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ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the potential of synchronous computer-mediated communication (SCMC) to promote pragmatic competence among language learners in a higher education context. Specifically, the development of their L2 address system and their interactive resources to display closeness when engaged in communication with L1 speakers. Through Conversation Analysis (CA), the sequential organization of SCMC between L1 speakers of Spanish and L2 Spanish learners was analyzed to discover what type of address behavior they exhibited, as well as documenting any change in their pragmalinguistic resources and patterns of interaction. Eight weeks of SCMC between US students of Spanish and L1 Spanish speakers in Spain were microanalyzed through Conversation Analysis (CA). The data illustrate how students engaged in organized meaningful interaction, employing a turn-taking system borrowed from oral communication but re-shaped and adapted to the medium, much in the same way that L1 speakers do.

As for address behavior, the data revealed that L1 speakers consistently used informal pronouns and verb morphology, while employing a variety of resources to do ‘being close’. The learners’ data presented two distinctive groups. The first displayed large variety in their use of formal and informal address forms. A longitudinal exploration revealed that, in order for learners to develop proficiency in the use of the Spanish address system, a minimum amount of interaction is needed. The students’ knowledge of the address system at the beginning of the study may also be a determinant on the ratio of development, as well as personal attitude and their first language. In addition, learning seemed to happen when there was explicit focus on the address forms. For those students that already used informal address behavior at the onset of the study, the data revealed that students
developed a variety of resources to do 'being close' in the co-construction of interaction with collaborative L1 speakers. The findings suggest that SCMC can be a valuable tool for the development of the Spanish system, especially in context with limited access to L1 speakers and other resources vital for the development of L2 address behavior.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments ............................................................................................................. v
Abstract .......................................................................................................................... vii
List of tables ...................................................................................................................... xiv
List of figures ..................................................................................................................... xv

## Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. Rationale and significance of study ................................................................. 1
1.2. Scope and findings .............................................................................................. 3
1.3. Contributions of the study ................................................................................... 5
1.4. Organization ......................................................................................................... 6

## Chapter 2: Background

2.1. Introduction ......................................................................................................... 8
2.2. Address behavior ................................................................................................. 9
    2.2.1 Address behavior as a form of affiliation .................................................... 9
    2.2.2. Pronominal address behavior ................................................................. 10
    2.2.3. Studies of Spanish address systems ....................................................... 13
    2.2.4. Studies of address behavior in Spain ................................................... 15
    2.2.5. Other forms of doing being close ......................................................... 17
    2.2.6. Closeness and intimacy through SCMC ............................................ 18
2.3. Pragmatic development of address behavior .................................................... 19
    2.3.1. L1 developmental studies of address behavior ..................................... 20
    2.3.2. L2 pragmatic development ................................................................. 21
    2.3.3. SCMC and pragmatic development ................................................... 23
    2.3.4. L2 Pragmatic instruction ................................................................. 29
2.4. Synchronous computer-mediated communication ............................................. 30
    2.4.1. Introduction .......................................................................................... 31
    2.4.2. SCMC and SLA ................................................................................... 31
    2.4.3. Cross-cultural studies in SCMC ......................................................... 34
2.5. Conversation Analysis ......................................................................................... 35
Chapter 5: L1 speakers' address behavior

5.1. Introduction ..................................................................... 85

5.2. Doing being close .......................................................... 85
  5.2.1. Sharing reports of activities ................................. 86
  5.2.2. Discussing personal problems ............................... 87
  5.2.3. Recognition of shared knowledge ......................... 87
  5.2.4. Shared laughter ...................................................... 88

5.3. Doing being closer: Intimacy .......................................... 89
  5.3.1. Elaboration of a problem ....................................... 89
  5.3.2. Shared laughter ..................................................... 90
  5.3.3. Use of improprieties followed by shared laughter .... 91

5.4. Address pronouns and verb morphology ......................... 93

5.5. L1 speakers doing 'being close' ...................................... 93
  5.5.1. Sharing personal activities ................................... 94
  5.5.2. Asking for updates ................................................. 99
  5.5.3. Displaying interest as a second pair-part ............... 101
  5.5.4. Discussing personal problems ............................... 103
  5.5.5. Sympathy uptake .................................................. 107
  5.5.6. Recognition of shared knowledge ......................... 109
  5.5.7. Joking and sharing laughter .................................. 112

5.6. Doing 'being closer': Intimacy ........................................ 116
  5.6.1. L1 speakers' use of improprieties and slang ........... 116
  5.6.2. Flirting ............................................................... 117
    5.6.2.1. Sonia and Heyo ............................................ 118
    5.6.2.2. Meme and Chiso .......................................... 122

5.7. Doing 'being distant' .................................................... 125

5.8. Summary ......................................................................... 127

Chapter 6: Learners' pragmatic development

6.1. Introduction ..................................................................... 129
6.2. Learning the singular informal address system ........................................ 132
  6.2.1. Exposed corrections and pragmatic feedback — Vero’s case .......... 133
  6.2.2. When the L1 speaker did not provide correction ...................... 144
6.3. Learning the plural informal address system — Heyo’s case ............... 151
6.4. Conclusions: Learning and not learning the Spanish address system ..... 160

Chapter 7: From address behavior to affiliation: learning to do ‘being close’

7.1. Introduction .................................................................................. 163
7.2. Interaction with engaging language experts .................................... 163
  7.2.1. Learning to share laughter .................................................... 164
  7.2.2. Learning to share personal information ................................. 173
  7.2.3. Asking for updates .............................................................. 179
  7.2.4. Learning to uptake ................................................................ 181
  7.2.5. Joking and language play to display intimacy ....................... 195
  7.2.6. Use of slang and improprieties to display intimacy ............... 200
7.3. Interaction with ‘non-engaging’ L1 speakers .................................. 204
7.4. Summary .................................................................................... 214

Chapter 8: Discussion and conclusions

8.1. Introduction .................................................................................. 216
8.2. The students’ development .......................................................... 217
8.3. The role of the L1 speaker ............................................................ 220
8.4. SCMC for L2 learning ................................................................. 221
8.5. CA for language learning ............................................................. 222
8.6. Pedagogic implications ............................................................... 223
8.7. Limits of the study ....................................................................... 225
8.8. Future research ........................................................................... 226
  8.8.1. Transferability of pragmatic development to FtoF interaction .... 226
  8.8.2. The use of code-switching in L2 SCMC ................................ 227
  8.8.3. Repairs, corrections and feedback ......................................... 227
  8.8.4. Compliments and identity in SCMC ..................................... 228

Appendix A ......................................................................................... 230

xii
Appendix B ........................................................................................................... 232
Appendix C ........................................................................................................... 235
Appendix D ........................................................................................................... 236
Appendix E ........................................................................................................... 237
Appendix F ........................................................................................................... 241
References ........................................................................................................... 242
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Spanish second person pronominal system. Fernandez Rodriguez (2003)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Time frame for the study</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Continuum of address behavior</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Practices that define from doing 'being distant' to doing 'being close'</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Practices that define the L1 speakers' address behavior</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Instances of address forms by language student</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Distribution of formal and informal forms of address for Vero, Jeff, and Am</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Kim’s use of formal and informal</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Ben and Amaris’ formal and informal use</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Instances of second person forms by the L1 speakers</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Heyo’s use of formal and informal address in person singular contexts</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7 Heyo’s informal and formal use in second person plural context</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Turn allocation for Nico, Jana, and Alex</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Continuum of address pronouns</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Accuracy of use of cases (based on data in Norris, 2001)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Screen shot from Yahoo! Messenger</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Development of Spanish address (operationalized as shift towards informal</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>address use) for those student who displayed little or no variability at the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onset of the study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Development of Spanish address (operationalized as shift towards informal</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>address use) for those student who displayed variability at the onset of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Vero’s use of formal and informal pronouns and verbs by interaction</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Jeff’s use of formal and informal pronouns and verbs by interaction</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Kim’s use of formal and informal pronouns and verbs by interaction</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Ben’s use of formal and informal Spanish address</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Amaris’ use of formal and informal Spanish address</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Ash’s address use</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Ash’s address use with her classmate</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>Ash’s address use with her project partner in Spain</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>Heyo’s informal and formal use in second person singular contexts</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>Heyo’s informal and formal use in second person plural context</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Turn allocation for Nico, Jana, and Alex</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Student placement in address behavior continuum</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

1.1. Rationale and significance of study

Students are becoming citizens of a technological world where they often need to interact with others using a variety of tools. Computer-mediated communication (CMC) is one of the most frequent forms of communication among students today. CMC, in its two varieties, synchronous (chat, video, audio conferencing, Moos, virtual worlds) and asynchronous (email, bulletin boards, blogs, and wikis), has gained popularity as an everyday communication tool among individuals and groups all over the world. As language educators, such tools open tremendous horizons of possibilities, breaking down the walls of the classroom into a broader space filled with language materials and other speakers of the language. However, it is necessary to explore exactly what these possibilities as language tools are and how they fit into second language acquisition theories and methodologies. This study explores the potential of one of these tools, synchronous computer-mediated communication (SCMC), to promote pragmatic competence among US language learners of Spanish in a higher education context.

The potential of SCMC for pragmatic development resides mainly in the possibility that learners have to engage with other speakers of the language, including L1 speakers, which is especially important for the acquisition of social and pragmatic competence. Given the constraints of the discourse in a foreign language classroom, interaction with other speakers through SCMC has real potential to create new social environments in which to develop not only language skills but also interactional
competence. Since more than four million students are currently enrolled in Spanish classes in the United States (Welles, 2004), the potential of this tool is worth exploring.

This study focuses specifically on the development of Spanish address behavior by language learners engaged in interaction with university students in Spain for a semester. Mori (2004b) asks for second language acquisition (SLA) research that would help understand “the process in which learners increase the level of participation in a wider range of SLA interaction” (p. 176). This study contributes to the understanding of such participation in a very common and frequent form of second language interaction: SCMC.

In order to study the address behavior exhibited by US students of Spanish and their interlocutors in Spain for a four month period, Conversation Analysis (CA) was applied. CA allows the researcher to microanalyze the data focusing on the structure of the interaction and the sequential co-construction of the talk by the participants, revealing how they display closeness and distance at any given time during their interaction, and how this may vary longitudinally. According to Markee and Kasper (2004), longitudinal research is “an underpracticed methodology in current CA for SLA work” (p. 495) and they call for a longitudinal perspective “as a necessary area of methodological growth in CA for SLA” (p. 495). This study aspires to contribute to that growth.

Previous literature on the topic suggests that pronouns of address are the main resources to display closeness and distance among interlocutors. However, a preliminary analysis of the present data revealed that the L1 speakers in the study used a variety of interactional resources to display their closeness or distance other than pronouns of address and morphological verb marking.
1.2. **Scope and findings**

Based on a preliminary analysis of the data, sequences that included pronouns of address were analyzed in detail to investigate patterns of use by L1 and L2 participants. The data presented a clear picture of the L1 speakers. They all used consistently informal pronouns and verb morphology when engaged with either one interlocutor (tú, te, tí, tu(s), contigo), or several (vosotros, vuestro(a/s), os). However, the students’ data displayed much more variety. While some students presented great variety in their address system, others were consistent in their use of the singular form but used formal plural forms (ustedes, su, les, 3rd person plural verb morphology) when addressing more than one interlocutor. The longitudinal data afforded the investigation of the development of the students’ address systems, that is, their progress towards their interlocutors’ norms during the four months of their interaction.

The L1 speakers used a variety of resources to do ‘being close’ (Pomerantz & Mandelbaum, 2004) with their interlocutors in addition to their consistent use of informal address pronouns and verb morphology. The sequential analysis of the data revealed that they shared personal information about their activities and personal troubles, and asked for updates on their partner’s activities and schedule. When presented with a personal problem from their interlocutors, the L1 speakers engaged in an adjacency pair sequence, following the trouble talk with an uptake turn (an exclamation, display of sympathy, or request for more information). In addition, the L1 speakers did ‘being close’ by constructing sequences of shared laughter with the other participants.

In a continuum of address behavior between formal and intimate, most groups varied from ‘formal’ to ‘acquaintances’ towards ‘friends’, and two groups displayed
address behavior that rapidly moved from ‘acquaintances’ to ‘friends’ to ‘intimate’; understanding ‘intimate’ here as a relationship with close friends, family members, siblings, or boyfriend/girlfriend. In order to do ‘being closer’ or ‘being intimate’ the language students learned to share laughter, use slang, share personal information, and engage in joking and language play. It is important to note that students’ address behavior developed as a result of the interaction with engaging, collaborative L1 speakers who fostered interactions in which students and L1 experts experienced and co-constructed resources to do ‘being close’.

Additionally, the data revealed that language students with limited linguistic capacity are able to engage in complex and sophisticated SCMC interactions that involve language play, joking, repairs, teasing, and even flirting. They are also able to negotiate the interaction, constituting themselves and their interlocutors through different categories, and orienting to their interaction as conversation and/or pedagogic activity in a moment by moment basis.

Following the growing interest in the application of CA as an approach to L1-L2 conversation, this study demonstrates that CA methodology is valid and adequate for examining not only L1 speaker interaction, but interaction that includes language learners as well. In addition, this study also shows that a CA of longitudinal data can be successfully employed for the study of linguistic and interactional development. As suggested by Kasper (1997), CA may enable us to “reconstruct links between L2 discourse and the acquisition of different aspects of communicative competence” (p 311).
1.3. Contributions of the study

This study contributes to three main areas: synchronous computer mediated communication of language learners, interlanguage pragmatics, and conversation analysis and language development (CA for SLA). This study enhances the growing body of research on the applications and effects of synchronous computer-mediated communication on language learning, especially on sociopragmatic competence (Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Chun, 1994; Kinginger, 2002). It also contributes to studies on interlanguage pragmatics on the development of language learners' address systems (DuFon, 1999; Liddicoat, 2006; Lyster, 1993, 1994; Norris, 2001), adding Spanish to studies on French, German, and Indonesian.

In addition, this study adds to the current debate on CA for SLA. According to Markee and Kasper (2004) it is important for the SLA field to find out "what insights CA may (or may not) have to offer SLA studies" (p. 495). And although several researchers have argued that CA studies are not, or should not be, concerned with learning and acquisition (Gass 2004; Larsen-Freeman 2004; He 2004), several studies have started to explore how CA can contribute to SLA, and how SLA can contribute to CA.

Finally, this study contributes to the recent, and still scarce, research that has applied conversation analysis to SCMC (Golato & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; Rintel et al., 2001; Schönfeldt & Golato, 2003), and especially research that has investigated the interactional SCMC patterns of language learners from a CA perspective (Kitade, 2000; Negretti, 1999).
1.4. Organization

This dissertation is organized as follows: Chapter 2 reviews the main topics and areas of research in the literature that informed this study: (a) address behavior, including pronominal address behavior (and especially in those studies that have focused on address behavior in Spain), and other interactional resources to do ‘being close’; (b) Developmental studies of address behavior (L1 and L2), including those conducted in a SCMC environment; (c) The links between Conversation Analysis and L2 interaction, grammar, pragmatics, and language learning, as well as some fundamental principle of CA relevant to the study; and (d) Cross-cultural and SLA studies in a SCMC mode, as well as the potential of CA to analyze SCMC.

Chapter 3 presents the details of the study: participants, the environment, the tasks, duration of the study, steps taken to obtain permission, procedures to collect and analyze data, as well as how development was measured. It also includes details on transcription conventions.

Chapter 4 explores the sequential organization of SCMC and how students engage in SCMC to construct meaning in their interactions.

Chapter 5 describes the address system used by the L1 speakers in the interaction, as well as those resources they employ to do ‘being close’ and ‘being intimate’. The chapter also presents a few cases of L1 speakers doing ‘being distant’ at the end of a continuum of address behavior between formal and intimate.

Chapter 6 presents the development of students’ addressivity system. It first shows two different tendencies in students’ use of address form: those that presented variation from the onset of the study and those that did not. It then examines the group
that displayed variation and showcases one of the student’s developmental progress towards the use of singular informal address forms. The chapter then examines the role of the L1 speaker in the students’ developmental process. Finally the chapter presents another case study to illustrate a student’s development of the plural informal address system.

Chapter 7 looks at how language students learned to do ‘being close’ when interacting with L1 speakers, through several resources: shared laughter, shared personal information, asking for updates, anduptaking when presented with a problem or trouble talk. In addition, some students developed a closer relationship with their interlocutors and engaged in interactional practices to display ‘being closer’ such as joking, language play, use of slang, and flirting. This chapter also presents the cases of those groups in which L1 speakers and L2 learners did not engage in personal conversation but rather focused mainly on the task to be accomplished.

Finally, Chapter 8 summarizes the findings of the study and its shortcomings. It then discusses pedagogic implications for the language classroom, and proposes lines of future research in the fields of SCMC for second/foreign language learning, CA for SLA, and development of L2 pragmatic and interactional competence.
2.1. Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature associated with the main areas of interest in this study. The first section identifies the literature that has studied address behavior, particularly Spanish address behavior. In addition, this section proposes other forms of affiliation and doing 'being close' and 'being intimate'. This section closes with a few remarks about the potential of SCMC to create affiliation.

The second section concentrates on studies of pragmatic development, both in first (L1) and second language (L2) environments, including those studies that were conducted employing a SCMC environment. Finally, this section presents research on the effects of instruction for L2 pragmatic development.

The third section presents the rationale for using Conversation Analysis (CA) as the research methodology of this study. Some fundamentals of CA relevant to this study are presented as well as studies of second language interaction that have employed a CA. Since the participants in this study are students interacting with L1 speakers of the language as part of their language curriculum, studies in a similar institutional setting and with similar participants are reviewed. Afterwards, this section examines the intersections between CA and grammar, CA and pragmatics, CA and language learning, and CA and SCMC. These two last areas are very recent fields of study, with still much room to grow. Finally, this section presents some methodological issues of using a CA approach to the study of language learning. The last section of the literature review occupies itself with issues of language learning through a SCMC environment as well as a review of relevant
research on the area. The last part of this section shows how this study fits among other similar studies in the field, especially among cross-cultural studies and studies of language interaction through SCMC.

2.2. Address behavior

This section reviews several forms of address behavior to accomplish closeness or distance between participants, from the more traditional pronouns of address to other forms of ‘doing being close’ in consonance with a CA perspective, and closes with discussion of the possibility of applying this activity to a SCMC environment.

2.2.1. Address behavior as a form of affiliation

The idea that interlocutors use multiple sociolinguistic strategies to ‘converge’ or ‘diverge’ from their interlocutors was put forward by Yllänne-McEwen and Coupland (2000) in their extended model of sociolinguistics processes in Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) based on Coupland et al. (1988). In this framework, Yllänne-McEwen and Coupland (2000) consider forms of address to be a strategy to control interpersonal relations. In addition, discourse management strategies help focus on the interlocutor’s conversational needs by attending to content construction (topic-selection, topic-sharing); interpersonal roles (face-maintaining, interactional organization); and the textual dimensions that structure the interaction (turn-managing and cohesion). From a different perspective, Spencer-Oatey’s (2000) presents address behavior as part of a domain (Stylistic domain), essential to create and maintain cross-cultural rapport and affiliation together with four other domains: an illocutionary domain concerned with the production of speech acts, a discourse domain which concerns the
discourse content and structure, a participation domain concerning procedural aspects of the exchange such as turn-taking sequences, and a non-verbal domain which concerns the use of gestures, body language, eye contact, etc. In this framework, affiliation is seen as something dynamic, a performed or achieved activity (Conroy, 1999) which is accomplished by the participants through the interaction on a moment-by-moment basis.

2.2.2. Pronominal address system

According to Braun (1988), addressivity can be accomplished through the use of mainly three forms:

- **Forms of address**: These are pronouns referring to the collocutor(s);
- 2) **Verb forms of address** in which reference to the collocutor is expressed, for example by means of inflectional suffixes; and
- 3) **Nouns of address**, substantives and adjectives which designate collocutors or refer to them in some other way, these include names, kinship terms, titles (p. 7).

