and create language learning opportunities (i.e., L2). First, the text chat environment, which is considered less face-threatening than the video-mediated interaction and in which participants can decide when to respond (van der Zwaard & Bannink, 2014), afforded the dyad opportunities to ask questions that they might have been too afraid to ask in the Google Hangouts environment. For example, Yoko said, “So, I have a question! I have thought since I saw you for the first time, why do you color your hair Rainbow??” (line 2). This shows that the text chat environment made Yoko feel comfortable and confident in English enough to ask the potentially face-threatening question, which facilitated their familiarization process. Moreover, the dyad used Facebook Messenger to share emotions more freely. For instance, Yoko produced affective and evaluative comments using various phrases and emoticons such as “びっくり” (surprised) (line 6, 33), “すごく嬉しいよ～😊” (I am really happy😊) (line 25), “次回のセッションでエイミーの髪(かみ)を見るのは楽しみにしてる！” (I am looking forward to seeing your hair.) (line 26-28), and “I hope I play it to you sometime:)” (line 32). Amy also used various emotional phrases and emoticons such as “本当にすごい！” (It is really awesome!) (line 22), “I am always excited for our sessions😊” (line 30), and “That would be great!!!” (line 35) to show her emotional involvement. This way, the dyad created a space where they could openly talk about any topics and share emotions.

What is also interesting about their interaction via Facebook Messenger is that they used text chats to enhance Google Hangouts interaction. Specifically, the dyad used the text chat
environment to reflect on their prior discourse and expand on the topic via reframing. For instance, Amy initiated her reflection in line 31 by saying, “Oh, I also learned something recently! I was wrong about homecoming. A lot of colleges do homecoming, but because mine does not have a football team, we don’t do homecoming. So I didn’t realize that other colleges DO do homecoming!” Amy’s comment here shows that she researched about American homecoming after they talked about the school tradition in Session 2. Although it is not clear exactly how long ago Amy did this research, the fact that she admitted her being “wrong” during their Facebook messaging indicates that the modality made it easier or perhaps more convenient for Amy to share what she had been meaning to tell Yoko. In response to Amy’s reflective comment about homecoming, Yoko also reflected on what they had discussed in Session 2 by recycling the topic on her school festival (line 34). By reciprocating reflectivity, Yoko highlighted their shared access to their prior discourse, and this led to their engaging conversation, as shown by Yoko’s enthusiastic statement, “I am SO excited!” (line 34), and Amy’s similarly enthusiastic response, “That’s sooooo exciting!” (line 35), which mirrors Yoko’s statement.

Furthermore, the dyad’s reflection on their prior Google Hangouts interaction created opportunities to learn about each other’s culture via reframing. In line 33, Yoko expressed her disbelief, commenting that she was surprised to find that Amy’s school does not have a football team given that it is a large school. This comment reframed the conversation, and in response, Amy talked about ice hockey, which is a popular sport at her school compared to American football (line 36). This comment again reframed the conversation, and Yoko talked about the unpopularity of ice hockey in Japan and her desire to learn more about the American sport because it is not a common sport in Japan (line 38). Her expression of “Wow! In Japan, hokey is
not so popular. So I’m interested in it!!” (line 38) indicates that Yoko was developing a taste for learning about anything in the U.S. that does not resonate or duplicate the things she already knows from Japan. This may indicate that Yoko was growing international posture, namely “a tendency to relate oneself to the international community rather than any specific L2 group” (Yashima, 2009, p. 145), through interacting with Amy.

The engaging discussion about Amy’s hair color continued until line 30, during which the dyad not only socialized but also engaged in language teaching and learning. For instance, in line 7 and 27, Yoko wrote “髪(かみ)。” The first character, 髪, is a kanji (Chinese character used in Japanese orthography) which is pronounced as /kami/. Yoko thought Amy might not know the Chinese character 髪 and provided a hiragana reading in parenthesis next to the Chinese character (i.e., (かみ)) to indicate how the Chinese character is read in Japanese. This shows that Yoko designed her text message according to Amy’s Japanese proficiency level to provide a language learning opportunity. A similar episode is found in line 19, when Yoko wrote, “サークル(クラブ).” The word サークル literally means a “circle,” but in Japanese, this word means college students’ club activities. To compensate for the different interpretations of the word between English and Japanese, Yoko translated “circle” into English (i.e., club) but wrote it in katakana (i.e., Japanese syllabary mainly used for loan words) as (クラブ). This again shows that Yoko changed her utterances based on Amy’s knowledge about the Japanese language and culture. Finally, Yoko corrected Amy’s utterance in line 17 by writing “(※「楽しい」⇒「楽しみ」) (((※ “Enjoyable” ⇒ “Looking forward to it”))) (line 21). Yoko used the ※ symbol to make the correction salient for Amy to attend to. In response, Amy thanked Yoko in line 24, acknowledging that she had understood the corrective intention. This explicit error correction had rarely been observed in Amy and Yoko’s video-mediated interaction because their
error correction was usually via recasts, which they were trained to use (see *Corrective Feedback Training* in Chapter 4). It may be that text chat modality, which does not require conversational participants to respond instantly and which emphasizes “task-appropriateness” rather than “face-appropriateness” (van der Zwaard & Bannink, 2014), influenced the way they corrected their partner’s linguistic errors.

Finally, the analysis of the dyad’s interaction via *Facebook Messenger* revealed how they utilized code-switching to achieve these four “strands” of meaning making described above. In Excerpt 24, Yoko initiated the conversation in her L2 (English). In return, Amy let herself use her L2 (Japanese), so she could reciprocate the opportunities to practice their TLs (line 3-4). In line 5, Yoko responded to Amy’s question, “元気?” (*How are you?*) in Japanese and made a comment about Amy’s answer to Yoko’s question (line 6-8). In line 9, Yoko then switched to English to manage a logistical issue. Amy then responded to Yoko’s message in English (line 10-12), according to which Yoko also used English (line 13-15). Amy then switched to Japanese in line 16, and their interaction between line 16-28 was done in Japanese, namely Amy’s TL. In line 29, Amy switched to English to let Yoko use her L2 (English), and their interaction in English continued between line 29-39. As this code-switching behavior shows, Amy and Yoko used more bilingual resources during the text chats than during their *Google Hangouts* interaction. This means that the dyad considered the text-mediated environment suitable for demonstrating their shared bilingual speaker identity. In other words, the text-mediated environment functioned as a *safe space* (Yi, 2009) that let them demonstrate their bilingual and bicultural identity.

In summary, their interaction via *Facebook Messenger* created intertextual links between the past and present and relational links between Amy and Yoko. Such intertextual links afforded
them opportunities to get to know each other, establish their friendship, and learn about each other’s language and culture in depth. The text chat environment also provided the dyad with an alternative route through which they could get connected with each other. Sending messages via Facebook Messenger was perceived to be less face-threatening than talking via Google Hangouts and thus seemed to encourage the participants to make bold statements and correct linguistic errors in a rather explicit manner (although error correction itself was rarely observed in their interaction via Facebook Messenger). Moreover, the safe space let them demonstrate their bilingual identity by code-switching. Overall, their extracurricular interaction via Facebook Messenger functioned as a way to form themselves into a group of two people who share a concern or a passion for something they do, and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly. Below, I will explicate how Amy and Yoko developed such a community of practice by integrating the video and text modes of communication and creating cross-modal intertextual links.

7.4.3. Bonding Over the Discussion About Language Learning: Building a Community of Practice via Cross-modal Intertextual Links

The dyad kept interacting via Facebook Messenger after their fifth Google Hangouts session. Indeed, their intertextuality observed between Facebook Messenger and Google Hangouts started to play a major role in shaping their interaction, as evidenced by Amy’s reflection of Session 6 when she said she changed the way she interacted with Yoko based on what Yoko said during their interaction via Facebook Messenger.

"Today I learned that it’s important to adapt to the needs of the conversation and its context. Yoko is taking her TOEFL test tomorrow, which is terrifying! So I was"
more than happy to speak a little longer and more in depth with English to help her prepare, and be a little harder on her mistakes than I normally would be. Of course, she didn’t ask me to do any of that, but she did say that the sessions help her study. So it’s important in intercultural communications to be aware of what’s going on in the other person’s life so you can be helpful if you can!

(Amy, from her reflection of Session 6)

This comment of Amy also shows that their social interaction became personal and indeed had “gone beyond some of the superficial stuff” (see pp. 279–280 for Amy’s comment in the post-project interview).

7.4.3.1. Talking about language learning struggles and providing encouraging comments via Facebook Messenger. The following exchange of Facebook messages took place between Session 5 and 6. I will first analyze the text chat interaction because their Google Hangouts interaction in Excerpt 26 was shaped by the exchange of Facebook messages. In Excerpt 25, the dyad talks about two types of exams that Yoko needs to take: the TOEFL test and a test to obtain a driver’s license. Here, I will focus on analyzing the discourse on language learning, as it was closely linked to their Google Hangouts interaction in Excerpt 26. I argue that their discussion about language learning via Facebook Messenger provided them with opportunities to talk about their concerns as L2 learners, reveal how they feel about each other’s language ability, and display their willingness to learn from their partner and support their partner’s L2 learning.
Excerpt 25

Amy 1 (11/07 7:59AM)

| 1 | Okay! Is it okay that we do it that day, or would the next day be better? |

Yoko 1

| 2 | Saturday is better than Sunday. |
| 3 | I have TOEFL test on Sunday. It includes reading, listening, speaking and writing test! |
| 4 | It takes for 4 hours!!!😭 Besides, we are permitted breaks only for 15 minutes😱 |
| 5 | But I will do my best! |

Amy 2

| 6 | Okay! Saturday 8:30 my time, 10:30 your time it is! We can make that one quick, too, so that you can study and sleep. |
| 7 | Oh wow! That’s scary! I am sure you will get a very good grade though. |
| 8 | Yes, please do your best! |

Yoko 2

| 9 | I believe Hang Out will be training for listening and speaking test! |
| 10 | Thanks😊 |
| 11 | Actually, I have an exam for temporary license (=pre-driver license?) on next Tuesday. I’m nervous:( I want to be able to drive as soon as possible! |

Amy 3

| 12 | Oh, I understand! That makes sense. I hope I can help! |
13 That’s exiting! Are you ready to take the test? Driving is fun! In America, we get Learner’s Permits first after taking a paper test, which means we can only drive with our parents or other adults for practice until we take our actual driver’s test and get our full Driver’s License.

14 Are you doing something like that?

Yoko 3

15 I think I mistake many times, so I want to recast my mistakes more 😊 Especially, grammar and pronunciation! I want to speak well!)

16 I believe I will pass!(maybe…!)

17 In Japan, we get Learner’s Permits after taking a paper test and a driving test at driving school.(not on real road!) Until we get Driver’s License, we can only drive with teachers for practice. We can’t drive with our parents.

Amy 4

18 I don’t think that you make very many mistakes 😊 But I will try to point out even the small mistakes during our Hang Out, to help!

19 You already do speak well 😊

20 Oh wow! That’s a lot to do. It must be hard to practice driving if you can only do it with teachers.

Yoko 4

21 Thank you!

22 I don’t have confidence, but I’m happy to hear such a comment 😊

23 Yeah, it’s hard. It takes much time and money until I get Driver’s License 😓
Amy 5

24 Of course 😊 It’s the truth!

25 Wow… will it be useful to be able to drive in Tokyo?

Yoko 5

26 In Tokyo, many people use public transportation like train or bus, so we seldom use cars.

27 But in Toyama (my hometown), many people drive a car because public transportation hasn’t developed yet.

28 We can’t live without car in Toyama So when I come home, I will drive😊
Excerpt 25 shows that the dyad’s discussion about the TOEFL test helped them form a community of practice and establish the foundation for their sixth Google Hangouts session (see the analysis of Excerpt 26 below). When Amy asked when to meet for the next Google Hangouts session (line 1), Yoko said Saturday would be better, as she would need to take the TOEFL test on Sunday (line 2-3). This comment opened up their productive discussion about language learning where Yoko shared her concerns about the test and English learning such as “I think I mistake many times” (line 15) and “I don’t have confidence” (line 22), and where Amy provided evaluative comments about Yoko’s English such as “I am sure you will get a very good grade though” (line 7), “You already do speak very well!” (line 19). Yoko also revealed how she feels about the eTandem project by saying “I believe Hang Out will be training for listening and speaking test!” (line 9) and by making a request to Amy, saying “I want (you) to recast my mistakes more 😊 Especially, grammar and pronunciation! I want to speak well:)” (line 15). Amy also positioned herself as a tutor and said, “I hope I can help!” (line 12) and “I don’t think that you many very many mistakes😊 But I will try to point out even the small mistakes during our Hang Out, to help!” (line 19). As these messages show, the dyad increased the sense of community by Yoko openly talking about her struggle as an English learner and by Amy providing emotional support by praising Yoko’s English.

7.4.3.2. Using cross-modal intertextuality to position each other as an equally struggling language learner and equally supportive language expert. The following conversation took place after their interaction via Facebook Messenger in Excerpt 25. Excerpt 26 is taken from the English part of Session 6 where the dyad is engaged in free conversation. In the following excerpt, Amy starts talking about her Japanese class, and Yoko reciprocates by talking about her English class. Yoko then talks about her “examination” (i.e., the TOEFL test) and
confesses that she is not confident in speaking and listening, and this conversation about
language learning led to their bonding experience. Using the concepts of positioning and
identities (Davies & Harré, 1990) and intertextuality (Kristeva, 1980), and drawing on Sanchez’s
(2015) finding on eTandem, I will demonstrate how the dyad used positioning and intertextuality
to increase a sense of a community and facilitated bonding over the discussion of language
learning. Specifically, I argue that the two participants shared their language learner and expert
identities and treated each other as equals, so they could provide encouraging comments about
their partner’s L2 ability and acknowledge that they were both developing as language learners
together (i.e., through what Tannen (2005) calls mutual revelation).

Excerpt 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amy</th>
<th>Yoko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have a Japanese class tomorrow.</td>
<td>Ah ah so Japanese class is speaking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ah it’s everything.</td>
<td>Ah reading or listening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yeah=</td>
<td>=Ah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We do all the bits in each class.</td>
<td>Ah today I have I have an English class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ah ok.</td>
<td>Our English speaking class we talk about Sakura Festival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Oh are you going to talk about your recycling club?</td>
<td>Yes but I do not practice yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I’m sure you’ll do great. 洋子の説明は、あ～、わかりやすい。 You explained about your club very well to me. (I’m sure you’ll do great. Yoko’s explanation is a::h easy to understand. You explained about your club very well to me.)</td>
<td>@@@ ありがとう。Ah uh I have I have a ex-examination tomorrow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I know. Are you nervous?

Ah yeah. A little. Uh I um I don’t I don’t have con-confident um of speaking and listening.

I understand. I feel the same way about Japanese.

Yeah. Um I think reading and writing is more easier than speaking and listening.

I read in um in a textbook for a class I’m taking um I’m taking a Japanese anthropology class? [um]

[Un]? anthropology?

Yeah. Um I think reading and writing is more easier than speaking and listening.

[Anthro]-ah thank you.

Ah and I read that um that Japanese schools? um high schools? don’t really teach um listening and speaking? [cause] [Ah]

College-college entrance exams? only test reading and writing. Is that true?

Um I I-in-when I was a high school student? uh speaking um uh I didn’t have speaking class.

Ok.

Um I um in English class? we always read? or write. Uh sometimes listen listen English?

Ok.

Um we until to enter university? we we have ah we have examination reading writing and listening.

Ok.

But no speaking.

Well at least now you’re learning to speak too yay-or we are.

[@@] Yeah.

Because you’re very good at it.

Ah thank you.

[@@]

And you are very good at Japanese.

ありがとう。We are getting better together.
314

Thank you. We are getting better together.

Yes.

*Sakura is used to replace Yoko’s school name.

Excerpt 26 as well as other parts of the dyad’s conversation after Session 4 reveal that Amy and Yoko often addressed the affective side of language learning by openly talking about their lack of confidence and fear of speaking and by encouraging each other to learn their L2. In doing so, they positioned themselves as equals (i.e., equally struggling language learners) and shared their L2 learner identity. For example, when Yoko said, “I don’t I don’t have con-confident um of speaking and listening (line 16), Amy said, “I understand. I feel the same way about Japanese” (line 17). Note that a similar exchange of messages occurred via Facebook Messenger, when Amy said, “You already do speak well😊” (line 19 of Excerpt 25) and Yoko said in response, “I don’t have confidence” (line 22 of Excerpt 25). While Amy’s comment during Facebook Messenger suggests that she positioned herself as a language expert, her utterance in the Google Hangouts interaction suggests that Amy positioned herself as a fellow language learner who is also struggling just like Yoko rather than positioning herself as an expert of the English language. This shows that Amy occasionally broke away from her expected role as a language expert and treated Yoko and herself as equal language learners.

Amy then continued to discuss what she learned from her Japanese anthropology class, saying that she read that Japanese high schools do not teach listening and speaking because college entrance exams only test reading and writing (line 22, 23). Yoko shared her experience learning English, saying that she had listening practice in class, but not speaking (line 28, 30). Here, Amy’s positioning herself as a cultural novice shifted the epistemic imbalance and allowed the dyad to explore why Yoko was not confident about her speaking. In response to Yoko’s explanation about English education in Japan, Amy said, “Well at least now you’re learning to
speak too yay-or we are” (line 31). The reformulation of “you’re learning” to “or we are” indicates that Amy positioned herself not only as an expert of the English language but also as a fellow language learner who is learning to speak Japanese (line 33).

In addition to positioning themselves as L2 learners, Amy and Yoko also used their linguistic expertise to provide emotional support, encouraging each other that they speak their L2 well and reminding themselves that they together are improving their L2 through the partnership. For instance, in order to help Yoko have more confidence in English, Amy positioned herself as an English expert and said, “I’m sure you’ll do great. (Yoko’s explanation is a::h easy to understand.) You explained about your club very well to me” (line 13) and “… you’re very good at it (speaking)” (line 33). In response, Yoko positioned herself as an expert of Japanese and said, “And you are very good at Japanese” (line 36). This way, both Amy and Yoko positioned themselves as a language expert and reciprocated their encouraging comments about each other’s L2 proficiency. Note that Amy’s evaluative comments about Yoko’s English such as “I am sure you will get a very good grade though” (line 7 in Excerpt 25) and “You already do speak very well😊” (line 19 in Excerpt 25) are recycled from the Facebook interaction and strengthen the video-mediated environment. In the end, these evaluative comments about each other’s language ability, which are strengthened by the dyad’s intertextual use of prior text produced via Facebook Messenger (see the analysis of Excerpt 25), led to the participants’ increased sense of community, likely strengthened trust in each other, and helped create a strong partnership for language learning.

In conclusion, Amy and Yoko’s interaction via Facebook Messenger created cross-modal intertextual links and led to the formation of their own small community of practice. Using language learning as a topic of conversation and revealing how they feel about it allowed them to
not only share their learner identity, so they could treat themselves as equals, but also position themselves as language experts, so they could provide words of encouragement to the other. This suggests that eTandem participants may resist adopting inherent roles as NS-as-expert and NNS-as-learner (see Sanchez, 2015 for a similar finding) and instead prioritize their joint positioning as equally struggling language learners and equally supportive language experts. In other words, eTandem participants may prioritize reciprocation of their positions over adopting inherent NS vs. NNS roles in order to maintain human relationships, and this may be one of the key factors in strengthening their partnership. The analysis above also provided a new insight that cross-modal intertextuality, which was observed in the discussion of language learning via Facebook Messenger and Google Hangouts, strengthened the community of practice and allowed the dyad to show a form of interdependency that resulted in emotional support.

7.4.4. Summary of Amy and Yoko’s Use of Technological Affordances

As learners’ participation, non-participation, or resistance in a discourse depends on who they want to be and become (Nguyen & Yang, 2015), knowing that Amy and Yoko respected and valued each other’s identity contributed to improving their participation in and appreciation of the project. The analysis of Amy and Yoko’s interaction after the coming out discourse revealed that the dyad changed the way they communicated with each other, and with that change, the purpose of interactions became less language-oriented and more focused on intercultural understanding and building friendship. Indeed, they stopped correcting errors as frequently as before and did not keep track of as many errors in the journal as before. What contributed to this change the most was the use of Facebook Messenger that was used prior to and following Google Hangouts sessions. Facebook Messenger was used not only for logistics
management (e.g., deciding what to talk about and when) but also for preparing for and reflecting on their Google Hangouts interaction, language learning and teaching, and familiarizing themselves with each other. As a result, their interaction went beyond the Google Hangouts environment and created links between different modes of communication (i.e., cross-modality), the past and present (i.e., intertextuality), and Amy and Yoko (i.e., friendship).

Such cross-modal intertextual resources helped the participants create a community of practice where they shared their language learner identity, treated each other as equals, and invested in supporting a partner who was equally struggling. Indeed, the formation of such a community enabled the dyad to talk about hardships in learning a language, provide encouraging comments, and make affective and evaluative comments that might have been difficult to produce in a video-mediated interaction alone. In addition, by using the cross-modal intertextual resources, the dyad started to position themselves and each other as bilingual speakers and adopted bilingual practices (e.g., code-switching). This bilingual practice was facilitated in the text-mediated environment where they did not make a clear boundary between two languages, as opposed to the video-mediated context in which time divided the use of the two languages. It is possible that such a bilingual practice during their extracurricular interaction via Facebook Messenger helped them forget about the dichotomy between being a NS vs. NNS, which often constrains participants to pay more attention to form and accuracy (e.g., Ke, 2016), and fostered their international posture. In other words, their bilingual practices allowed them to relate themselves not only to the specific TL community but also to the international community at large. Thus, it seems that the use of Facebook Messenger and Google Hangouts together enabled them to bond as bilingual speakers, trust each other, and form a strong partnership as
international communicators, and such improvement in the relational element of interaction created affordances for language and cultural learning.
7.5. Enactment of Reciprocity: Main Findings for Amy and Yoko

How then did Amy and Yoko enact reciprocity, and how successful was that enactment? Did it change over time? If so, what factors or events may have been related to those changes? In this section, I return to these main questions and inspect the various senses of reciprocity found in the extant literature: (1) quantitative equality (i.e., number of turns and topic shifts, Schwienhorst, 2004; Schwienhorst and Borgia, 2006) and other senses of equality, (2) interactional patterns based on equality (i.e., degree of task control) and mutuality (i.e., involvement with each other’s contribution) (cf. Storch, 2002), (3) various forms of exchanged behavior, and (4) compatibility.