Of all these forms, pronouns of address have been the most investigated as indexing address behavior. Pronouns of address were once described quite simply by Brown and Gilman (1960) as a dichotomy between a simple or intimate pronoun of address (T) (from the French *tu*) used to express familiarity/solidarity and intimacy, and a polite, distant or secondary pronoun (V) (from the French *vous*) used to express formality/distance/hierarchy. However, they have proven to be much more complicated (Braun, 1988; Morford, 1997; Mühlhäusser & Harré, 1990). Morford (1997) proposes that the complexity of the pronoun system is due to two different but related orders of indexicality. The first order involves social relationships (solidarity, intimacy, hierarchy), while the second one refers to aspects of the speakers' identity (social class, political orientation).
In these terms, the address system in Spanish is highly complex. Not only does it reflect solidarity and power (Brown and Gilman, 1960), but it also includes geographical and dialectal variations. Spanish address behavior is deeply rooted in the social and historical context of each of the 20 countries and numerous communities where Spanish is used, from the United States to Patagonia, and Spain. Explanations of Spanish address forms vary from very simplistic, especially in the language textbooks (D’Ambrosio, 2004), to highly complicated which try to account for all the existent varieties and uses (See Appendix A). According to Fernandez Rodriguez (2003) there are four partially different systems for the second person forms in Spanish (Table 2.1), depending on the geographical area and whether the speakers prefer the use of ‘tú’ (tuteo), ‘vos’ (voseo) or both.

Table 2.1 Spanish second person pronominal system. Fernandez Rodriguez (2003)

**Pronominal system I: Peninsular norm (Spain)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Solidarity/ Familiarity / Intimacy /Closeness</th>
<th>Formality / Courtesy / Power /Social distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>tú</td>
<td>usted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>vosotros /-as</td>
<td>ustedes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBJECT** | **OBJECT** | **REFLEXIVE** | **PREPOSITIONAL TERM** | **POSSESSIVE**
---|---|---|---|---
| tú | te | te | tú/contigo | tu(s), tuyo/-a(s) |
| usted | lo/la/le | se | usted | su(s), suyo/-a(s) |
| vosotros /-as | os | os | vosotros | vuestro/-a(s) |
| ustedes | los/las/les | se | ustedes | su(s), suyo/-a(s) |

**Pronominal System II: América tuteante (‘tú’ is used)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Solidarity/ Familiarity / Intimacy /Closeness</th>
<th>Formality / Courtesy / Power /Social distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>tú</td>
<td>usted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>ustedes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, Spanish, in contrast with English, allows for the use of null-subjects or the absence of a subject when accompanying a finite verb which is morphologically marked to contain the subject information. In most utterances the “grammatical subject” is implicit in the morphology of the verb which makes the difference in formal and
informal uses not salient for L2 learners, and difficult to use, since it is linked to other morphological markings for tense and aspect.

One more way to mark formal and informal address behavior is through the use of appellative expressions. According to Díaz Pérez (1997) one of the most characteristic phenomena of colloquial language is the use of vocatives to denote closeness or distance, friendliness or reserve among interlocutors. He states also that many vocatives have been 'desemantisied' or 'gramaticalized', that is they are not used with their primary meaning.

A woman can tell another woman of her same age "¡hija mía!" (literally "my daughter") without any reference to the literal relationship. The most frequent vocatives are those from family relationship words, although most of them have been gramaticalized, lost their original meaning, in favor of the use that the speaker wants to offer according to the interlocutor and the context. This allows for great variety of use. As indicated by Díaz Pérez's research, Spanish women use more vocative tokens than men. When men do, it is mainly with women to express affection and intimacy. When men use vocatives with other men, they employ vocatives that are not desemantized such as "tío", "chico", "chaval", "hombre", etc.

2.2.3. Studies of Spanish address system

Turning to first-hand research for a more accurate picture of the Spanish forms of address does not help clarify the matter. Most of the studies undertaken to explore address in Spanish have followed the influential work of Brown and Gilman (1960), and the majority have been descriptive in nature, investigating, usually through questionnaires, the address system in a certain country, area, or community: Argentina

It is difficult to summarize the results of these studies because they all arrive at different conclusions, sometimes even contradictory ones, on who uses what term of address with whom and in which sociocultural situation. For example, while 'usted' is reported to indicate a lack of solidarity in Honduras by Rey (1994), according to Castro (2000) it is used to express high level of solidarity and extreme intimacy. However, from the group of studies as a whole it is clear that the use of terms of address is anything but simple or transparent to the foreigners coming into the community, and it is nothing like the normative forms that we can find in written materials. These studies suggest an extremely variable and complex system, related to personal characteristics such as age and gender, which also seem to vary from country to country (Lambert & Tucker, 1976), and is largely embedded in the sociocultural and economic context of the speakers. Since the students in this dissertation engaged in interaction with L1 speakers of peninsular Spain, it is tempting to assume that the complexity of the Hispanic countries does not
affect their contact with address pronouns. Nevertheless, the chance that the students
have encountered different L1 speakers (even if only their teachers) over the course of
their studies is high.

2.2.4. Studies of address system in Spain

The studies of address focusing on Spain (see Fernandez Rodriguez, 2006 for a
complete bibliography) seem to agree that Spanish speakers in Spain tend to prefer the
use of ‘tú’ as a form of symmetry, democratizing existing power differentials (Uber,
1985), and that social use of pronouns is changing, with the recent generations using
almost exclusively the informal forms (tú and vosotros) (Aguado Canedo, 1981; Alba de
Diego & Sánchez Lobato, 1980; Blas Arroyo, 1994; Fox, 1969; Marín, 1972; Schwenter,
1993). Already in the early 1960s, Brown and Gilman (1960) claimed that the binary
system of T/V was merging towards a unique use of mutual T, and Dámaso Alonso
(1962), one of the first and most famous Spanish linguists and literary critics, wrote
nostalgically about La muerte de “usted” (The death of ‘usted’)

ya por aquellos años antes de 1936 eran evidentes los avances del tuteo. Pero fue
con el desgarrón de España con lo que recibió el impulso decisivo. ... ¿Va a
extinguirse el ‘usted’ en España? ¿Va a quedar relegado a una antigüalla
solamente, una especie de vuecencia?....Otros cambios léxicos tienen menos
importancia. Pero este, expresivo por excelencia de la relación social, no puede
por menos de afectar profundamente al lenguaje, que es, ante todo, un sistema
social de relación. (p. 265-6)

Already in those years before 1936 the advances of the use of tú (tuteo) were
evident. But it was the rift in Spain that gave it the final push. ... Is usted going to
be extinguished in Spain? Is it going to be relegated to an old relic only, some
type of vuecencia (thou-ness)? ... Other lexical changes have less importance. But
this one, expressive par excellence of human relations, can only but deeply affect
the language, which is, above all, a social system for human relations (my
translation).
In a recent study, Rossomondo (2002) collected 77 questionnaires in Madrid from people between 19 and 56 years of age of different socio-economic classes and in different contexts. She followed up with interviews to clarify some of the questionnaire answers, and applied regression analysis to find out which social factors were influencing the choice of 'tú' or 'usted'. She found a symmetrical trend for age, that is, people over 46 gave and receive more 'usted', while younger people used more 'tú' (the same conclusion as most of the studies mentioned above). She also found that professionals engaged in more asymmetrical interaction, receiving more 'usted' and giving more 'tú' than housewives, workers, and university students. Also, with family members 'tú' was exclusively used, and almost exclusively with co-workers. An interesting novelty of Rossomondo's study is that she created three categories for degree of acquaintance: stranger (someone we do not know, for example un/a policia, un/a taxista), acquaintance (someone we know but with whom we do not have a personal relationship un/a cliente, el/la cajera del super,...), and intimate (someone with whom we have any type of relationship). She found that 'tú' was used with intimates and acquaintances and 'usted' only with strangers, therefore claiming that "recognizing a person is sufficient to minimize social distance or create a sense of solidarity" (Rossomondo, 2002, p. 127).

Finally, she reported that gender was not an intervening factor, which conflicts with some of the previous studies that claim a tendency to use more 'tú' by women.

These studies provide a glimpse of how complex and how deeply embedded in sociocultural factors addressivity is. They also show that speakers of a certain community use, adapt, and also transform sociopragmatic forms. The question is then: What do L2 students need to do to develop their pragmatic competence so that they can interact with
other speakers? And what role do the more competent speaker participants play in the process?

In order to answer these questions, in this dissertation I will consider Rossomondo's idea of a category *acquaintance* (with whom you use informal 'tú'), between *strangers* (with whom we usually use formal language) and *intimates*. In addition, I will divide her *intimate* category in two categories: "friendly" (a classmate, a neighbor, a friend of a friend with whom we may have a friendly relationship but we not necessarily convey personal information) and "intimate" in the true sense of the word (i.e., a close friend, a family member, a boyfriend/girlfriend to whom we convey personal and intimate information). According to these categories I will consider participants' address behavior along a continuum between formal and intimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Acquaintance</th>
<th>Friendly</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usted</td>
<td>Tú</td>
<td>Tú</td>
<td>Tú</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1- Continuum of address pronouns

**2.2.5. Other forms of doing ‘being close’**

In addition to address pronouns, there are other techniques utilized by the interlocutors when they engage in interaction to express closeness or distance between them. Distance and closeness here are understood as "subject to the ongoing, step-by-step management within talk between persons; rather than as a state of affairs that underlines their talk" (Maynard & Zimmerman, 1984)

the behavioral requisites for a finding of “intimacy” or “distance” are interactional accomplishments or outcomes that are crafted within talk as a sequential and ritually proper activity. (p. 302)
When people engage in conversation they use their knowledge of relationship categories and their membership in these categories (Sacks, 1992).

The membership categories we are talking about are what Sacks termed ‘inference-rich’. They are the store house and the filing system for the common-sense knowledge that ordinary people -- that means ALL people in their capacity as ordinary people-- have about what people are like, how they behave, etc. This knowledge is stored and accessed by reference to categories of member/person. (Schegloff, 2007b, p. 469)

Interactants engage in actions and practices that are appropriate of that relationship category and they are recognizable as such by them. That is strangers who meet for the first time will engage in activities proper of the category “strangers”, while members of the category “friends” will engage in different activities and actions. These activities are recognized by the participants as specific to a certain membership category and they were termed ‘category-bound activities’ by Sacks (1992).

Category-bound activities: Among the items that compose category-based common-sense knowledge are kinds of activities or actions or forms of conduct taken by the common-sense or vernacular culture to be specially characteristic of a category’s members (Schegloff, 2007b, p. 470).

Therefore, by focusing on the activities, we can study what it is that participants do to act as acquaintances, friends, or intimates, and how are they oriented to by their interlocutors. Doing being distant, close, or intimate are viewed as “activities or actions or forms of conduct taken by the common-sense or vernacular culture to be specially characteristic of a category’s members” (Schegloff, 2007b, pg. 470).

2.2.6. Closeness and intimacy through SCMC

It is well known that people who meet in chatrooms on the Internet develop relationships, cyberdate, and even get married (Barnes, 2001). According to Spencer-
Oatey (2000), being able to handle appropriately non-verbal aspects of an interchange (gestures, body movement, eye contact...) is one of the main domains to manage and maintain rapport. However, SCMC participants, in the absence of such non-verbal aspect, seem to manage to convey feelings and emotions in alternative ways such as the use of emoticons (ASCII characters forming graphic designs), expressions of actions (crying, blinking...), special use of uppercase (to simulate volume increase), acronyms (LOL, UR, 4U), and orthographic marks (!!, ??, @,...) (Barnes, 2001; Wilkins, 1991; Herring, 1996). Researchers have also observed that conversations in an on-line environment are more helpful and social than competitive. Interactive messages seem to be more humorous, contain more self-disclosure, display a higher preference for agreement and contain many more first-person plural pronouns (Rafaeli & Sudweeks, 1998). People engage in playful communication (Danet et al., 1996) and build interpersonal relationships by establishing mutual understanding of each other and shared experiences (Barnes, 2001). Therefore, SCMC seems to be a fruitful environment for the possible development of closeness and intimacy, and the pragmatic resources associated with them.

2.3. Pragmatic development of address behavior

In this section of the literature review, studies dealing with interlanguage pragmatics will be reviewed, in particular studies that have researched the development of address behavior both in first and second language contexts. Then the section will focus on studies that have investigated the topic in connection with on-line environments.
and computer-mediated communication, and finally I will review the role that pragmatic instruction may play in language acquisition.

2.3.1. L1 developmental studies of address behavior

Given the importance that address behavior may have for successful communication, it is surprising how little attention it has received in second language research. In the field of L1 development, a few studies have looked at Spanish pronoun development (Anderson, 1998; Gathercole et al., 2002). These studies suggest that child development of addressivity takes a number of years and progresses in stages (usually subject pronouns appear before object pronouns), but it is also related to the child’s experiences, and the developmental process varies across children.

From the field of grammatical development in SLA, there are few studies devoted to the research of forms of address and not all are developmental in nature. Liceras et al. (1997) open their study by stating: "we do not have studies which analyze the development of Spanish interlanguage from the early stages, either in natural or in institutional learning settings" (p. 99). There are a few studies, generativist in nature, that treat pronouns of address tangentially while focusing mainly on verb morphology (Al-Kasey & Pérez-Leroux, 1998; Liceras, 1996, 2000; Liceras et al., 1997; Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997). The results of these studies suggest that students rely on subject pronouns for identification purposes and to gain time to retrieve verbal forms (Liceras et al., 1997), and the developmental sequence may be "bell shaped", since high-proficiency learners overuse subject pronouns compared to L1 speakers (Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997). Although pronouns of address are linked to the morphology of the verb, morphological
errors seem to be related to difficulty of retrieving the verb form that matches the referent. However, "there is no clear-cut pattern that would allow us to relate the problems of morphology with the use of null subjects or pronoun subjects" (Liceras et al., 1997, p. 114). In addition, the students' L1 seems to play an important role in the production of L2 pronouns (Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997).

2.3.2. L2 pragmatic development

Since Canale and Swain (1980) proposed pragmatic competence as an essential component of communicative competence, the field of pragmatics has produced important theoretical and practical research in the field of second languages, usually under the term 'interlanguage pragmatics'. For Kasper and Rose (1999) interlanguage pragmatics in the field of second language use examines:

> How nonnative speakers comprehend and produce action in a target language. As the study of second language learning, interlanguage pragmatics investigates how L2 learners develop the ability to understand and perform action in a target language. (p. 5)

In Kasper and Schmidt (1996) and Kasper and Rose (2002), the authors summarize results from pragmatic development research suggesting that learners have access to the same range of realization strategies as NSs. They also point out that the development may not be linear but rather "bell-shaped" (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986), which seems to coincide with Pérez-Leroux and Glass's (1997) results. It is important to notice here, that studies on the interlanguage pragmatics of Spanish are scarce. As Koike et al., (2003) point out "There are no published studies on Spanish SLA and deixis" (p. 163). This dissertation aims to contribute to fill the gap in this area of research.
As Kasper and Schmidt (1996) have suggested "It would be a mistake to view developmental issues in ILP [Interlanguage Pragmatics] in purely cognitive terms because the strategies for linguistic action are so closely tied to self-identity and social identity" (p. 165). In addition, recent research from discourse-functional linguistics (Bybee, 2002; Bybee & Hopper, 2001; Tomasello, 2003a, 2003b) suggest that even linguistic items are not part of preexisting mental representations, but rather emerge as responses during the interaction. These perspectives reinforce the idea of pragmatic development as co-constructed and intertwined with the development of interactional competence, considering identity, context, and the construction of knowledge by participants during the interaction. I will discuss further the idea of ‘learning’ under the heading 4.6 CA and language learning, below.

There are a few studies that have investigated the development of L2 forms of address, although none of them specifically study Spanish forms of address. Lyster (1993, 1994) investigated, as part of the effect of functional-analytical teaching of sociolinguistic competence, the development of the formal vous pronoun in a French immersion program in Canada. DuFon's (1999) presents an ethnographic analysis of the development of the Indonesian address system for six learners in a study abroad program. And Norris's (2001) investigated the use of address terms on the German Speaking Test in a cross-sectional study, which provides insightful information about the possible developmental pattern of pronouns of address, even though this was not the main purpose of the study.

These studies suggest that participants generalize the use of one form of address (Lyster 1993, 1994; Norris, 2001), and after several weeks of focused instruction most
students (but not all) can improve their use of formal and informal pronoun forms (Lyster, 1993, 1994), but with great variability among students (DuFon, 1999) and still not at the same level of performance as the L1 speakers (Lyster, 1993, 1994; Norris 2001), which suggests the difficulty of this feature (DuFon, 1999; Norris, 2001). These studies also point out that students use different strategies to cope with the difficulty of the address system such as avoidance, generalized use of one form, and the use of routines or chunk formulas with the pronoun (DuFon, 1999; Norris, 2001).

2.3.3. SCMC and pragmatic development

Julie Belz and Celeste Kinginger have conducted a series of studies, from a sociocultural perspective, all based on data collected during a three-year telecollaborative project among students in the United States, Germany and France. Several investigated the development of the informal pronoun (T) via electronic social contact from a sociocultural perspective (Lantolf, 2000, 2006) through a series of activities in which students in Germany/France and the United States engaged in discussion in small groups of four or five during about fifty days. Belz and Kinginger (2002) presented two case studies of an American student of French and another of German, working in telecollaboration with partners in France and Germany, respectively. In both cases the students (Jennifer and Joe) exhibited free variation on their use of V and T at the beginning of the interaction, in spite of explicit instruction from their teachers about using T with their key-pals. After Jennifer received explicit feedback from her French partner about her incorrect use of T/V, and although the variation persisted for one more message, by her third message she had corrected her pronoun use. Actually, she
overcorrected it, since she failed to use V in required cases. This is consistent with the proposed “bell-shaped” learning by Kasper and Schmidt (1996). At the end of the semester, Jennifer was consistent in her use of the T pronoun. Similarly, Joe wrote messages with free variation between T and V until he received peer assistance from his German partner, Gabi, with whom he was developing a close personal relationship. Belz and Kinginger (2002) point out that this feedback is highly meaningful for Joe; it constitutes a “critical incident with respect to socialization into appropriate T/V use” (p. 9, italics in original). From this instance until the end of the seven weeks, Joe only used V one more time, and it was not when talking to Gabi, but rather with another group member.

In a second report, Belz and Kinginger (2003) presented a group of American students of German engaged in telecollaboration with students in Germany. At the beginning of the interaction, although US students had been explicitly instructed about the use of T forms with other students, and the German students opened and maintained their interactions with T, the U.S. students did not reciprocate with T, and their messages were full of V pronouns. Belz and Kinginger (2003) suggested that this may be explained by a power differential in which the U.S. students viewed the German students in a position of authority since they were older and training to be teachers. When the German students provided peer assistance, explicitly instructing the US students not to use V, there was an abrupt change in five out of the eleven students from V to T which was maintained for the rest of the semester. However, five other participants underwent a gradual change which the authors attributed to a lack of domain of the grammatical system once the sociopragmatics system was understood; and one student persisted in her
use of V until the end of the semester. Belz and Kinginger (2003) presented an explanation for this case based on the fact that this student had regular contact with expert-speaking Germans (father, mother, and relatives in Germany) and probably did not perceive peer assistance as a threat to her positive face and did not pay much attention to it; for Irene “peer assistance may be less likely to serve as a critical moment of noticing” (2003, p. 640).

Belz and Kinginger (2002, 2003) concluded that “it is not rules that must be acquired, but awareness of complexity, sensitivity to social cues, and the form meaning pairings that serve to index this knowledge within particular settings” (p. 12), and that a telecollaborative environment provided the students with the opportunities that they needed to observe appropriate use, receive peer assistance, and practice the forms in a real socially-bound environment.

In a third study, Kinginger (2000) presented data from the same studies above focusing on development of French pronouns. She showed three case studies on how students changed their initial use of V pronouns to T after either receiving explicit feedback from their key-pals or after “peripheral participation” (Lave and Wenger, 1991). Her data confirmed the results of her previous two studies, in which the change in the pragmatic use of the pronouns happened after the participants received specific feedback from their counterparts.

The results reviewed above seem to suggest that the context and the social and individual differences of the participants play an important role in the developmental process and ultimate attainment of addressivity, as well as the complexity of the pragmatic system, and the type of interaction with L1 speakers. Both Belz and Kinginger
(2002, 2003) and DuFon (1999) place great importance on socialization for the acquisition of the forms. Belz and Kinginger consider that it was peer assistance in critical moments that lead to development, and DuFon points out that a factor in the lack of acquisition of some pronouns for most of the students may have been that the participants were not receiving feedback on social indexicality from the L1 speakers. In addition, in both studies personal beliefs and motivations play a significant role in the process. Charlene, the student in DuFon’s (1999) study, acquired most of the personal pronouns because she pushed herself to use the language: “I’ve been trying to use specific *hormat* [respectful] address wherever I go. I know for me the best way to learn how to address in Indonesia is to just try not to use Anda (Charlene, Week #12)” (DuFon, p. 438).