7.5.1. Equality

7.5.1.1. Quantitative equality. Based on the cursory perusal of the transcripts, it was found that Amy and Yoko’s interaction, when it was analyzed as a session overall, was equal in the quantitative sense. In other words, the number of turns and topic shifts was balanced between the two participants in both the English and Japanese parts of a session. When we look into each language part, however, it was found that a participant who owned the cultural expertise during a given interaction spoke more and led the conversation, regardless of the language of discussion. In other words, although their interaction achieved quantitative equality across the two language parts, their interaction was not equal when examined within a topic, as Amy would talk more when the topic of discussion was about the U.S., and Yoko would talk more when it was about Japan. The same pattern was observed throughout the duration of the project, even after the critical incident in Session 4. In other words, cultural expertise continued to impact Amy and Yoko’s turn distribution in the same way throughout the duration of their partnership.
As revealed in the analysis of Excerpts 18-20, Amy and Yoko’s unequal turn distribution within a topic was mainly due to the static role assignments. Specifically, the dyad interacted in accordance with the language spoken (i.e., who held the linguistic expertise) and the topic of discussion (i.e., who held the cultural expertise). As such, a language expert would provide linguistic support in the form of error correction; a language novice would use the TL and receive error correction; a cultural expert would introduce the culture to the interlocutor and lead the conversation; and a cultural novice would listen to the cultural expert’s explanation and learn about the unfamiliar culture. These clear and static role assignments between the participants dictated when to take turns and when to change the topics of discussion. This is unlike the case of Benjamin and Tomoya, who reciprocated conversational roles and benefited from a dynamic shift of footings even within a role-taking configuration.

7.5.1.2. Qualitative equality. During the coming out discourse in Session 4, the dyad took a transcultural perspective in discussing their sexual identities. Through the discourse, the dyad shared their honest feelings and opinions about same-sex relationships without being bound by what is considered “appropriate” by their cultures. The critical incident made Amy realize that her gay identity was respected and her resources and competences were valued by Yoko and that she did not have to defend her sexual orientation in the eTandem exchange. As for Yoko, she realized that there was a new world outside her heteronormative view and that eTandem partnership offered a window through which she could explore the cultural diversity of the world. As a result, both Amy and Yoko thought the eTandem partnership offered so much social and linguistic capital that they decided to invest in it more after Session 4. In other words, their interaction was reciprocal in that both of them were equally invested in the project.
7.5.2. Interactional Patterns

Amy and Yoko’s interaction was characterized by low to mid equality and mid to high mutuality throughout the duration of the 10-week project except for Session 4 when they experienced a critical incident. Their interaction did not achieve high equality because the cultural expert mainly took responsibility for developing topics, as shown in the analysis of Session 2 interaction (Excerpts 19 where Yoko talked about her Japanese idol groups and 20 where Amy talked about pidgin). Although their interaction was characterized by limited equality, it achieved mid to high mutuality, as both participants were involved with the interlocutor’s contribution in the form of corrective feedback and its uptake (rather than participatory listenership) as in Excerpt 18, where Yoko talked about her university festival.

The only time Amy and Yoko could not achieve mutuality was when a language novice had a total epistemic superiority about a cultural topic in the TL, namely when the language novice was explaining a difficult concept in the crossed expertise configuration. As revealed in the analysis of Session 2 interaction (Excerpts 19 and 20), a language novice was reluctant to involve the language expert in expressing her thought in the TL, as they thought it was face-threatening and/or because they had not realized the potential benefit of regarding each other as bilingual resources. During the critical incident, however, the dyad used their bilingual resources (e.g., code-switching) to negotiate sexual identities and achieve intercultural understanding. This experience made them realize the value of using bilingual resources in eTandem interaction, and their interaction after Session 4 during a crossed expertise configuration became less solitary, as they started to use their bilingual repertoire to tackle communication issues.
7.5.3. Exchanged Behavior

Amy and Yoko demonstrated various forms of exchanged behavior. One significant feature of this dyad was the way they engaged in error correction routines. The analysis of Session 2 (Excerpt 18) is one example of how, in both the English and the Japanese parts of a session, the language expert frequently provided corrective feedback in the form of recasts and took notes of errors made by the language novice in the journal. A cursory perusal of the transcripts confirmed that Amy and Yoko’s conversation was broadly reciprocal in terms of the frequency of error correction and the degree of linguistic support provided by the language expert in both language parts. This indicates that they shared the responsibility as the language experts and were committed to providing linguistic support. However, their excessive focus on language teaching created a form of reciprocity that was not necessarily beneficial to the participants’ social interaction, as they could not get to know each other via cultural exploration. This is contrastive with Tudini’s (2016) finding that her participants mostly focused on a conversational task but used code-switching for correcting each other’s errors, so they could overcome linguistic asymmetries and manage the face-threatening nature of corrective feedback.

In Session 4, prompted by Amy’s coming out and Yoko’s asking about the status of lesbians in the U.S., the dyad engaged in mutual revelation and negotiated their sexual identities. After the critical incident, Amy and Yoko focused much less on error correction, and their interaction started to emphasize the cultural learning aspect of eTandem as well. As part of cultural exploration and process of familiarization, the dyad started to exchange text messages via Facebook Messenger (Excerpts 24 and 25) and this online platform outside the Google Hangouts environment facilitated the creation of cross-modal intertextual links, namely interpersonal connections afforded by the use of a prior text across different modalities. Using
the tool, Amy and Yoko asked potentially face-threatening questions about each other that they were seemingly too afraid to ask in the video-mediated environment. Such exchange of candid opinions and knowledge exchange about each other across different modalities strengthened their partnership and further improved the community of practice.

7.5.4. Compatibility/Sharedness

Amy and Yoko shared the conversational rhythm because Amy and Yoko both demonstrated high-considerateness style features (Tannen, 1987, 2005) such as the non-use of cooperative overlaps, machine-gun questions (Tannen, 2005) and frequent presence of inter-turn pauses. The compatibility of conversational styles helped the dyad achieve equality in turns and topic shifts. This is contrastive with the case of Edwin and Hiroyuki who suffered from complementary schismogenesis (Bateson, 1972), namely a vicious cycle that occurs when people with different interactional norms interact.

Later in the semester, specifically after they started to interact via Facebook Messenger, Amy and Yoko focused less on language learning and teaching and more on understanding each other’s culture and diversity in the world. With that change, members of the dyad started to position each other as bilingual speakers rather than positioning themselves and each other as native versus non-native speakers. In addition, through their interaction via Facebook Messenger, the participants shared their struggles as language learners and provided encouraging comments as language experts. Their shared identity as equally struggling language learners and equally supportive language experts (Excerpts 25 and 26) facilitated the formation of a community of practice and allowed them to rely on each other in sense making (i.e., interdependency).
7.6. Conclusion

Amy and Yoko made a unique dyad in that the critical incident of coming out in Session 4 changed the trajectory of their social interaction. To summarize this chapter, I will mention three particularly interesting features of their interaction that did or did not change after the critical episode: how to repair linguistic troubles, use of technological affordances, and assignment of conversational roles. First, a glimpse of a change was observed in the way they engaged in conversational repair. Before Session 4, the dyad individually looked up a word using a dictionary without aligning toward the same trouble source (i.e., a solitary word search, M. H. Goodwin & C. Goodwin, 1986). They even gave up talking about a concept that only a language novice had epistemic access to during a crossed expertise configuration. As such, the participants did not use each other as bilingual resources and did not show signs of interdependency in meaning negotiation. During and following the critical incident, in contrast, they started to develop and utilize their bilingual resources by switching languages (Excerpts 22, 23, and 26) and negotiated bilingual practices (e.g., deciding which language to use) (Excerpt 22), mainly because the critical incident changed their focus from language learning and teaching to mutual understanding. This demonstrates that, over time, the dyad learned to express trouble sources and use their bilingual resources, so they could collaboratively resolve a communication trouble for mutual understanding.

One of the most significant changes was observed in the way Amy and Yoko used technological affordances. After the critical incident, the dyad started to communicate via Facebook Messenger outside the video environment. Their text-mediated communication created cross-modal intertextual links and eventually shaped their video interaction. For instance, through their interaction via Facebook Messenger, they realized that both of them were equally
struggling language learners and could be equally supportive language experts. Consequently, the cross-modal intertextuality helped them form a community of practice in which they were equally invested in supporting each other.

In contrast to the significant change in the channel of their communication, there were some conversational features that remained the same throughout the 10-week project. One of them was the use of an online and electronic dictionary. Although they used it significantly less frequently, as they increasingly used code-switching to negotiate for meaning, the dyad continued to demonstrate similar word search behavior. Although the dictionary use contributed to equal turn distribution, it led to reducing social presence, because the dictionary user did not let the interlocutor know what was the trouble source as the novice held the floor searching for the term (see Edwin and Hiroyuki in Chapter 6, who engaged in solitary and cooperative word searches).

Another conversational feature that remained the same even after the critical incident was the static role assignment. Unlike Benjamin and Tomoya (Chapter 5), who reciprocated a conversation via the frequent shift of footings, this dyad mainly interacted in two configurations, as their cultural and linguistic expertise determined the behavior of what a speaker and a listener do. One is a “cultural contribution vs. participation via error correction” configuration (cf. crossed expertise configuration), where a language expert takes up a footing of a listener and a language tutor and provides error correction on the utterances of a language novice who talks about her own culture. The other one is a “linguistic and cultural contribution vs. being a good listener” configuration (cf. unilateral expertise configuration), where a language expert provides an explanation about her own culture and a language novice listens to the explanation. As a result of these static configurations that are based on language and cultural expertise, the dyad’s
interaction did not become as dynamic as Benjamin and Tomoya’s, although they benefited from one of the most important outcomes of the project, namely friendship.
Chapter 8
Discussion and Conclusion

8.1. Summary of the Findings

Chapters 5-7 presented the results of this dissertation study, each chapter offering a discourse analysis of the interactions by three focal dyads. In this chapter, I will begin by summarizing the three case studies, first focusing on the dyads’ trajectories of reciprocity and then on the interactional features and the use of technological affordances. Following the summary section, I will answer the three research questions that guided this study: (1) What is reciprocity, and how is it enacted and accomplished? (2) What factors may impact the enactment of reciprocity in ongoing interaction? and (3) What aspects of reciprocity seem more amenable to change than others in 10 weeks of eTandem project?

8.1.1. Trajectories of Reciprocity in the Three Dyads

Table 9 brings together information already presented in each results chapter, this time comparing all the six participants’ profiles regarding their age, TL proficiency, ICC, motivation, and experience abroad. Quantitatively speaking, the only item that was different from the group average by more than one standard deviation was Tomoya’s age. Otherwise, these three dyads were not significantly different from each other or from the group average. Qualitatively speaking, Benjamin, Tomoya, and Amy had more international experience than the other participants, as they had been abroad and communicated with the local people using the TL.
Table 9. Summary of the Six Participants’ Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benjamin</th>
<th>Tomoya</th>
<th>Edwin</th>
<th>Hiroyuki</th>
<th>Amy</th>
<th>Yoko</th>
<th>Group Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countries of residence</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>M = 20.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency (EIT) (out of 120 points)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>M = 88.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 20.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC (out of 5 points)</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>M = 4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation: L2 ideal self (out of 6 points)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>M = 4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD = .73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience abroad</td>
<td>Has spent one summer in Japan for an intensive Japanese language program; has been exposed to Japanese culture (but not the language) through his mother (a third-generation Japanese American); has travelled to China twice as a child</td>
<td>Has never been abroad; does not have any Japanese friends</td>
<td>Has never been abroad; has never used English with people outside the English classroom</td>
<td>Has been to Japan for a week in high school; maintains pen-pal friendships since then</td>
<td>Has been to foreign countries only for short trips</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benjamin and Tomoya, whose discourse was analyzed in Chapter 5, were the most successful dyad (i.e., most satisfied about the experience and sustained the partnership beyond the semester) of all the 30 dyads that participated in this eTandem project. Their interactions were characterized by discursive features that show involvement (i.e., “an internal, even emotional connection individuals feel which binds them to other people as well as to places, things, activities, ideas, memories, and words,” Tannen, 2007, p. 12), and their partnership was sustainable such that they continued to interact beyond the curricular requirement and engaged in 22 sessions over the 13-month partnership. Both Benjamin and Tomoya had some experience in intercultural communication prior to the eTandem project, as Benjamin is a heritage speaker who had studied Japanese in Japan over a summer and Tomoya had travelled to various countries and had a clear vision of how he wanted to use English in international settings (i.e., working in Rwanda). The dyad’s Session 1 predicted their successful and reciprocal interaction. First, they had already been connected via Facebook and email exchanges, and such extracurricular interaction prior to their first video interaction led to increased involvement, creation of cross-modal intertextual links (i.e., interpersonal connections afforded by the use of a prior text across different modalities), and establishment of friendship. In addition, the dyad used code-switching to show rapport, revealing that they positioned themselves and their partner as bilingual speakers who would be a valuable resource for mutual language and cultural learning. Reflecting on Session 1 interaction in his journal, Tomoya told himself that he should let Benjamin talk more in Japanese by redirecting a question to him (再質問, saishitsumon). In the interaction of Session 2, Tomoya indeed redirected questions and reciprocated cultural expertise positions. The dyad also juggled multiple frames to address the incompatibility of knowledge schemas (Tannen & Wallat, 1987), showing that they established a collaborative way to engage in a conversational
repair around Session 2. Their reciprocal conversation observed in Session 1 and 2 became a part of regular interaction for the rest of the project and only improved over the 10 weeks’ time. What also distinguished their interaction from that of the other two dyads is the multimodality of their use of technology to enhance communication. The tools they used ranged from screen sharing and text chatting functions of *Google Hangouts* to a computer game, *Facebook*, and *Facebook Messenger*.

Edwin and Hiroyuki were the most unsuccessful dyad in this eTandem project, defined as the dyad who showed the least satisfaction. Indeed, they were the only dyad who explicitly told the coordinator at the post-project interview that they wanted to work with another partner and also who required an intervention with the coordinator after Session 2. Throughout the 10-week project, they suffered from what I called in Akiyama (2017b) the vicious cycle of turn negotiation as a result of Edwin being a high-involvement communicator and Hiroyuki being a high-considerateness communicator (Tannen, 1987, 2005), which eventually resulted in complementary schismogenesis (Bateson, 1972). Specifically, the dyad’s conversation was characterized by Edwin’s conversational dominance and Hiroyuki’s reticence, whether they were speaking in either English or Japanese and whether they were talking about topics related to either the U.S. or Japan. The only time they could break away from this vicious cycle was when they were assigned a clear conversational role (e.g., cultural or linguistic expert) due to the nature or content of the task, and they therefore attempted to perform the duty as such. In Session 8, the task induced a crossed expertise configuration (Cappellini, 2016; Cappellini & Mompean, 2015), where Hiroyuki spoke in English about Japanese cultural content. Supported by this crossed expertise configuration, the dyad’s English interaction achieved reciprocity in the sense of quantitative equality, because Hiroyuki held the floor and attempted to explain a Japanese
concept using his bodily conduct and electronic dictionary. Although the use of the electronic
dictionary allowed him to hold the floor, it also reduced the sense of social presence (Short et al.,
1976), as his word search was solitary (M. H. Goodwin & C. Goodwin, 1986). Only when Edwin
joined the word search using Google Translate, did it become “cooperative” and lead to mutual
understanding. However, even the cooperative word search did not increase the degree of
salience of the other person in the interaction because they had a clear division of labor and did
not rely on each other to resolve the trouble source.

Amy and Yoko are the dyad who was not satisfied with their interaction at the beginning
of the project but ended up being one of the most successful student pairs due to the occurrence
of the critical incident in Session 4 and the dyad’s response to it. Before the critical incident,
Amy and Yoko emphasized the language learning aspect of eTandem over cultural learning such
that they corrected even minor errors and took notes of each other’s errors during an ongoing
interaction. They did so rather than reflecting on a few crucial errors after they finished talking,
as they had been instructed to do for this project. During Sessions 1 through 4, the language
novice in the given language half would also thank the expert for providing error correction.
During a crossed expertise configuration in Session 2, the language novice in each half tried to
explain concepts without relying on the partner. As such, the language novice often resorted to
an online/electronic dictionary, and when the strategy did not work, she would give up the topic
and moved onto the next topic. Despite their desire to “get along” with a partner (Yoko, from her
self-introduction email) who is “patient” and who they can feel “comfortable” with (Amy, from
her pre-project interview), they could not establish a personal connection in the first three
sessions, most likely due to their overemphasis on language learning. In Session 4, when they
were discussing dating practices in Japan and the U.S., Amy came out as lesbian. This took
Yoko, who had grown up being socialized into the discourse of heteronormativity in Japan (Brutt-Griffler & Kim, 2017), by surprise. Although they could not discuss their sexual identities when Amy came out, Yoko recycled (Tannen, 2006) the topic of homosexuality before they were about to end the session, and the dyad used various resources (e.g., text chatting, code-switching) and Amy produced constructed dialogue (Tannen, 2007) that Yoko appreciated; they were thus able to understand each other’s culture regarding homosexuality and to reflect on their sexual identities from a transcultural perspective. This critical incident changed their interactional trajectory, and after this incident, the dyad started to interact outside the Google Hangouts as well. Their text-mediated interaction via Facebook Messenger created cross-modal intertextual links, allowing them to both share struggles as language learners and show their stance as a supportive partner. Facebook Messenger also functioned as a safe space (Yi, 2009) where the dyad could position themselves and each other as bilingual speakers who could be valuable resources for each other. In the end, such cross-modal intertextual links and bilingual practices helped them form a community of practice in which the members were equally invested in helping each other.

**8.1.2. Discourse Features**

In this section, I will summarize the three dyads’ interaction by the six discursive features that were found in each case study (see Tables 3, 5, and 8). These features are (1) management of turns, (2) repairing communication issues, (3) listenership, (4) management of conversational roles and identities, (5) conversational style, and (6) L1 vs. L2 use. By looking at the three dyads’ interaction across these dimensions, I will attempt to reveal what discursive features might facilitate vs. hinder successful eTandem experience.
8.1.2.1. Management of turns. Benjamin and Tomoya’s conversation in Session 1 demonstrated various high-involvement features (Tannen, 1987, 2005) such as the lack of intra-turn and inter-turn pauses, change of pitch, amplitude, and voice qualities. Moreover, repetition of a word between the two participants was frequent, and participants’ utterances often overlapped with each other’s. In Session 2, Tomoya’s intra-turn pauses were observed (Excerpt 6). This may indicate that he was making an effort to simplify his Japanese, as he was determined to do (see Tomoya’s reflection of Session 1 on p. 103). The dyad’s conversation was characterized by the lack of inter-turn pauses, frequent latching, and collaborative finishes (Excerpt 5). Change of pitch, amplitude, and voice qualities were often observed, and repetition was frequent, especially that of a trouble source (Excerpt 5). Participants’ utterances often overlapped with each other’s. They redirected a question asked by the interlocutor about their own culture back to the interlocutor who asked the question (Excerpt 6). For example, Tomoya redirected a question asked by Benjamin about Japan and asked Benjamin about the U.S. Turns were equally distributed between the two participants, and this reciprocal configuration of turns continued over the span of 10 weeks.

In contrast, the English conversation of Edwin and Hiroyuki in Session 2 was characterized by frequent inter- and intra-turn pauses, lack of overlaps, and relatively monotonous, slow-paced conversation. Similarly, the Japanese conversation in Session 2 was characterized by frequent inter- and intra-turn pauses and relatively monotonous, slow-paced conversation. However, the Japanese interaction was also marked by Edwin’s use of “broken starts” (Gardner, 2007) and frequent overlaps between Edwin’s broken starts and Hiroyuki’s listener responses. In both English and Japanese interaction, Edwin held the floor most of the time, something that I argue may have been due to their incompatible conversational styles.
(Tannen, 1987, 2005). There was a change to Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction in Session 8 during a crossed expertise configuration; the interaction became less monotonous than that in Session 2 mainly thanks to Hiroyuki’s use of bodily conduct to engage in conversational repair and Edwin’s use of exaggerated responses to show understanding. However, it was still characterized by many intra-turn pauses that were produced when Hiroyuki was looking up a word in his electronic dictionary.

As for Amy and Yoko, their conversation in Session 2 was characterized by intra-turn pauses when a language novice was taking time to think as well as silent pauses when the participants were individually looking up a word online (Excerpts 19 and 20) and when the language expert was taking notes of her partner’s errors in the journal (Excerpts 18 and 19). Overlaps and change of pitch, amplitude, and voice qualities, and repetition between the two participants were rarely observed. Their turns were equally distributed within each language part, but speakership change was not as frequent as that of Benjamin and Tomoya. The interaction during and after the critical incident in Session 4 was characterized by intra-turn pauses when the language novice was taking time to think. In contrast, the number of silent pauses decreased (Excerpts 19 and 20), as the participants learned to depend on their partner for bilingual support rather than looking up a word individually (Excerpt 22) and because the language expert stopped taking notes of her partner’s errors during an ongoing interaction. Overlaps and change of pitch, amplitude, and voice qualities were observed during the critical incident when Amy came out (Excerpt 23), and repetition of a trouble source was frequently observed (Excerpts 21 and 22).

8.1.2.2. Repairing communication issues. Benjamin and Tomoya’s conversation was characterized by frequent negotiation for meaning when language items (Excerpts 5 and 8) or cultural concepts (Excerpt 7) posed communication difficulties. In negotiating for meaning, the
dyad benefited from using the screen sharing function of *Google Hangouts*, as they could search for a definition of a word, images, videos, etc., in a collaborative manner (e.g., Excerpt 7). The dyad also used a signal delay as an opportunity to switch languages and show their bilingual speaker identities (Excerpt 2). In contrast, they rarely code-switched to negotiate meaning; rather, they used other multimodal affordances (e.g., technology) to resolve communication issues in the given designated language. Error correction was sometimes observed in the form of a recast, but the dyad mostly focused on meaning as long as they could understand each other (i.e., negotiation for comprehensibility, Saito & Akiyama, 2017).