In Belz and Kinginger’s (2003) study, Irene persisted in her use of V because, according to the authors, peer assistance was not a very relevant activity for her since she was used to interacting with fluent L1 speakers, and she considered herself German. Note also that Siegal (1996) reported that one of her participants, Sally, an American woman learning Japanese in Japan, avoided paralinguistic devices associated with women’s polite speech (*desu/masu*), and refused to emulate the speaking style of Japanese women, whom she saw as subservient in society. She did not want to accept the way women were positioned in society, and she refused such a position for herself by avoiding pragmatic features associated with women’s speech, in spite of explicit correction from L1 speakers and other learners. It is possible then that Irene, in Belz and Kinginger (2003), was also rejecting her positioning as an American, in need of help from a German student.
Examining the developmental processes in all the studies above, they seem to suggest that students start the process with free variation of forms (Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; DuFon, 1999; Norris, 2001; Kinginger, 2000), although not for Lyster's (1993, 1994) participants in the immersion program, who had been using the informal pronoun almost exclusively for years. After avoidance, students tend to avoid the use of those forms that they do not control while they overgeneralize the use of one form for all purposes (Norris, 2001; DuFon, 1999). Progress towards the correct use happens either when they receive correction that is meaningful for them (Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003), or when personal reasons motivate them to improve (DuFon, 1999). From the more linguistic studies, we can also generalize that nominative or subject pronouns seem to be acquired before object pronouns, and that the progression is not straight but rather bell-shaped (Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997).

It can be deduced from Norris's (2001) data that there are several stages in the production of pronouns according to morphological categories, which in German are highly complex given its case-marking system. As summarized by Figure 1 below, students up to Novice-High proficiency level on the ACTFL Proficiency Scale (ACTFL, 1999), seem to be able to use accurately nominative and genitive pronouns (about 80%). After this level, the dative case seems to start emerging, but it is not used accurately until the students reach an advance level. At the Intermediate-High level, the dative continues to emerge while the accusative is mastered. At the advanced level, students seem to be able to use all cases. It is important to note that the tasks in the German test elicited data that were mainly directed to an individual, and therefore there were few cases of plural pronouns. (See Norris, 2001, for more results and in-depth discussion.). These results are
similar to those by DuFon (1999), and they seem to also confirm results by Anderson (1998), who found that in Spanish L1 nominative pronouns are acquired before their object-case use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice-High</td>
<td>**********</td>
<td>********</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate-Mid/Low</td>
<td>**********</td>
<td>********</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***********</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate-High</td>
<td>**********</td>
<td>********</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>***********</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>**********</td>
<td>********</td>
<td>**********</td>
<td>***********</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance-high/Superior</td>
<td>**********</td>
<td>********</td>
<td>**********</td>
<td>***********</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2. Accuracy of use of cases (based on data in Norris, 2001)

Students' L1 may also play an important role (Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997; DuFon, 1999). Given the difference in morphological complexity between English and the languages in these studies (German, French, and Indonesian), it is important to point that morphology may play a key role in the use that students make of the language, and even if their pronominal forms improve, the surrounding verb morphology may not (Lyster, 1993, 1994).

As for rate of development, there is quite a variation between the short time (only a few weeks) that it took Belz and Kinginger's students to cease their free variation to the three months that it took the only participant in DuFon's study that actually acquired the addressivity system (for most of them 3 months was not enough time). In between, most of Lyster's participants improved after seven weeks of treatment, although there is no way to know if the change may have happened sooner than seven weeks, since this is when they were first post-tested. This variation on rate of development may be due to several factors: First, the higher complexity of the Indonesian system, compared to the German and French pronoun system; Second, the lack of feedback for the students of
Indonesian compared to focused feedback received by the students of German and French; Third, the provision of pragmatic rules in a controlled pedagogic environment versus the variability of use by L1 speakers; And finally, possible issues of identity, motivation, and resistance.

2.3.4. L2 pragmatic instruction

Kasper and Schmidt (1996) point out that although instruction seems to be a key element in the acquisition of pragmatics (according to the research on language socialization, e.g. Schieffeling & Ochs, 1986; Ochs, 1996, 2002), the foreign language classroom may offer a limited environment for learning. Several reasons are that the opportunities for human interaction are limited (Kasper, 2001; Kasper & Rose, 1999; Lyster, 1994; Swain & Carroll, 1987). Also, the materials that the students are exposed to are usually artificial and decontextualized (Bardovi-Harlig et al., 1991) and may not generate the “type of sociolinguistic input that the learners need” (Porter, 1986, p. 218, as cited in Kasper and Schmidt, 1996). Given these limitations, studies on the teachability of pragmatic competence in the language classroom have tried to find the best way to teach pragmatic competence to language learners, exploring how different techniques and methods affect pragmatic learning. The volumes by Rose and Kasper (2001) Pragmatics in Language Teaching, and Martínez-Flor et al. (2003) Pragmatic Competence and Foreign Language Teaching, and the 2005 special issue of System volume 33 (3) on Pragmatics in Instructed Learning are examples of the increasing interest in this issue. According to the results of a meta-analysis of the effects of instruction on pragmatic development, Jeon and Kaya (2006) suggest that it is clear that instruction does make a
positive difference, although more research is needed to know how exactly different types of instruction affect pragmatic development.

Looking for alternatives to the traditional language instruction for pragmatic development several researchers have started to explore the field of computer-assisted, or computer-mediated, language learning (CALL) for environments and pedagogic tools to aid the teaching of pragmatics (Belz & Thorne, 2006; Blyth, 1999; Lelouche & Hout, 1998; Levy, 1999; Sykes, 2005; Vyatkina & Belz, 2006; see also “Dancing with Words” a CARLA project at the University of Minnesota). Among the CALL technologies, telecollaboration between students in two different countries is viewed as a form of increasing the students’ opportunities for a wider range of human interaction, usually with people from another culture. When students meet over the Internet they need to develop their social relationships much in the same way as when they meet a stranger face to face for the first time. Through repeated contact and interaction, the relationship evolves, creating a dynamic relationship in need of adjusting sociolinguistic and sociopragmatic practices (Belz, 2002, 2003; Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003). This study follows this line of thought and aims at discovering what patterns are distinctive in SCMC interaction and whether those patterns change over time.

2.4. Synchronous computer-mediated communication (SCMC)

The following review addresses the research in the area of SCMC and second language acquisition, focusing on those studies with a strong social component. This section reviews also a few developmental studies. Last but not least, those studies that incorporate Conversation Analysis in the study of SCM interaction are presented. There
are only two studies to date, to the best of my knowledge that have investigated student interactions with L1 speakers through an on-line environment from a CA perspective. This dissertation seeks to contribute to the knowledge in this new area of research.

2.4.1. Introduction

There are two types of computer-mediated communication: synchronous and asynchronous. In synchronous CMC, participants interact in real time, such as chat, audio and video-conferencing, MOOs (Multi-user Domain Object Oriented), and 3D virtual worlds. In asynchronous CMC, the students do not need to be present at the same time. Examples are email communication, bulletin boards, and discussion forums. All these tools were designed to enhance and facilitate communication and therefore have a natural attraction for language educators, especially since they have the potential to open the boundaries of the FL classroom to remote knowledge, spaces, and speakers, transforming a "decontextualized exercise into an engagement with authentic real-world contexts of language use" (Kramsch & Thorne, 2002, p. 1).

2.4.2. SCMC and SLA

SCMC discourse has been defined as a hybrid between oral and written communication, sharing characteristics of both, yet different from each of them (Blanco-Rodriguez, 2002; Collot & Bellmore, 1996; Davis & Brewer, 1997; Ferrara et al., 1991; Lanham, 1993; Murray, 1995). Although the medium of transmission is written, the characteristics of the text are closer to spoken language in register, familiarity, informality (Herring, 1996), and it includes discourse markers typical of oral speech (Tudini, 2002). However, some of the sequential patterns of interaction are different from
those of spoken conversation (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999; Herring, 1999; Pellettieri, 1999; Smith 2003a).

The first SCMC studies compared face-to-face (FtoF) and CMC interactions in the hope that if they shared enough commonalities, the interactional principles of oral language acquisition would apply equally (Bearden, 2003; Freirermuth, 2002; Kern, 1995; Sotillo, 2000; Warschauer, 1996). Most of these studies claim that synchronous CMC is similar enough to FtoF to be able to promote the type of interaction necessary for language acquisition. Following SLA studies, researchers have analyzed CMC discourse to determine whether it was an “optimal environment for SLA” (Tudini, 2003, p. 1), which contained features that had been found to promote language acquisition such as negotiation moves, repairs, modification of input, etc., during meaningful interaction (Darhower, 2000; Fernández-García & Martinez-Arbeláiz, 2002; Kitade, 2000; Knierim, 2001; Kost, 2004; Kötter, 2003; Pellettieri, 1999; Smith, 2003a; Toyoda & Harrison, 2002; Tudini, 2002, 2003). The results of these studies are mixed. While several found SCMC to be a productive environment to promote negotiation (Kötter, 2003; Pellettieri, 2000; Smith, 2003a; Toyoda & Harrison, 2002; Tudini, 2003, 2007), others found the negotiations were minimal (Blake, 2000; Jepson, 2005; Lee, 2001, 2002; Warschauer 1996; See Ortega (in press) for a detail discussion of this topic). It is interesting to note that this lack of negotiation moves is consistent with CA research that suggests that participants engaged in activities tend to collaborate to maintain interaction, rather than focusing on and pursuing language problems (Hauser, 2005; Mori, 2004a).

Outside this debate, other studies have analyzed the language produced in SCMC and proposed some benefits of incorporating this tool in the language classroom. SCMC
interaction includes a variety of patterns of interaction, communication strategies, speech acts, off-task interactions, and discourse functions (Chun, 1994; Kern, 1995; Knierim, 2001). It equalizes class participation, allowing some students to produce more language (Beauvois, 1998; Chanrungkanok, 2004; Chun, 1994; Kern, 1995; Lee, 1998; Skinner & Austin, 1999; Tudini, 2002 Warschauer, 1996). It promotes learner-centeredness by placing the teacher in a facilitator role which allows the students to control and manage the discourse (Bearden, 2003; Beauvois, 1997, 1998; Chun, 1994; Darhower, 2000; Freiermuth, 2002; Kern, 1995; Warschauer, 1996) and provides students with more time to reflect and monitor their language (Kern, 1995; Lai & Zhao, 2006; Pellettieri, 2000; Smith 2004), allowing them to engage in self-correction (Fiori, 2005; Kitade, 2000; Sotillo, 2005; Tudini, 2007).

Moving from investigating comprehension as an indicator of acquisition to investigating a direct link between interaction and acquisition (see Keck et al., 2006 and Mackey and Goo, 2007 for two meta-analyses on the effects of interaction on L2 learning), studies of CMC have tried to establish a direct connection between the use of technology and second language acquisition. Most studies employ a pre-post test design to investigate the acquisition of lexical items (de la Fuente, 2003; Shekary & Tahirian, 2006; Smith, 2001, 2004, 2005; Zhao et al., 2004), oral skills (Payne & Ross, 2005; Payne & Whitney, 2002), grammatical features (Coniam & Wong, 2004; Fiori, 2005; Loewen & Erlam, 2006; Shekary & Tahirian, 2006), verb morphology (Salaberry, 2000), and overall language skills (Kost, 2004).

These studies have also yielded mixed results. Some studies found that students' production in SCMC and FtoF increased equally, both quantitatively and qualitatively,
(Coniam and Wong, 2004; Kost 2004), and students improved their oral proficiency regardless of engagement in CMC or FtoF (Payne & Ross, 2005; Payne & Whitney, 2002).

Looking for "emergence" and maintenance of target forms in the CMC discourse, Smith (2001, 2004) investigated students' uptake of several new lexical items during computer-mediated interaction. His results show multiple uptakes of the target lexical items. However, in a follow up study (2005), he found that there were no gains in participants' post-tests, in spite of showing lexical uptake. Similarly, Lowen and Erlam (2006) found no accuracy gains for their students in spite of receiving high amounts of negative feedback in the target grammatical feature. The present study seeks to clarify this current debate about whether SCMC is an environment which can foster language learning.

2.4.3. Cross-cultural studies in SCMC

Several researchers have taken a sociocultural perspective on the study of SCMC, mainly to answer questions about how people interact through computers (Aoki, 1995; Darhower, 2000; Rafaeli & Sudweeks, 1998; Thorne, 1999; Walther, 1996), how politeness is enacted (Al-Shalawi, 2001; Baym, 1996; Bays, 1998), and in the field of language learning, issues of empowerment and equalitarian participation (Freiermuth, 2002; Warschauer et al., 1996), identity (Warschauer, 2000; Wolfe, 2000), and cross-cultural communication (Belz, 2002, 2003, 2005; Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Belz & Reindhart, 2004; Furstenberg et al., 2001; Kinginger, 2000; Kramsch & Thorne, 2002; Lee, 1998; Tudini, 2007; Ware, 2003). Most of these studies analyzed the texts and
discourses produced by language students engaged in interaction with L1 speakers of the target language/culture. Their results suggest that SCMC promotes a sense of community (Darhower, 2000; Skinner & Austin, 1999, Wilkins, 1991) and relationship building (Belz & Reinhardt, 2004), but the interaction per se does not necessarily lead to socio-cultural understanding (Kramsch & Thorne, 2002). SCMC promotes language play (Herring, 1999; Ruedember et al. 1995; Murphy & Collins, 1997) and allows for different representations of self (Kramsch et al., 2000; Kramsch & Thorne, 2002; Thorne, 1999), providing opportunities for self-presentation, idealization, and reciprocation (Walther, 1996). Finally, CMC serves as an environment for the development of pragmatic/sociopragmatic competence (Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Chun, 1994; Kinginger, 2002; Tudini, 2007).

2.5. Conversation Analysis

This section presents the rationale for using CA as the research methodology of this study. Some fundamentals of CA relevant to this study are discussed, as well as studies of second language interaction that have employed a CA. Since the participants in this study are students interacting with L1 speakers of the language as part of their language curriculum, studies in a similar institutional setting and with similar participants are also reviewed. Afterwards, this section examines the intersections between CA and grammar, CA and pragmatics, CA and language learning, and CA and SCMC, these last two areas very recent fields of study with still much room to grow. Finally, this section presents some methodological issues of using a CA approach to the study of language learning.
2.5.1 Introduction

CA grew in the mid 1960's as a subfield of sociology. Initially CA concentrated on the description of the organization of ordinary, mundane conversation, describing its organizational structure in terms of turn-taking sequences and repair practices (Jefferson, 1974, 1978; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 1968; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). After the initial years, a growing body of research expanded CA into other institutional contexts that were not just mundane conversations (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Drew & Heritage 1992; Egbert, 1991).

One of the main principles of CA, derived in part from these studies is that interaction is structurally and systematically organized, and in different institutions the organization of the interaction is different, depending on the institutional aims and constraints. According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) there are “two core analytic questions to CA: What interactional business is being mediated or accomplished through the use of a sequential pattern? How do participants demonstrate their active orientation to this business?” (p. 99)

In order to discover such sequential patterns, and participants' orientation to them, it is important to do a bottom-up, inductive, data-driven analysis in which such patterns are not the results of preformulated theoretical conceptions but rather what the participants produce in situ (Ten Have, 2007). In this way, CA takes an emic perspective to the data, explicating “meaning in terms of the local context of talk-in interaction” (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 495), and uncovering how the speakers themselves orient to sequentially emergent turns of talk. For Sacks et al. (1974) turn-taking is:
the basic form of organization for conversation—'basic', in that it would be invariant to parties, such that whatever variations the parties brought to bear in the conversation would be accommodated without change in the system, and such that it could be selectively and locally affected by social aspects of context (p. 700).

In a turn-taking system, a turn can be a lexical item, a phrase, clause, or sentence, and it projects its completion in what they called a “transition-relevance” place. It is in these points in conversation that a transfer of speaker is decided according to some basic rules to minimize overlap and a gap in the conversation.

1- If the current speaker selects the next speaker, then he “has the right and is obliged to take next turn to speak” (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 704)

2- If the current speaker does not select the next speaker, then another speaker may self-select to continue the conversation. If this does not happen, then the current speaker may continue.

This process continues at each transition-relevance place, and allows the conversation to flow in accordance with the interactional rule ‘one speaker at a time’. This does not mean that overlapping and silence do not occur, but rather that when they do they have special significance for the interaction. This system is what Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) termed an ‘Interactionally Managed System’.

There are cases where the turn-taking system can be seen operating in a more ‘obvious’ way. This is the case of ‘adjacency pairs’ (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) which include cases such as ‘greeting-greeting’, ‘invitation-acceptance/decline’ ‘question/answer’ etc. Adjacency pairs are multi-turn units constituted by a ‘first pair-
part' and a 'second pair part'. In such a sequence a first pair part produced by a speaker is
directly followed by an utterance from another speaker which is a second pair part from
the same pair part type as the first pair type. As Schegloff and Sacks (1973) suggest, the
study of adjacency pairs is useful because;

by an adjacently positioned second, a speaker can show that he understood what a
prior aimed at, and that he is willing to go along with that. Also, by virtue of the
occurrence of an adjacently produced second, the doer of a first can see that what
he intended was indeed understood, and that it was or was not accepted (pp. 297-8)

Adjacency pairs provide a window into how participants are viewing each other’s
actions, the construction of their relationships and the conversation itself. By analyzing
these units, we can observe whether the participants are uttering preferred or dispreferred
(Pomerantz, 1984) second part pairs, towards the project action of the first pair part.
Several authors have employed CA to demonstrate that interlocutors negotiate social
solidarity through the mechanisms of preference organization\(^{1}\) built into talk-in-
interaction (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990; Golato, 2005; Pomerantz, 1984).

As I will discuss below, turn-taking and sequence organization present a
challenge for data collected in a medium such as synchronous computer mediated
conversations, however they are still relevant and useful concepts for its analysis.

2.5.2. CA of L2 interaction

In a growing multilingual word of global communication, where many of the
participants are using a second language to communicate, CA researchers are focusing on

\(^{1}\) Preference organization is concerned with the alignment that recipients display in their second pair part
toward a first pair part (Pomerantz, 1984). For a recent account on the organization of
preference/dispreference, see Schegloff (2007).
interactions where one or more speakers communicate in a language different from their first language (Brouwer, 2003; Egbert, 2005; Egbert et al., 2004; Firth, 1996; Gardner & Wagner, 2004; Gaskill, 1980; González-Lloret, 2005; Kidwell, 2000; Kurhila, 2001, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006; Skårup, 2004; Wagner, 1996). One of the main findings of this body of research is that non-L1 speakers of a language are not deficient language users that cannot communicate, as traditionally seen by other disciplines. Instead, these studies have shown that language learners are able to engage and co-construct conversation, they do not often orient to linguistic errors, and they skillfully manage to interact employing their minimal resources in multiple settings.

The expansion of CA into the realm of second language interactions has sparked a recent interest to theoretically explore the intersection between CA and SLA/applied linguistics (He, 2004; Kasper 2006a; Markee, 2000; Markee & Kasper, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004; Schegloff et al., 2002; Wong & Olsher, 2000; and edited volumes by Richards & Seedhouse, 2005; Wei et al., 2007).

The practical studies that have explored L2 classroom interactions have describe the organizational sequences of the classroom, and how teachers and students construct and orient to the different activities that occur in a language classroom, what Markee and Kasper (2004) have termed “classroom talks” (Buckwalter, 2001; He, 2004; Koshik, 1999; Lee, 2006; Lerner, 2002; Markee, 2000, 2004, 2005; Mondada & Pekarek-Doehler, 2004; Mori, 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Olsher, 2004; Pckett, 2005; Rylander, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004; Stewner-Manzanares, 1983, Young & Miller, 2004). These studies suggest that in a language classroom participants’ turn-taking practices are dynamic, with different speech exchanges constituting different activities. Learners are capable of
orienting to multiple activities (Markee 2005, Mori 2004b), and identities (Kasper, 2004), and they are able to transform the tasks presented to them into different activities (Markee 2005; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Mori, 2002). [See Seedhouse (2004) for a discussion of the difference between task-as-workplan and task-in-process (Breen, 1989) and its pedagogic applications to the language classroom].