As for Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction in English, they were able to repair communication breakdowns and achieve conversational synchrony if both of them employed speech and bodily conduct together (i.e., if they resorted to mutual contextualization) (Excerpt 10) and if they were in the “language teaching and learning” frame and understood what the trouble source was (Excerpt 12). However, they could not engage in conversational repair when Edwin provided an explanation about American culture and Hiroyuki used silences to indicate comprehension difficulties (Excerpts 11 and 12) as well as when Edwin rapidly asked many questions about Japan (i.e., machine-gun questions, Tannen, 2005) (Excerpt 13). In the Japanese part of Session 2, it was rare for Edwin to not understand Hiroyuki because Edwin did most of the talking, while Hiroyuki did most of the listening. It was when Edwin was expressing his thought that he had to engage in conversational repair. Instead of looking up a word in the dictionary, Edwin asked Hiroyuki to translate it, thus showing a “high-involvement” style of conversational repair (Excerpt 14). Their English interaction in Session 8 during a crossed expertise configuration changed in terms of how they engaged in conversational repair. Hiroyuki used bodily conduct to indicate comprehension difficulties and to emphasize and repair the
trouble source (Excerpt 15). He also used his electronic dictionary to perform his duty as a cultural expert (Excerpts 15 and 16). As for Edwin, he also used his bodily conduct to negotiate meaning and show understanding and lack thereof. Edwin’s participation in Hiroyuki’s solitary word search via Google Translate (i.e., cooperative word search) helped the dyad achieve mutual understanding.

Finally, in the case of Amy and Yoko, the language novice did not involve the partner in meaning negotiation when the language novice had to use her TL to explain a culture-specific concept that her partner was not familiar with, that is, when facing epistemic asymmetries during a crossed expertise configuration. Instead, she used a dictionary without letting her partner know what the trouble source was and/or gave up the talking about it and moved onto the next topic (Excerpts 19 and 20). The language expert engaged in frequent error correction (i.e., a type of retrospective recipient design, Erickson, 1986). During and after the critical incident, the dyad started to mix languages to engage in conversational repair, especially to address lexical issues (Excerpt 22). They also aligned toward the same trouble source by explicitly telling her partner where the trouble source was (Excerpt 22). However, they sometimes looked up a word individually and moved onto the next topic if a concept was too difficult for the language novice to explain. Instances of error correction were observed much less frequently after the critical incident, as the partners provided support to each other in an alternative way, by positioning each other as equally struggling learners and equally supportive experts.

8.1.2.3. Listenership. Benjamin and Tomoya’s interactions were characterized by participatory listenership in the form of cooperative overlaps. In addition, quite a lot of aizuchi (i.e., short listener responses, Maynard, 1986) was observed in both the Japanese and English parts of a given session for both participants. A speaker’s ability to recipient design talk
prospectively and retrospectively (i.e., adaptation of utterances moment by moment according to listener’s expected reactions, Erickson, 1986) helped the listener make conversational contributions. These listenership behaviors did not change over the span of 10 weeks.

In contrast, in the English part of Session 2, Edwin failed to effectively recipient design his talk unless the dyad was interacting in the “language teaching and learning” frame. The malfunction of both prospective and retrospective recipient design did not afford a chance for Hiroyuki to contribute to the conversation, and this led to complementary schismogenesis. As for the Japanese part of the interaction, Hiroyuki’s listenership was demonstrated in the form of very short listener responses and head nods. He rarely engaged in salient listenership moves such as asking follow-up questions and providing evaluative comments. For that reason, Edwin, who held an essentialized idea about Japanese people’s aizuchi, reported being emotionally hurt when Hiroyuki did not produce salient types of listenership moves (as uncovered in Edwin’s interview data). Thus, Edwin kept holding the floor via broken starts, making it even more difficult for Hiroyuki to make a conversational contribution as a listener (Excerpt 14). In the English part of Session 8, when Hiroyuki was explaining about a Japanese concept, Edwin changed his listenership behavior and showed understanding and lack thereof by using his bodily conduct (e.g., head nods, his look away from the camera) instead of simply relying on linguistic cues. This shows that Edwin learned to use more salient listener feedback himself.

Participatory listenership (Tannen, 2007) was observed in Amy and Yoko’s interaction, but only from a language expert’s side. Specifically, a language expert would show listenership by letting the language novice talk and then repeating a word/phrase. In contrast, a language novice’s listenership was limited to short listener responses, as she was focused on understanding the content of the conversation in the TL. This held true for both the English and the Japanese
parts of a given session. Even after the critical incident in Session 4, not much change was observed with regard to the dyad’s listenership behavior other than the fact that in a given half of a session, the language expert provided much less error correction when listening to her partner’s explanation of her culture.

8.1.2.4. Management of conversational roles and identities. Even in their first interaction session via Google Hangouts, Benjamin and Tomoya used intertextual references (i.e., recontextualization of a prior text), in this case Facebook photos and email messages, to position themselves not only as either a Japanese or an American individual but also as a cosmopolitan, well-travelled individual from Osaka (Tomoya) and an American individual with a Japanese heritage and experience of studying in Japan (Benjamin). In Session 2 and onwards, their role assignment was found to be dynamic, as the two participants were able to reciprocate cultural expertise positions via redirection of questions (Excerpt 6). Their use of code-switching suggests that the participants felt comfortable demonstrating their bilingual speaker identity and considered each other a bilingual resource (Excerpt 5).

As for Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction in the English part of Session 2 when Edwin was talking about the U.S. culture in English (i.e., unilateral expertise configuration, Cappellini, 2016; Cappellini & Mompean, 2015), Hiroyuki took up a footing of a language learner and expected Edwin to pick up his silence cue as a request for repair. Edwin, on the other hand, took up the footing of a language and cultural expert and used silence to elicit listener feedback from Hiroyuki (Excerpt 11). Neither of them used salient linguistic cues to save each other’s face when initiating conversational repair. In a crossed expertise configuration in English (i.e., when Hiroyuki was talking about Japan in English), Edwin took up the footing of a cultural novice and interviewer, while Hiroyuki took up the footing of a language novice and, to a lesser extent, that
of a cultural expert because he did not understand many questions that Edwin asked rapidly in English (i.e., machine-gun questions). In the Japanese part, Hiroyuki provided language assistance and considered himself a language teacher only when he was explicitly prompted to take up a footing as a language expert. When he took up the footing of a language expert, Hiroyuki found in this the reason or purpose of the interaction and felt comfortable and qualified enough to stop being a listener and make a conversational contribution. Otherwise, however, Hiroyuki, who felt inadequate when speaking English, continued to settle on his role as a novice/student even in the Japanese part of interaction and did not contribute as a language and cultural expert. In Session 8, Edwin and Hiroyuki used multimodal resources to perform their assigned roles as a cultural novice and expert, respectively. These resources ranged from bodily conduct to the use of material surround (i.e., an electronic and online dictionary). In a similar way to how Hiroyuki contributed to the conversation when explicitly prompted to take up a footing as a language expert in Session 2, Hiroyuki stopped being a listener and contributed to the conversation when he was explicitly asked to explain a Japanese concept.

As for Amy and Yoko, there was a clear, static role assignment between the two participants. The language spoken as well as cultural expertise dictated the role assignment, according to which they positioned each other as either an expert or a novice of language and culture (e.g., Excerpt 18). Even after the critical incident in Session 4, language and cultural expertise continued to influence their role assignment. However, this dyad started to develop and utilize their bilingual speaker identity by mixing languages (Excerpts 22, 23, and 26) and negotiating bilingual practices (e.g., which language to use) (Excerpt 22). Moreover, through talking about their struggles as a language learner, they learned to position themselves and each
other as equally struggling language learners and equally supportive language experts (Excerpts 25 and 26).

8.1.2.5. Conversational style. Benjamin demonstrated more high-considerateness features than Tomoya, who was a very high-involvement communicator. However, they did not suffer from the incompatibility, probably because they knew how to adjust their speech styles drawing from their previous rich experience in using the TL in intercultural settings.

Both Edwin and Hiroyuki communicated based on their own conversational style and expected the other to understand and adjust to his conversational pattern, rather than trying to find a good balance between their styles. Their incompatible conversational styles affected the dyad’s interaction over the span of 10 weeks, resulting in complementary schismogenesis (Akiyama, 2017b). However, the dyad could temporarily break away from the vicious cycle when they took up the footing of an expert vs. a novice and performed the duties entailed in each role.

Finally, Amy and Yoko’s conversational styles were compatible, as both of them demonstrated high-considerateness style features. However, unlike Edwin, who was a high-involvement communicator, neither Amy nor Yoko avoided silences, thus giving each other enough time to think and make a conversational contribution.

8.1.2.6. L1 vs. L2 use. Both Benjamin and Tomoya used code-switching as part of listener responses (Excerpt 1), to indicate a shift of frame (i.e., to indicate that the speaker was in the “information processing” frame, Excerpt 5), and to show rapport and displayed their bilingual speaker identity (Excerpts 2 and 5). In general, the shift of languages was smooth and occurred at the lexical level. These bilingual practices continued over the span of 10 weeks.
As for Edwin and Hiroyuki’s English interaction in Session 2, code-switching was observed when Edwin used *Google Translate* to provide a Japanese translation of an English word that Hiroyuki was having trouble understanding. In contrast, Hiroyuki did not switch to Japanese but resorted to silence when he was having trouble expressing his thought. This suggests that Hiroyuki did not see the use of his L1 as a tool for communication and learning and thus did not use the affordance of having a bilingual partner who knew his L1 (Japanese). In the Japanese part of Session 2, Hiroyuki, as a language expert, attempted to explain a Japanese word using English (i.e., Edwin’s L1 and Hiroyuki’s L2). Unlike Edwin, who resorted to a dictionary to provide a Japanese translation for Hiroyuki in the English part, Hiroyuki did not use a dictionary to provide an English translation of a Japanese word that Edwin was having trouble understanding. Since Hiroyuki could not provide a good explanation in his limited proficiency in English, his effort to help Edwin was not fruitful for resolving the communication breakdown.

As for Edwin, he code-switched to ask Hiroyuki to translate an English sentence into Japanese and demonstrated a “high-involvement” technology use style for conversational repair. In the English part of Session 8, code-switching was observed when Edwin used *Google Translate* to provide a Japanese translation of an English word that Hiroyuki produced and that Edwin had trouble understanding. Hiroyuki, on the other hand, did not see the use of his L1 (Japanese) as a tool for expressing his thought. Thus, he used his electronic dictionary (i.e., used object mediation, Lantolf, 2006) to provide an English translation of the Japanese concept he was trying to explain rather than relying on human mediation, namely his bilingual partner.

Amy and Yoko rarely used code-switching in Session 2. Even when the language novice was attempting to explain a difficult concept during a crossed expertise configuration, she did not use her L1 to involve the language expert in the meaning negotiation process (Excerpts 19 and
During the critical incident in Session 4, they negotiated their bilingual practices (i.e., deciding which language to use in a communication breakdown), tackled lexical issues via code-switching, and realized the value of having a bilingual partner to achieve mutual understanding (Excerpt 22). As such, their interaction after Session 4 was characterized by occasional code-switching in *Google Hangouts* and frequent code-switching in *Facebook Messenger*.

### 8.1.3. Use of Technological Affordances

The participants’ digital literacies, including what technology tools they used and how they used them for what purpose, shaped their interactions and thus the enactment of reciprocity. Below I will first revisit the three dyads’ profiles regarding their technology skills. I will then provide a summary of how the participants used technological affordances of *Google Hangouts* and other technology tools in and outside the *Google Hangouts* environment.

**8.1.3.1. Participants’ technology skills.** Tomoya was one of the most proficient users of technology in this eTandem project because he majored in engineering for his bachelor’s degree and technology management for his master’s degree and also because he often used videoconferencing tools like *Skype* to talk with his parents in Osaka. The technology resources that Tomoya used ranged from an electronic and online dictionary and screen sharing to *Google Search*, including *Google Maps* and *Google Images*. As for Benjamin, he was also one of the most proficient users of technology in the project. A good indication is that, as he stated in the pre-project interview, he “really like[s] playing video games.” The technology resources that Benjamin used ranged from an online dictionary and screen sharing to various *Google* services. In addition, as shown in the analysis of Session 8 interaction, Benjamin used screen sharing to play a computer game with Tomoya.
Edwin was also one of the most technologically advanced users in the project, as he was a linguistics major with a concentration in computational linguistics and knew several programming languages. He also stated that he had several years of video conferencing experience in mostly Skype, and thus felt comfortable using Google Hangouts. However, when it came to the actual interaction with Hiroyuki over the 10 weeks of the project, he can be considered an average or less than the average user of technology. For example, he looked up a word online but did not use the screen sharing or text chatting function of Google Hangouts. As for Hiroyuki, the interactional evidence suggests limited technology skills for the purpose of language learning. For instance, the only tool Hiroyuki used during the 10-week project was his electronic dictionary. He did not think to use an online translator like Google Translate. Just like Edwin, Hiroyuki never used the text chatting or screen sharing function of Google Hangouts.

Both Amy and Yoko were average users of digital technologies. Neither Amy nor Yoko majored in technology-related fields of study. However, the analysis of Google Hangouts interaction over the whole duration of the project revealed that Amy knew from the very first session various ways of using online tools for language learning and teaching, including the use of Google Translate to look up a word, use of Google images to explain a concept that is specific to American culture, screen sharing to show Google images, and text chatting functions of Google Hangouts to spell out words/sentences that were considered the trouble source. As for Yoko, the only technology tool that she used in Session 1 was an electronic dictionary. However, starting Session 2, she used an online dictionary to look up a word and the text chat function of Google Hangouts to spell out a Japanese concept that Amy did not have access to. This may suggest that Yoko learned to use the affordances of Google Hangouts via interaction with Amy.
In summary, the participants who were digitally advanced were Benjamin, Tomoya, and Edwin. However, Edwin did not use his technology skills in actual interaction with Hiroyuki. Amy was an average user of technology but knew how to use it for language learning and teaching purposes. Although Yoko and Hiroyuki’s digital literacies were not comparable with their partner’s, Yoko learned to use an online translator and a text chat from interacting with Amy. As for Hiroyuki, he did not imitate Edwin’s technology use behavior; rather, he resorted to his way of conversational repair by using his electronic dictionary.

**8.1.3.2. Types of technological affordances used.** The analysis of the three dyads’ interaction revealed that the way they used technological affordances was different regarding the types of technology tools they used and how they used them. Table 10 summarizes the three dyads’ use of technological affordances. These affordances are categorized into (1) affordances of *Google Hangouts* (i.e., what the videoconferencing tool allowed participants to do and how they used it), (2) tools that facilitated the video interaction (i.e., technology tools that they used during the *Google Hangouts* interaction), and (3) communication outside *Google Hangouts* (i.e., technology tools that they used to communicate outside the *Google Hangouts* environment). Each category lists a few technology tools that the three dyads did (and did not) use and provides an explanation on how they used them.
Table 10. The Three Dyads’ Use of Technological Affordances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Technological Affordances</th>
<th>Technology Tools</th>
<th>Dyads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benjamin &amp; Tomoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordances of Google Hangouts</td>
<td>Text chatting</td>
<td>√ (both)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Screen sharing</td>
<td>√ (both)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools that facilitate the video interaction</td>
<td>Online dictionary (Google Translate)</td>
<td>√ (both)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic dictionary</td>
<td>√ (Tomoya only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Google Search</td>
<td>√ (both)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Google Images</td>
<td>√ (both)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication outside Google Hangouts</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>√ (both, for both socializing and logistics management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being friends on Facebook</td>
<td>√ (became friends before Session 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook Messenger</td>
<td>√ (after Session 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First, this study identified three types of Google Hangouts affordances that the participants used: text chatting, screen sharing, and Google Effects. Both Benjamin-Tomoya and Amy-Yoko dyads utilized the text chatting function of Google Hangouts. They used it mainly for spelling out a word or phrase that the language novice was having difficulty understanding, taking notes of each other’s errors, and sending URLs and images. Secondly, Benjamin, Tomoya, and Amy also used the screen sharing function of Google Hangouts. While Benjamin and Tomoya had the function on almost throughout an interaction session (i.e., one of the participants’ screen was shared the entire session), Amy used it selectively, mainly for explaining an American concept to Yoko by showing an image. Lastly, Benjamin and Tomoya played with Google Effects spontaneously (or by accident) when they were exploring what “tetherball” was (Excerpt 7). This incident created a humorous conversation and facilitated their bonding experience.

This study also found that the participants often used technology tools in conjunction with Google Hangouts to facilitate their video-mediated conversation. First, all the six participants analyzed in this study used a dictionary, but whether this was an electronic dictionary or an online one made a difference. While the participants in the U.S. used an online dictionary, those in Japan mostly used an electronic dictionary, which they were used to using from years of English education in middle school. Nevertheless, Tomoya used both electronic and online dictionaries from the beginning of the project and Yoko started to use an online dictionary in Session 2 by imitating Amy. Hiroyuki did not change; he never used an online dictionary at any point in the 10 weeks. The benefit of using an online dictionary, as opposed to using an electronic dictionary, is that a participant can see what his/her interlocutor is doing from the tail of his/her eye, if s/he places two windows side by side (i.e., one window that shows the
online dictionary and the other window that shows the image of the interlocutor). With an electronic dictionary, however, unless a participant places it in front of the computer screen, s/he loses sight of what his/her interlocutor is doing and may look disengaged to the interlocutor because s/he needs to look away to use the dictionary. Thus, it is possible that the types of a dictionary influenced the participants’ interaction, and thus reduced social presence for those who used the electronic dictionary.

Next, all the participants except for Hiroyuki used Google Search, but it is noteworthy that some did so more frequently and more collaboratively than others. All used the tool mainly to find a definition of a concept that they were discussing. While the frequency of use was similar between Benjamin and Tomoya, it was not balanced between Amy and Yoko, as Amy used it more frequently than Yoko. Also, while Benjamin and Tomoya used Google Search not only when they were exploring the concept as a cultural expert but also when they were checking the concept as a cultural novice, in the case of Amy and Yoko, it was usually the cultural expert who used Google Search. This suggests that Benjamin and Tomoya used the tool to explore the concept collaboratively, while Amy and Yoko used it as a tool for the cultural expert to explain a culture-specific concept. In addition to Google Search, Benjamin, Tomoya, and Amy used Google Images to visually explain a concept that they were discussing. Benjamin and Tomoya also used Google Maps to show each other’s hometown (Excerpt 4) and YouTube to explain “tetherball” (Excerpt 7). This supports the interpretation that Benjamin and Tomoya did not rely solely on linguistic cues to engage in a conversational repair but resorted to an array of visual cues (e.g., images and movies) that increase imagery and thus involvement (Tannen, 2007).

Multimodality and unpredictability of Benjamin and Tomoya’s technology use is exemplified by the interaction in Session 8 when they played the computer game together. As
they were playing the game, they read the game characters’ bilingual scripts together, and this created opportunities for learning and teaching each other’s language as a bilingual speaker (Excerpt 8). The game also afforded opportunities for them to engage in mutual revelation (Tannen, 2005) and learn about each other’s culture. Upon encountering a stereotypical image of Japan that they saw in the game (i.e., a tatami room), they took this as an opportunity to compare the cultural stereotype and real life. Tomoya’s revealing his bedroom prompted Benjamin to do the same, facilitating reciprocity in the sense of exchanged behavior (Excerpt 9).

One stark difference between the interaction of Edwin and Hiroyuki, on the one hand, and that of Benjamin and Tomoya and Amy and Yoko, on the other, is how they were connected outside the Google Hangouts environment. Edwin and Hiroyuki emailed each other only to manage logistics, such as sending images that they would use for the visual-based conversation and deciding when to talk. In contrast, the other two dyads engaged in social interaction as an extracurricular activity to better understand each other. Such socially enriched interaction afforded cross-modal intertextual links, which I defined as interpersonal connections afforded by the use of a prior text across different modalities, and these links helped the dyad visualize each other’s life outside the Google Hangouts interaction, increase imagery and thus involvement, and bond as friends. Their friendship and bilingual practices in Facebook Messenger (e.g., code-switching) helped the two dyads form a community of practice (i.e., a group of people who share a passion for something and learn to do it better through regular interaction, Wenger, 1998) in which either partner could ask potentially face-threatening questions and let each other know that they were equally invested (Norton Peirce, 1995) in the project. Moreover, their focus on intercultural understanding allowed them to take a balanced approach to language and cultural
learning and made them realize the benefit of having a bilingual partner in exploring each other’s language and culture.
8.2. What is Reciprocity, and How Is It Enacted and Accomplished?

In this section, I will answer the first research question, namely the “what” of reciprocity. In particular, I examine how informative the five senses of reciprocity identified in the extant literature (see Chapter 3) are with respect to the present data and what each sense can tell us about eTandem participants’ enactment of reciprocity. The five senses are: (1) quantitative equality (Schwienhorst & Borgia, 2006), (2) qualitative equality (cf. Norton Peirce, 1995; Wenger, 1998), (3) interactional patterns based on equality and mutuality (Storch, 2002), (4) various kinds of exchanged behavior, and (5) compatibility/sharedness.

8.2.1. Quantitative Equality

Schwienhorst and Borgia (2006) examined English and German participants’ text chat interaction, focusing on the amount of turns. They measured what they call “bilingual proportions” of English and German, namely the ratio of English-German utterances produced in the bilingual text chat. Schwienhorst (2004) also examined quantitative equality, but the study focused on number of topic initiation moves, and their proportions between the English and German cultural groups. These studies are similar in that they calculate the average number of the target discursive feature for the two cultural groups and consider it reciprocal if the number is equally distributed between them. Since the present study is qualitative, my account below is holistic when it comes to the actual number of turns and topic initiations. I will delve into what an interactional analysis of a session can reveal that the group average of turns and topic initiations cannot.