Some studies have focused on characteristics of the L2 interactions, rather than on the large picture of the classroom. These studies investigate some of the fundamental aspects of the organization of the interaction and compare them with well established research on L1 practice, including turn-taking, repair sequences, and membership categorization and identity. Following well established traditional CA studies on turn-taking (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974) and turn organization (Schegloff, 1982, 1996), studies of second language learners have investigated how students take turns and how their practices compare to that of the L1 speakers (Carroll, 2000, 2004, 2005; Gardner, 2007; Lynch, 1998; McHoul, 1990; Pekarek Doehler & Ziegler, 2007; Stewner-Manzanares, 1983). These studies show that L2 speakers are able to design their turns and engage in turn-taking practices despite their limited linguistic ability by employing multiple interactional resources to achieve understanding such as delay responses (Gardner, 2004; Wong 2000b, 2004), and non-verbal resources such as gaze (Carroll, 2004), and gesture (Mori & Hayashi, 2006; Olsher, 2004).

Research on L2 repair sequences has examined how it is that participants deal with trouble or problems in speaking, hearing or understanding during the interaction when the interaction is asymmetrical in participants' language abilities, and how these sequences are similar or different from those between L1 speakers' well documented
practices by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, (1977), Schegloff (1987, 1997, 2000) and subsequent CA research. Research in this area suggests that in these asymmetrical interactions the participants avoid engaging in repair sequences (Brouwer, 2004; Kurhila, 2000), unless necessary to achieve mutual understanding (Brouwer et al., 2004; Hosoda, 2006; Wong, 2005). The repairs are similar to those in monolingual data: self-repairs are common, while other-initiated repairs are rare (Brouwer et al., 2004; Gaskill, 1998; Kasper & Kim, 2007), and L2 speakers employ several interactional resources to accomplish the repair (vowel marking, Carroll (2005); rising intonation, pauses and repeats, Brouwer, 2004)

Another area which has recently attracted a large amount of research is that of membership categorization and identity. Form a CA perspective, participants’ identities are only relevant when they are oriented to by the participants themselves through interactional conduct. Several studies have investigated whether participants actually orient to these different identities and how this is understood and expressed (Egbert, 2005; He, 2004; Hosoda, 2000, 2006; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Kasper 2004; Markee, 2004; Mori, 2004; Park, 2007; Waring, 2005). These studies suggest that participants’ identities are not static. Learners’ identities change as the activities they engage in change (Kasper, 2004; Markee, 2005), and members “deploy them to construct roles and identities, and make particular types of learning behavior relevant at a particular moment in the interaction” (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 496).
2.5.3. CA studies of L2 interaction with a pedagogic purpose

The participants in the present study engaged in interaction outside the language classroom with L1 speakers of their L2, but as part of their language learning curriculum. Several researchers have studied interaction between language students and L1 speakers (other than their teacher) as part of an educational institutional setting and/or with a pedagogic purpose. These studies are consistent with results of studies of L2 speakers (outside a pedagogic context) which state that participants engage in collaborative work to maintain interaction rather than focusing on language problems (Hauser, 2005; Mori, 2004a; Wong 2005), orienting to different activities and membership categories to accomplish and co-construct understanding (Kasper, 2004; Kasper & Kim, 2007). L2 learners already bring a full range of competences from their L1, in spite of their lack of linguistic competence, to the interaction (Lee, 2006; Mori & Hayashi, 2006) and are able to employ multiple interactional resources (Mori, 2004a; Mori & Hayashi, 2006). The studies suggest that L2 speakers in a language learning environment orient to language issues only partially, and in spite of their limited language competency, they are able to maintain a successful interaction with more competent speakers of the language.

2.5.4. CA and grammar

This study explores the use of address pronouns and verb morphology from a CA perspective. According to Schegloff et al. (2002), CA research has always had a "keen interest in the lexical and grammatical details of everyday and institutional talk." (p 15). CA considers grammar and lexical choices as resources which participants 'deploy, monitor, interpret, and manipulate as they design turns, sort out turn taking, co-construct
utterances and sequences, manage intersubjectivity and (dis)agreement, accomplish actions and negotiate interpersonal trajectories as real-time talk and interaction unfold" (p. 15). Since Schegloff's (1979a) “The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation” and the edited volume by Ochs, Schegloff, and Thompson (1996) Interaction and Grammar, it has been recognized that CA can contribute to the study of grammar and syntax for conversation (Markee & Kasper, 2004; Ten Have, 2007).

In the introduction to their edited volume, Schegloff et al. (1996) incorporate research that explores the ideas that ‘grammar organizes social interaction’, ‘social interaction organizes grammar’, and the more radical version that ‘grammar is a mode of interaction’ (p. 33). They state that “Grammar is not only a resource for interaction and not only an outcome of interaction, it is part of the essence of interaction itself. Or, to put it another way, grammar is inherently interactional” (p. 38). In this view, “grammatical structures are revisualized as interactional structures that have their own interactional morphology and syntax within and across turns” (p. 40). Also, according to Schegloff (1996), if the basic environment for sentences in conversation is in turn-at-talk, it is possible that “aspects of their structure — for example, their grammatical structure — are to be understood as adaptations to their environment.” (pp. 54-55). It seems, then, that CA is one useful analytical approach to study grammatical aspects of talk-in-interaction.

In accordance with this line of CA work, several volumes have appeared in the last decade, which gather studies on what Selting and Couper-Kuhlen (2001) has termed Interactional Linguistics, “a perspective on language structure and use informed by languages natural habitat in the interaction order” (p.1), a combination of linguistics, conversation analysis, and anthropology. According to the authors, these three disciplines

2.5.5. CA and pragmatics

According to Schegloff et al. (2002), conversation analysis offers the potential for useful contribution to intercultural communication studies and interlanguage pragmatics. “CA studies of speaking practices across languages and cultures can provide a basis for comparison of L2, or language learner, speaking practices with L1 speaker norms in both L1 and L2” (p. 16). According to Seedhouse (2004), “although CA’s main interest has been in how social acts are performed through language, it has always been interested in the reflexive relationship between grammar and interaction and the domain of pragmatics” (p. 234, my emphasis). Kasper (2006b) also points out that interlanguage pragmatics can benefit from data of participants carrying out social action through talk, analyzing its sequential organization. However, Schegloff *et al.* (2002) also advise against the common practice in interlanguage pragmatics of looking for instances of a
pre-established set of speech acts, defined according to speakers’ intent, and they suggest to base research in already established CA studies of familiar social actions such as invitations, complaints, conversational openings and closings, etc. In this line of research we have CA studies of apologies (Robinson, 2004), complaints (Darsley & Wotton, 2000), requests (Kasper, 2004; Taleghani-Nizkarn, 2006), invitations (Bersten, 2002), questions (Kasper, 2006; Kasper & Ross, 2007), compliments (Golato, 2005) and compliment responses (Pomerantz, 1978).

Following Kasper (2006b), this dissertation takes a discursive approach to pragmatics, applying conversation analysis (CA) to address behavior. According to Kasper, in a discursive approach:

"analysts do not need to invoke motivations, intentions and other mental events ... Instead, the advocated analytical policy is to pay close attention to (a) where an action is placed in the sequential structure and (b) how the turn that houses the action and its immediate preceding and following turns are composed." (p. 290)

2.5.6. CA and language learning

Several authors have suggested that CA cannot address language acquisition at this point in time because it is not a language learning theory (Egbert et al., 2004; Hauser, 2005; He, 2004). However, rather than dismissing CA as an approach to language learning, some researchers are advocating for expanding the definition of ‘learning’. Markee and Kasper (2004) point out that “CA needs to respecify whatever learning is primarily in terms of learning processes that are constructed in and through the talk of participants” (p. 496). In this view, language learning is not just limited to the linguistic features but also to the social context and sequential development of interaction. As Nguyen (2003) states:
Seeing language as dynamic and organically bound with social interaction also shifts our conceptualization of how the process of language development takes place. In this understanding, the development of language takes shape in and because of social interaction (p. 6, italics in original)

This suggestion is in line with several other theories which view learning as socially distributed rather than internally located in the participants' minds: Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1981), Language Socialization (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986), and Situated Learning (Lave and Wenger, 1991). For reviews of similarities and differences between these theories, and how their views on development and explicit teaching compare, see Nguyen (2003) and Kasper (2006a).

Finding compatibility in their views of learning as social practice, several researchers have recently coupled CA with these theories of L2 learning: with Sociocultural Theory (Ishida, 2006; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Ohta, 2001) with Situated Learning (Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Hellermann, 2006; Young & Miller, 2004), and with Language Socialization (Hellermann, 2006).

Presenting a different view of learning, Mori (2004b) in her study of 'negotiation of meaning' in a small group in an upper-level Japanese class proposes to look at 'learning' as participation-based, focusing on the improvement of the resources used by learners for talk-in-interaction rather than just on their linguistic skills. See also Sfard (1998) for acquisition and participation metaphors.

In a similar line, CA's potential as a theory for learning can be explored by "extending the scope of CA itself from socially distributed cognition to socially distributed learning (Seedhouse, 2004)" (Kasper 2006a p. 91), exploring the participants' social actions as they display them to each other through their interactional behavior. An
example of CA as a theory for learning is Wootton’s (1997) developmental study of requests. Wotton used CA to investigate longitudinally the development of requests by Amy, his daughter, from the age of 12 to 24 months. In this study, Wootton frames learning as situated in the local sequence of actions in which the child engages. Learning is viewed as the emergence of intersubjectivity, that is, the emergence of “the capacity to recognize that other people are acting on understandings and the capacity to act on such recognitions” (p. 24).

This dissertation will examine how L2 learners’ interactional capacity to express and display understanding of closeness/distance develops over time when they engage in synchronous computer-mediated communication with more competent users of the language. Specifically, whether there is any variation over time on their linguistic abilities to use the Spanish address system (pronouns and verb morphology), as well as their interactional competency to engage in the action of doing ‘being close’.

2.5.7. Reliability, validity, generalizability, and quantification in CA

Traditionally, reliability has to do with whether the results presented are replicable by other researchers (Bryman, 2001). In CA, reliability can be maximized through the quality of the recordings, transcripts, and the analysis of the data. Paying attention to selection and technical quality of recordings, as well as a detailed transcription of the audio or video data can help assure the reliability of the data (Peräkylä, 1997). In the present study, there was no need to transcribe the data, since the interaction is itself written, and the recording is done by the software tool that allows the interaction.
According to Peräkylä (1997), CA addresses issues of validity through the transparency of analytic claims, validation through the ‘next turn proof procedure’, demonstrating that the researcher’s analysis coincides with the participants’ displays of their orientation (in accordance with the emic perspective that CA brings to the data analysis). In addition, CA addresses validity by exploring ‘deviant cases’, that is, cases that “seem to depart from a previously formulated rule or pattern” (Ten Have, 2007). Rather than treating these cases as outliers, the analysis should account for them. It can be that the participants also orient to them as departing from the norm, and in this case, they provide additional support for the patterns. There may be cases where the deviant cases do not fit the discovered pattern, and they lead either to a reformulation of the initial ideas (Schegloff, 1968) or an explanation of why that case was deviant for those participants in that specific situation. This ‘deviant case analysis’ is essential in an analytical inductive approach like CA (Ten Have, 2007). It is important to note here that it may be especially difficult to identify and analyze deviant cases in second language data, especially when the data is from beginning language students. It may be difficult to distinguish which cases are real deviances from a possible pattern, and which are the product of the student’s lack of language capability. This is a topic in much need of both theoretical and research attention.

As for generalizability, Peräkylä (1997) suggests seeing this as descriptions of ‘possibilities’, that is as patterns that would possibly arise given the same context and interactional competencies as the participants of a study have. Wagner and Gardner (2004) point out that “one of the strengths of CA is that it is based on collections of data, on ‘the regularity of behavior as documented in the collection of cases’” (p. 7). In this
way, new studies such as the present build up on original studies, reinforcing the data
collections, and expanding the context and type of participants to whom the findings
apply, producing a body of cumulative knowledge.

CA practitioners have cautioned against quantification given that complex
practices may be forced under simpler categories and "something that is analytically
important may be lost from sight" (Peräkylä, 1999: 298). Coding and quantification may
lead to the classification of different phenomena, which may seem the same on the
“quantification is no substitute for analysis” (p. 114); some phenomena may be
quantifiable, but a detailed analysis is a precondition for any quantification. Some CA
studies have successfully applied quantification in CA analysis to document change
(Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Heritage & Roth, 1995; Heritage et al., 2001). For example
Clayman and Heritage (2002) used CA to explore historical change on broadcast news
interviews in United States and England and to compare both contexts (Heritage & Roth,
1995). This dissertation employs quantification for the analysis of variation of
pronominal and morphological address behavior by the language students. The coding
and quantification was conducted after the microanalysis of the interactions was done to
discover emic categories.

2.5.8. CA and SCMC

The present study employs a conversation analysis not only as an analytical tool
but also to make claims about the development of students' language during interaction.

---

2 Part of this section is in González-Lloret (in press). CA for computer-mediated interaction in the Spanish
Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai‘i. National Foreign Language Resource Center.
Most of the studies which examine SCMC incorporate some type of qualitative analysis with excerpts of the data; however few do this in a microanalytical perspective.

Several authors have taken a CA approach to SCM interaction among native speakers, investigating the nature of sequence organization and turn-taking system in SCMC, and how these compare to the well established findings of sequence organization in oral communication described by Sacks et al. (1974), Schegloff (1968, 1996, 1997), and Schegloff et al. (1977), (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999; Herring, 1999; Hutchby, 2001; Murray, 1989). In addition, a few studies have employed a CA perspective to study special conversation sequences in SCMC such as openings (Rintel et al., 2001), lack of response (Rintel et al., 2003), repair (Schönfeldt & Golato, 2003), and negotiation of face (Golato & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006).

In spite of the growing interest in the analysis of language learner's interaction from a CA perspective as presented above, to the best of my knowledge, there have been only a few studies to date (Kitade, 2000; 2005; Negretti, 1999) which investigated the interactional SCMC patterns of language learners from a CA perspective.

Negretti (1999) investigated the dialogue produced by eight NNSs of English (L1 Italian) engaged in SCMC interaction with NS of English through a cybercafe site. She studied the sequence organization of the chatroom interactions, paying special attention to the organization of turn-taking, openings, closings, and turn design. She also reported on several paralinguistic features found in her data and how NSs and NNSs used them differently. Negretti concluded that her participants (both NSs and NNSs) demonstrated the context relevance of Web Chat in their interactions, adapting to the medium as needed. They engaged in complicated interactions, maintained turn-taking sequences
which were more disrupted than in oral interaction, performed opening and closing sequences similar to oral interaction, and used speaker selection as the main technique for turn allocation. In addition, the participants in her study used a variety of paralinguistic features to compensate for the lack of visual cues present in oral interaction, mainly the use of punctuation and upper case writing. However, the use of some paralinguistic features was different for NSs and learners. While NSs used onomatopoeia and emoticons frequently, these were never employed by learners. Negretti pointed out that this difference was probably due to the learners' lack of familiarity with the technology at hand.

Kitade (2000, 2005) studied the interaction of learner–learner and learner–L1 speakers of Japanese in an Internet chat environment. She presented those features of CMC that are conducive to language learning according to several theories of learning: negotiation of input, modification of output, and cooperative learning in the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Kitade (2000) examined the data from a CA perspective to conclude that CMC facilitates collaborative and comprehensible interaction by providing opportunities for learner-centered interaction.

Some researchers have pointed out that the multidimensional and non-linear sequentiality of SCMC poses a problem for a CA classical sequential approach to data (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999). It may well be that SCMC does not conform to the turn-taking sequence as proposed by Sacks et al. (1974) because it is not a purely oral conversation, and its sequential principles are tightly related to the medium. Therefore, rather than imposing existing structures on the new medium, we should be looking at how the participants are achieving different sequence types in the medium, much in the same way.
that telephone conversations were first explored using a CA approach (Schegloff, 1979b, 2002a, 2002b; Wong, 2000b).

Finally, Garcia and Jacobs (1999) claimed that CA may not be an appropriate tool for the study of SCMC because the analysis of the textual data only may not be enough to explain what happens in the process. Garcia and Jacobs used video data of their participants’ screens to investigate the composing process before the turns were posted to the chatroom. They concluded that without video, it cannot be seen what the turn-taking process is, and no claims can be made about, for instance, the process of repairs in SCMC since when a turn is posted it is impossible to know whether there was any self-correction before posting. Although video recording of this type may be imperative for certain areas of study (institutional use of SCMC, composition process, etc), it is not necessary for the study of the interaction as constructed and viewed by participants. From a CA perspective, what happens before the turns are posted is not relevant to the interaction unless participants demonstrate it explicitly through their interaction, or unless it is “brought into being by the actions people produce” (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997, p. 70). Participants cannot see what is written in the other participants’ screens before it is posted or deleted, and therefore it is irrelevant to them and to the interaction. Therefore, CA may be a useful framework for the study of computer-mediated interaction depending on what is under investigation.

As obvious by the scant number of microanalytical studies of learners’ SCMC to date, there is a strong need for more research in this area. This study intends to help fill this gap by providing such an analysis.
2.6. Conclusions

This background section has provided an overview of the research that has contributed to knowledge on the areas of address behavior, pragmatic development, and synchronous computer-mediated communication for language learning. From these studies we can conclude that Spanish address behavior is a complex system and students may need to engage with speakers of the language in order to learn it. From the moment two speakers open an interaction in Spanish the deployment of address pronouns and accompanying morphological verb choices seem necessary to define their relationship, which may or may not evolve as the interaction continues over time. However, these linguistic features are not the only devices to display a close or distant relationship. Sharing reports of activities, discussing and elaborating personal problems, shared knowledge, and shared laughter are actions that students may employ and orient to in interaction to express their relationship on a continuum from formal to intimate.

Developmental studies on pragmatic features have shown that students start with free variation and they tend to avoid those forms they cannot control. They also tend to overgeneralize the use of one form. The development seems to occur in the presence of feedback, and motivation seems to be an important factor in the rate and amount of development, which varies greatly among students. Their L1, and the complexity of their L2 seem to be important factors in development. To the best of my knowledge, there are no studies of Spanish L2 address behavior development. This study is an attempt to fill the void in this research area.
To explore the possibility of employing a Conversation Analysis as the theoretical framework to investigate L2 pragmatic development, this background section has presented several studies of learner/L1 speaker interaction which showed how participants’ orientation to the construction of relationships can be investigated through the analysis of the interactional sequence, in particular the turn-taking system. This section has also presented previous research which has employed CA for the study of grammar and interlanguage pragmatics, as well as recent projects to establish a theoretical link between CA and language learning.

The final part of the background section presented studies of second language acquisition through SCMC, which seem to suggest that SCMC is an environment that can foster language learning, cross-cultural awareness, and pragmatic development since it can connect L2 learners with other speakers of the language for 'real' interaction.

Finally this background section has presented some examples of studies of SCMC through a CA methodology. Most of these studies, still very few given the youth of this area, have been conducted in a L1. Only two studies to date have used a CA methodology to study language learner/L1 speaker interaction in an on-line environment. And that I know of, this dissertation is the first attempt to look at language student/L1 speaker interaction through SCMC developmentally from a CA perspective.

In summary, all the previous studies reviewed above help inform the main questions of the present study: (a) What does the sequential organization of SCMC between L1 speakers and L2 learners look like?, (b) What type of address behavior do L1 speakers of Spanish exhibit when engaged in synchronous computer-mediated interaction with L2 learners?, (c) How do L2 learners of Spanish interact with L1 speakers in a
synchronous computer-mediated environment? What patterns of interaction do they employ to do "being close/ distant"? Do these patterns change with time? What is the role of the L1 speaker in any possible development?, and (d) Is Conversation Analysis a feasible methodology for the study of L2 development of address behavior in SCMC?
CHAPTER 3 - METHOD

3.1. Introduction

This study takes a Conversation Analysis (CA) approach to interactional data, followed by a description of frequencies, similar to that employed by Belz and Kinginger (2002, 2003). Although some authors are skeptical about the possibilities of merging CA and any type of quantification (Schegloff, 1993; Wong & Olsher, 2000), this is mainly because they believe that quantification of phenomena may group observable facts that are only equal on the surface, since without a detailed exploration of the data it is impossible to know if the groupings are actually accurate (Hauser, 2005; Seedhouse, 2005b). Taking this into account, Seedhouse (2005b) proposes two stages for the analysis of interactional phenomena: first, a CA emic and holistic microanalysis in a qualitative paradigm that would generate definitions and categories from a socially shared cognition and learning perspective (see '2.5. Conversation Analysis' above); second, a quantitative approach once the construct validity is assured.