First, my findings suggest that taking the group average of utterances produced across the two languages (e.g., the ratio of English vs. German in Schwienhorst & Bogia (2006) or English
vs. Japanese in the present study) obscures the turn distribution pattern within each dyad within each language part. For example, a bird’s eye view of the transcripts confirms that all the three dyads produced more or less equal English and Japanese turns, as they complied with the instructions and spent 30 minutes in each language part, and because their proficiency levels in their respective TLs were not significantly different from each other. This means that, if we focus on the idea of bilingual proportions and average the turn contributions of the three dyads in English and and those in Japanese in these data, we see no indication of anything but a good bilingual proportion in the two cultural groups, the U.S. students and the Japanese students. However, as the findings of the case study in Chapter 6 revealed, it was Edwin who contributed more to the conversation in both language parts. That is, what Edwin and Hiroyuki could not achieve was a balanced turn distribution between the two participants within a given language part, as their interactions in both language halves were characterized by Edwin’s conversational dominance and Hiroyuki’s reticence. Thus, I argue that quantitative equality, as measured by the “bilingual proportion” (Schwienhorst & Borgia, 2006) or the ratio of utterances produced in each of the two languages, is not a sufficient indicator of reciprocity.

What would a quantitative approach reveal, if a researcher wanted to engage in counting? Of various possible ways of measuring quantitative equality, what seems to be more useful is the combination of (1) the proportion of turns produced by Participant A and Participant B in each language part (e.g., Sanchez, 2015) and (2) the proportion of turns produced by Participant A and Participant B in a unilateral vs. crossed expertise configuration (cf. Cappellini, 2016).

Let us examine the step involved in (1) first. By counting how many turns each participant produced in each language part, we can find out if a dyad suffered from conversational dominance. If we find that one participant produces significantly more turns than
the other participant, we can think of two possible scenarios. One scenario that is that the language expert in a given half of a session is making more contribution than the language novice, and this holds true in both languages. In other words, turn inequality is attributed to the language expert talking more when interacting in his/her respective L1. In this case, for the quality of interaction to be more reciprocal, the language expert needs to learn how to accommodate to the needs of a language novice by recipient designing the talk. For instance, the language expert can switch between a “language teaching and learning” frame and a “cultural teaching and learning” frame, as such frame switching provides more chances for the novice to indicate any comprehension issues and contribute as a cultural expert. The language novice, on the other hand, needs to learn how to use whatever resources available (i.e., multimodal bricolage strategy, Mehus, 2011) to seek linguistic support (instead of resorting to silence) and contribute more when s/he holds a cultural expertise position (cf. see the analysis of Hiroyuki’s English interaction when he explained tatami in Session 8). The other scenario is that the same participant is dominating the conversation in both language parts, as was indeed the case for Edwin and Hiroyuki (Chapter 6). When this happens, it is likely that the dyad is experiencing complementary schismogenesis due to having incompatible conversational styles. That is, Participant A is showing involvement by talking more, while Participant B is showing involvement by listening more.

If turn distribution is equal between the two participants within both language parts, we then would need to turn to step (2) above, and look within and across each language part to examine the proportion of turns produced by the two participants in a unilateral vs. crossed expertise configuration. This would allow us to differentiate the case of Amy and Yoko from that of Benjamin and Tomoya, both of whom achieved balanced turn distribution in each language
part. A qualitative perusal supports the claim that both Amy and Yoko made significantly more
turns when they took up the footing of a cultural expert and fewer turns when they took up the
footing of a cultural novice. As such, the proportion of turns produced by Amy and Yoko across
each language part was found to be more or less equal. However, when we look into their turn
distribution within a unilateral vs. crossed expertise configuration, as Cappellini (2016) and
Cappellini and Mompean (2015) suggest researchers do, reveals a different picture: Whoever
held the cultural expertise led the conversation whether the language of interaction was in their
L1 or in the TL. For instance, Amy’s conversational contribution was much greater in a
unilateral expertise configuration in English and in a crossed expertise configuration in Japanese,
while Yoko’s conversational contribution was greater in a unilateral expertise configuration in
Japanese and in a crossed expertise configuration in English. This means that, although the dyad
achieved reciprocity in proportion of turns in each language part, their interaction was not
balanced within a role-taking configuration. In contrast, in the case of Benjamin and Tomoya, it
was found that it was not only both participants in the role of the cultural expert but also in the
cultural novice who contributed to a conversation on a certain topic. Specifically, in the role of
the cultural novice both Benjamin and Tomoya asked follow-up questions and made evaluative
comments about the partner’s culture. As such, both participants refrained from taking a static
role of being a speaker vs. listener and equally contributed to the conversation, whether cultural
expertise belonged to Benjamin or Tomoya. In other words, they achieved reciprocity in both the
proportion of turns within each language part as well as the proportion of turns within a role-
taking configuration.

In conclusion, the qualitative analyses undertaken in the present study suggest that
measuring turn distribution alone may not be the most appropriate index of reciprocity,
especially if it only examines “bilingual proportions” of two language parts, as Schwienhorst and Borgia (2006) did. If we use quantitative equality as an index of reciprocity, we at least need to examine the equality of turns within a language part, as Sanchez (2015) recommended. If a dyad fails to achieve equality at this level, this may be an indication that these participants may be suffering from the incompatible conversational styles or incompatible language proficiency levels in the TL. If a dyad achieves equality at this level, at least we can confirm that their conversational contribution is relatively equal in both languages (cf. conversational dominance) and that the language expert knows how to accommodate to the needs of the language novice. If we want to examine if both members of a dyad were able to contribute to the conversation not only as a cultural expert but as a cultural novice, we need to delve into the interaction further and analyze their turn distribution within a role-taking configuration, as Cappellini (2016) suggests. If they achieve equality in this sense, it is most likely that their speakership and listenership were reciprocated, as in the case of Benjamin and Tomoya. Table 11 shows what the index of equal turns can reveal about eTandem participants’ enactment of reciprocity.
Table 11. Different Levels of Quantitative Equality and What They Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality of Turns</th>
<th>Equality Between</th>
<th>What it Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a session overall</td>
<td>Language A = Language B</td>
<td>Both languages were used equally (but it is not clear who spoke how much in which language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant A = Participant B</td>
<td>Equal contribution was made by both participants (but it is not clear in which language they made the contribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within a language part</td>
<td>Participant A = Participant B</td>
<td>Equal contribution was made by the two participants in Language A/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant A &gt; Participant B in Language A &amp; Participant B &gt; Participant A in Language B</td>
<td>TL proficiency level influenced their turn distribution (e.g., the language expert made more contribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant A &gt; Participant B in both Language A and B</td>
<td>Conversational styles influenced their turn distribution (cf. Edwin and Hiroyuki)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within a role-taking configuration</td>
<td>Participant A = Participant B whether it is a unilateral or crossed expertise configuration</td>
<td>Cultural expertise did not influence their turn distribution (cf. Benjamin and Tomoya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant A (cultural expert) &gt; Participant B (cultural novice) in a role-taking configuration</td>
<td>Cultural expertise influenced their turn distribution (cf. Amy and Yoko)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.2 Qualitative Equality

This study found that there are other senses of reciprocity beyond those that a researcher may want to measure quantitatively or by simply looking at the Google Hangouts transcripts. In Chapter 7, I defined Amy and Yoko’s reciprocity in the sense of qualitative equality sense. That is, I argued that they were equally invested (Norton Peirce, 1995) in the project. Specifically, I argued that, through their interaction via Facebook Messenger, they started to treat each other as equally struggling language learners and equally supportive language experts. What is particularly interesting about Amy and Yoko’s case is that this reciprocity was observed outside the Google Hangouts interaction rather than during the video-mediated interaction. Indeed, Amy
and Yoko’s *Google Hangouts* interaction itself did not change in terms of apparent quantitative equality even after the critical incident in Session 4. What happened was that their interaction outside the *Google Hangouts* environment provided opportunities for them to share language learning struggles and encourage each other as language experts and form a community of practice, which allowed them to invest in learning and teaching of each other’s language and culture. In other words, it can be said that they achieved reciprocity in the form of *interdependence*, namely the idea that “individuals perceive that they can attain their goals if and only if the other individuals with whom they are cooperatively linked attain their goals” (Johnson & Johnson, 2009, p. 366).

As for Benjamin and Tomoya, it seems that they were also equally invested in the project, as both participants reported a clear L2 ideal self and were willing to support their partner as a language and cultural expert. In addition, even before their first *Google Hangouts* session, they carefully read each other’s self-introduction emails and had become friends on *Facebook*. This shows that both of them were invested in the project to a similar extent. In contrast, although speculative, it seems that Edwin was more invested in the project than Hiroyuki. This can be observed by the fact that Edwin completed all the reflection journal entries, wrote quite long reflection entries, and stated that his motivation for taking part in this project was not only to improve Japanese but also to make a friend in Japan. On the other hand, Hiroyuki completed only a few short reflection entries, and he stated his reason for participation was “to improve English,” an ambiguous goal that may signal his limited ability to imagine his future L2 self (Dörnyei & Chan, 2013).

Drawing on insights from SLA, we can relate this finding of a sense of felt qualitative equality or felt equal investment to the research on “collaborative mindset” (i.e., mutual trust and
respect for peers, Ballinger, 2013; Sato & Ballinger, 2012), “comity” (i.e., establishment and maintenance of friendly relationships, Aston, 1993; Martin-Beltrán, Chen, Guzman, & Merrills, 2016), and a “collaborative environment” (Naughton, 2006). This strand of research has demonstrated how a person’s relations with others is crucial for his/her language learning, as one’s relations shape the ways one can use and interpret language (Martin-Beltrán et al., 2016; van Lier, 1998). I argue that reciprocity in the qualitative equality sense should be examined as one of the factors that influence participants’ interactional experience, comity, and collaborative mindset. To do that, not only participants’ interaction but also their perception data, collected in the form of reflection journal and retrospective interviews, should be utilized. The findings of this study also suggest that we need to examine not only the participants’ interaction that takes place in the designated modality or official sphere for a curricular project (i.e., Google Hangouts in this study) but also the social interaction that takes place among them in extracurricular contexts (e.g., interaction via Facebook Messenger). Finally, the significant contribution of this study is that it examined participants’ change of reciprocity in the qualitative equality sense over time. Without such a longitudinal perspective, it would not have been possible to identify their enactment of reciprocity in this sense.

8.2.3. Interactional Patterns Based on Equality and Mutuality

Storch (2002) categorized interaction into four major patterns, which she based on two continuum scales of equality (i.e., control over a task) and mutuality (i.e., engagement with each other’s contribution). The four patterns were collaborative (+equality, +mutuality), dominant/dominant (+equality, –mutuality), dominant/passive (–equality, –mutuality), and expert/novice (–equality, +mutuality). Storch’s proposal was based on her work, which is of a
Vygotskian sociocultural orientation. The data in the 2002 study, from which she drew her oft-cited proposal, and data in more recent studies following it (e.g., Tan et al., 2010) share certain characteristics: (1) the empirical evidence is not longitudinal and is not focused on the change of interactional patterns, (2) the participants are all language learners of the same TL (i.e., the evidence is gleaned from L2-L2 peer interaction), which means there is not much power differential between the conversational participants, and (3) interlocutors do not switch languages in the middle of a session, unlike the eTandem participants in this study. Keeping these differences in mind, below I will explain how her work informed my analysis of interactional patterns in eTandem and examine cases where her categorization did not fit the present evidence. Then, I will propose a new model for analyzing interactional features based on the indices of equality—control over a task—and mutuality—engagement with each other’s contribution—that seem more appropriate for analyzing eTandem interaction.

8.2.3.1. Evaluating Storch’s (2002) model. First, Storch’s four interactional patterns seem to characterize well two of the three dyads in the present study and thus can be applied at face value to some but not all dyads at hand. Benjamin and Tomoya’s dyad can be considered “collaborative” in Storch’s terms because they showed various interactional features of cohesion and unpredictability (van Lier, 1989). Specifically, their interactions were characterized by frequent collaborative finishes, repetition, and positive and negative feedback. Their talk was “highly contingent” (van Lier, 1996) and “exploratory” (Wegerif & Mercer, 1996), demonstrating characteristics of a “conversation” (van Lier, 1989). In particular, Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction demonstrated features of local assembly (i.e., not planned in advance), unpredictability, and potentially equal distribution of rights and duties in talk (van Lier, 1996).
As such, Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction fits well into what Storch called “collaborative” on the two dimensions of high mutuality and equality (+equality, +mutuality).

The interaction of Amy and Yoko, in contrast, can be categorized as “expert/novice” in Storch’s model because within each half of the eTandem session but also across changing frames, the “expert” involved the novice in the interaction and provided assistance and explanations, while the “novice” incorporated the expert’s view. Here, however, it is important to highlight the difference between the participants in Storch’s and those in this study. While an “expert” in the former meant a language expert, as the tasks were language-focused (e.g., an editing task, a text reconstruction task), an expert in this study means either a language or cultural expert. In the case of Amy and Yoko, a cultural expert mainly took responsibility for developing topics, while a cultural novice listened to the explanation to learn about her partner’s culture. As such, this dyad’s interactions were characterized by low equality. In contrast, they achieved mid to high mutuality, as both participants were involved with the interlocutor’s contribution. Their involvement was mainly observed in the form of corrective feedback and its uptake as a language expert vs. novice and in the form of a cultural explanation and short listener responses that indicated the cultural novice’s understanding. In sum, Amy and Yoko’s interaction fits relatively well albeit with some conceptual modification into what Storch called an “expert/novice” pattern on the two dimensions of low equality and high mutuality (–equality, +mutuality).

By comparison to the two dyads just discussed, Edwin and Hiroyuki were a dyad whose interactional pattern does not easily fit Storch’s model. If only Edwin’s monologues are considered, their interaction was similar to the “dominant/passive” pattern, showing low equality and low mutuality. However, Edwin also asked many other-directed questions (i.e., machine-gun
questions) as an attempt to involve Hiroyuki in the talk. In this regard, Edwin and Hiroyuki may have been closer to a fifth type of interactional style that Watanabe and Swain (2007) named “expert/passive.” These researchers studied patterns of pair interaction using Storch’s taxonomy with two groups of learners: high-proficiency learners (i.e., learners whose proficiency is higher than that of the core participants) and low-proficiency learners (i.e., learners whose proficiency is lower than that of the core participants). The results revealed that, of the eight peer interactions they examined, seven fitted Storch’s categories well: three were collaborative, three were expert/novice, and one was dominant/passive. However, the eighth dyad did not conform to Storch’s model. This dyad’s interaction was characterized by (1) ongoing encouragement of the more proficient expert participant and (2) the less proficient participant’s reluctance to participate. Watanabe and Swain based this interpretation on the “dominant” participant’s comment in the stimulated recall session that he was talking more to involve the other participant. Similarly, Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction in English can be considered “expert/passive,” as Edwin talked more as an attempt to involve Hiroyuki. However, even this fifth interactional pattern of expert/passive proposed by Watanabe and Swain (2007) is insufficient to explain Edwin and Hiroyuki. The reason is that Edwin’s dominance and Hiroyuki’s reticence were observed in both language parts, English and Japanese, regardless of whether the language expert was Hiroyuki or Edwin. This suggests that it was not their TL proficiency levels (as Watanabe and Swain found of their eighth dyad) but their incompatible conversational styles and how the participants dealt with incompatibility that impacted their interaction. More specifically, in the analyses developed in Chapter 6, I found that Edwin was in fact not trying to “dominate” the conversation, and furthermore that he was not dominating it when in the role of a linguistic expert. Rather, in both his maximally proficient English and his
less proficient Japanese, he was trying to show involvement using hyperexplanation (Erickson, 1986), machine-gun questions, and floor holding via broken starts. Ultimately, these conversational moves led to Edwin’s monologues, but it was never his intention to “dominate” the conversation. As for Hiroyuki, he was not being passive; rather, he was showing involvement in his way as a high-considerateness communicator. For instance, from the beginning he used silence as a contextualization cue (Gumperz, 1982) to seek linguistic help and later on he learned to use bodily conduct to indicate comprehension difficulties and tackle a trouble source. Ultimately, these discursive moves led to Hiroyuki’s reticence, but it was never his intention to be “passive” in conversation. Indeed, he was actively engaged in interactions but in a different way from Edwin.

It would seem, therefore, as if Storch (2002) is on the right track in suggesting that interaction is shaped by equality and mutuality dynamics, but fixed interactional patterns – be it four as she proposed or five as Watanabe and Swain (2007) proposed in their modification of Storch’s model– cannot explain all and any interactional dynamics. Instead, it seems necessary to take a relativistic and situated view to conversational patterns, which precludes having to fit all interactions into an exhaustive categorization of interactional patterns.

What can then be proposed as an expanded framework that might help accommodate findings contributed by Hiroyuki and Edwin’s evidence? In the next section, I present a new framework for analyzing reciprocity patterns in eTandem retaining the two indices of equality and mutuality proposed by Storch (2002), but leaving out the four fixed interaction patterns she proposed.

8.2.3.2. A new model for understanding reciprocity in eTandem interaction. In light of the above discussion, I propose a new framework for analyzing reciprocity patterns based on
the two indices of equality and mutuality that Storch (2002) originally considered at the basis of her model. Devising a new framework is important because the eTandem set-up requires a more fine-grained way of describing interaction, as it is influenced by the dynamic shift of topics and languages spoken (see Sanchez, 2015 for the same argument). The newly proposed model includes four labels of reciprocity patterns that in my view best reflect the evidence of situated practices found in this study. These are “collaborative,” “instructional,” “parallel,” and “unbalanced.” Figure 11 provides a summary of each reciprocity pattern in terms of (1) the degree of reciprocity (from high to low), (2) situated practices (i.e., what participants were doing), and (3) the types of reciprocity observed (i.e., +/- mutuality (i.e., the level of engagement with each other’s conversational contribution), +/- equality (i.e., the degree of control or authority over the task), +/- exchanged behavior (e.g., redirection of questions, mutual revelation, listenership and speakership, and error correction and uptake).

Note that the new model focuses on a situated practice, which becomes a unit of analysis instead of focusing on interactional properties of participants/dyads, as Storch (2002) did. Thus, the model focuses on the situated practices such as “co-constructing” and “cooperating.” The use of progressive verbs also signals a departure from the assumption that dyadic interactional patterns are static. Instead, the new model considers reciprocity patterns dynamic and changeable within the one hour of eTandem interaction. Note also that the new model takes a relativistic view to analyzing reciprocity patterns. Thus, instead of equating a certain linguistic strategy with a particular concept, the new framework discusses an interactional behavior of one participant in relation to that of the other. For instance, as Tannen (1993) famously noted, depending on the local qualities of each interaction, “overlaps” may indicate solidarity rather than dominance. Similarly, I have argued that Edwin’s “dominance” was a result of his showing “solidarity” as an
attempt to encourage Hiroyuki to participate more. As such, the new model interprets a reciprocity pattern in several ways; for instance, the “parallel” pattern (i.e., a reciprocity pattern where participants are not engaged with each other’s contribution but both of them contribute to the conversation to the same extent) may be observed when participants are cooperating (e.g., each participant looking up a word in a dictionary as per division of labor strategy to come to mutual understanding) or when they are both trying to compete for the conversational floor.

Below I explain each reciprocity pattern in detail.

![Figure 11. Reciprocity Patterns and Situated Practices](image)

First, the pattern of high reciprocity is “collaborative” (cf. “collaborative” in Storch, 2002), and Benjamin and Tomoya’s situated practices mostly fit this pattern. The pattern is +
mutuality and equality, and various types of exchanged behavior (e.g., redirection of questions, mutual revelation, and effective listenership) are observed, as they co-construct the conversation. It is also characterized by various features of a conversation (van Lier, 1996) such as local assembly, unpredictability, and equal distribution of rights and duties in talk. Situated practices in this pattern are organic and dynamic, but governed by the common objective of the interaction, namely learning of each other’s culture and language. This pattern is also similar to Galaczi’s (2008) “collaborative, high conversational dominance” pattern, namely other-centered interaction that is characterized by the frequent use of follow-up questions, overlaps and latches, collaborative finishes, and next-speaker selection.

The next ideal pattern is “instructional” that is mid to high in reciprocity (cf. “expert/novice” in Storch, 2002). This pattern is mutuality and equality, meaning that participants engaged in each other’s conversational contribution but one of them talked more than the other. Specifically, the one who takes up a footing of a “teacher” (whether for language and/or cultural subjects) makes more of an interactional contribution than the one in the footing of the “learner,” who nevertheless shows engagement by incorporating the expert’s linguistic and cultural explanation. Amy and Yoko’s situated practices mostly fit this pattern, and so does Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction when they were interacting in the “language teaching and learning” frame. In the case of Amy and Yoko, a participant who took the footing of a cultural expert contributed more, while, in the case of Edwin and Hiroyuki, a participant who took the footing of a language expert contributed more. Whether it is for language learning or for cultural learning, the interlocutor in the “learning” footing and the interlocutor in the “teaching” footing establish intersubjectivity, which supports the claim that such situated practice nurtures
conditions for learning potential within the zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Lantolf, 2006).

The third pattern is “parallel” that is - mutuality but + equality. This pattern is low to mid reciprocity (cf. “dominant/dominant” in Storch, 2002; “cooperative” in Tan et al., 2010), meaning that both participants make a relatively equal conversational contribution but are not engaged with what each other says. There are two situated practices that are observed in this pattern. One is “cooperating.” This situated practice was observed when participants shared the common objective of mutual understanding but attempted to tackle a trouble source alone (i.e., a division of labor). For instance, Edwin and Hiroyuki resorted to the use of an electronic and online dictionary (i.e., object mediation) instead of involving the interlocutor in sense making, when Edwin could not understand Hiroyuki’s explanation about tatami. Amy and Yoko often resorted to object mediation instead of asking the bilingual partner for help when they faced an extreme case of epistemic asymmetries during a crossed expertise configuration, namely when explaining about their own culture in the TL. This situated practice was especially prevalent before Amy and Yoko started to utilize each other and themselves as bilingual resources. The other situated practice in this reciprocity pattern is “competing for domination.” Although this practice was not observed in the current study, it is possible to observe a situated practice where both participants try to dominate the conversation by avoiding floor yielding. In this reciprocity pattern, it would be rare to observe any type of exchanged behavior, as the two participants are either working in their own workspace (i.e., “cooperating) or trying to dominate the conversation (i.e., competing for domination).

Finally, the least ideal pattern that is low in reciprocity is “unbalanced.” This pattern is - mutuality and - equality, meaning that one participant is making more conversational
contribution than the other, and the participants are not engaged with what each other says. The situated practice in this pattern is “trying to work out the incompatibility,” and the incompatibility can be that of conversational styles and/or that of language proficiency differences. For instance, Edwin and Hiroyuki suffered from incompatible conversational styles, since Edwin, as a high-involvement communicator, showed involvement by talking more but Hiroyuki, as a high-considerateness communicator, showed involvement by listening more. Edwin and Hiroyuki also suffered from their inability to understand each other due to the gap in proficiency levels between the two participants. When participants cannot achieve intersubjectivity due to the differences in the proficiency level, what often happens is that the language expert (i.e., NS) continues to hold the floor, while the language novice (i.e., NNS) remains silent without knowing what to say. Thus, in contrast to the “instructional” pattern above, the situated practice in this pattern is low in mutuality.

Combining the findings above, the ideal patterns of interaction seem to be the ones that are high in mutuality, rather than the ones that are high in equality. Mutuality is a dimension of interaction shown in involvement with each other’s contribution, which empirically can be traced in discursive phenomena such as collaborative finishes, listener responses, and repetitions. Furthermore, based on the theory of social presence (Short et al., 1976), I argue that mutuality plays an even more crucial role in a video-mediated environment, as limited involvement with each other’s contribution can negatively impact the saliency of the interlocutor, who is not co-present physically. Therefore, in measuring the enactment of reciprocity using the indices of equality and mutuality, I propose the following analytical process. First, the researcher should focus more on the mutuality sense over the equality sense, first identifying if a dyad’s interaction is mostly characterized by either “collaborative” or “instructional” moves. Only then should the
researcher examine if participants whose interaction was low or mid in mutuality achieved equality. If they achieved equality, the “parallel” pattern can be inferred, meaning that they can at least contribute to the conversation equally. However, the interactants may not be able to form a strong interpersonal relationship due to the reduced sense of social presence. If they did not achieve equality, the dyad may be suffering from some incompatibility, for example being a high involvement communicator vs. being a high considerateness communicator, or limited proficiency in the TL, namely spawning the situated practice of “trying to work out the incompatibility of language proficiency differences,” which likely harbors less learning potential in the fly.

The proposed framework for conceptualizing the enactment of reciprocity (see Figure 11) offers several advantages over the framework that focuses on dyads’ interactional patterns such as that proposed by Storch (2002). First, it focuses on participants’ situated practices that constitute the dyadic interaction. That is, instead of labeling a dyad, the new taxonomy focuses on what its members do during an interaction and how what they do may change depending on the shift of frames during a given interaction and over time. Second, it takes a relativistic perspective, incorporating the view that the same interactional features mean different things in relation to the interlocutor and depending on why they use the interactional features. Third and finally, the present enactment of reciprocity framework helps disambiguate the roles played in creating certain dynamics in discourse by the two distinct factors of proficiency and conversational styles by calling for a full analysis of interaction where linguistic and cultural expertise are crossed by the topic of discussion and eTandem design and where footings of an expert and novice are negotiated in the moment by virtue of the bilingual nature of eTandem. Participants’ proficiency levels in the TL alone are a relatively constant characteristic of an
individual across interactions, and incompatible conversational styles are a characteristic that emerges only out of situated interactions with others. Both factors can affect the enactment of reciprocity, but both factors can work jointly or independently, as shown in the case study of Edwin and Hiroyuki. The analysis of both language parts offers a unique methodological advantage in eTandem interaction data, as it enables researchers to identify the underlying cause or causes of interactional tensions.

8.2.4. Exchanged Behavior

In this section, I will look at various forms of process-oriented reciprocity, all contained under the umbrella of exchanged behavior. Analysis of exchanged behavior allows us to see how participants did and did not achieve reciprocity in the form of equality and mutuality. Below I will focus on four types of exchanged behavior: (1) error correction and uptake, (2) speakership and listenership, (3) redirection of questions, and (4) mutual revelation.

8.2.4.1. Error correction and uptake. First, similar to what Akiyama (2017a) and Bower and Kawaguchi (2011) found, the provision of corrective feedback and its uptake was not so common in the interaction of Edwin and Hiroyuki or Benjamin and Tomoya. This is because these two dyads mostly focused on cultural discussion and shifted to the “language teaching and learning” frame only when necessary (e.g., when comprehension difficulty was explicitly indicated by Hiroyuki). In contrast, particularly during the first 4 sessions, Amy and Yoko provided a substantial amount of corrective feedback, mostly in the form of recasts, as they had been trained to do, and they did so even on errors that were not likely to cause comprehension difficulty. Whenever either Amy or Yoko was in the language novice role, they not only reformulated their erroneous utterances (i.e., successful uptake) but also demonstrated their
appreciation for error correction by saying, “thank you.” This indicates that their interaction was focused on language learning and teaching rather than on cultural discussion. Indeed, this is demonstrated by the fact that they kept track of each other’s errors in the reflection journal even during an ongoing interaction. Their focus on language learning was such that it was often the case that the language expert did not engage with the language novice’s cultural contribution by, for instance, asking follow-up questions and making evaluative comments.

In contrast, after the critical incident of coming out in Session 4, Amy and Yoko focused less on error correction and more on intercultural understanding and establishment of friendly relationships (i.e., comity). For instance, they stopped taking notes of each other’s errors and saying “thank you” for the provision of corrective feedback. Instead, they only corrected errors that would hinder comprehensibility (i.e., negotiation for comprehensibility, Saito & Akiyama, 2017). With the shift of focus away from language learning, they started to use code-switching to ask personal questions about each other and each other’s culture. What is interesting is that this bilingual socializing often took place outside the Google Hangouts environment and in the text-mediated discourse via Facebook Messenger. That is, Amy and Yoko used the two technology platforms to achieve two different objectives: video interaction for language and cultural learning and text chats for socializing. This corroborates Tudini’s (2016) finding that code-switching can facilitate an eTandem dyad’s socialization process. However, the finding of this study is different from that of Tudini in that Amy and Yoko’s bilingual practices were observed in a particular modality (i.e., text medium), which was reserved mainly for the purpose of socializing, as opposed to error correction.

In summary, reciprocity in the form of error correction and its uptake may not always benefit eTandem participants. Indeed, too much of it may risk the cultural learning aspect of
eTandem and not allow them to treat each other as bilingual resources. Amy and Yoko’s reduced focus on error correction and its uptake, which was prompted by the critical incident of coming out, created opportunities to take a balanced approach to the learning of language and culture and facilitated the establishment of friendship.

8.2.4.2. Speakership and listenership. We can operationalize reciprocity as the exchanged behavior between a speaker and a listener, namely speakership and listenership. Barron and Black (2015) examined one successful and one unsuccessful German and Irish eTandem dyad’s English interaction via Skype, concluding that NNSs’ level of interactional competence influenced whether they achieved a successful interaction. In the unsuccessful dyad, the NNS left the interactional burden on the Irish English NS by not shifting topics, using few backchannels/backchannel forms, and responding to her partner’s topic shift with equivocal short-form topic replies (e.g., Yes). In contrast, the NNS in the successful dyad showed active participation via frequent topic shifts and a wide range of backchannel behaviors. Barron and Black’s thus suggested that NNSs’ interactional competence is key to achieving reciprocity between a speaker and listener.

However, what the current study found was that it was not so much the interactional competence of an NNS but the incompatible conversational styles between the two participants that prevented Edwin and Hiroyuki from reciprocating the contribution of a speaker and listener. I argue that in the presence of evidence in only one language it is too early to conclude that participants’ successful/unsuccessful interaction is attributed to the NNS’ limited interactional competence, because, only when we analyze participants’ speakership and listenership behavior in both language parts of an eTandem session (i.e., English and Japanese interaction in this study), will we be able to conclude that it was due either to the lack of the NNS’ interactional
competence or the two participants’ incompatible conversational styles. Furthermore, as the analysis of Edwin’s post-project interview data revealed, what exacerbated this vicious cycle was the mismatch of the two participants’ perception of *aizuchi* (i.e., Japanese word for short listener responses) or their expectation of what a listener does. Edwin had a somewhat essentialized idea of *aizuchi* as being a necessary part of Japanese people’s communication. For that reason, although Hiroyuki did make some non-salient verbal and non-verbal *aizuchi*, Edwin made a negative interpretation of the lack of salient listener feedback and a number of long silences that were salient, concluding that Hiroyuki was not interested in him. This indicates that the mismatch of expectations about what a listener does (i.e., incompatible expectations, Ware, 2005) can drive the vicious cycle of low reciprocity, together with participants’ culture-shaped conversational styles.

Whether it is due to the limited interactional competence or to incompatible conversational styles or even to the mismatch of expectations about what a listener does, it seems that exchanged behavior between a speaker and a listener, in particular a listener’s contribution, is one of the most fundamental forms of reciprocity that needs to be addressed in reciprocity research in eTandem. This is especially true in video-mediated eTandem, because, based on the social presence theory (e.g., Short et al., 1976), the greater number of linguistic and nonverbal cues users have in communication, the more social presence they experience, and this leads to “interpersonal warmth, friendliness, and satisfaction with the interaction” (Walther, 2011, p. 19). That is, salient verbal and non-verbal listenership cues increase social presence and thus accentuate the realism and immediacy of the interaction for those who are interacting long distance, making the actual distance between them seem to be reduced (Bitti & Garotti, 2011). Edwin and Hiroyuki’s use of silences thus reduced their social presence, making Edwin seek
even more salient types of verbal listenership, with negative consequences for the interaction when Hiroyuki’s listener behavior did not measure up to his expectations.

In summary, this study corroborates Barron and Black’s (2015) finding that limited online contribution by the listener negatively impacts conversational participants’ interactional experience. I argue that in video-mediated eTandem, where physical presence is not possible, social presence plays a crucial role in increasing the feeling of intimacy and realism of interaction. Therefore, exchanged behavior between a speaker and listener should be one of the most important forms of reciprocity that should be examined in reciprocity research in video-mediated eTandem. Methodologically speaking, in examining participants’ speakership and listenership behavior, we need to analyze participants’ interaction data in the two language parts and include participants’ perceptions about listenership as well (e.g., Edwin’s idea about aizuchi), to see if the participants’ incompatible conversational styles and perceptions are affecting their enactment of reciprocity in this sense.

**8.2.4.3. Redirection of questions.** Another form of exchanged behavior that facilitated the enactment of reciprocity was what Tomoya called in his reflection of Session 1 “再質問” (saishitsumon; redirection of questions). The analysis of Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction revealed that they were skillful at reciprocating their cultural expertise positions by redirecting questions. Questions like “How about Japan?” and “What do American people think?” changed the owner of cultural expertise and allowed both participants to position themselves as a cultural expert in a situated manner. Such exchanged behavior allowed the dyad not to be caught in one static role designated by the language and topic of discussion. In the case of Amy and Yoko, in contrast, their interaction was impacted by who held cultural expertise, as whoever was a cultural expert provided a rather long explanation in a monologue. Edwin and Hiroyuki’s role assignment
was even more static, and it changed only with a clear shift of frames (mostly initiated by Edwin) when Edwin explicitly asked if Hiroyuki understood him (in English), when Edwin expressed linguistic troubles (in Japanese), and when Edwin asked Hiroyuki to translate English into Japanese and to explain a culture-specific concept about Japan.

In summary, redirection of questions alone may not be the best indicator of reciprocity, but redirection of questions seems to be one of the most effective ways to achieve equality, namely the number of turns and topic shifts (Schwienhorst, 2004; Schwienhorst & Borgia, 2006) and control over a task (Storch, 2002), as it provides both participants equal chances to contribute to the conversation as a language and cultural expert. Therefore, I argue that redirection of questions, as fundamental a conversational strategy as it may sound, should become one of the strategies to be taught to eTandem participants, so they may increase reciprocity in the sense of equality.

8.2.4.4. Mutual revelation. The last form of exchanged behavior that I discuss in this section is mutual revelation (Tannen, 2005), namely the use of a personal statement to elicit a similar personal statement from the other. Mutual revelation was frequently observed in Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction throughout the 10-week interaction, and it facilitated the establishment and maintenance of friendship. In Session 1, Benjamin used the screen sharing function of Google Hangouts to show a few pictures of his family and house in the U.S. In return, Tomoya also used the screen sharing function to show his hometown via Google Maps. In Session 8, the dyad also explored each other’s culture in the “real-life” frame by showing each other’s bedroom, so they could engage in the comparison between the virtual world and real life. These two incidents exemplify reciprocity in the sense of mutual revelation. Benjamin and Tomoya’s use of mutual revelation not only facilitated and strengthened the learning objective of
eTandem (i.e., learning of language and culture) but also helped them socialize with each other by transcending the boundaries that exist between real life and the virtual world.

Mutual revelation was also observed in Amy and Yoko’s interaction, and it became the most critical incident of their 10-week interaction. In Session 4, Amy came out as lesbian. Although the dyad could not stay on the topic at that very moment, Yoko later at the closing of the session “recycled” the topic of homosexuality and intimated to Amy that she had experienced culture shock with her disclosure. This mutual revelation led to a productive discussion about sexual orientations and gayness in Japan and the U.S. and cultivated their curiosity about each other’s culture. Subsequently, they started to interact via Facebook Messenger, and this communication platform helped them ask potentially face-threatening questions about each other that they were uncomfortable asking in the video-mediated environment (e.g., Amy said, “I have a question! I have thought since I saw you for the first time, why do you color your hair Rainbow?? Your hair is so cool! Please tell me:)). In the end, prompted by the critical incident in Session 4 and the further discussion via Facebook Messenger, the dyad formed a community of practice; Amy and Yoko shared a passion for language and cultural learning and learned how to do it better through regular interaction.

In contrast to the interaction of Benjamin and Tomoya and that of Amy and Yoko, mutual revelation was not observed in Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction. I can speculate that the incompatible conversational styles prevented the dyad from reciprocating personal statements. Specifically, although Edwin talked about his culture and himself, his explanation was “hyper” in that it provided many unnecessary details. Hiroyuki, who was overwhelmed by the hyperexplanation, did not get a chance to reciprocate it by sharing his personal story.
As the comparison of these three dyads suggests, reciprocity in the form of mutual revelation impacted the long-term interactional outcome of the three dyads. For the two dyads, mutual revelation helped them form a strong partnership and establish friendship; for the other dyad, lack thereof contributed to preventing them from getting to know each other, feeling intimate with each other, and forming a sustainable partnership. Therefore, I argue that reciprocity in the form of mutual revelation should be identified and analyzed in a learning arrangement like eTandem, where the same participants interact with each other over a certain period of time, with the assumption that some of the participants will form a friendship.

8.2.5. Compatibility/Sharedness

We have examined reciprocity that is oriented to the product (i.e., interactional outcome) and process (i.e., “doing reciprocity”). In this section, I will examine reciprocity in the form of compatibility/sharedness that mediated participants’ interactional experience. The dimensions of compatibility/sharedness that I examine are (1) the compatibility of conversational styles, (2) the compatibility of technology use styles, and (3) sharing a bilingual speaker identity.

8.2.5.1. Compatibility of conversational styles. First, this study revealed how incompatible conversational styles can impact eTandem participants’ turn-taking patterns. Specifically, it was found that, if participants’ conversational styles are compatible, as in the case of Amy and Yoko, they are least likely to suffer from conversational dominance by one of the participants. In contrast, if participants’ conversational styles are significantly different, as in the case of Edwin and Hiroyuki, they are likely to experience complementary schismogenesis and not achieve reciprocity in the equality sense. Indeed, Edwin and Hiroyuki’s conversation was mostly characterized by Edwin’s conversational dominance and Hiroyuki’s reticence, except
when they were enacting language or cultural expert roles using available resources (i.e., multimodal bricolage). This indicates that they could tackle incompatible conversational styles and achieve reciprocity in a situated sense, depending on how they defined the situation, how they aligned themselves with the topic and interlocutor, and how they used available resources for communication.

As for Tomoya and Benjamin, although Tomoya showed more high-involvement features than Benjamin, who showed more high-considerateness features, they could overcome this incompatibility most likely because both knew how to adjust their styles in intercultural communication based on their previous encounters with various other cultures and languages. This suggests that, although incompatible conversational styles impact participants’ conversational experience, they can overcome the incompatibility, depending on their intercultural experience and how they situate themselves in interaction.

8.2.5.2. Compatibility of technology use styles. What is also interesting about Edwin and Hiroyuki is that their interaction was influenced not only by the incompatibility of conversational styles but also by that of technology use styles. First, while Hiroyuki never used any material surround, Edwin used a technology tool to resolve communication issues during Session 2. Secondly, while Edwin, as an expert of English, used a dictionary to provide a Japanese translation of an English word to facilitate Hiroyuki’s understanding, Hiroyuki did not resort to any material surround to explain a Japanese word that Edwin did not understand. Thirdly, while Edwin used a “high-involvement” strategy and involved Hiroyuki in conversational repair by asking Hiroyuki to translate an English word or sentence into Japanese, Hiroyuki took a “high-considerateness” approach to explaining a Japanese concept in English by using his electronic dictionary, and not “imposing” on Edwin.
It is also important to note that Edwin was one of the most technologically advanced participants in the project, but he did not use the skills in the *Google Hangouts* environment. Hiroyuki, on the other hand, was an average or less than average user of technology, who did not have much experience utilizing technology for instructional purposes. Benjamin and Tomoya, in contrast, were two of the most digitally capable participants, and they used the same types of technology tools to achieve similar communicative goals. As for Amy and Yoko, Amy knew more about technology than Yoko. However, Yoko learned to use the tools that Amy used (e.g., text chats) by imitating what Amy did with technological affordances and made their technology use styles compatible. As these examples demonstrate, the compatibility of technology use styles and compatible digital skills may predict how well the dyad can engage in conversational repair and relationship building using technological affordances. It may also indicate how much they rely on human vs. object mediation to carry out a conversational task.

8.2.5.3. **Sharing a bilingual speaker identity.** The previous sections discussed how the critical incident in Session 4 led Amy and Yoko to pay more attention to intercultural understanding and take a balanced approach to the learning of language and culture. From an identity perspective, this shift means that they started to consider themselves not only as a “language learner” and “language teacher” but also as “explorers of each other’s cultures.” With this shift of identity, an increased use of bilingual resources was also observed. Amy and Yoko did not mix languages toward the beginning of the project. However, during the critical incident of coming out in Session 4, the dyad mixed languages as a “compensatory device” (Gullberg, 2011) to understand each other and to engage in an in-depth discussion about female same-sex relationships. This critical incident appears to have become a turning point for Amy and Yoko’s exploitation of language mixing, in the sense that the incident seems to have made the dyad
realize the utility of using two languages to achieve intercultural and personal understanding. This interpretation is based on the observation that their interaction after the critical incident was characterized by more instances of language mixing, especially during their interaction via Facebook Messenger. As such, the critical incident seems to have prompted members of the dyad to take on identities of bilingual speakers and appreciate language mixing. With the shift of their identities and engagement in language mixing, the dyad moved from positioning themselves as a NS and NNS of Japanese/English toward sharing the identity as a bilingual, cosmopolitan, and international communicator, and this allowed them to not only learn about each other’s language but also to use the two languages to engage in intercultural understanding. Thus, Amy and Yoko may have been developing an international posture (Yashima, 2009), a general positive attitude toward what learning a new language – whether English for Yoko or Japanese for Amy – symbolizes regarding feeling connected to an international community.

As for Benjamin and Tomoya, they shared a bilingual speaker identity, shaped by their respective past biographies, even from Session 1. They used code-switching not only to resolve communication breakdowns but also to indicate the shift of frames (Session 2), read a bilingual text to create language learning opportunities in playing the computer game (Session 8), and resolve an Internet connection issue in a socially contingent manner by using code-switching to show rapport and solidarity (Session 1). In other words, each partner treated the other as a bilingual resource and utilized the affordances of interacting with a bilingual speaker. As these examples show, sharing the bilingual speaker identity was found to influence the degree of mixing two languages, focus of interaction (i.e., language-focused, culture-focused, or both), and the extent to which participants make locally emerging choices and position themselves as a NS vs. NNS.
8.2.6. Summary: Answering Research Question 1

Table 12 summarizes the various senses of reciprocity and lists what each sense of reciprocity can reveal. They are first categorized by the types of reciprocity: product-oriented (i.e., macro-level analysis on interactional outcomes), process-oriented (i.e., micro-level analysis on “doing reciprocity”), and mediators (i.e., factors that may influence the enactment of reciprocity; see the discussion of Research Question 2 below). Each type of reciprocity is then grouped by the definitions of reciprocity: quantitative equality, qualitative equality, interactional patterns based on equality and mutuality, exchanged behavior, and compatibility/sharedness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Reciprocity</th>
<th>Definitions of Reciprocity</th>
<th>Constructs of Analysis</th>
<th>What Can It Reveal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Product-oriented (macro-level analysis) | Quantitative equality | Session overall (i.e., traditional sense of reciprocity) | • Whether both languages were used equally  
• Whether two cultural groups’ conversational contributions were equal |
|                       | Within a language part |                         | • Whether two participants in a dyad equally contributed to the conversation  
• Whether proficiency level in the TL became an obstacle to participants’ making an equal contribution in each language part  
• Whether participants suffered from incompatible conversational styles |
|                       | Within a role-taking configuration |                         | • Whether cultural expertise determined how much one can contribute to the conversation  
• Whether there was sufficient contribution from the listener |
| Qualitative equality | Investment in the project (interdependence) |                       | • Whether participants were equally invested in the project  
• Whether participants perceived that they could attain their goals if and only if their partner attained his/her goals |
| Interactional patterns (Storch, 2002) | Equality and mutuality |                       | • To what extent dyads achieve equality (i.e., control over a task) and mutuality (i.e., engagement with each other’s contribution) in a task-based peer interaction  
• Note: Storch (2002) provides labels for dyads (cf. situated practices) |
| Process-oriented (micro-level analysis) | Interactional patterns: Newly proposed model (Figure 11) | Equality and mutuality | • To what extent a dyad’s situated practice achieves equality (i.e., control over a task) and mutuality (i.e., engagement with each other’s contribution)  
• Note: In this model, mutuality plays a more important role for the enactment of reciprocity than equality |
| Exchanged behavior | Corrective feedback and uptake |                       | • To what extent language expert vs. novice roles were emphasized in the ongoing interaction  
• Whether participants were overly focused on the language learning aspect such that they paid much less attention to the content of discussion and the social aspect of interaction |
| Speakership and listenership | • Whether the listener contributed to the conversation as much as the speaker  
• Whether the video interaction was high in social presence (Short et al., 1976) and facilitated “interpersonal warmth, friendliness, and satisfaction with the interaction” (Walther, 2011, p. 19) |
|---|---|
| Redirection of questions | • Whether participants could reciprocate their cultural expertise positions  
• Whether the dyad could break away from the static role assignment that is designated by the language and topic of discussion  
• May indicate that the dyad achieved equality (i.e., number of turns and topic shifts, control over a task) |
| Mutual revelation | • To what extent participants became intimate and bonded as friends  
• May predict the sustainability of the partnership |
| Mediators  (cf. Research Question 2) | Compatibility/sharedness  
Conversational style | • How likely it was for the dyad to suffer from complementary schismogenesis (Bateson, 1972)  
• How likely it was for them to achieve reciprocity in the equality sense |
| Technology use style | • How well the dyad used technological affordances to engage in conversational repair  
• To what extent a participant resorted to human vs. object mediation (Lantolf, 2006) |
| Bilingual speaker identity | • How frequently the dyad mixed two languages  
• For what purpose the dyad used code-switching (e.g., to engage in conversational repair, to achieve intercultural understanding, to socialize with each other)  
• How likely the dyad emphasized their NS vs. NNS identities |
8.3. What Factors May Impact the Enactment of Reciprocity in Ongoing Interaction?