3.2. Participants

Two intact classes of Spanish language learners at a US University in the Pacific, and several university students from two classes of English learners, in two different cities in Spain participated in this study.

3.2.1. The learners

The US students were fifth semester university level students learning Spanish. They had completed four semesters of Spanish as part of their requirements and were
enrolled in a Spanish basic reading course. This level was chosen for two reasons: first, at this level students already have enough grammatical competence that they can engage in limited interaction with other speakers of the language; and second, in order to be able to establish comparisons with similar existing studies that also targeted students at this level (e.g., Beauvois 1998; Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Blake 2000; Darhower, 2000; Kinginger, 2000; LeMond, 2004; Pellettieri 1999). Most of the students were female (80%) and all students were between the ages of 18 and 26. In each group, the students were paired up according to their available times to connect with Spanish key-pals. Each of the two intact classes was assigned to an activity (free conversation or project-based) according to their preference as a group. Based on a needs analysis conducted at the beginning of the semester, the majority of students (85%) in one class stated they would probably use their second language for social purposes, while in the other class there was not a unified intended use though many students stated they would probably use it when they travel.

3.2.2. The students in Spain

The participants in Spain were very similar to the US participants in age. They were also university students and part of two intact classes. One group was formed by university level computer engineering students learning English at a large university in Castellón, on the East coast of Spain. This group worked on the project-based task in Spanish with the US students for the duration of the project and at a later time they engaged again in SCMC interaction, this time in English, to help shape their final oral project for their English language class.
The second group was formed by Spanish students of English at an adult language school in Toledo, in the center of Spain. Most were studying to be English teachers. These students engaged via SCMC in free conversation with the second group voluntarily, to make friends, meet English speakers, and practice their language skills. The group in Toledo and the US group also exchanged emails in English as practice for the students in Spain, however those will not be considered as part of the data for this study. In each group two US students were paired with one or two students in Spain according to their possible Internet connectivity times.

3.2.3. The teachers

The two instructors from the two classes in Spain and the instructor of the two classes in the United States (the researcher) played a marginal role in the study. They were in charge of explaining the activities and the process to their students. They trained them in the use of the chat environment and provided technical support and clarification when necessary, but they did not participate in any of the chats. The three teachers maintained communication via SCMC among themselves during the entire process mainly to articulate deadlines, create instructional materials, and solve technical problems.

3.3. The environment

The three teachers agreed on using Yahoo! Messenger as the medium of interaction because it allows for cross-platform use (Apple and PC), it is free, easy to download, install, and use, and it allows for the storage of the conversations in the student’s computers. In addition, Yahoo! Messenger allows the user to stamp each turn.
entry in the chatroom with the exact time of posting, which was an initial concern for the study of interactional sequences (see Chapter 4 for a discussion of the actual value of time-stamps). In addition, Yahoo! Messenger permits the interaction among several participants at the same time. They can choose a text color, which helps identify each participant visually. As in most chat tools, there is a window for writing messages (the lower one), and a window where the messages appear in the order they are received by the server (the top window). In the very bottom part of the window a message "(name) is typing a message" appears when another participant is typing and before that message is sent. This feature was also considered desirable since it may prompt students to wait longer for another participants’ message before they self-select as next speaker in the absence of an incoming message.

![Figure 3.1 Screen shot from Yahoo! Messenger](image)

Another reason to select Yahoo! Messenger was that it is not an open-to-the-public type of chatroom. No one can enter a conversation unless they are invited into the room.
With Yahoo! Messenger it is possible to form groups easily by adding all the members of one group to one account, so all participants can see who is connected and able to participate. If a participant is not connected, the others still can leave messages or email his/her Yahoo account from within the messenger. Finally, Yahoo! Messenger allows the participants to save their interactions to a folder in their computer, which the students then forwarded via email to their respective teachers.

The US students created their Yahoo! Messenger accounts in a class session at a computer lab in their university, tried the program to become familiar with it, and in groups created an instructional document in the target language (Spanish) to aid their Spanish key-pals through the process (See Appendix B). This process was done before the Spanish students started their semester (several weeks after the US students).

3.4. The tasks

According to a strong approach to task-based language that envisions real-world application tasks (Norris, forthcoming), this study employs three tasks. First, in accordance with the educational principle of “experience learning”, or learning by doing, learning to use an online environment effectively is a task in itself. By engaging in this project, students had the chance to learn to use a chat environment, explore its possibilities, and gain “the ability to create, manage and participate in effective online communication in a variety of genres and formats” (Warschauer 2006, p. 163). To improve their electronic literacy (Kern, 2006, Warschauer, 1999a, 1999b) or more specifically their “computer-mediated communication literacy” (Shetzer & Warschauer, 2000; Warschauer, 2003a).
Two more tasks were included in the study: one free-conversion task and a project-based task. Both of these tasks are considered “strong tasks” in the sense that they are both real-world tasks with real applications (Norris, forthcoming), and both based on the students’ needs. The free-conversation task has a real social application. Millions of people meet in chatrooms to converse and create social relations. In order to be able to interact appropriately there are certain rules and properties of the medium and the discourse that need to be known and followed. The project-based task also has real application in a world were business and education projects are conducted globally and collaboratively with people working at a distance. According to the 2004 Pew Internet & American Life surveys (2008), 53 million people in America use instant messaging programs, and about 11 million of them, use chatrooms or instant messaging at work and “they are becoming fond of its capacity to encourage productivity and interoffice cooperation” (np).

The group engaged in the project-based task had to create a complete itinerary for a trip. This task was comprised of several pedagogic tasks: First the pedagogic task “Un fin de semana fuera” (a weekend out). The students met at a computer lab to search for Spanish travel agencies and look at their prices, packages, destinations, etc. In groups of three, using Yahoo! Messenger and the target language, they proposed and negotiated some destination for a weekend trip. This pedagogic task was designed to provide students with a variety of input, similar to the one they would encounter later, and allow them to become familiar with the on-line environment. As a second pedagogic task, built on the previous one, the students wrote a two-day itinerary based on their chat discussion. After this, students started their transatlantic collaborative project. First, each group (two
US students of Spanish and one or two Spaniards) had to negotiate their destination for a vacation with a budget of $6,000/per person for four weeks, visiting at least three different countries. After they had decided on places to visit, they had to create a full itinerary for the trip with a detailed budget, including flight information, hotels, and any activities, such as excursions, museums, and restaurants that they planned to visit (see Appendix C). The students were not provided with information on how to divide the work or how to work in their groups. They were only asked to meet once a week for at least one hour to work on the projects, and they were given instructions on the final product of the collaboration: a detailed itinerary in Microsoft Word format, with pictures and references to all the relevant links of cited Internet sites and other resources (see Appendix C).

The group that engaged in the free-conversation task was suggested topics related to the language curriculum similar to those in their Spanish textbook; however, these were only suggestions and they were free to “talk” about anything that was of interest to them. Some of these topics were: food in Spain, drinking outside the bars, the university, and nudity in movies. To become familiar with Yahoo! Messenger, this group also met at the computer lab for a session where they wrote instructions on how to open an account with Yahoo and invite participants to their chatroom (in Spanish). Afterwards, they practiced using the environment by engaging in the discussion of one of the texts in their Spanish book. Both groups were asked to meet once a week with their partners and chat for at least 60 minutes on the topic of their choice.
3.5. **Duration**

Following Ortega and Iberri-Shea’s (2005) recommendation to include longitudinal data that would allow one to “trace evidence for the long-term impact of the critical incidents on learners’ overall development of the L2 aspect under study” (p. 38), this study lasted eight weeks. Although a full semester (16 weeks) would have been preferred, this was impossible due to conflicting schedules between university calendars in Spain and the United States. However, it is important to note that although the project lasted eight weeks, the interactions between students and L1 speakers happened only once a week and they varied greatly in duration (from 10 to 75 minutes). In the eight week period students interacted between 2 and 7 times, with an average of 4 times (See Table 6.1. for students’ amount of participation).

3.6. **Permission**

The first step on this project was to obtain approval from the Committee on Human Studies at this university. The two teachers involved in the project in Spain also obtained permission from their respective institutions to conduct the project and collect data. The students filled a consent form allowing or rejecting the use of their data for the study before they started the activity (Appendix D). Students were also offered the alternative to be moved into a different section of the same course if they did not want to have this activity included in their curriculum. After the researcher explained the project none of the students took this option, and they seemed willing and motivated to participate. This seems to be in line with already reported positive attitudes of L2 students towards SCMC (Lee, 1998; Skinner & Austin, 1999, Tudini, 2002).
3.7. Procedures

After obtaining permission for this project, the researcher negotiated the topics, length, deadlines, and other details with the Spanish teachers. Both teachers were extremely cooperative and enthusiastic, and were willing to work with the researcher’s ideas.

3.7.1. Needs Analysis

During the first day of classes at the US institution, a needs analysis (NA) was conducted for both groups of students. The NA consisted of a questionnaire with five multiple-choice questions and five open-ended questions about their expectations and wants for the class and their vision of the use of the L2 for their future. The second day of class, a group interview was conducted to clarify some of the answers from the questionnaire. During the same week, individual interviews were conducted with teachers of other sections at the same level to elicit their idea of what the students’ needs were and what they thought was important for them to learn during the semester. Results suggested that some of the students had a general interest in learning Spanish for social purposes, while others thought they would use it for traveling purposes and in their future employment. From the teachers’ perspective, the need to communicate with other speakers of the L2 seemed to be a priority. From the communications with the teachers of the groups in Spain, it was clear that one group preferred to engage in casual conversation with the intention of “making friends” and learning more about other students in a different country as an outside of class activity, while the other group wanted to meet English speakers that would help them with their class projects. The teacher in this group
wanted her students to engage in some type of collaborative project and, given the difference in curriculum between the US students (general undergraduate) and the students in Spain (computer engineers), the interest of the US students in the use of Spanish for traveling was favored for this project. In exchange, the US students agreed to help the students in Spain with their final class assignment, an oral presentation. Based on these results, the researcher and the teacher in Spain decided on the topic of the project-based task, its duration, and final product.

3.7.2. Training

During the fourth week of the course at the US institution, before the students went to a lab session, they were asked to meet through the chat function of their university web site system, which is simpler than Yahoo! Messenger, and complete a simple task. One group completed a vocabulary game where one student provided definitions for relevant vocabulary words and the rest of the students tried to identify the word. The other group was asked to choose the next semester classes for a foreign/exchange student new to their university according to their own experiences and what they thought he might enjoy. The students’ chats last between 10 and 45 minutes, and one member of the group emailed them to the researcher at the end of the interaction.

The next class session was conducted at a computer lab for a training session. Students in both groups created Yahoo accounts, learned to download Yahoo! Messenger software, and practice using Yahoo! Messenger.

In the fifth week, the class was conducted again at the computer lab and this time one group engaged in the "Un fin de semana fuera" (a weekend out) pedagogic task (see
above 3.4 Topic and tasks), while the other group engaged in the discussion of a reading in their textbook using Yahoo! Messenger. One more week passed before the groups were formed and everybody was assigned to their Yahoo! Messenger groups, formed according to their schedule and availability to connect to the Internet. This proved especially difficult given the twelve-hour time difference between the US institution and Spain. After the groups were formed, the students arranged their own times to meet with their partners and set their pace of work. The students worked independently from the teachers, outside of class, for the following 6 weeks. This decision was made mainly because of the time difference between the two locations and for the students’ convenience, but also supported by Sanders (2006) who found that outside-of-class production in an SCMC environment was greater than in-class production. Table 3.1 provides a summary of the project time line.

### Table 3.1 Time frame for the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In the U.S.</th>
<th>In Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-semester</td>
<td>Permission from SHC</td>
<td>Initial contact with instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial contact with teachers in Spain</td>
<td>Permission from their institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>NA &amp; Task Design</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong> Chatroom practice + development of documentation for Yahoo! Messenger</td>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong> Chatroom practice + development of documentation for Yahoo! Messenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Still on vacation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>1) Pedagogic task: &quot;a weekend cut&quot; using Yahoo! Messenger</td>
<td>1) Pedagogic task: &quot;text discussion&quot; using Yahoo! Messenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) group formation</td>
<td>2) group formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1 1) Yahoo training with documents created by the US students 2) group formation</td>
<td>Group 2 1) Yahoo training with documents created by the US students 2) group formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>Final group formation</td>
<td>Final group formation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66
Week 6/7-12/13 | Project-based task (agree on destination) | Free-conversation task | Project-based task (agree on destination) | Free conversation
---|---|---|---|---
Week 13 | Final product + chat sessions to teacher | chat sessions emailed to teacher |  |
Week 14-16 | Help Spanish students with their Oral presentation | Get help from US students to prepare for their Oral present. |  |

### 3.7.3. Data collection

The main data for this study are the SCM interactions. After the students completed their chat discussions, they saved them to their computer and forwarded them to the researcher. Each group was expected to produce between five and ten interactions, which lasted approximately one hour. Two groups of students produced less than the required amount of interaction for a variety of reasons, mainly the difficulty to connect with their counterparts in Spain given the time difference. Those students decided to chat among themselves and complete the project without a L1 speaker in the group and therefore their data were not considered in this study.

### 3.7.4. Data analysis

A CA approach was taken to analyze the data. The entire data were first analyzed searching for patterns on the student/L1 speaker interaction that would reveal how the participants orient and display their address behavior. Since previous studies had pointed out second person pronouns of address as one of the main grammatical features to express closeness/distance and different types of affiliation, special attention was paid to those sequences that included linguistic features of address: Subject or object pronouns, vocatives, and verbs that include morphology for second person use. These instances
were recorded numerically for a systematic exploration of any possible variation in the
students’ use and any possible changes over time. [For a discussion on quantification of
CA data see Chapter 2, Reliability, validity, generalizability and quantification in CA].
After the first analysis of the data, several patterns arose which seemed to mark the
participants’ orientations to their relationships with the other group members. Those
sequences were then analyzed more in depth to investigate each participant’s patterns of
interaction, and whether these changed over time.

3.8. Transcription convention

The transcription of the data is somewhat unusual for CA. This is mainly due to
the fact that there are not clear standards of transcription for SCMC L2 data. The data are
arranged in two columns. The left column is the text from the synchronous computer-
mediated interactions without any modifications. Any orthographic symbols were used as
such by the participants. Nothing has been added or subtracted; only the names of the
participants have been changed. I have kept the data in a column which resembles closely
the actual look of the interaction for the participants, since the Yahoo! Messenger
window where the turns appear is about half a page width by default. In the second
column the translation from Spanish to English appears. In this column, those terms to
which the students refer metalinguistically, by talking about them during the talk, have
been kept in italics.

234. sonia: eres muy cachondo!!
235. heyo: Cachondo?
236. sonia: no se la traducción
237. sonia: gracioso
234. sonia: you are very funny!@[slang]
235. heyo: cachondo?
236. sonia: I don’t know the translation
237. sonia: funny
Square brackets [ ] are used to add possibly important information about a word, as in the example above. Although language errors were not marked as such, square brackets were also used when the students misspelled a word, or used an incorrect word, that was relevant for the interaction. This was done so that the reader would see clearly my interpretation of the incorrect word.

→ 241. heyo: Mucho mejor que monotonoso, | heyo: much better than monotonous (monótono)

When a longer explanation about a term or structure was needed, it was incorporated as a footnote. The translation is meant to help the reader follow the original interaction, and therefore easiness of reading was prioritized over accuracy or close reflection of participants' spelling (misspelling, abbreviations, etc). The translation is meant to be as close as possible to the Spanish structure and words, rather than a more accurate and fluent English translation.

In the right column the reader can also find the abbreviations 'infor-sg', 'infor-pl', 'form-sg', and 'form-pl' subindexing verbs and pronouns to visually help distinguish second person formal and informal pronouns and verb morphology.

- infor-sg = informal singular
- infor-pl = informal plural
- form-sg = formal singular
- form-pl = formal plural

In addition, since Spanish is a pro-drop language with infrequent overt subject pronouns, the translation of the subject pronouns was placed between parentheses “(you)” when they were not explicitly used by the participants (but necessary in English).
3.9. Measuring development

In the present study ‘development’ is defined as the improvement of the language learners on their linguistic abilities to use the Spanish address system (pronouns and verb morphology), as well as their interactional competency to engage in the action of ‘doing being close’. In order to determine whether there was any linguistic change in the students’ variation in the use of informal pronouns and verb morphology, each instance of second person subject pronouns (tú/usted/vosotros/ustedes), verb endings reflecting second person (as/a/aba/abas/ías/ías/ etc), direct, indirect, and prepositional pronouns (te/le/les/ti/se/contigo/etc) were identified and coded as formal or informal for each participant and for all their interactions (see Table 6.7. for an example). It is important to note here that, according to CA principles of emic analysis, the use of linguistic features coded was based on students’ production only, and not in relations to any possible obligatory environments were the verb could have or must have been used, as CA does not account for any intentionality or other possible alternative productions, but rather what the participants actually produce in each interaction.

From the data it was clear that the L1 speakers used informal address from their first interaction both when addressing one interlocutor (tú, te, ti, tu, contigo) or several (vosotros, os). Development of students’ pronominal addressivity is then shown as their increase of informal pronouns and verb morphology use and decrease of formal use (as in Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003).

From the first exploration of the data it was clear that several students were employing resources other than pronouns and verb morphology to display closeness and distance. These patterns were microanalyzed and a framework based on Pomerantz and
Mandelbaum's (2004) characterization of 'being close' was used to focus the scope of the multiple resources employed by the participants. This framework will be presented in detailed in chapter 5. In order to measure learners’ development of interactional competence, or how students learned to do 'being close' the patterns of interaction discovered through the CA in their practices were placed in a possible continuum of address behavior (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2 Continuum of address behavior

| Distant | Acquaintance | Friendly | Intimate |
|---------|--------------|---------|----------|----------|


CHAPTER 4 - SEQUENTIAL ORGANIZATION IN SCMC

4.1. Introduction

SCM discourse has been defined as a hybrid between oral and written communication, with shared characteristics, but different from both (Coolot & Bellmore, 1996; Davis & Brewer, 1997; Ferrara et al., 1991; Lanham, 1993; Murray, 1995). This is one of the most salient characteristics of this medium, but it is not unique to it. A note on the refrigerator written to a roommate is delivered in the written medium; nevertheless it may contain linguistic features (colloquialisms, simplified structures, incomplete sentences, jokes...) which are more typical of oral communication. In the case of SCMC, the mode of communication is written (keyboard strokes transmitted via Internet), but the interactional features of the discourse are more similar to an oral conversation. The fact that the medium is an emergent form of communication entails that the participants are helping shape the medium. In order to answer the first research question: What does the sequential organization of SCMC between L1 speakers and L2 learners look like?, the data gathered from the first interaction that students had in week 4, outside of the class, where they completed a simple task using the chat function of their university web site system (See Chapter 3 “7.2. Training”) was microanalyzed. These data were selected for two reasons: First, it was the first chat interaction in which students engaged for this

---

study, and second, their interactions lack time-stamps, since the chat system they used does not provide this feature. I will argue then that although time-stamps are a useful tool as indicators of the turn-taking system, we can actually see the progression of the sequence and the students’ orientation towards it even without time-stamps.  

4.2. Sequence Organization

The sequence organization in SCMC seems chaotic, highly disrupted, without any adjacency (Herring, 1999), mainly due to the fact that the exact timing of message placement cannot be controlled by the interactants. That is, they do not know exactly where in the interaction their message is going to be placed, and this is even more unpredictable when more participants join the interaction (Schönfeldt & Golato, 2003). All researchers agree that the structure of SCMC is different from that of oral communication, and although some researchers claim that the interaction is not sequential and does not follow the time patterns of adjacency pairs and sequences described for oral interaction by previous CA research (Negretti, 1999), others have advocated for a difference between the overall structure of the interaction, and individual strands or conversions which do seem to adhere to the basic rules of sequential organization, especially with respect to adjacency pairs (Schönfeldt & Golato, 2003).