In response to Research Question 2, this study found various factors that influenced the enactment of reciprocity, in addition to the reciprocity in the form of “mediators” (see Table 12 above). In this section, I will discuss five major factors that influenced the enactment of reciprocity: (1) conversational roles, (2) conversational topics (i.e., who has epistemic access to what), (3) participants’ positioning, footing, and identities, (4) L2 proficiency, and (5) use of technological affordances and participants’ digital literacies.

8.3.1. Conversational Roles

Priego (2011) conceptualized NS vs. NNS status as pre-determined conversational roles and quantitatively analyzed email tandem exchanges between secondary ESL and L2 French students focusing on scaffolding strategies first described in Villamil and Guerrero (1996). Her study found that the participants’ strategy use was different depending on whether they were assuming NS vs. NNS conversational roles in the two language parts of a session. Specifically, that study revealed that, when participants were taking the role as a NS (i.e., a tutor), they often used strategies like advising, eliciting, clarifying, restating, and checking comprehension, while NNSs used strategies like responding to advice and elicitation, asking for feedback, saving face regarding their lack of linguistic competence, thanking, and responding to apologies. Although a big-picture look at my data corroborates Priego’s finding that NS participants provided corrective feedback and NNS participants asked for corrective feedback, I argue, based on the findings of my discourse analysis, that quantitatively examining the frequency and types of scaffolding strategies based on the NS vs. NNS roles would not be so useful in looking at reciprocity in eTandem because it is not simply participants’ NS vs. NNS status (i.e., their
linguistic expertise) that influenced participants’ interaction. In other words, eTandem participants’ conversational roles are multilayered, such that their roles as a NS vs. NNS would not sufficiently capture the dynamic nature of reciprocity practices. For instance, while Priego argued that an NNS was the one who often made a comment about the lack of linguistic competence, the analysis of Amy and Yoko’s interaction revealed that such a face-saving move by the NNS of English (Yoko) influenced the NS of the same language (Amy) to share her struggle as a language learner, and this shared identity as equally struggling learners led to the creation of a sense of community of practice. This suggests, as Sanchez (2015) found, that participants often prioritized reciprocation of their positions over adopting inherent NS vs. NNS conversational roles in order to maintain human relationships.

The most significant difference between the interaction of Benjamin and Tomoya and that of Edwin and Hiroyuki as well as Amy and Yoko was that the first dyad’s role assignment was dynamic while the other two dyads’ was static. Specifically, in the case of Amy and Yoko, cultural expertise shaped who could hold the floor and how much contribution each participant could make. As such, while they could achieve quantitative equality within a language part, within a role-taking configuration, whoever held the cultural expertise made more contributions (see Quantitative equality above). In the case of Edwin and Hiroyuki, even the shift of cultural expertise could not break the vicious cycle of turns, as Edwin continued to make more contributions than Hiroyuki, whether they were talking about Japan or the U.S. and whether they were talking in Japanese or English. On the other hand, Benjamin and Tomoya possessed the ability to reciprocate cultural expertise positions and thus conversational roles via redirection of questions (see Redirection of questions above). They were also skillful at showing involvement as a listener (see Speakership and listenership above). Accordingly, it can be said that dynamic
shift of conversational roles as a cultural expert vs. novice and a speaker vs. listener facilitated the enactment of reciprocity.

8.3.2. Conversational Topics

Relevant to conversational roles is participants’ epistemic access to the topic of discussion. In eTandem, cultural expertise is determined by who had greater epistemic access to the cultural content of discussion. When the topic is about the U.S., the American participant usually takes up the footing of a cultural expert, and the Japanese participant does the same when it is about Japan. As Cappellini (2016) and Cappellini and Mompean (2015) have rightly noted, what complicates this is that, depending on the language of interaction, participants interact either in the unilateral expertise configuration (i.e., both linguistic and cultural expertise belongs to the same individual) or crossed expertise configuration (i.e., linguistic and cultural expertise belongs to two different individuals). What was observed in the present study was that, during a given crossed expertise configuration, a language novice would use various bricolage strategies to explain things about his/her own culture. These strategies ranged from asking the language expert to translate (e.g., Edwin) and using a dictionary to look up a word (i.e., solitary word search) (e.g., Amy, Yoko, and Hiroyuki) to sharing the trouble source with the language expert via screen sharing, so both participants could align toward the same trouble source (e.g., Benjamin and Tomoya). This indicates that, while all the participants attempted to perform their duty as a cultural expert when they had greater epistemic access to the content of discussion, the strategies they used during a crossed expertise configuration were different, and that in turn influenced the enactment of reciprocity.
For instance, Edwin’s “high-involvement” strategy of asking Hiroyuki to translate an English word and sentence into Japanese in the Japanese part of interaction inadvertently exacerbated Edwin’s conversational dominance and Hiroyuki’s reticence, because the way Edwin asked Hiroyuki to translate led Hiroyuki to taking up a footing of an English learner and resorting to silence to indicate comprehension difficulties. As a result, ironically, Edwin’s conversational move to involve Hiroyuki in the meaning making process occasionally reduced reciprocity. As for Hiroyuki, Amy, and Yoko, they used the solitary word search strategy as a language novice and held the floor until they found the word to explain their culture. However, the word search was not projectable to the interlocutor (Barrow, 2008), and this led to reduced social presence, since the number of linguistic and nonverbal cues that participants used decreased during the solitary activity. That is, they sacrificed their “interpersonal warmth, friendliness, and satisfaction with the interaction” (Walther, 2011, p. 19) because they did not make trouble source visible to the interlocutor, for example via screen sharing, which would have allocated some responsibility to the language expert (who was also a cultural novice in the local interaction in question) and created a context for interdependence.

8.3.3. Positioning, Footing, and Identities

Lam (2004) examined a Chinese/English bilingual chat room to illuminate affordances it may provide to support two teenage Chinese immigrants’ language socialization. The study found that the focal youth and their peers developed a mixed-code variety of English to construct their relationships as bilingual speakers of English and Cantonese and to create what Lam considers a collective ethnic identity. Similarly, Yi (2009) explored literacy practices of two Korean-American adolescents to examine how they constructed their transnational identities on
the Internet. The study found that the online community functioned as a safe space that let them demonstrate their bilingual and biliterate identity. This study also revealed, as I discussed in answering the first research question, that adopting a bilingual speaker identity impacted what participants do with the two languages. Engaging in bilingual practices (e.g., code-switching) in turn enabled the participants to not only focus on language learning but also to use such bilingual resources to achieve intercultural understanding. In the case of Amy and Yoko, their emphasis on intercultural understanding changed the way they corrected each other’s errors, leading them to focus only on errors that would hinder successful communication (i.e., negotiation for comprehensibility).

Footings that participants took up also impacted their enactment of reciprocity in the form of interactional patterns (see Figure 11). For example, Amy and Yoko’s interaction in Session 2 mostly demonstrated features of the “instructional” pattern, as a participant who took up the footing of a cultural expert talked more, while a participant who took up the footing of a cultural novice engaged in learning by listening, and a participant who took up the footing of a language expert showed involvement by providing error correction, while a participant who took up the footing of a language novice showed involvement by engaging in repair (i.e., - equality, + mutuality). As for Edwin and Hiroyuki, the dyad managed to break away from the “unbalanced” pattern and achieve the “instructional” pattern when Hiroyuki dutifully performed his role as a language expert (e.g., when Edwin asked Hiroyuki to translate an English sentence into Japanese and when Edwin asked Hiroyuki about a Japanese concept). This means that, when Hiroyuki took up a footing as an expert, he seemed to find the purpose of interaction and felt comfortable and qualified enough to stop being a listener and contribute to the conversation. This, on the
other hand, also implies that Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction could break away from the vicious cycle only when Hiroyuki was explicitly prompted to take up the footing of an expert.

8.3.4. L2 Proficiency and Differences in L2 Proficiency Between Members of a Dyad

In this study, the participant in the U.S. with the highest proficiency in the TL was Edwin (EIT 98), followed by Benjamin (EIT 90) and then Amy (EIT 73). The participant in Japan with the highest proficiency in the TL was Tomoya (EIT 82), followed by Hiroyuki (EIT 72) and then Yoko (EIT 62). The dyad with the largest gap in their respective TL proficiencies was Edwin and Hiroyuki (Edwin is 26 points higher than Hiroyuki) and the dyad with the smallest gap was Amy and Yoko (Amy was 11 points higher than Yoko). Although the comparability of English and Japanese EIT scores has yet to be validated, based on the current EIT data available and interactional evidence, it is possible that Hiroyuki felt powerless in his TL given Edwin’s higher proficiency in his TL. More specifically, it is possible that Hiroyuki felt inadequate in the English part of the eTandem interaction and settled on his role as a novice/student even in the Japanese part of the interaction, in which he could have contributed as a language expert. That is, he did not seem to have reaped benefits from the affordances of eTandem whose project design enables participants to switch conversational roles. Indeed, it is possible that Hiroyuki’s seeming sense of powerlessness exacerbated the dyad’s incompatible conversational styles, if Hiroyuki did not feel like he could make much contribution either as a cultural expert or as a language expert. Hiroyuki’s feeling may also be attributed to the design of this particular eTandem project, as participants in the current study spoke English first and then switched to Japanese. Hiroyuki might have felt differently if the order of languages was reverse, in which case he could have started the session in Japanese as a language expert.
Ryder and Yamagata-Lynch (2014) found that a U.S. learner of Chinese placed in a high functionality pair, whose proficiency was much lower than that of his/her partner’s proficiency in English, maintained a more balanced teacher-student relationship by acting as a cultural ambassador. This suggests that participants’ willingness to position themselves as a cultural expert influenced how they tackled the gap in TL proficiency. In the current study, Tomoya listed cultural contribution and cultural learning as one of the objectives of taking part in this project; Benjamin said he wanted to learn Japanese to communicate with his grandfather; and Amy and Yoko both stated that they wanted to be friends with each other. This means that the participants in these two dyads emphasized not only the language learning aspect but also the social, cultural, and affective sides of eTandem interaction. In contrast, unlike Edwin, who said he wanted to make a friend in Japan, Hiroyuki only emphasized the language learning aspect by saying his motivation for the project was to “improve English.” This may imply that language learning was the only objective for Hiroyuki, and when he lost confidence in his TL, he did not feel like he could make contribution in any alternative way.

In summary, the gap in participants’ TL proficiency may make one of them with the higher proficiency in the TL position him/herself as a person with power and make the other participant with the lower proficiency settle on the role of an inadequate novice, if s/he cannot find an alternative way to change the power dynamics. At the same time, as Ryder and Yamagata-Lynch (2014) found, it is possible for participants to overcome the gap in the TL proficiency level depending on how they position themselves in the interaction. If they find a way to empower themselves as a cultural ambassador or an expert in their L1, they may be able to reciprocate their expert-novice roles, and this will lead to a more equal, mutual, and dynamic conversation.
8.3.5. Use of Technological Affordances

One of the most important contributions of this study is the finding that use of technological affordances changed the enactment of reciprocity. In other words, reciprocity was mediated by the types of technology tools the participants used, how they used them, and for what purpose they did so. First, the most distinctive feature of Benjamin and Tomoya’s interaction was the use of screen sharing. Screen sharing allowed the dyad to benefit from having virtual joint attention, namely the shared focus of two individuals who are not physically co-present on an object that exists in a virtual space. The virtual joint attention was found to facilitate collaborative exploration of a conversational topic by making the “process” of sensemaking visible to both participants. They used screen sharing for Google Search, Google Maps, Google Images, and YouTube videos, and they even used screen sharing to play a computer game and read aloud a bilingual text together. As these examples demonstrate, Benjamin and Tomoya benefited greatly from creating a shared space. As a result of interacting in and via the shared space, their social presence increased, and so did their conversational involvement and chances to reciprocate a conversational contribution and learn each other’s language and culture.

It was also found that cross-modal intertextual links (i.e., the use of a prior text across different modalities) facilitated the enactment of reciprocity. For instance, both Amy-Yoko and Benjamin-Tomoya dyads were connected outside the Google Hangouts via social networking sites such as Facebook. Their having access to the partners’ personal history via Facebook and their regular extracurricular interaction via email and Facebook Messenger afforded chances to get to know each other, identify commonalities and differences, and carry out a conversation based on this shared repertoire. That is, their shared memory and repertoire affirmed
conversational participants’ mutual access to prior texts, confirmed their membership to the same group (Gordon, 2009), and increased involvement. In the end, cross-modal intertextual links facilitated various form of reciprocity including mutuality, mutual revelation, and most of all, their equal investment in the project.
8.4. What Aspects of Reciprocity Seem More Amenable to Change than Others in 10 Weeks of the ETandem Project?

In the previous two sections, I have addressed the two first research questions in the study, discussed what forms of reciprocity were observed in the eTandem interaction, and identified five major factors that influenced the enactment of reciprocity in the various dimensions. In this section, I will address now the third research question and discuss how the enactment of reciprocity changed over the span of 10 weeks in the examined forms of reciprocity.

8.4.1. Change in Quantitative Equality

First, as discussed in answering the first research question, in the case of Benjamin and Tomoya, their interaction from Session 2 onwards was characterized by quantitative equality as a session overall, within a language part, and within a role-taking configuration. This is in part thanks to Tomoya’s realization in Session 1 that he should make sure to redirect questions to Benjamin, so he could create more opportunities for Benjamin to speak (see Tomoya’s reflection of Session 1 on p. 103). Amy and Yoko’s interactions were characterized by quantitative equality in entire sessions and within a language part; however, their conversational contributions were not equal within a role-taking configuration. This is because whoever held the cultural expertise talked more to explain her own culture and to perform the duty of a cultural expert. Although the critical incident in Session 4 led them to focus less on error correction and helped them bond as friends, change in these dimensions was not powerful enough to change the interactional outcome of quantitative equality.
Edwin and Hiroyuki made up the only dyad who changed in the aspect of quantitative equality. Although the change was limited to their performance in the English part during a crossed expertise configuration, their use of multimodal bricolage improved the balance of conversational contribution in Session 8. Specifically, Hiroyuki used his bodily conduct (e.g., head and body movement) to engage in repair and consulted his electronic dictionary to explain a culture-specific concept. The use of the electronic dictionary was solitary in that the trouble source was not projectable to Edwin. Thus, although they improved reciprocity in the sense of quantitative equality, their interaction could not achieve high social presence, as they worked in their respective workplace (i.e., a division of labor). In summary, this finding indicates that over time Hiroyuki learned to use whatever resources were available in the immediate environment to perform his duty as a cultural expert. His use of bodily conduct helped him indicate and tackle a trouble source, and his use of the electronic dictionary helped him hold the floor and improve reciprocity. However, the use of his electronic dictionary also reduced their social presence and thus mutuality (see Types of technological affordances used above), highlighting the trade-off effect of resorting to the mediation of a tool that is placed outside the shared space.

8.4.2. Change in Qualitative Equality

The only dyad that changed in qualitative equality over time was Amy and Yoko. After the critical incident in Session 4, the dyad started to interact via Facebook Messenger, which helped them share struggles as a language learner, show their dedication to learn from and support each other (i.e., investment), and form a community of practice. Their feeling of interdependence (Johnson & Johnson, 2009) and shared identity as bilingual speakers was enhanced via interaction on Facebook Messenger, in which they often engaged in code-
switching. This finding thus indicates that the critical incident, which made the dyad want to understand each other in the true sense, led to the improvement of reciprocity in the qualitative equality sense.

8.4.3. Change in Interactional Patterns

If I adopt Storch’s (2002) taxonomy, I would conclude that there was no change in how I describe the three dyads’ interactional patterns. However, we can see slight changes in their interactions if we focus on their situated practices. Based on the revised taxonomy of reciprocity that I developed (see Figure 11), it seems that Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interactional patterns changed when we look at their situated practices. Although Edwin and Hiroyuki were mostly “trying to work out the incompatibility of conversational styles” (i.e., the unbalanced pattern), they broke away from the vicious cycle when they focused on language teaching and learning. By Session 8, Hiroyuki had learned to use non-linguistic means such as the use of bodily conduct and object mediation to perform his duty as a cultural expert in the English part of the interaction. While the use of bodily conduct to engage in conversational repair resulted in a “collaborative” pattern, the use of electronic/online dictionaries led to the “parallel” pattern.

As for Benjamin and Tomoya, their interaction was either “collaborative” or “instructional” throughout the span of 10 weeks. Even when they were engaging in conversational repair, they achieved a “collaborative” pattern, because they tackled the trouble source together via screen sharing. Amy and Yoko’s interaction also did not change over the 10-week project, as their interaction was mostly “instructional,” in that language and cultural expertise continued to influence their interaction.
8.4.4. Change in Exchanged Behavior

This study identified four types of exchanged behaviors that are process-oriented: corrective feedback and uptake, speakership and listenership, redirection of questions, and mutual revelation. Of these four aspects, the only dimensions that I observed a change of were (1) corrective feedback and uptake and (2) mutual revelation. First, as exemplified by the case of Amy and Yoko, although language and cultural expertise continued to influence their role assignment, the critical incident in Session 4 made them realize the benefit of mixing languages and negotiating bilingual practices (e.g., deciding which language to use). With such a change, the dyad started to pay less attention to the NS vs. NNS dichotomy and error correction. Indeed, after Session 4, they only corrected errors that would hinder comprehensibility (i.e., negotiation for comprehensibility) and stopped taking notes of each other’s errors and thanking the feedback provider. This shows that the critical incident allowed the dyad to take a balanced approach to language and cultural learning, making them focus less on enacting reciprocity in the form of corrective feedback and its uptake and focus more on intercultural understanding and establishing friendly relationships.

Related to Amy and Yoko’s focus on establishing friendship is mutual revelation. The critical incident in Session 4 itself was an incident of mutual revelation in that Amy came out as lesbian and Yoko revealed her heteronormative view, telling her that she experienced a culture shock when Amy came out. Their mutual revelation continued in Facebook Messenger where Amy and Yoko asked each other personal questions that they were too hesitant to ask during Google Hangouts interaction, shared their struggles as language learners, and revealed how they felt about each other’s foreign language proficiency (e.g., “You already do speak well 😊”).
In summary, it was found that the critical incident of Amy and Yoko, and more specifically, their departure from positioning each other as a NS vs. NNS and instead positioning each other as a bilingual peer, affected their exchanged behavior. This may mean that error correction and mutual revelation exist on two ends of a spectrum, with error correction representing participants’ focus on form and mutual revelation representing their focus on comity (i.e., establishment and maintenance of friendly relationships). The fact that Amy and Yoko as well as Benjamin and Tomoya could engage in both forms of exchanged behavior in the end suggests that enacting these two types of reciprocity together are related to their satisfying interactional experience.

8.4.5. Change in Compatibility/Sharedness

Of the three types of reciprocity in the form of compatibility/sharedness, the only construct that did not change over time was the compatibility of conversational styles. This finding indicates that participants’ conversational style is so entrenched that it is difficult to calibrate it in just 10 weeks of interaction. In other words, it is likely that participants with compatible conversational styles will benefit from the shared style throughout their partnership, while those whose conversational style is not compatible will struggle with the discordance unless they find a way to overcome it using various conversational strategies such as “wait time” (Kozar, 2016) and the use of the material surround.

A change was observed in the compatibility of technology use styles for Edwin and Hiroyuki. In Session 2, Edwin was the only participant who used a dictionary. In contrast, in Session 8, Hiroyuki also used a dictionary when explaining a Japanese concept in English. This means that the two participants achieved compatibility in the types of tools they used. However,
since their use was not compatible regarding how they used them (i.e., Edwin looked up a word to provide a Japanese translation of the trouble source for Hiroyuki vs. Hiroyuki looked up a word to provide an explanation about the Japanese concept in English), their styles did not achieve compatibility in the true sense of the term.

Finally, Amy and Yoko both developed an identity as a bilingual speaker and shared the identity after the critical incident in Session 4. With the change, they started to use code-switching not only as a compensatory device but also to achieve intercultural understanding and to socialize with each other. No change was observed for Edwin and Tomoya, as both of them shared the bilingual speaker identity and exhibited bilingual practices from the first session. As for Edwin and Hiroyuki, they did not develop shared identities as bilingual speakers throughout the 10 weeks of eTandem interaction, because code-switching was considered merely a compensatory device.

Table 13 below summarizes the aspects of reciprocity that changed over the 10 weeks of the project. As the table shows, Benjamin and Tomoya was the dyad who did not make much change in the way they enacted reciprocity, as they had been successful throughout the semester, and in particular after Session 2 when Tomoya realized the importance of redirecting questions to Benjamin. In contrast, Amy and Yoko were the dyad who made a significant change after the critical incident in Session 4. The changes were observed in the aspects of reciprocity that impacted the quality of interaction overall (e.g., the frequency of corrective feedback, mutual revelation, use of code switching, and the mindset that focuses on establishing comity). We can speculate that these macro-level changes are hard to attain, unless there is an incident that is so powerful like the coming-out discourse in this study that it changed the interactional trajectory and perception about each other and the project. Finally, micro-level changes (i.e., changes that
were found only in a particular segment of an interaction) were observed in Edwin and Hiroyuki’s interaction, as Hiroyuki learned to use bricolage strategies to compensate for his limited English proficiency. These findings together suggest that the aspects of reciprocity that are more amenable to change are the ones that can be easily influenced by the use of bodily conduct and the material surround, namely non-linguistic features of a conversation. On the other hand, aspects of reciprocity that are more general and language-oriented, such as compatibility of conversational styles and participants’ mindset, are less amenable to change and may change only after a critical incident.

Table 13. Aspects of Reciprocity that Changed in 10 Weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benjamin &amp; Tomoya</th>
<th>Edwin &amp; Hiroyuki</th>
<th>Amy &amp; Yoko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative equality</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanged behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(corrective feedback and uptake; mutual revelation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility/sharedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(compatibility in the technology use style)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(shared identity as a bilingual speaker)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.5. Pedagogical Implications

In this section, I will discuss what the findings of this study mean for language teaching, in particular for the implementation of telecollaboration projects. This section provides pedagogical implications in terms of (1) project design, (2) participant training, (3) selection of an appropriate technology platform, and (4) partner matching.

8.5.1. Designing a Project that Focuses on Both Language and Culture

The findings of the present study suggest that when designing a telecollaboration project it is important to take a balanced approach to language and cultural learning. One way to foster this balanced approach is designing a task that focuses on both language and cultural learning. In a meta-analysis of 55 studies of telecollaboration published between 1996 and 2016, Akiyama and Cunningham (2018) identified four major types of tasks that are often used in telecollaboration projects: *information exchange tasks* (i.e., talking about each other and each other’s culture), *comparison and analysis tasks* (i.e., comparison of languages and cultures that is usually classroom-embedded and led by a language teacher), *co-construction tasks* (i.e., creating a product together such as a bilingual website), and *language-focused tasks* (e.g., information gap tasks, jigsaw tasks). Of these four types, the type of tasks that is least appropriate for the enactment of reciprocity within an eTandem format is the language-focused task, as it would be difficult for the type of tasks to promote social interaction. Although comparison and analysis as well as co-construction tasks would be ideal for the enactment of reciprocity, a coordinator of a culture-focused project like *Cultura* (Furstenberg, Levet, English, & Maillet, 2001) would need to make sure that the students are not overemphasizing the cultural aspect over language
learning, as ultimately language and culture are inseparable and understanding a culture requires one’s language skills.

Yet another way to promote a balanced approach to language and cultural learning is to appreciate and encourage the use of their bilingual resources. Although eTandem imposes a strict language division rule, making it a rule to divide a session into two language parts, the findings of this study suggest that participants benefit from code-switching, as long as they are aware that they should spend about half the time in one language and the other half in the other language. Tudini (2016) revealed how code-switching was used to achieve the dual purpose of eTandem: language learning and socialization. The findings of this study also suggest that code-switching reflects participants’ identity as a bilingual speaker and sharing such an identity between interactants fosters the development of a community of practice. Thus, it seems that coordinators of an eTandem project should treat their students as bi/multilingual individuals, rather than as NSs/NNSs of two languages, by teaching them the value of engaging in code-switching and by allowing them to consider eTandem as a safe space where they can index their bilingual speaker identity.

In the present project, the participants engaged in a type of information exchange task called a visual-based task (see Interaction Sessions in Chapter 4). As a preparation for the task, they chose two visuals that they thought would represent the Japanese and American cultures and came up with four discussion questions. Since these four discussions guided their interaction, the quality of these questions greatly influenced how much cultural learning the dyad could make. In order to help students ask questions that may lead to a dialogue (Helm, Guth & Farrah, 2012) and even a critical incident (Belz & Kinginger, 2002), it may be beneficial to have a workshop where students learn how to come up with “good” questions.
It also seems crucial to promote moments of culture shock, since such cultural episodes can become valuable learning opportunities. Be that as it may, there will be some participants who feel uncomfortable and cannot cope with culture shock. For those participants, it may be useful to create an opportunity to openly talk about what they think is unique/strange about each other’s culture and have a facilitator monitor their interaction, as in the case of Soliya (Helm, 2013). It is hoped that a critical dialogue about each other’s culture, while being monitored by a facilitator, will make them see the similarities and differences about each other and position themselves as an intercultural or transcultural person. Furthermore, as Ware and Kramsch (2005) argued, discussing moments of miscommunication should be done as a class activity, as sharing episodes of a culture shock with others will make them realize if it was related to one’s partner as a person or to the whole culture.

8.5.2. Participant Training

In order to alleviate the difficulties that peers face in providing corrective feedback, an increasing number of studies in SLA are looking into the effects of learner training. For instance, Fujii, Ziegler, and Mackey (2016) examined the effects of metacognitive instruction on learner-learner interactions in the task-based EFL classroom. The training offered tips and practice on how to provide corrective feedback to their peers. The results showed that metacognitive instruction led to greater provision and use of interactional feedback in subsequent interactions. Sato (2013) trained his EFL learners to provide corrective feedback to each other. The results of the study revealed the effectiveness of the intervention in facilitating “trust in their classmates as learning resources” (p. 611) and increasing willingness and confidence in providing corrective feedback.
Based on Akiyama’s (2017a) finding that participants preferred to provide recasts to other types of corrective feedback (see Lyster & Ranta, 1997 for the six types of corrective feedback), the participants in this project were trained to provide recasts on errors that they thought would hinder comprehensibility (see Corrective Feedback Training in Chapter 4). In contrast, the participants in this project were not provided with intercultural training (e.g., Baxter, 1983; Bennett, 1986). Amy and Yoko’s overemphasis on error correction may be a result of this pre-project training (in addition to the corrective feedback sheet in Appendix A) that emphasized the language learning aspect over the cultural learning aspect. Thus, I suggest that participant training highlight both language and cultural aspects of eTandem. For instance, participants can be trained to learn how to deal with culture shock, how to engage in a potentially face-threatening discourse about culturally sensitive and controversial topics (e.g., homosexuality, religion), and how to take a bicultural or transcultural stance. It is also important for the coordinators to learn how to deal with these issues and facilitate students’ socialization process.

As Edwin’s over-simplified idea about Japanese listenership illustrates, undetailed explanation of conversational strategies without presentation of situated data may lead to stereotyping the underlying conversational rules and the overgeneralization of such subtle, practices in situ. Thus, it seems crucial that participants are provided with opportunities to compare existing linguistic and cultural knowledge with situated practice of conversation. Practitioners can, for instance, have participants read articles on cross-cultural differences in listenership and discuss the validity of such claims based on their telecollaborative experience. They can even have participants transcribe a portion of interaction and compare the differences
in turn-taking patterns between the two language systems. In this way, they can also become aware of differences in culturally-influenced conversational styles.

While it would be ideal to do such awareness-raising tasks as a whole class, they require a substantial amount of scaffolding by the languacultural expert in and outside the class. Therefore, in a relatively autonomous telecollaborative setting where such teacher mediation is not plausible, practitioners can at least provide online resources that they and their students can refer to before the project starts or when interactional troubles occur. These resources could include a video that illustrates the importance of listeners’ contribution to increase mutuality, a video that shows how people of different conversational style show involvement and what happens as a result of complementary schismogenesis, a video that explains how to redirect questions to change cultural expertise, and a video that explains the value of wait time in video-mediated communication where transmission delays are expected. Practitioners can also create an archive of language- and culture-related episodes, making them available to current participants.

The findings of this study also suggest that high digital literacy levels facilitate the enactment of reciprocity. The digital literacy level of 30 Japanese participants who participated in this eTandem project was comparatively lower than that of the American counterparts. This is consistent with the past research (e.g., Mehran, Alizabeh, Koguchi, & Takemura, 2017) that maintains that, despite Japan relying its economy on the production of high-tech gadgets, Japanese students’ digital literacy levels are comparatively low among the generation of “digital natives” (Prensky, 2001), especially when it comes to using technology for educational purposes.

Of the three dyads analyzed in this study, Benjamin and Tomoya were the only dyad who both possessed high technology skills. Although Edwin possessed sophisticated and advanced
technology skills, he did not utilize them for facilitating the interaction with his partner. Amy, on the other hand, knew how to use technological affordances for language learning, and Yoko learned to use a few technology tools from interacting with Amy. This finding suggests that eTandem participants in both countries need to be trained to use technology for the specific purpose of language learning and teaching. It also bolsters the argument that needs analysis must include the current technological skills and future technological aspirations of L2 students (González-Lloret, 2014). Moreover, the finding opens up the possibility that digital literacy learning is one of the educational benefits of eTandem and other forms of technology-mediated communication, such that perhaps “digital literacy-learning objectives and language-learning objectives must be planned hand-in-hand” (Ortega, 2017, p. 304).

The literature on readiness for digital language learning (e.g., Mehran et al., 2017) highlights the need for learner training that prepares all students to make effective use of technology-enhanced language learning tasks and activities. Hubbard (2013) emphasizes that learner readiness represents not only technical expertise but also the ability to understand pedagogical principles and to adapt strategies that are required for successful online language learning. Furthermore, the same past research on language learner e-readiness suggests that digital literacy training is context-bound and highly contingent upon factors such as technological infrastructure of an institution, demographic features of learners (e.g., nationality), and their attitude toward e-learning. Thus, together with González-Lloret (2014) I argue that the first step for eTandem coordinators to take is to conduct a needs analysis study (e.g., Fageeh, 2011; Winke & Goertler, 2008) and measure participants’ e-readiness (Koc & Barut, 2016; Mehran et al., 2017). Based on the data, coordinators can devise a tailor-made training program that teaches students how to use technological affordances of a particular videoconferencing tool,
including text chatting, screen sharing, and file transfer, as well as tools that can be used in conjunction with the videoconferencing tool (e.g., *Google Search, Google Images*). The findings of this study also highlight the importance of having social interaction outside the videoconferencing environment. Thus, it may be beneficial to introduce students to various social networking sites (e.g., *Facebook, LINE, WhatsApp, Twitter*) and promote their interaction outside the curricular context. However, in doing so, it is also important to raise students’ awareness about “how SNSs encode user privacy or safety, how they represent friends as ‘contacts’ and affiliation through ‘likes,’ and how they embed advertising and sponsorship” (Livingstone, 2014, p. 3) and promote social media literacy (Livingstone, 2014). Finally, it is also recommended that coordinators check in with participants occasionally and provide digital and social media literacy training on a regular basis.

**8.5.3. Selection of an Appropriate Videoconferencing Platform**

The findings of this study suggest that “shared space,” namely the place that affords virtual joint attention, facilitated the co-construction of conversation and enactment of reciprocity. It was also found that collaborative word search as opposed to cooperative and solitary word search promoted reciprocity in the sense of mutuality. In addition, text chats were used often for conversational repair and to keep track of each other’s errors. Based on these findings, I propose that an ideal videoconferencing platform should afford (1) screen sharing, (2) text chatting, and (3) a “shared space.”

First, screen sharing should be included as one of the functions of the platform, as it allows participants to share what they see on their computer with the interlocutor. This is especially useful when one of the participants, who has a lower digital literacy, needs help from
the interlocutor regarding how to use the videoconferencing tool. Secondly, the videoconferencing platform should include the text chatting function, as it enables participants to visualize the spoken language and helps with resolving communication breakdown and error correction. Text chats also afford multimodal features that spoken discourse does not come with such as emoji and GIFs. These features would enrich the spoken discourse and enable those participants whose proficiency in the TL is comparatively low to express themselves via multimodal bricolage. Lastly, the ideal platform should provide a “shared space.” It was found that collaboratively exploring a word, definition, image, video, maps, etc., as in the case of Benjamin and Tomoya, increased social presence and various forms of reciprocity (e.g., quantitative equality, mutuality, mutual revelation). Based on this finding, an ideal videoconferencing platform should incorporate a space where participants can look up a word together, search for a word, definition, image, video, maps, etc. together, and write and draw collaboratively. Figure 12 visually illustrates the proposed videoconferencing platform for telecollaboration.
As the coordinator of the project and the author of this study, I decided to pair up the students into 30 dyads based on their available times of a week, their proficiency level in the TL, sex, academic major, hobbies, and self-introduction messages written in the TL. In particular, being of the same sex was prioritized because (1) many of the participants stated in a pre-project questionnaire that they wanted to be with a partner of the same sex and (2) the coordinator wanted to remove the possibility of dyads forming a romantic relationship, as past research (e.g., Belz & Kinginger, 2002) has suggested that different-sex partners sometimes bond in a romantic way. However, the analysis of Amy and Yoko’s interaction made me realize that the matching
procedure itself reflected my heteronormative view, as I had assumed that people’s sex indicated their sexual orientation. In other words, as a researcher and coordinator, I had assumed that all students would be happy to be treated as gender conforming, that is, as wishing to adhere to society’s rules about dress and activities that are expected of them based on their biological sex at birth, or cisgendered, that is, of a sexual orientation that agrees with their assigned sex at birth. Based on this experience, I argue that we need to be aware of our potentially heteronormative view, so eTandem coordinators would be able to find ways to balance the need to take into account as many factors as possible, including participants’ race, gender, sex, education level, and digital literacy, etc., with the need to understand and treat sex and sexuality in sensitive, fair, and socially justifiable ways.

Next, practitioners may need to bear in mind that eTandem participants are subject to attributing negative personal traits to their partners in facing communication breakdown, as they associate different conversational styles with personality. Specifically, interacting with the same partner longitudinally (usually over a semester in eTandem) may entrench either positive or negative experiences of intercultural exchange. The findings of this study indeed suggest that it is difficult to increase reciprocity in just 10 weeks of interaction. This is especially so without an occurrence of a critical incident, as in the case of Amy and Yoko, and without resorting to multimodal bricolage strategy, as in the case of Edwin and Hiroyuki, who learned to resort to bodily conduct and material surround (Mehus, 2011) only toward the end of the project. The findings of this study also indicate that, on the one hand, two participants’ having incompatible conversational styles negatively impacts the enactment of reciprocity, and on the other hand, having compatible conversational styles has a facilitative effect on the enactment of reciprocity. Since the two conversational styles (i.e., high-involvement vs. high-considerateness style) are
“not a matter of polar distinctions” and exit on a continuum (Tannen, 2005, p. 183) and each person uses a unique mix of conversational devices to serve the “human needs for interpersonal involvement and independence” (p. 185), it seems extremely challenging for coordinators to try to match participants of the same conversational style.

One solution for this is to come up with non-threatening ways of offering students the possibility of changing partners at some point over the duration of the project. For instance, coordinators can hold an event in the middle of a project for everyone in the project to attend and ask if they want to change partners. Here, it is important to frame partner change as voluntary and normal, explaining that their failure to engage in effective communication may not be their or their partner’s fault but simply an issue of compatibility. Another solution is to monitor participants’ interaction and provide some pedagogical intervention to those who seem to be suffering from incompatible conversational styles. In this study, as the coordinator and researcher, I intervened with Edwin after their interaction in Session 2 upon realizing that their interaction was not reciprocal (see Appendix D for the timeline of this exchange with Edwin). I decided to intervene with Edwin, and not both Edwin and Hiroyuki, because, upon watching their English interaction (i.e., the first half of Session 2), I had assumed that intervening with the language expert (i.e., Edwin) would smooth their interaction. Since interaction is a collaborative act between conversational participants, however, the intervention should have been given to both participants. In addition, their interaction should have been monitored throughout the semester and the intervention be given when considered appropriate. Although Edwin felt that their interaction improved, as he said in his reflection of Session 3, “overall this week’s session marked a massive improvement in communication, I think…” the one-time intervention did not hold its effect over the duration of the project. This indicates that, especially for the dyads who
may be suffering from incompatible conversational styles, the coordinator need to watch their interaction closely and provide support when considered appropriate.
8.6. Limitations

In this section, I will discuss the limitations of this study that are worth bearing in mind when interpreting the present findings. I will also illustrate what could have been done in terms of project design, the quality of data, and data analysis.

8.6.1. Project Design

In the current project, participants spoke English first and then switched to Japanese. This inevitably granted English-speaking participants more power, initiative, and control over a task as a language expert in the first 30 minutes of the session. It is possible that this arrangement made some Japanese participants feel powerless and discouraged when in the role of a language novice. In addition, since participants talked about a theme of the week in English first, it is possible that they had more content to talk about in English than in the latter half of the session in Japanese. In other words, it is possible that English speakers had more power as a cultural expert, as well. Hence, Hiroyuki, who felt inadequate and did not reap the affordances of eTandem when participants switch conversational roles, might have felt differently if the order of languages was reverse, in which case he could have started the session in Japanese as a language expert. It is thus suggested that future projects reverse the order of languages every week in order to reciprocate their language expertise positions.

8.6.2. Data

In the current eTandem project, the participants video-record and submitted their sessions to the author using a function of Google Hangouts on Air. The technical affordance of Google Hangouts allowed only one speaker to be video-recorded. That is, in using Google Hangouts, it
was not possible to capture the simultaneous movement of two participants. However, in alignment with the convention of video data analysis and, more importantly, to understand how bodily conduct and speech of both participants synchronize with each other’s, it is important for future research to choose a videoconferencing platform that allows both participants’ bodily conduct to be captured simultaneously.

In this study, I only provided a speculative account of participants’ digital literacy based on the interactional evidence. However, it is important that any technology-mediated language learning activities measure participants’ digital literacies and technological needs when setting up a technology-mediated project (González-Lloret, 2014). Thus, future research should examine participants’ digital literacy levels and measure their e-readiness (Mehran et al., 2017) using quantitative and qualitative means. Quantitative data can be collected via a questionnaire (e.g., Koc & Barut, 2016; Fageeh, 2011; Winke & Goertler, 2008) but should be supplemented by qualitative data (e.g., interview), as participants’ e-readiness is context-bound and highly contingent upon socioeconomic, institutional, and demographic factors (Mehran et al., 2017).

8.6.3. Data Analysis

This study adopted a case study approach to analyzing the three dyads’ interactional experiences over the span of 10 weeks (and beyond). Although this study provided a rich account of what happened to the six participants based on the analysis of various sources of data, it is certainly limited in the number of participants analyzed. In order to see if the findings of this research can be applicable to other participants in the project and to other eTandem contexts, future research may target one of the reciprocity constructs identified in this study and analyze more participants using both qualitative and quantitative methods.
8.7. Future Directions

In this section, I will to list a few areas of inquiry whose in-depth analysis would advance the research on SLA and discourse analysis and suggest future directions reciprocity research in eTandem should take given the insights gained from conducting the study.

8.7.1. Establishing the Relationship Between Reciprocity and Learning

It must not be forgotten that the goal of the present study was to illuminate the much invoked but poorly understood concept of reciprocity, and as such, no evidence was sought of whether higher degrees of reciprocity result in better language or culture learning, even though this is the link that ultimately researchers assume eTandem promotes. In the past, however, I have engaged in quantitative analyses of the same eTandem project from which the data for the qualitative analyses in this dissertation come (Akiyama & Saito, 2016; Saito & Akiyama, 2017). Thus, some limited observations can be made about the measured linguistic gains that these L2 learners made as a group out of the present eTandem exchange. Using a quasi-experimental design involving a comparison group who engaged in take-home assignments without any oral practice, Saito and Akiyama (2017) found that the 15 least proficient of the 30 eTandem students in the Japan site, including Hiroyuki, and Yoko, outperformed the comparison group on English comprehensibility gains over the 10 weeks, with comprehensibility defined as ease of understanding (Derwing & Munro, 2009) and measured via five NS raters’ intuitive judgment. Akiyama and Saito (2016) also measured the development of comprehensibility quantitatively, this time with all 30 learners of Japanese in the U.S. site, thus including Benjamin, Edwin, and Amy. The approach was to collect blind ratings of comprehensibility of some of the video interactions at the beginning and end of the eTandem experience in order to establish any
improvement over time, and if improvement was found, to find out the best linguistic correlates of comprehensibility gains (e.g., lexical sophistication, lexical richness, morphological accuracy, and fluency). Akiyama and Saito found that only a subset of the 30 participants improved comprehensibility, and that fluency measures provided the best correlates for that improvement. While both Saito and Akiyama (2017) and Akiyama and Saito (2016) measured the development of comprehensibility and found evidence that L2 learning in this area took place for at least the less proficient group of English learners in Japan and a subset of Japanese learners in the U.S., it is impossible to establish any direct link between the kinds of qualitative findings uncovered in the present study and the measured gains in the quantitative studies.

In the current study, I used the discourse analytical techniques to re-define and operationalize reciprocity and understand its nature in eTandem interactions. The findings revealed various aspects of interaction that past studies looking into reciprocity quantitatively did not explore sufficiently. This suggests that different research lenses and research purposes offered different insights into the same empirical reality. As it is my hope that reciprocity will become a theoretical construct that interests not only discourse analysts and eTandem researchers but also researchers in the quantitative SLA paradigm, the next step forward would be to take an interdisciplinary approach and examine the validity of the construct by linking the relationship between the enactment of reciprocity and the outcome of language (and cultural) learning. An appropriate quantitative strategy may be to group dyads by quantitatively measured equality in a whole session, within a language part, and within a role-taking configuration, and try to relate these patterns statistically to learning outcomes. Or it may be possible to compare the independently measured linguistic or cultural learning of dyads whose interactional patterns were mostly “instructional” vs. those who were “collaborative,” or dyads with similar vs. not
compatible conversational styles. Future research can also take a case study approach to those dyads who made the greatest and least gains in comprehensibility or some other aspect of language and/or intercultural knowledge and analyze their interaction from the reciprocity perspective.