Although the data for this study seemed chaotic at first glimpse, a closer look demonstrated that students are capable of conducting complicated interactions without any apparent problem, and that multiple strands of communication are intertwined.

4 Several of the interactions in the data are lacking time stamps, specially the first interactions, because the students forgot to select this feature.
forming the macro sequence of the interaction. In example 4.1. the participants carry out at least two main strands of conversation.

(4.1.)

2. Heidi (10:41:37 PM): ¿Cómo estás?
3. John (10:41:46 PM): ¿Dispones de Carlos para la escuela?
4. Sheila (10:41:54 PM): hola, bien, y tú
5. Heidi (10:41:58 PM): no!
7. Sheila (10:42:12 PM): ¿Cuándo llegará?
10. Heidi (10:43:08 PM): o perfecto! El puede empezar con el semestre de verano

Heidi: Hello girls
Heidi: how are you?  
John: Good! [bien] do (you) hear that Carlos is going to Hawaii for school?  
Sheila: hello, good and you  
Heidi: no!
John: yes it is the truth  
Sheila: when will he arrive?  
Heidi: good  
John: this summer I think in June  
Heidi: oh perfect! he can start with the summer semester [semestre]

Turns that appear next to each other in an oral interaction are viewed as adjacency pairs, which form a strongly inter-related sequence. When we observe turns that appear next to each other in Extract 1, we can see that they do not constitute adjacency pairs, they do not reflect interconnected actions. However, a closer look shows that interlocutors' messages clearly orient to specific previous messages within the conversation. This phenomenon was observed in chatrooms where all interactants were L1 speakers, and was termed "virtual adjacency" by Schönfeldt and Golato (2003).

Extract 4.1 contains several of these "virtual adjacency pairs", for example: greeting-

---

5 All orthographic and diacritic marks in the transcripts reflect not intonation or CA conventions, but rather the participants' postings as they happened, including typographical errors. Translation was done by the researcher and efforts were made to reflect the students' utterances as much as possible. Morphological, typographical, and lexical errors, although frequent, are only marked in the translation (err) when relevant for the interaction. All names are pseudonyms, and they do not coincide with the names of the same participants later in the study, since they selected new names for themselves for the rest of the interaction.

6 Although very common in SCMC, the interruption of adjacency pairs is not exclusive of this medium. Insertion sequences, repairs, and utterances from a multiparty oral conversation might interrupt an adjacency pair in face-to-face conversation (Schegloff 1995, 2007a).
greeting (1/2-4, 1/2-8, 1/2-3, extract 4.1.a), question-answer (7-9 extract 4.1.b), and news announcement-response (3-5).

(4.1.a)

2. Heidi (10:41:37 PM): como estan?  
4. Sheila (10:41:54 PM): hola, bien, y tu  

(4.1.b)

7. Sheila (10:42:12 PM): cuando llegara?  

(4.1.c)

1. John (10:41:46 PM): escuchas que carlos va a Hawaii para escuela?  
5. Heidi (10:41:58 PM): no!

The data also suggest that students orient to a sequence composed of adjacency pairs, even inside a “disrupted” interaction. Extract 4.2 exemplifies how students orient to the absence of an expected response, in a greeting sequence, where the second part of the adjacency pair is missing.

(4.2.)

1. Lee (9:15:25 PM) Hola  
2. Pat (9:15:26 PM) hey  
3. Pat (9:15:28 PM) hola iris  
4. Iris (9:15:30 PM) chicos como estas?  
5. Pat (9:15:35 PM): bien, empezamos tengo mucha trabajo  
6. Lee (9:15:40 PM): si me too  
7. Iris (9:15:50 PM): kristie  
8. Iris (9:15:52 PM):  
10. Kristie (9:16:08 PM): si estoy
Lee, Pat, and Iris greet their classmates when they enter the chatroom. Although Kristie shows as present in the chatroom, she has not answered anybody’s greeting. In line 7 Iris summons Kristie unsuccessfully. After this, we see an upgraded turn by Pat in line 9 with multiple uses of her name and a typographic extension, which is usually the equivalent to phonetic indication of excitement, negative or positive (Danet et al., 1996; Werry, 1996). The missing second pair part to the summons is treated as relevantly absent by the coparticipants. Both Iris in line 11 “finalmente” [finally] and Lee in line 13 “es damn tiempo” [it’s damn time] hold Kristie accountable for her lack of response when she finally shows briefly in line 11. Kristie orients to this accountability by apologizing in line 20 “lo siento” [I’m sorry] when she reenters the conversation.

Several instances of adjacency pairs, and virtual adjacency pairs, especially opening and closing sequences, were present in the data (in agreement with Negretti, 1999). These sequences are very similar to those employed by native speakers in SCMC (Rintel, Pittam, & Mulholland, 2003), and both are very similar to those employed in FtoF or telephone interaction (in addition to the CA literature, see also Braun, 1998; Edmondson,
Furthermore, the data also presented instances where messages that seem part of a sequence are only placed next to each other by chance (called “phantom agency” by Garcia & Jacobs, 1999), resulting from the participants’ lack of control over the placement of their postings. It takes commitment from the participants to distinguish and orient to those messages that are relevant to their conversational strands and disregard those that are not. Language students do not seem to be different from native speakers in this respect.

4.3. Turns and turn-taking system

While in oral conversation the floor usually belongs to one speaker at a time (Sacks et al., 1974), in SCMC all participants can be composing and posting messages simultaneously. The sequence in which the messages will appear depends on when they are received by the server, which in turn depends on the length of the turn, the composer’s typing speed, and the connection speed between the participant’s computer and the server. Therefore, there is no competition for the right to submit a message (all messages can be submitted at any time), although there may be competition to submit first for a specific turn space (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999; Schönfeldt & Golato, 2003), since the farther a message is placed from its referent, the higher probability for it to be misunderstood or ignored.

There is high agreement among SCMC studies that the turn-taking system in SCMC is quite different from any PtoF turn-taking system, and that it is highly constrained by the medium (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999; Herring, 1999; Murray, 1989;

---

7 It is worth noting here that Murray (1998) found opposite results in her data of technical consultations through CMC.
Negretti, 1999; Schönfeldt & Golato, 2003). In oral conversation, participants indicate to their coparticipants the end of their turn construction unit through vocal and non-vocal behaviors. When the end of the turn can be projected, turn-transition becomes relevant, at which point the current speaker may select the next speaker, or, if this does not happen, a next speaker may self-select, and if the next speaker does not self-select, then the current speaker may continue (Sacks et al., 1974). Because in SCMC, turns appear on screen as complete units, recipients cannot anticipate transition-relevance places; in fact, each posted message is viewed as a transition-relevance place (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999). Based on this factor, most authors have claimed that the concept of TCU is irrelevant to SCMC, and that chat interactions cannot exhibit overlaps, recycled turn beginnings, collaborative completions, interruptions, continuers, and so forth (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999; Negretti, 1999; Schönfeldt & Golato, 2003).

One of the reasons to select Yahoo! Messenger for this study was that this program includes timestamps indicating when a message is posted. Timestamps cannot guarantee that the turns were produced at the same time, as Internet connection, server access and speed, and typing speed may be factors to determine the exact order the turns appear on screen. However, they are indicators of how overlaps are recorded by the computer, as well as how turns appear in the screen and are made available to participants at the same time, much like hearing them simultaneously during oral interaction (see Extract 4.3).⁸

⁸ Some of the on-going debate about what constitutes ‘overlapping’ in SCMC has to do with the definition of overlap. If we take a more general definition “Talk by more than one person at a time in the same conversation” (Schegloff, 2000: 2), instances such as the ones in Extract 4.3 could be considered overlapping. However, if we consider Schegloff’s provision that overlapping occurs when more than one speaker talks in a conversation “which is the locus for the “one-speaker-at-a-time” provision in the first
(4.3.)

26. John (10:46:04 PM): pienso que el debe estudiar historia tambien
27. Sheila (10:46:16 PM): si!
29. Heidi (10:46:19 PM): carlos va a estar muy ocupado
33. Sheila (10:46:56 PM): porque 79elcil el debe sabe algo de historia
34. John (10:47:00 PM): como la historia de Hawal y otras
35. Heidi (10:47:00 PM): si un poco de la historia
...
88. Heidi (10:55:29 PM): pero no mucha lectura
89. John (10:55:34 PM): exactamente
90. Sheila (10:55:34 PM): si

John: I think he should study history too
Sheila: yes!
John: because there are a lot of history courses at the university
Heidi: Carlos is going to be very busy
John: it is the truth!
Sheila: because he still needs to know some history
John: like history of Hawaii and others
Heidi: yes some history
Heidi: but not a lot of reading
John: exactly
Sheila: yes

Extract 4.3 shows three instances where students' postings overlapped, and although the time stamps cannot guarantee the students' intentions of posting the messages at that exact time, the microanalysis of the data shows that Heidi's statement 'carlos va a estar muy ocupado' [Carlos is going to be very busy] in line 29 is a comment on John's proposal in line 26 'pienso que el debe estudiar historia tambien' [I think he should study history too]. Heidi's comment could be seen as a mild disagreement to John's proposal and Sheila's emphatic agreement (line 27), which happens at the same time that John expands his idea on line 28. Lines 34 and 35 are both agreement tokens to Sheila's statement in line 33 which are posted at the same. Similarly, both line 89 and 90

instance" (Schegloff, 2000: 5), then SCMC does not seem to be the appropriate environment to be discussing "overlapping", since one of the main intrinsic characteristics of SCMC is the possibility of multiple speakers and multiple conversations happening at the same time.
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are agreement tokens to Heidi’s statement in line 88 which appear simultaneously on screen.

However, the timestamps are not the best indicators that some overlapping is occurring. Extract 4.4. illustrates that participants themselves orient to the overlapping messages in SCMC. Mele, in line 26, posts “we wrote this at the same time,” orienting to the overlap of her turn in line 24 and Ana’s turn in line 23.

| 22. Mele: diane lane es una actriz que me gusta también | Merle: diane lane is an actress that I like also |
| 23. Ana: Si, Me gusta la 80elícula “Under the Tuscan Sun” | Ana: yes, I like the movie “Under the Tuscan Sun” |
| 24. Mele: “debajo el tuscan sol” es un video muy bueno | Merle: “under the 80elicu sun” is a good video |
| 25. Mele: que sorpresa | Merle: what a surprise |
| 26. Mele: nosotros escribimos esta al mismo tiempo | Merle: we wrote this [esto] at the same time |
| 27. Ana: ;( | Ana: ;( |

These data suggest that some type of overlap occurs in SCMC, and it is visible not only through timestamps (which may be deceiving) but through the microanalysis of the interaction which shows student orientation to the phenomenon.

Turn allocation is highly conditioned by the characteristics of the computer-mediated mode. The lack of visual and audio clues limits the strategies that the participants use for turn allocation. Common features such as gaze, intonation, and gestures that have proved important for oral communication among language learners (Mori & Hayasi, 2006; Olscher, 2004) are not available to them. Nevertheless, SCMC participants employ a variety of different turn-allocation techniques. They select the next speaker, or what Garcia and Jacobs (1999) have termed “next poster”, by addressing their postings to a specific participant (especially when there are multiple participants). Garcia
and Jacobs pointed out that this method of turn allocation does not guarantee that participant's turn selected as next will be posted in the 'next' turn, and therefore they refer to this as 'future' poster, rather than 'next' poster. Although nothing guarantees a participant as the possible next poster, there is motivation to position messages as closely as possible to their referent to increase the chances of being understood. One of the techniques that has been pointed out to select next speaker in SCMC is addressivity (to name the next speaker explicitly inside a turn). While previous studies found high use of addressivity in SCMC (Herring, 1999; Kitade, 2000; Negretti, 1999; Schönfeldt & Golato, 2003), the students in my data did not show such a phenomenon. Quite likely, because most of the interactions involved only two or three participants, the need for explicit future poster selection was not as great as in public chatrooms where turns are highly displaced by the large number of postings from multiple participants.

The following is an example of the use of the 'current speaker selects next' technique. Quite similar to instances of telephone openings, Charles opens the conversation with a summons, which makes a response relevant in the next turn as part of a 'summons-answer sequence' (Schegloff, 1968).

(4.5.)

30. Charles: Hola Donde 81 ellc mi amigas?
31. Charles: Hoy, tengo muchas otras tareas Garamba!
32. Charles: hola!!
33. Anna: como esta ?
34. Rose: hola
35. Rose: bien, gracias

Charles: Hello Where are (you) my friends?
Charles: Today, I have a lot of other homework Darn! [caramba] Charles: hello!! Anna: how are (you) ? Rose: hello Rose: fine, thanks

Since there is no answer to Charles' summons (line 30), he continues, upgrading his turn with an expletive and an exclamation mark (line 31). When he still does not
obtain a response, he repeats his summons, upgrading it with several exclamation marks (line 32), a common practice in SCMC, usually equivalent to some intonation emphasis in oral conversation.⁹

In oral conversation the current speaker may decide to hold his or her turn and continue speaking beyond a transition-relevance place. This practice would usually be accompanied by non-final pitch (Selting, 1996) and/or non-verbal cues that would prevent a potential next speaker from treating the turn as having reached a transition-relevance place. In SCMC, turn-keeping practices are highly constrained since prosodic and non-verbal cues are limited. One of the techniques that native speakers use to hold the floor is to post shorter messages that can be typed and submitted faster, and if the message is too long, divide it in two or more separate turns (García & Jacobs, 1999). The students' data also show instances of participants trying to maintain the floor. For example, in Extract 4 above, Mele breaks her message into two turns (25 ‘que sorpresa’ and 26 ‘nosotros escribimos esta al mismo tiempo’), probably to ensure that at least her turn in line 25, a very short one, will be placed before Ana continues the conversation.

Although there seems to be no conventional way for a participant to signal that her turn is incomplete beyond a possible completion point, Herring (1999) explained that one of her participants reported agreeing with his partner on the use of “%” at the end of a message to indicate that they were not ready to yield the floor. Similarly, in Extract 6, one of the students used suspensive points to maintain her turn. In line 3, Chrisi announces that she

---

⁹ It is interesting to note that in oral communication, if a current speaker selects next and the other speakers do not take a turn, the resulting absence of a turn (silence) may be part of the format of a dispreferred second-pair part. However, the tolerance for the absence of a turn from the recipient of a ‘current speaker selects next’ technique in SCMC seems to be non-problematic for the participants (lines 33-35). This is an important area in much need of further research.
is ready to start the task at hand and negotiates her role as the conductor (‘yo empezara, de acuerdo?’) Her partner accepts her role in line 4, and a multi-turn sequence starts which Chrisi marks with suspensive points to hold the floor for five turns (lines 5 to 9). It is not until she types a period instead of suspensive points, in line 9, that Moto ventures his answer, which seems to imply that Moto orients to the suspensive points as a device to hold the floor and to the period in line 9 as indicating a turn-transitional relevance place.

(4.6.)

1. Chrisi: Hola, Moto! Como estas?
2. Moto: Hola Chrisi, estoy lista, y tu?
3. Chrisi: Si, estoy lista. Yo empezara, de acuerdo?
4. Moto: si
5. Chrisi: OK, esta persona tiene mucho dinero y trabaja con 83elícula83 ... 
6. Chrisi: Tiene coches 83elícula ...
7. Chrisi: Su trabajo es va a fiestas y paga los actores ...
8. Chrisi: y director ...
10. Moto: es el productor?

Chrisi: Hello, Moto! How are you?
Moto: Hello Chrisi, I am ready, and you?
Chrisi: Yes, I am ready. I will start (empazaré) do (you) agree?
Moto: yes
Chrisi: OK, this person has a lot of money and works with movies ...
Chrisi: Has good cars
Chrisi: His job is he goes to parties and pays the actors ...
Chrisi: and director ...
Chrisi: his name is always in movie poster
Moto: is it the producer?
Chrisi: Yes, it is true

This interaction seems to suggest that students used conventions from FtoF, or other mediated interaction such as phone conversations in the SCMC environment.

4.4. Summary

Although interaction in SCMC does not allow the students to utilize the same resources as in oral conversation (e.g., relying on the prior turn as context, accessing a turn as it is being produced to project an upcoming transition-relevance place), the
students in the study engaged in meaningful and organized interaction, they allocate turns employing a turn-taking system borrowed from oral communication but re-shaped and adapted to SCMC. By confirming that students orient to the sequential and turn-taking organization of the interaction, we can now look at such organization to investigate how students demonstrate addressivity behavior when engaged in SCMC with L1 speakers.
CHAPTER 5 - L1 SPEAKERS' ADDRESS BEHAVIOR

5.1. Introduction

This chapter explores the second research question: What type of address behavior do L1 speakers of Spanish exhibit when engaged in synchronous computer-mediated interaction with L2 learners? This chapter presents the address behavior of the L1 Spanish speakers in the project. It illustrates how L1 speakers displayed closeness and what interactive resources they employed to build, or not, relationships with the language students. A first analysis of the data revealed that the L1 speakers were employing many resources to create affiliation, develop relationships, and convey closeness. In order to narrow the scope of these resources, Pomerantz and Mandelbaum's (2004) proposal of actions and practices that are recognized as part and parcel of specific relationship categories was used. The examples presented in this chapter are from different L1 speakers and from different moments during the project, but the data is not developmental in nature since it is assumed that L1 speakers are not acquiring these resources but rather displaying them according to the relationships they build through the interactions.

5.2. Doing 'being close'

According to Pomerantz and Mandelbaum (2004) it is possible to study explicit relationship categories based on Sacks' analysis of representative and inference-rich properties, through CA, by analyzing how participants claim "incumbency in a relationship category", how the participants rely on their assumptions about the activities and competencies when accomplishing conversational actions. Pomerantz and
Mandelbaum (2004) point out several actions and conducts associated with “the entitlement to claim the relationship descriptor ‘close’” (p. 161).

5.2.1. Sharing reports of activities

The first one of these is “sharing reports of one’s activities”, which is usually also associated with remembering information from previous interaction and asking for updates on the activities and the events on the interlocutor’s life, monitoring closely each other’s schedule and events and displaying understanding and interest for the other’s activities.

The actions include providing news of events in one’s life about which the other person would not know, inquiring about events or problems discussed during previous interactions, and providing updates in response to inquiries and to displays of interest. (Pomerantz & Mandelbaum, 2004, p. 162).

As an example Pomerantz and Mandelbaum offer an extract from Morrison (1997)

Excerpt 5 (UTCL A35C.5:12, modified)
36 Lisa: How was your drive
37 Howie Just fine,
38 Lisa Good
39 Howie Just fine, (.) no problem, (0.3) no problem at all
40 ...that road over to uh: the interstate was like slick,
41 but not too bad.

In their analysis of the excerpt they point out that after Howie’s minimal response to Lisa’s question, in line 38 Lisa seems to encourage Howie to elaborate in the initial question, which serves as enacting “mutual high involvement”, an action in which one person asks about an event both parties know has happened since their last contact and the other answers sharing the news, updating the first person about the event.
5.2.2. Discussing personal information

Pomerantz and Mandelbaum (2004) point out ‘discussing personal problems’ as an activity proper of the category of friends and inappropriate for the categories of acquaintances and strangers. They report work by Jefferson and Lee (1980, 1981) and Sacks' (1992) work on phone calls to a Suicide Prevention Center, which illustrate how talking about personal problems is a co-constructed activity in which the recipient contribution may indicate affiliation. In the same line, Drew and Chilton (2000) point out that inquiring about the other’s schedule and problems, particularly concerning health, provides a sense of ‘proximateness’ between interactants (p. 157).

5.2.3. Recognition of shared knowledge

Another practice considered by Pomerantz and Mandelbaum (2004) that allows participants to claim the relationship trait “close” is that of initiating talk about a shared experience or shared knowledge with minimal reference, which the other party recognizes. Pomerantz and Mandelbaum (2004) cite research by Lerner (1992) who states that in multi-party conversations, a speaker usually expects a relational partner to be able to remember shared past events to bring to the floor to share with the group. And by Maynard and Zimmerman (1984) who found that acquaintance interactants (from friends to married couples) consistently rely on shared knowledge for topic initiation.

Excerpt 8 (From Maynard & Zimmerman, 1984, p.303)

1  Bill: Joe came by the other night
2  James: Oh yeah?
3  Bill: Yeah
4  James: This is all on tape and don’t say anything that could uh
5  Bill: Incriminate you?
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James: Exactly. Anyway what do you say?
Bill: Well we went to Los Angeles
James: Yesterday?
Bill: → Yeah I went by you know the guy’s place and
Bill: → he went to Los Angeles, so- I’m gonna get it Monday maybe
James: You discuss the price?
Bill: No but I think it’s gonna be lower than he said

By using “the guy” in line 10 and “it” in line 11, Bill relies in James’s previous knowledge to understand what it is being referred to as a referent to a previous conversation. According to Pomerantz and Mandelbaum (2004), this display of shared knowledge is a practice to enact incumbency in a relationship with a degree of familiarity.

In a study conducted on married couples appearing in a TV program, Conroy (1999) also found that married couples employed shared knowledge as a form of affiliation and loyalty, even in the presence of “structural disaffiliation” (disagreement).

5.2.4. Shared laughter

Laughter has long been associated with the building of rapport or affiliation. Although laughter may be associated to multiple events and may be used by interactants to fulfill several communicative actions (see Attardo, 2003; Glenn, 2003; Jefferson, 1979, 2004; Stewart, 2000), several studies have focused on shared laughter and conversational humor as an affiliative move, designed to create and maintain rapport and solidarity (Baym, 1995; Coates, 2007; Davies, 2003; Ellis, 1997; Glenn, 2003; Norrick, 1993, 2003; Hay, 2000; Boxer and Cortes-Conde, 1997). According to Moerman (1988) shared laughter is “conversation’s greatest device for conviviality and co-alignment” (p. 73).

Jefferson et al. (1987) point out that laughter is a systematic, socially organized activity.
It can be “an achieved product of methodic co-ordinated processes, with occasion of laughing together oriented to, produced, extended, as an event in itself” (p. 159) as a component of an affiliative sequence.

Studies in cross-cultural interaction often analyze shared laughter as an interactional management strategy used as a communicative tool by the interactants to develop relationships. Davies (2003) claims that for Americans “joking is a significant manifestation of conversational involvement, because it represents an important way in which rapport is developed and maintained” (p. 1362). She found in her study that language learners, even very beginning ones, engage in the construction of jokes and share laughter as a communicative tool. They achieve communication within these jointly-constructed joking episodes “through displaying understanding by playing within the frame set out by the other, which is essential for the development of rapport” (p. 1381). Bravo (1996, 1998), observed that laughter is used to create an affiliative environment among Spanish negotiators, used to mitigate the negative effect of personal disapproval expressions.

5.3. Doing ‘being closer’: Intimacy

According to Pomerantz and Mandelbaum (2004) there are three main resources used to display intimacy: elaboration of a problem, shared laughter, and use of improprieties, usually followed by laughter.

5.3.1 Elaboration of a problem

Following the idea that discussing personal problems is an action linked to the categories of friends or family, Jefferson and Lee (1980) suggest that when after the
telling of a problem and a sympathetic response to it, an elaboration, more emotional turn follows up, it constitutes a moment of intimacy between the interactants. Similarly, Cohen's (1999) research on support groups found that empathetic responses to the stories told in the support group constituted a type of intimacy, connecting interlocutors that had shared the same experiences.


Excerpt 6 (NB:IV:14;2)
E: I have to take two tub baths with tar in it every hhhhhh day?  B: Yeah?
E: Ahhhhh And I have t have inment oy put on four times a day and I'm under:: violat ray for a few seconds, and I got a shot in the butt of vitamin: (0.2) A:: skin.
(0.5)
L: Jesus
E: Little, honest to God you know, I just broke out terribly and, I just- just my legs were just covered hh

Jefferson and Lee (1980) suggest that after L’s affiliative uptake as a response to E’s reporting of her problem, E produces a more emotional version of what happened, creating a “moment of intimacy” between the interactants (p. 163).

5.3.2. Shared laughter

According to Glenn (2003), shared laughter, speech errors, teasing and impropriety contribute to conversational play and intimacy. Errors followed by shared laughter provide a warrant for some next action to prolong the laughter, and the error becomes a potential extension device to continue language play.
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(Jefferson, 1979, P.80)

DAN  I though that wz pretty outta sight didju hear me gay'r you a junkie.
     (0.5)
DAN  hheh heh
DOLLY hheh-heh-heh

In this example, Dolly's laugh does not occur until Dan provides a laugh invitation after a lack of uptake by Dolly at the end of his candidate laughable (marked by the silence). By joining in laughter with Dan, Dolly shows responsive and mutual ratification of the humorous frame.

5.3.3. Use of improprieties followed by shared laughter.

The next category presented by Pomerantz and Mandelbaum (2004) is the use of improprieties and the uptake by others of this improprieties by using other improprieties or/and by laughter. According to Jefferson (1974):

rudeness, blasphemy, and obscenity can operate as indices of intimacy, their occurrence in some ongoing talk constituting an offered formulation of degree of intimacy, that formulation being negotiable in subsequent talk. (p. 198)

If an impropriety is brought into conversation by the speaker, initiating a move towards intimacy, it may be accepted by the listener not just as acceptable but also as an invitation to intimacy. Sequences that start with an impropriety then provide opportunities in subsequent turns for intimacy display (Glenn, 2003).

Jefferson et al. (1987) suggest that intimacy is enacted as an interactive matter in and through the production of "improper talk" where the interactants may use improper talk to move towards the co-construction of a more intimate interaction. According to Jefferson et al. (1987) the affiliation through laughter is sometimes embedded in a more
complex sequence where the listener may first resist and then laugh together as a sign of affiliation.

The introduction of ‘improper’ talk may have an interactional basis. That is, it is a convention about interaction that frankness, rudeness, crudeness, profanity, obscenity, etc., are indices of relaxed, unguarded, spontaneous; i.e. intimate interaction. (...) Further, the introduction of such talk may be, not only a display of perception by one party of the status of the interaction, but a consequential, programmatic action. By introducing such talk (...) [a] Speaker may be offering an invitation to his co-participants to produce talk together whereby they can see themselves as intimate; together they will be constructing intimacy. (p. 160)

The following is an example from Jefferson (1974, pp 197-198)

Cathy: 'Wuld this could work you intuh the full principalship couldn’it?
Gene: Oh, if I wannida go tht route I, don't know.
Gene: Yih know.
Cathy: 'W'wuuh wd that 'nvolve. More schooling.
Gene: → Oh yea it's justa buncha crap y'know? Cathy, en it's, I uh,
Cathy: Wul is the money there though Gene tuh compensate, you?
Gene: Yeah, there would be, there’s quite a- there’s good money 'n-
They’re - talkin now about goin up tuh thirty one grand ez a principal.
Cathy: Oh rrilly?
Gene: Yeah.
Cathy: Wul knowing you you'd have thirty one en, thousand and nickel,
Gene: hhh! Heh-heh-heh-heh
Cathy: → Shit y- I think y'got the original nickel,
Gene: hheh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh

In this example, the use of one of the interactants of obscenity (crap) produces a reciprocal second by the other speakers (shit), followed by laughter from the first speaker. In this way, participants negotiate their understanding of each other and their relationship.

The following table (presented in Chapter 3) is a summary of the practices presented above and how they contribute to the understanding of ‘doing being distant’ to ‘doing being intimate’ in Spanish.
Table 5.1. Practices that define from doing ‘being distant’ to doing ‘being intimate’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distant</th>
<th>Acquaintance</th>
<th>Friendly</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Formal address behavior (usted)</td>
<td>o Formal address behavior (tú)</td>
<td>o Informal Address behavior (tú, vocatives)</td>
<td>o Informal Address behavior (tú, vocatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Neutral, non-personal topics</td>
<td>o Neutral, non-personal topics</td>
<td>o Sharing reports of one’s activities</td>
<td>o Share personal problems - empathy/sympathy uptake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o No shared laughter</td>
<td>o No shared laughter</td>
<td>o Asking for updates on the other’s activities</td>
<td>o Use of improprieties, blasphemy, and slang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Discussion of personal problems</td>
<td>o Shared laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Sharing common knowledge</td>
<td>o Sharing common knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Shared laughter</td>
<td>o Language play</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4. Address pronouns and verb morphology

The data in the present study indicated that L1 speakers display a homogenous address behavior. All L1 speakers employed exclusively the informal pronouns ‘tú’, ‘te’, ‘túl’, ‘tuyo/a/s’, ‘contigo’ to address one other speaker, and ‘vosotros’, ‘os’, ‘vuestra/a/s’ to address several speakers, accompanied by verbs with morphological marking for second person singular (tú) and plural (vosotros). This confirms the previously observed tendency of Spaniards to employ informal addressivity, especially when engaged in conversation with people of their same age, even if they have never met before (Blas Arroyo, 1994; Fox, 1969; Marín, 1972; Schwenter, 1993).

5.5. L1 speakers doing ‘being close’

In spite of the general use of informal address, the data presented clear differences in how close or distant the L1 speakers and students were. Some of the conversations starting being informal, but not necessary close, and evolved to address behavior that displayed friendliness or even intimacy. Some others started informally and maintained a
tone of distance through the entire process. As stated above, Pomerantz and Mandelbaum (2004) suggested several activities associated with incumbency in the relation category of "close": sharing reports of activities and asking for updates, displaying interest in the other's activities, discussing personal problems and displaying sympathy, recognizing shared knowledge, and joking and laughing together. And some actions associated with 'being intimate' such as flirting and the use of improprieties and slang. Therefore, by analyzing whether the participants enact these actions we can state whether they belong to the category of friends (close), intimate (closer), or not friends (distant).

5.5.1. Sharing reports of activities

Sharing reports of one's activities, as a form of affiliation and doing 'being friendly', entails both parties providing information about one's own schedule, daily life, likes and dislikes, asking for updates on the activities and the events of the interlocutor's life, monitoring closely each other’s schedule and events and displaying understanding and interest for the other's activities and schedule. The following are examples of such behavior by several of the L1 speakers in the present study.

5.1. Cid and Jacy, Interaction 4

67. Cid (10:16:31 AM): sueles leer periódicos en español?
68. Jacy (10:16:54 AM): no...porqué?
69. Cid (10:17:36 AM): yo es que me suelo meter en webs de periódicos en inglés y los leo, así practicas lectura (aunque a veces, no entiendas nada=

70. Jacy (10:19:02 AM): una idea buena...a veces mi profesora traje artículos de españa o otras países

Cid: do (you) usually read newspapers in Spanish?
Jacy: no...why?
Cid: I usually go into english newspaper websites and read them, that way (you) practice reading (although sometimes (you) don't understand anything= 10
Jacy: a good idea...sometimes my teacher brings articles from Spain or other Spanish countries

10 'you' here is an impersonal form rather than directed to Jacy
In this excerpt, Cid volunteers personal information about activities he usually engages in to practice his L2. The excerpt opens with a pre-sequence which seems to make an advance bid to tell a story about his activities (Lerner, 1992). Jacy orientes to his turn both as a question, and also as a story preface by answering the question, line 68 'no', and by requesting elaboration of his turn ('¿porqué?'). This provides Cid with 'action space' to deliver his report (Lerner, 1992), aligning herself as a story recipient (Jefferson, 1978).

Many of the sequences in which personal activities were volunteered by the L1 speaker happened during opening and closing sequences of the interaction (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). During the opening sequences both L1 speakers and learners asked for updates on activities which had been referenced in previous interactions. During closing sequences, providing personal information was often part of a pre-closing sequence in which students tried to set their next meeting time. The next excerpts illustrate the L1 speaker providing personal information as part of such a sequence.

5.2. Meme, Juanjoloci and Chiso, Interaction 3 for Juanjoloci, 4 for Chiso

387. Meme (11:55:58 AM): si, Cencienta se tiene que ir despidiendo ya
389. Meme (11:56:09 AM): cuando podéis quedarse otra vez
Several turns omitted
396. Juanjoloci (11:56:56 AM): puedes quedarse por la mañana, mañana entiendo no muy temprano

Meme: yes, Cinderella has to say goodbye
Juanjoloci: it is twelve, Chiso
Meme: when can (you) meet again
Juanjoloci: can (you) meet in the morning, morning I understand not too early

95
Towards the end of their interaction, Meme utters a two part pre-closing sequence, by announcing she has to leave (lines 387) and introducing a new topic, an ‘unmentioned mentionable’ (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) (the time to meet again), a common practice in closing sequences among Spanish speakers (Coronel-Molina, 1998). At this point, Juanjoloci orients to her question by providing a suggestion of a time to meet (line 396). In the following line, although Meme could have rejected the suggestion with a minimal post-expansion (Schegloff, 2007a), she provides an alternative non-minimal post expansion in which she volunteers personal information, which she elaborates a few turns later (line 415). A similar example happened between Sonia and Heyo in their first interaction.

5.3. Sonia and Heyo, Interaction 1

137. sonia: bueno ahora si q te dejo
138. sonia: tengo q hacer unas cosillas, tengo que ir a comprar un regalo
139. heyo: Bien.
140. sonia: y no se lo q voy a tardar
141. heyo: Nos vemos.

sonia: ok now I do have to go
sonia: I have a few things to do, I have to go buy a present
heyo: Fine
sonia: and I don’t know how long it will take
heyo: See you

\[11\] Literally ‘leave you alone’
142. heyo: Nos charlamos.
143. sonia: si no estas luego
144. sonia: hablamos manana
145. heyo: De acuerdo.
146. sonia: bye
147. heyo: Good night.

In line 137, Sonia starts a pre-closing sequence, announcing the end of the conversation, providing a reason for her leaving in which she includes an account of personal activities. Although the L1 speakers volunteered information about their personal activities, sometimes the sharing of this information was part of a sequence initiated by the L2 learner, as illustrated in Excerpt 5.4 and 5.5.

5.4. Meme, Juanjoloci, and Chiso, Interaction 2

→ 127. Juanjo (11:23:43 AM): y después de 0:00 donde vas?
→ 128. Chiso (11:23:54 AM): si donde vas chula
→ 129. Meme (11:23:56 AM): pues iré a ver a mis amigas
130. Chiso (11:24:06 AM): oh sí
→ 131. Meme (11:24:10 AM): y a beber con ellas para celebrar mi cumple
132. Chiso (11:24:12 AM): oye Juanjoloci
133. Juanjoloci (11:24:12 AM): y bailar y tomar algo otro vez?
134. Meme (11:24:16 AM): (otra vez)
→ 136. Meme (11:24:24 AM): vamos a la disco

Chiso, Juanjoloci, and Meme met for their second interaction on a Saturday night in Spain. When Meme, the L1 speaker, initiates a closing sequence in line 106 and after a repair sequence (before the extract), it is then Juanjoloci, one of the L2 learners, who in line 127 initiates a sequence about the L1 speaker activities, reinforced by Chiso’s
repetition of his question. Meme orients to their question with an answer in line 129. After her second pair part answer to the question would have been a possible point for sequence closure. However, Chiso with his 'post-expansion' (Schegloff, 2007a) turn ‘oh si’ aligns himself as a recipient of the information (Jefferson, 1978), marking it as “news” in need for further expansion of the sequence (Maynard, 2003). Meme orients to the turn as a request for elaboration of her previous information, which she elaborates in line 131, expanding it in line 133. Once more, after Meme answers ‘si claro’, a second pair part to Juanjoloci’s question in line 131 ‘y bailar y tomar algo?’, she provides more information ‘vamos a la disco’ as a “sequence-closing third” turn (Schegloff, 2007a) although she could have ended the sequence with the second pair part of the adjacency pair.

Similarly, in the following sequence, The L1 speaker, Ivan, provides personal information in a sequence initiated by the L2 learner, Kim.

5.5. Ivan, Kim and Cal, Interaction 1 for Cal, 2 for Kim

17. Kim (2:15:39 PM): No se mucho de Barcelona
→ 19. Kim (2:16:02 PM): conoces Barcelona?
20. Ivan (2:16:20 PM): Es una ciudad muy bonita
→ 21. Ivan (2:16:33 PM): i was born in barcelona
→ 22. Kim (2:17:15 PM): ahora vives allí
→ 23. Cal (2:17:20 PM): Yo tengo una amiga de Barcelona, pero no se mucho sobre Barcelona
→ 24. Ivan (2:17:43 PM): no, ahora vivo9 en castellon
→ 25. Ivan (2:18:07 PM): desde que tenía un año de edad vivo en castellon
27. Ivan (2:18:48 PM): ahora hace buen tiempo aqui

Kim: I don’t know much about Barcelona
Cal: Where do (you) want flocploy visit
Kim: do (you) know infra-ag Barcelona?
Ivan: It is a very beautiful city
Ivan: i was born in Barcelona
Kim: now (you) live info-ag there
Cal: I have a friend from Barcelona, but I don’t know much about Barcelona
Ivan: no, I now live in castellon
Ivan: since I was a year old I live in castellon
Cal: is [face] it cold now
Ivan: now it is nice weather here
28. Cal (2:19:00 PM): Que país quieren visitar para el proyecto? Cal: What country do (you) want to visit for the project?

The students and Ivan, the L1 Spanish speaker, are considering Barcelona as one of the places to visit for their project. Kim initiates a sequence with an indirect request for information about Barcelona pre-sequence ("no se mucho de Barcelona"). However, neither of the participants orients to her request and she restates her turn more directly through a direct question, for which an answer is the projected second-pair part turn. Ivan answers her question in turn 20, and although he could have closed this sequence with this turn, he "post-expands" the sequence with a "non-minimal" turn, which is itself a first pair part (Schegloff, 2007a). Kim orients to the expansion of the sequence as an invitation to tell more personal information and produces another adjacency pair first pair-part question, which Ivan completes in line 24 with an answer. At this transitional-relevance place, again, the sequence could be completed. However, the L1 speaker volunteers further personal information about his childhood. These examples show that L1 speakers volunteered personal information even beyond that necessary to maintain affiliation through preferred responses in the turn-taking sequence of the interaction.

5.5.2. Asking for updates

According to Pomerantz and Mandelbaum (2004) doing "being close" by sharing information on personal activities also implies displaying early in an encounter interest on previously discussed events, demonstrating knowledge of the other party's schedule in previous interactions. In asking for updates the L1 speakers initiated a recipient-oriented "topic-proffering sequence" (Schegloff, 2007a). Excerpt 5.6 illustrates such a display.
In their fourth interaction, after Meme shares part of her weekend activities with Juanjoloci, she inquires about his weekend. Her turn in line 74 (‘‘aparte del partido de voleibol?’’) is what Schegloff (2007a) describes as a “topic proffer” (p. 170). A yes/no-type question designed to offer Juanjoloci the possibility of accepting or rejecting a topic in which the recipient is oriented to as the authority speaker. With this action the L1 speakers provided the L2 learners with interactional space to produce language and engage in meaningful interaction. Asking for updates played in the data a “double duty”. It enacts its own action (proffering) but it is also “the vehicle or instrument for another action” (Schegloff, 2007a, p. 169), it displays shared knowledge between the participants, another action to indicate closeness. With this turn Meme indicates that she remembers from previous interactions that Juanjoloci was going to play volleyball during the weekend, since there is no reference to this activity during the preceding turns of the interaction.
5.5.3. **Displaying interest as a second pair-part**

Most participants, both L1 speakers and students, displayed great interest in knowing about their counterparts on the other side of the world, especially during their first interactions. On multiple occasions, the L1 speakers displayed interest in learners' personal information as an affiliative interactional resource. Displaying interest helped elaborate the topic and provided the learner with the opportunity for language production and the construction of a closer relationship. Extracts 5.7 and 5.8 illustrate this action.

5.7. Heyo and Mijo, Interaction 1

| Heyo: Cuando estudiaba en la Universidad de Tokio, la profesora siempre usaba vosotros. | Heyo: when I was studying at the University of Tokyo, the teacher always used vosotros. |
| Heyo: Soy de Japón. | Heyo: I'm from Japan. |

→ 188. Mijo: QUÉ BIEN!!!!!!!
→ 189. Mijo: me encanta japon!!!!!!
190. Heyo: Bueno, sí y no.