8.7.2. The Effectiveness of Reciprocity Training and Its Impact on Learning

The next step after revealing the relationship between the enactment of reciprocity and language and cultural learning would be to examine the effectiveness of participant training on the enactment of reciprocity. As discussed in the Pedagogical Implications section above, participant training can be on listenership, redirection of questions, and corrective feedback, all of which were found to be related to the enactment of reciprocity in this study. It would be also interesting to examine whether having a training session on the value of critical dialogue (Helm, 2013), intercultural miscommunication (Ware & Kramsch, 2005), and conversational style (Tannen, 2005) would make participants engage in more instances of mutual revelation and potentially face-threatening discursive moves.

Finally, it would be a fruitful area of inquiry to examine if digital literacy training leads to the improvement of reciprocity. For this, coordinators can provide digital literacy training to a group of participants, analyze the effectiveness of the training on the enactment of reciprocity during an ongoing interaction, and examine if the group made more language and cultural gains than the other group that did not receive the same training. It may also be interesting to include digital literacy learning as an objective of eTandem as in other technology-mediate language learning projects (Ortega, 2017).
8.7.3. The Impact of Bilingual Practices on Reciprocity

This study revealed that participants’ departure from a NS vs. NNS dichotomy encouraged them to adopt a bilingual speaker identity and promoted language mixing. Future research can delve into the role of language mixing for the enactment of reciprocity and for the development of social interaction and language/cultural learning. For instance, Tudini (2016) revealed that participants used code-switching to correct errors and socialize with each other. Ke (2016) found that his Japanese and Taiwanese participants used English as a lingua franca but occasionally mixed in a few Chinese or Japanese words to familiarize themselves with each other’s native language. As such, it would be interesting to reveal the purposes for which participants use their bilingual resources and how the bilingual practices change over time in relation to the enactment of reciprocity.

8.7.4. The Impact of Individual Differences and Socioinstitutional Factors on Multimodality and the Enactment of Reciprocity

The findings of this study suggest that multimodality in the form of multimodal bricolage and cross-modal intertextual links (i.e., the use of a prior text across different modalities) has a positive impact on participants’ social interaction. Future research may engage in a more in-depth analysis of multimodality and reveal its facilitative effects as well as potentially inhibitory effects in relation to participants’ individual differences and socioinstitutional factors (O’Dowd & Ritter, 2006). For instance, it is possible that people whose digital literacy level is relatively low may feel overwhelmed with multimodality and do not benefit from an excessive amount of it. It is also likely that participants’ multimodal competence (Ke, 2016) is influenced by a particular videoconferencing platform. For instance, as Ke (2016) found that having access to
various semiotic resources, such as audio, visual, and text communication, allowed the Japanese and Taiwanese EFL participants to mix languages for socialization and apply their linguistic knowledge into functional use.

8.7.5. Adopting the Interactional Sociolinguistics Approaches to Analyzing Reciprocity

The analysis of the eTandem data revealed the great advantage of adopting theoretical concepts used widely in interactional sociolinguistics such as framing (Goffman, 1974), footing (Goffman, 1981), epistemics (Raymond & Heritage, 2006), and intertextuality (Becker, 1995; Kristeva, 1980). For instance, framing, namely “a definition of a situation” (Goffman, 1974, p. 10), was particularly useful in analyzing what the participants thought they were doing in the ongoing interaction, whether it was language learning/teaching, cultural learning/teaching, or playing. The framing analysis, as opposed to the analysis of unilateral vs. crossed expertise configurations (Cappellini, 2016; Cappellini & Mompean, 2015) that is based on language and cultural expertise, would allow researchers to see a dynamic change in how the situation is defined within a role-taking configuration. Footing, which focuses on participant alignments, was found to be suitable for analyzing participants’ situated conversational roles that are “locally occasioned and prone to negotiation” (Park, 2007, p. 354). It also allowed me to analyze not only such labels as “NS vs. NNS” and “cultural/language expert vs. novice” but also more situated identities as a footing of a bilingual speaker, interviewer/interviewee, joker/co-joker, and gaming expert/novice. Accordingly, it would be fruitful for future research to adopt these concepts in examining, for instance, how participants used the bilingual structure of eTandem for socialization, how and when they provided corrective feedback, and how they engaged in conversational repair using various multimodal resources.
In addition, epistemics (Raymond & Heritage, 2006) was found to be useful for analyzing the impact of knowledge levels between participants. Potential topics of investigation include the knowledge of one’s L1 and TL, knowledge of one’s own culture and the partner’s culture, and prior experience (e.g., experience playing a computer game). This study found that the successful dyad resolved epistemic asymmetries (Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2014) by juggling frames and thus by reciprocating the power of knowledge, and this created more equal opportunities to participate (see Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2014 for a similar finding regarding game play and Sierra, 2016, for a related finding in conversation among friends). Future research may investigate the dynamic and complex interplay of these different domains of knowledge on participants’ interaction. Likewise, epistemic status (i.e., relative access to the domain of knowledge, Raymond & Heritage, 2006) allows researchers to take a relativistic view to cultural expertise. Since being from a certain area of the world does not mean that the person knows about the culture better than his/her partner, especially in this globalized world where domestic and international boundaries are becoming ever more blurred, it seems crucial that we take a relativistic view to the level of cultural knowledge and analyze its impact on participants’ interaction, instead of assuming that a person knows more about the culture if s/he grew up in the country.

Finally, intertextuality (Becker, 1995; Kristeva, 1980), more specifically, cross-modal intertextuality that was established by participants’ interacting in and outside the Google Hangouts environment, turned out to be one of the key ingredients for establishing a strong, sustainable partnership. Past research on intertextuality, namely “prior text” (Becker, 1995), has revealed that shared access to previous language experiences aids in the creation of involvement and helps create a social group as well as group identity (Gordon, 2009; Sierra, 2016). Based on
the analysis of the three dyads’ interaction, this study also found that the dyads who established intextuality across multiple modalities (i.e., those who established cross-modal intextual links) were the participants whose partnership was sustainable and who formed a community of practice. Future research should take a holistic approach to analyzing eTandem participants’ interactional experience and analyze not only videoconferencing interaction but also their interaction via email, instant messaging applications, and social networking sites. Only when we uncover the complex array of social interactions that span online, can we truly understand participants’ reciprocity.
8.8. Conclusion

We also live in a world where connecting with physically-dislocated intercultural peers has never been easier thanks to the use of technological affordances. However, the very technological mediation that connects us all can create formidable challenges when it comes to feeling connected. Because we live in such a digitally advanced age, one question we may ask is what is it that makes online comity (i.e., establishment and maintenance of friendly relationships) possible. “Reciprocity” seems to be one of the key constructs that facilitate the formation of human relationships, through which we learn languages and cultures, or for which we learn them.

This study examined the role of reciprocity in a video-mediated intercultural exchange project between U.S. learners of Japanese and Japanese learners of English. I took a case study approach to analyzing the discourse of three dyads who demonstrated contrasting interactional behaviors and perceptions about the project. Based on the insights gained from theories of SLA, CA-for-SLA, interactional sociolinguistics, and multimodal discourse analysis, I answered three research questions: (1) what is reciprocity and how it is enacted and accomplished, (2) what factors mediate the enactment of reciprocity, and (3) what aspects of reciprocity seem more amenable to change than others in 10 weeks of the eTandem project.

The analysis of discourse data showed that the participants enacted reciprocity beyond its traditional sense using not only linguistic but also non-linguistic resources such as bodily conduct, the material surround, and technological affordances. The most successful dyad’s interactions were characterized by a collaborative interactional pattern and maximization of technological affordances that afforded virtual joint attention and cross-modal intertextual links. Their interaction also exhibited various forms of situated reciprocity such as mutual revelation,
listenership that allowed the speaker to recipient design his talk, and redirection of questions that shifted cultural expertise positions and enabled the dyad to change footings. They were both capable of juggling multiple frames to make their knowledge schemas compatible, demonstrating discursive practices of a “dexterous speaker” (Goffman, 1981, p. 156) who was capable of shifting between multiple footings in accordance with a topic of discussion. Their frequent use of code-switching also indicated their bilingual identity that allowed them not to be bound by the dichotomous labels of being a NS vs. NNS, which in turn prompted them to focus on both language and cultural learning.

Meanwhile, the least successful dyad’s interactions were characterized by a disproportionate conversational contribution by the U.S. participant and silences by the Japanese participant, mainly due to the incompatibility of their conversational styles. This was observed in both the English and Japanese parts of a session and whether they were talking about Japan or the U.S., suggesting that proficiency played a lesser role than conversational style. The only time they broke away from this vicious cycle was when they were in the “language teaching and learning” frame and when the NS performed a duty as a language expert by recipient designing the talk. Another occasion when the vicious cycle did not affect their interaction was when the dyad members resorted to the use of the material surround and bodily conduct as a compensatory device to match their communicative intentions with expressive means at their disposal. Although the object mediation of a dictionary helped the dyad achieve mutual understanding and equalize their turn distribution, it reduced the sense of social presence, an idea that is closely related to mutuality and thus reciprocity.

Finally, the third dyad, who initially overemphasized the language-learning aspect of eTandem and struggled to establish comity, became one of the most successful and invested
dyads after resolving a “critical incident” that occurred when the U.S. participant came out as lesbian and the dyad engaged in a reflective dialogue about their respective sexual identities using constructed dialogue to reenact an earlier part of their conversation. The experience of achieving mutual understanding via code-switching made the participants realize the importance of focusing on intercultural understanding and fully exploiting each other’s bilingual resources. After the incident, they started to focus not only on language learning but also on the social side of eTandem, which led to the establishment of a community of practice. As members of the community, they recognized themselves and each other as equally struggling language learners, equally supportive language experts, and most of all, a bilingual speaker.

Based on these findings, I discussed how the three dyads’ reciprocity was enacted in terms of (1) quantitative equality, (2) qualitative equality, (3) interactional patterns based on the two indices of equality and mutuality, (4) exchanged behavior (e.g., speakership and listenership, mutual revelation), and (5) compatibility/sharedness. It was found that the traditional sense of reciprocity, operationalized as the purely quantitative balance of turns and topic shifts, did not fully capture the true nature of reciprocity in eTandem, as reciprocity is a multifaceted construct that is influenced by various factors (e.g., use of technological affordances, conversational topics, positioning) which change in a situated manner within a given interaction session. I thus argued that reciprocity be analyzed as a dynamic, situated practice. I also called for recognition of the importance of taking a holistic approach to analyzing participants’ interactions and examining how their social interactions expand beyond the designated modality or official sphere for a curricular project (i.e., Google Hangouts in this study), as extracurricular interactions may reveal the development of their reciprocity in the qualitative equality sense and development of bilingual identities. Finally, I also highlighted the impact of technology mediation on the
enactment of reciprocity, demonstrating that the way participants use technological affordances can greatly change the interactional experience of participants. It is my hope that the findings of this study will help eTandem participants and coordinators plan future interactions that can maximize the potential of reciprocity and form online intercultural partnerships that afford opportunities to use languages and “see” the world for themselves.
### Appendix A. Reflection Journal

**Corrective Feedback Sheet**  
*COMPLETE THIS SECTION AFTER ENGLISH INTERACTION (5 minutes)*

1. How often and what types of errors did you correct?  
2. If you remember some example errors, write them down as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>● 2 (partner’s grammar did not have many overt errors, but sentences were simple)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Vocabulary (Word choice) | 11111 | 5     | ● Said story to mean about yourself  
● Overtime got replaced for all the time  
●  
●  
● |
| Pronunciation       | 11111111 | 9     | ● pronunciation of “introduce”  
● vei bik = very big  
● hanbaga = hamburger  
●  
●  
● |

*COMPLETE THIS SECTION AFTER JAPANESE INTERACTION (5 minutes)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did you notice about your...?</th>
<th>Who said it? (Check as many as you want)</th>
<th>Was this new to you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pronunciation                     | My partner  
Me  
In the visuals  
Yes, new  
No, I’ve heard of it  
No, knew it | x  
x  
x  
x  
x  

1. Long vs. short sounds are hard in context  
2. uh could sound like wa (topic marker)  
3. English stress accent comes through  
4.  
5.  

| Grammar | My partner  
Me  
In the visuals  
Yes, new  
No, I’ve heard of it  
No, knew it | x  
|---------|--------------------------|----------------------|
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Wanted to overuse da/desu</th>
<th>x</th>
<th></th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Casual vs. polite forms was confusing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overused past tense</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relative clauses</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. mou vs. mada is confusing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vocabulary**

| 1. Tried to use literal words for an idiom | x |  | x |
| 2. sukioshi jikan for sugu ni (soon) (awkward phrasing) | x |  | x |
| 3. owarimashou for jikan desu ne | x |  | x |
| 4. had no idea how to say “anachronistic” | x |  | x |
| 5. Japanese word for common | x |  | x |

**Content**

| 1. bukatsudou | x |  | x |
| 2. Family | x | x | x |
| 3. What the university is like | x | x | x |
| 4. Anime | x | x | x |
| 5. General favorite subjects | x | x | x |

**Reflection Questions**

*COMPLETE THIS SECTION AFTER INTERACTION*

(A) Self-assessment

Please rate the following statements on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

1. I enjoyed today’s session.
   1 2 3 4 5

2. I am satisfied with my general performance today as a learner.
   1 2 3 4 5

3. I am satisfied with my general performance today as a tutor.
   1 2 3 4 5

4. I corrected my partner’s errors that hinder communication.
   1 2 3 4 5

5. My partner corrected most of my errors that hinder communication.
   1 2 3 4 5
6. I was familiar with today’s theme (Japanese culture).
   1 2 3 4 5

7. I was familiar with today’s theme (American culture).
   1 2 3 4 5

8. The visual-based task in Japanese was difficult.
   1 2 3 4 5

9. The visual-based task in English was difficult.
   1 2 3 4 5

10. How long did it take to prepare for the session today?
    (1) To search for two visuals: 5 hours
    (2) To prepare for the session (e.g., vocabulary): 0 hours

Other Comments: ______________________________________________________________

(B) Contact hours

1. Approximately how long did you study Japanese in class this week?
   _____2.5_____ hours

2. Approximately how long did you study Japanese outside the class this week (e.g., homework)?
   _____2____ hours

3. Approximately how long did you use Japanese with nonnative speakers of Japanese outside the class?
   _____0____ hours

4. Approximately how long did you use Japanese with native speakers of Japanese outside the class?
   _____0____ hours

5. Approximately how long did you use Japanese with your partner outside the set curriculum?
   _____0____ hours

(C) Reflection

Think of good examples from today’s session that show what you have learned about communicating with your partner.

During the first session I didn’t really try correcting my partner because it was time to get to know each other, but this time I learned that I’m pretty effective at making corrections, or at least Hiroki is good at taking corrections and actually understanding them. It was also interesting discussing the two cultures - we discussed transportation and housing, and even things so basic like these seem to be very different. The way we react is interesting - Hiroki seems to be very surprised to hear about many of the things I say (unless that is just more aitzuchi), while I, having had contact with Japan and Japanese culture for a while, knew most of the things he discussed, like the attendents pushing people onto the train, or all about yelling chikan on a train, etc.
### Appendix B. Pre-session Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Session Time (Japan)</th>
<th>Session Time (U.S.)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Visual Link (Japan)</th>
<th>Visual Link (U.S.)</th>
<th>Questions about Visual (Japan)</th>
<th>Questions about Visual (U.S.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1       | 9 am 8 pm            | Self introduction  | n/a   | n/a                 |                     | 1. 浩君のうちと比べて、この居間は大きいか小さいと思いますか。  
2. マンションとアパートのサイズどのように違いますか。 | 1. 飼うことができるなら、ペットを飼いたいですか。  
2. クリスマスに何をしますか。家族は宗教ではないけど、クリスマスにプレゼントをあげて、一緒に晩ご飯を食べて、話し合う、などなどすることと思う。KFCを食べますか。 |
| 2       | 9 am 8 pm            | life styles         | See below | See below |                     | 1. 中学校で高校の入学試験を受けなきゃいけなかったか。アメリカで入学試験がある高校が少ないと思う。私の高校はちゅうせんから選びました。  
2. 日本人は高校に行か | 1. あなたは高校で何の部活動をしましたか。そして、部活動とサークルはどう違いますか。新聞、もぎ国連  
4. 塾の経験はどうでしたか。アメリカの高校生は塾がありませんが試験の練習に行く。 |
| 3       | 9 am 8 pm            | Education k-12      |       |                     |                     |                                |                                |
| 4 | 9 am | 8 pm | diversity, religion, fashion | 1. どうして日本人はぶっきょうが大好きですか。しんごん、じょうど。
   2. キリスト教はあまり人気がない。どうして？ |

| 5 | 9 am | 7 pm | university life | 1. 日本の大学生は国際政治の事は面白いと思いますか。（私は先週末のもぎ国連会議について話す）
   2. 大学生はパーティに行きますか。どこで？ |

| 6 | 9 am | 8 pm | | 1. 日本ではユニクロはつまりなくて、安い服知られているが、アメリカではユニクロは居間目新しい。
   2. 何のブランドは人気がありますか。 |
## Appendix C. Transcription Conventions

### Japanese Transcription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Code descriptions</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>。</td>
<td>Japanese period</td>
<td>Falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>、</td>
<td>Japanese comma</td>
<td>Continuing intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>？</td>
<td>Question mark</td>
<td>Rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’</td>
<td>Single quotation mark</td>
<td>Rising intonation stronger than a comma but weaker than a question mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>あい</td>
<td>Underlined word</td>
<td>Emphasized speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>～</td>
<td>Wavy line</td>
<td>Prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them; extended ending typical of Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>“h” in parenthesis</td>
<td>Aspiration or laughter inside word boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word°</td>
<td>Word between degree signs</td>
<td>Self-directed speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ー</td>
<td>N dash</td>
<td>A sharp cut-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Equal sign</td>
<td>A latching (when two lines by different speakers are connected) or continuing speech (when two lines by the same speaker are connected by equal signs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[word] [word]</td>
<td>Set of lined-up brackets</td>
<td>Beginning and ending of simultaneous or overlapping speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>Single parenthesis</td>
<td>Silence represented in tenths of a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>Triple x’s</td>
<td>Inaudible talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(スピーチ)</td>
<td>Speech in parenthesis</td>
<td>A guess at what might have been said if unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((gaze))</td>
<td>Double parenthesis</td>
<td>Non-speech activity or transcription comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>Shaded words</td>
<td>Repetitions between speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>Squared</td>
<td>Where the bodily conduct was produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↗ ↘</td>
<td>Upward and downward arrows</td>
<td>Head nods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@@@@@</td>
<td>At mark</td>
<td>Normal laughing (out of embarrassment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### English Transcription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Code descriptions</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Comma</td>
<td>Continuing intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Question mark</td>
<td>Rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'</td>
<td>Single quotation mark</td>
<td>Rising intonation stronger than a comma but weaker than a question mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD</td>
<td>All caps</td>
<td>Emphasized speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>::</td>
<td>Double semi-colon</td>
<td>Prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>“h” in parenthesis</td>
<td>Aspiration or laughter inside word boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦word◦</td>
<td>Word between degree signs</td>
<td>Self-directed speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−</td>
<td>N dash</td>
<td>A sharp cut-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Equal sign</td>
<td>A latching (when two lines by different speakers are connected) or continuing speech (when two lines by the same speaker are connected by equal signs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[word] [word]</td>
<td>Set of lined-up brackets</td>
<td>Beginning and ending of simultaneous or overlapping speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>Single parenthesis</td>
<td>Silence represented in tenths of a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>Triple x’s</td>
<td>Inaudible talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(speech)</td>
<td>Speech in parenthesis</td>
<td>A guess at what might have been said if unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((gaze))</td>
<td>Double parenthesis</td>
<td>Non-speech activity or transcription comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>Shaded words</td>
<td>Repetitions between speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[word]</td>
<td>Squared</td>
<td>Where the bodily conduct was produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑ ↓</td>
<td>Upward and downward arrows</td>
<td>Head nods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@@</td>
<td>At mark</td>
<td>Normal laughing (out of embarrassment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Timeline of Coordinator’s Exchanges with Edwin

1. October 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2014: Session 2

2. October 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 2014: Email from coordinator to Edwin after Session 2
   
   How did your session go? I thought I might check in with you about your last session. Watching the video, I noticed that you two might be having difficulty communicating. If you need help, let me know!

3. October 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 2014: Email response from Edwin to coordinator
   
   Hi, thank you for your help. I’d love to practice how to talk to my partner.

4. October 7\textsuperscript{th}, 2014: Intervention
   
   The intervention was about an hour and took place at the school library where the coordinator provided counseling to Edwin, asking what he thinks is the reason for miscommunication and what he thinks he can do to improve the interaction. Then, the coordinator suggested that Edwin engage in wait time, speak slowly, and reduce the complexity of his English sentences. Edwin actually practiced this with his coordinator.

5. October 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2014: Session 3

6. October 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2014: Edwin’s reflection journal after Session 3
   
   Overall this week’s session marked a massive improvement in communication, I think… Breaking up my sentences into pieces, removing subordination, and reducing the complexity of my vocabulary made conversation go much more smoothly… If I want to improve communication even further I can use vocabulary that only has a literal correspondence in meaning, for example, using difficult instead of hard to describe something, so there is no ambiguity, as happened briefly in this week’s session. I’ve also learned that I speak too fast and I may need to wait for my partner and articulate more…

7. December 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2014: Post-project interview

   Coordinator: “Would you want to do this exchange project again?”
   Edwin: “Well… I would participate if I could get another partner.”

   Coordinator: “So, even after our meeting, your interaction with your partner didn’t go well?”
   Edwin: “It did improve. Definitely. But, I didn’t feel comfortable with my partner because he didn’t use aizuchi. Although I got used to it in the end, I felt very bad in the first couple of sessions because of that.”

   Coordinator: “Why is it that aizuchi so important to you?”
   Edwin: “Umm... because we learned that Japanese people use aizuchi a lot in conversation. I lost confidence in my communicative ability, because I thought my partner didn’t use aizuchi because he wasn’t interested in me.”

   Coordinator: “Interesting… Do you think you would have felt the same way with an American interlocutor?”
   Edwin: “Well… yes and no. I think it depends, but I guess I’d be less concerned about it.”
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