Several lines omitted

→ 205. Mijo: me hace mucha ilusión que seas japonés, estaba deseando conocer alguno |

Mijo seemed fascinated by Heyo's being Japanese as for her affiliative responses in line 188 and 189, marked by the use of capital letters, which in SCMC indicates emphasis and a louder voice (Herring, 1996), and multiple exclamation marks (a substitute for emphatic intonation in SCMC) as precedents to her statement in line 205 "me hace mucha ilusión que seas japonés, estaba deseando conocer alguno" [It is very exciting that you are Japanese; I was dying to meet someone Japanese]. The main topic
of this interaction was Japan and being Japanese, which provided Heyo with the opportunity to display his expertise about the topic and use the L2.

5.8. Sonia and Heyo, Interaction 1

99. heyo: Debe ser muy interesante.

→ 100. sonia: hablame de ti

101. heyo: Bueno...

→ 102. sonia: me has dicho q estas trabajando

→ 103. sonia: estudias?

104. heyo: Estudio en el departamento de oceanografÍa

→ 105. sonia: debe ser precioso

106. heyo: para obtener un degrado PhD.

107. heyo: precioso...

108. heyo: ?????

109. sonia: bonito

110. sonia: beautiful

111. sonia: nice

112. heyo: Si, es muy bonito

Bueno...

Before this sequence, Heyo and Sonia had been talking about Sonia’s work as a bartender. In line 100, Sonia switches the topic, initiating a recipient-oriented topic (Schegloff, 2007), by requesting information about Heyo. Heyo produces a minimal response ‘bueno’ followed by ‘...’ often used to hold the floor or indicating the person “is thinking” (much like a long pause in oral conversation). Sonia orients to Heyo’s trouble producing a complete second question in a subsentential format (line 103) designed to narrow the referential point of the question and constraining Heyo’s response (Kasper & Ross, 2007). In line 104, Heyo answers the simplest and the most proximal of her options providing the projected second pair part (‘Estudio en el departamento de oceanografÍa’) displaying a preference for contiguity (Sacks, 1987). In line 105, Sonia offers an assessment which makes relevant a confirmation or rejection from Heyo. The next line

12 “degrado” is not a Spanish word.
however seems to be a continuation of his narration (probably in overlap with Sonia's previous turn). The confirmation is delayed by an other initiated repair on the item ‘precioso’ through an ‘open’ class repair initiator (Drew, 1997) in line 108. Heyo then aligns with Sonia’s statement, once the repair is completed through indirect confirmation of the understanding of ‘precioso’ with the second assessment in line 112. This sequence demonstrates how the L1 speaker displays interest as a resource to co-construct affiliation and closeness as well as the L2 speaker’s alignment.

5.5.4. Discussing personal problems

Personal problems are a special form of personal information. They appeared often in the data, usually as part of the opening sequences of the interaction, right after (or connected with) a greeting sequence. Excerpts 5.9 to 5.10 are examples of the L1 speakers sharing problems and concerns with the language learners.

5.9. Meme and Juanjoloci, Interaction 1

16. Meme: Yo acabo de llegar a casa, después de un día muy duro!
17. Meme: Estoy muy agobiada con todos los proyectos!!!
18. Meme: u know
19. Juanjoloci: si, que hiciste
20. Meme: have u seen my email?
21. Juanjoloci: ??
22. Juanjoloci: no lo leído
23. Meme: please, leelo después.
24. Meme: de todas formas, yo puedo conectarme de seguro a estas horas:

Meme: I've just got home, after a very hard day!
Meme: I am very stressed [agobiada] with all my projects!!!
Meme: you know
Juanjoloci: yes, what did (you) do
Meme: have u seen my email?
Juanjoloci: ??
Juanjoloci: I haven't read it
Meme: please, read it afterwards.
Meme: anyhow, I can connect at this time for sure:

In their first interaction, after introducing themselves and fixing some problems with the voice feature of the Messenger, Meme starts her interaction with a newsworthy personal announcement. Her announcement, in line 16, enhanced by an exclamation mark
projects an announcement response (Jefferson, 1988) such as a request for a
continuation/expansion of the story. However, there is no uptake by the listener and she
self selects and expands her turn providing the “delivery” and exposition of her trouble
(Jefferson, 1988) in line 17, which she upgrades with multiple exclamation marks,
indicating the gravity of her problems. The preferred response to a trouble telling would
be an affiliative turn expressing empathy or sympathy (Drew & Holt, 1988; Jefferson,
1988; Pudlinski, 2005). Without an uptake by the listener, Meme code-switches to
English searching directly for an affiliative move (line 18). At this point, the L2 learner
orients to her first turn as a story telling sequence, asking in line 19 for an expansion of
the turn, ignoring the trouble-telling sequence. The L1 speaker, still in the learner’s
language, refers back to a document explaining her situation and switches topics in line
24, abandoning the trouble telling sequence. It is relevant to note here that L2 learners
who were not able to engage in trouble-telling sequences during their first interactions
learned to do so during the project (see Chapter 7).

The following examples are from Cid and Jacy’s data. Cid was probably the L1
speaker that shared the most personal “problems” of all the L1 speakers. Cid’s trouble-
telling sequences were almost always part of the opening sequences of his interactions.

5.10. Cid and Jacy, Interaction 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Cid</th>
<th>Jacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Cid (9:58:46 AM): hola jacy</td>
<td>Cid: hello jacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cid (9:59:00 AM): primero de todo, pedirte perdón pero es que he tenido unos problemas</td>
<td>Cid: first of all, to apologize to you inf-inf but I've had some problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cid (9:59:07 AM): muy bien</td>
<td>Cid: all right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Jacy (9:59:12 AM): No tengo problemas</td>
<td>Jacy: I don't have problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cid and Jacy were paired because they had compatible schedules. They had exchanged one email (through their Messenger account) introducing each other before their first synchronous interaction. At the beginning of their first interaction (Excerpt 5.10), before even answering Jacy's greeting (line 3, "¿Cómo estás?") he apologizes providing a reason for his not being on-line ('he tengo unos problemas'). At this point in the sequence the L2 learner could have provided two possible preferred answers: either an acceptance/rejection of the apology, or a request for an expansion on his minimal account of trouble. However, Jacy next turn orients only to Cid's delayed second part answer to Jacy's greeting in line 3, answering his greeting '¿Tú?' with 'no tengo problemas'. This turn suggests that Jacy orients to Cid's trouble-telling turn as part of the greeting sequence, failing to recognize it as an initiation of a different sequence.

In line 8 after a long pause for SCMC (almost one minute) and when the sequence seemed to be closed, Cid re-opens the trouble-telling sequence providing specific information about what the preceding 'problem' was. To deploy an apparently ended unit is evidence that the speaker did not consider the unit completed (Schegloff, 2007) and the expansion of the information demonstrates Cid's orientation to the sequence as an important one.

Cid and Jacy's interactions included multiple trouble-telling sequences during the entire project. The difference from their first interaction to later ones being that Jacy
learned to engage successfully in the sequences (see Chapter 7 Learning to uptake).

Excerpts 5.11 and 5.12 present two more examples of Cid’s initiating trouble-telling sequences. The analysis of the interaction can be found in Chapter 7 (7.2.4. Learning to uptake).

5.11. Cid and Jacy, Interaction 4

21. Jacy (10:00:55 AM): lo siento!
22. Cid (10:01:04 AM): lo siento yo!
23. Jacy (10:01:08 AM): Estaba cocinando el almuerzo
24. Jacy (10:01:20 AM): ...el desayuno
→ 25. Cid (10:01:30 AM): me he retrasado porque un amigo mío tuvo ayer un accidente y me he pasado a verle al hospital
26. Jacy (10:02:12 AM): que terrible! ¿Qué pasa?
27. Cid (10:02:30 AM): nada, ya está bien... posiblemente el lunes vuelva a casa
28. Jacy (10:02:52 AM): bueno...has visitado el hospital mucho...sí?

Jacy: I am sorry!
Cid: I am sorry!13
Jacy: I was cooking [cocinando] lunch
Cid: ...breakfast
Jacy: How awful! What happens?
Cid: Nothing, he is fine now... he’ll probably be home on Monday
Jacy: All right...(you) have visited the hospital a lot...yes?

5.12. Cid and Jacy, Interaction 5

2. Cid (8:43:57 AM): hola jacy
3. Cid (8:44:01 AM): q tal tu día?
4. Jacy (8:44:47 AM): bien...mi familia y yo salimos a un restaurante para el cumpleaños de mi abuelita...y tú?
→ 5. Cid (8:45:05 AM): realmente mal...
6. Jacy (8:45:17 AM): porque>
→ 7. Cid (8:45:52 AM): llegué de toledo a las 16.00 h, después me fui a la autoescuela, llegue a mi casa a las 18.00 h, y he estado toda la tarde con dolor de cabeza. Ahora he cenado, y he vomitado
8. Cid (8:45:57 AM): parezco un zombie!! jeje

Jacy: Hello!
Cid: hello jacy
Jacy: How was your day?
Jacy: good...my family and I went to a restaurant for my grandma’s birthday...and you?
Cid: really bad...
Jacy: why>
Cid: I got back from Toledo at 4 pm, then I went to the driving school, I got home at 6 pm, and I have had a headache all evening. I just had dinner, and I threw up
Jacy: ohhh! Are you sick?

13 The overt subject 'yo' has an emphatic function here.
The fact that Cid engaged in trouble-telling sequences much more than any other L1 speaker, seems to indicate that this resource to do ‘being close’ may not be so common, and it may depend on social and cultural constrains, and even personality.

5.5.5. Sympathy uptake

In those cases when the learner volunteered personal problems by initiating a trouble-telling sequence, the L1 speaker responded with acknowledgment or sympathy, creating an adjacency pair sequence of the type problem telling-sympathy uptake to display affiliation, providing a sense of ‘proximateness’ between interactants (Drew & Chilton, 2000). The following are some examples of this phenomenon.

5.13. Sonia and Heyo, Interaction 2

57. heyo: $1450 es la más barato.
58. heyo: y tenderé que usar un barco
→ 59. sonia: joder, pues si que sale caro!

Heyo is telling Sonia about his upcoming trip but he is complaining that travelling to the place is very expensive, and as an addition to his airfare, he will also have to pay for a boat ride (line 58). As an orientation to his trouble-telling, Sonia responds with an emotive reaction and a reformulation of the gist of the problem, techniques commonly employed to express empathy or sympathy (Pudlinski, 2005). In addition, She markes her

14 Note that in Spanish, improprieties do not have the same illocutionary force that they have in English. Although the translation is the closest in meaning, the English word has a stronger feeling to it than the Spanish one.
turn with multiple exclamation marks (a common feature in SCMC to denote emphasis), upgrading her reaction in this way.

In the next example, Chiso and Meme are collaboratively constructing a sequence about Chiso’s problems with his language classes. It is Meme, the L1 speaker who uptakes Chiso’s trouble-taking sequence initiation.

5.14. Meme and Chiso, Interaction 1

| Chiso: no siento que las clases son bien | Chiso: I don’t feel the classes are well [good-buenas] |
| Meme: es por el español? | Meme: because it’s Spanish? |
| Meme: o por la teacher? | Meme: or because of the teacher? |
| Chiso: no los profesoros son bien, especialmente marta | Chiso: no the teachers [profesores] are good [buenos], especially marta |
| Meme: entonces? | Meme: then? |
| Chiso: pero clases son solo 2 o 3 días por semana | Chiso: but the classes are only 2 or 3 days per week |
| Chiso: y no me gusta los libros | Chiso: and I don’t like the textbooks |
| → Chiso: y no me gusta los libros | Meme: oh, I know how do you feel |
| → Meme: a mí me pasaba igual el año pasado con el inglés | Meme: it was the same for me last year in English |

Chiso is telling Meme he feels he is not learning a lot in his language classes. Meme helps him construct the problem by asking him several focused questions (line 2, line 3, line 5) which allows Chiso to expand and complete his trouble-telling multiple-turn first part pair in line 156 marked by the use of ‘y’ as the conjunction preceding the last item of a list. Meme orients to the completion of his turn and produces the second pair part of the adjacency pair ‘problem telling – sympathy uptake’ by providing an emotional reaction (Pudlinski, 2005), an affiliative response (Conroy, 1999; Jefferson, 1988), followed by a complete turn in which she identifies herself with the problem, sharing similar feelings, which is a strong form of emotional identification, frequently
employed to express more than 'basic concern' (Pudlinski, 2005). This sharing of personal information and activities, and affiliative responses when the sequence is initiated by the learner was one of the resources deployed to do 'being close' by the L1 speakers. It will be discussed later in this chapter how L1 speakers in the data also withdrew personal information and refused to engage in this practice as a way of doing 'being distant'.

5.5.6. Recognition of shared knowledge

Recognizing knowledge and information that has been shared in previous interactions, is another resource to display closeness and affiliation (Conroy, 1999; Pomerantz & Mandelbaum, 2004). Knowledge about the other person's schedule requires that the interactants know each other for an extended period of time to be able to learn their partners' routines. It is important to note that some of the groups met only two or three times and/or changed partners several times. As a consequence, this action appeared only in the data of groups that interacted four or more times. The display of shared knowledge happened sometimes in connection with other actions, given the possible "double duty" of some turns (Schegloff, 2007a, p. 169), such as 'requesting an update' as in (5.5) above. Excerpts 5.15 and 5.16 illustrate this practice.

5.15. Meme and Juanjoloci, Interaction 4

39. Juanjoloci (7:03:53 AM): es muy temprano por la mañana para él
40. Meme (7:03:54 AM): ok, es estar enfadado contigo
→ 41. Meme (7:04:14 AM): lo sé, lo extraño es que tú estés levantado tan temprano y chatando contigo, no?

Juanjoloci: it is very early in the morning for him
Meme: ok, it is to be angry contigo

Meme: I know, it is strange that you  are awake so early and chatting with me, isn't it?
During their last interaction, Meme displays knowledge of Juanjoloci’s habits and schedule by showing her surprise that he is awake and talking to her early in the morning (line 41 and 42). By stating ‘lo extraño es que tú estés levantado tan temprano y chateando contigo, no? como es que te levantaste tan temprano hoy?’, being ‘hoy’ (today) the key word here, she displays her knowledge of his habits. Juanjoloci confirms the unusualness of the practice by stating ‘soy loco’ (line 43) and Meme aligns with Juanjoloci’s answer through laughter (lol=laughing out loud, the ‘loudest’ of laughs).

In a similar manner, Sonia displays knowledge of Heyo’s schedule in one of their last interactions by orienting to his change of schedule.

5.16. Sonia and Heyo, Interaction 4

In lines 319 and 320, Sonia displays her knowledge of when Heyo is connected to Internet first in the form of a question and then a statement. Heyo confirms the shared

\[15\] The correct Spanish expression would be either “estoy loco” or “soy un loco”.
knowledge by agreeing in line 321 with her statement in line 320 ('no'—'normalmente no sueles estar') a minimal second pair part, and providing an answer to her question in line 319 (non-minimal second pair part). In line 324, Sonia displays again shared knowledge of Heyo’s schedule by identifying a vague item he is providing in his answer, ‘a class tomorrow’, which she correctly identifies as the Spanish class.

Finally, in the following example we can see how the L1 speaker orients to the importance of shared knowledge, in this case the other person’s schedule, by holding the learner accountable when he fails to remember already shared information.

5.17. Sonia, Heyo, and Mijo, Interaction 2

96. heyo: ¿a qué hora usarás un ordenador en el jueves?
97. heyo: mañana o tarde?
98. sonia: a las 18.30
99. sonia: más o menos
100. mijo: q hora es allí ahora Heyo?
101. heyo: yo trataré a conectar al messenger a las 8 de la mañana aquí.
102. heyo: es decir, 20h en España.
→ 103. sonia: bueno...
104. heyo: pero discúlpame si
105. heyo: no lo puedo.
→ 106. sonia: pero ya sabes que luego me tengo que ir a trabajar
107. heyo: aah, claro.

| heyo: at what time will (you) use the computer on Thursday? |
| heyo: morning or afternoon? |
| sonia: at 6:30pm |
| sonia: more or less |
| mijo: what time is it over there Heyo? |
| heyo: I will try to connect to the messenger at 8 in the morning here |
| heyo: that is, 10:00pm in Spain |
| sonia: well...
| heyo: but excuse me if |
| heyo: I cannot |
| sonia: but (you) already know that then I have to go to work |
| heyo: oh, of course. |

In this sequence the students are negotiating their next meeting time. Heyo’s suggestion for their next meeting is accepted minimally by Sonia, signaling some trouble through a dispreferred/disagreeing turn projecting an expansion of the sequence (line 103) (Schegloff, 2007a). However, Heyo does not orient to this trouble, and continues his previous talk about his own schedule. At this time, in line 106, Sonia holds Heyo accountable for not remembering that she works at the proposed time ('pero ya sabes que
luego me tengo que ir a trabajar). Line 107 confirms that Heyo did not remember her schedule when he utters ‘aah’ equivalent to the English particle ‘oh!’ a change of state of knowledge (Heritage, 1984a) followed by an acceptance of her statement.

5.5.7. Joking and sharing laughter

Shared laughter and conversational humor as an affiliative move are designed to create and maintain rapport and solidarity. The data presented frequent instances of laughter by the L1 speakers. However, since ‘shared’ laughter also involves the language learners, I will present these sequences in the following chapter as part of the students’ learned interactional practices.

The L1 speakers often teased and joked with the language learners, which according to Davies (2003) is a manifestation of involvement used to develop and maintain rapport. However, most of the jokes produced by the L1 speakers were not oriented to by the learners. They ‘did not get the jokes’ and these even created misunderstandings and breaks in the communication at times.

5.18. Cid and Jacy, Interaction 2

46. Jacy (8:40:35 AM): si si....me gusta también visitar la costa del sol
→ 47. Cid (8:41:06 AM): como se nota que te gusta la playa!
→ 48. Cid (8:41:12 AM): jeje
49. Jacy (8:41:17 AM): si....yo nunca he visitado España...
51. Cid (8:42:48 AM): wow

Jacy: yes yes...I also want to visit Costa del sol16
Cid: you really like the beach, don’t you!
Cid: hehe
Jacy: yes... I have never visited Spain
Jacy: after Spain we are going to Greece to sail [navegar] in a boat around the Greek islands...
Cid: wow

16 Area of the east coast of Spain.
During their first interaction, Cid and Jacy talked about their likes and dislikes, and Jacy mentioned that she liked going to the beach and paddling. In line 47, Cid uses this shared knowledge to tease Jacy when she is trying to decide where to go on her upcoming trip to Spain. Cid marks his humorous contribution with an explicit laughter token (*jeje*), however Jacy does not orient to it as a joke. She agrees with Cid, provides an expansion of her previous turn (line 49), and continues the narration of her upcoming vacation (line 50), moving on with the topic.

Similarly in the next excerpt, Heyo does not orient to Sonia’s humorous turn, even when she initiates the sequence with an explicit SCMC conventional description of laughter (*lol = laughing out loud*). The interaction continues with an expansion on the topic without any orientation to the joking nature of Sonia’s comment in line 156.

5.19. Sonia and Heyo, Interaction 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heyo</th>
<th>Sonia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151. heyo: Me gustan muchos de otros aspectos de la cultura española.</td>
<td>Heyo: I like many other aspects of the Spanish culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152. sonia: como que?</td>
<td>Sonia: like what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153. heyo: Fútbol, flamenco,</td>
<td>heyo: soccer, flamenco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154. heyo: paella, siesta,</td>
<td>heyo: <em>paella, siesta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ 155. 113onía: lol</td>
<td>113onía: lol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ 156. sonia: eres como todos los guiris</td>
<td>113onía: (you) are <em>inref-as just like all the other guiris&quot;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyo: &quot;guiris?</td>
<td>Heyo: &quot;guiris?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyo: Oh, extranjeros.</td>
<td>Heyo: Oh, foreigners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159. sonia: en España se les llama guiris a los extranjeros</td>
<td>113onía: in Spain <em>guiris</em> are foreigners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160. heyo: Sí claro.</td>
<td>Heyo: Yes of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161. sonia: si</td>
<td>sonia: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162. heyo: ¿Usa &quot;gringo&quot; en 113onia113?</td>
<td>Heyo: Do you use <em>form-ie &quot;gringo&quot;</em> in Spain?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

17 Slang word used to refer to foreigners, usually from the United States.
18 Term used to refer to Americans in many Latin-American countries.
Towards the end of their projects the language learners also attempted to incorporate jokes in the interaction, however the attempts were not always successful. Excerpt 5.20 illustrates a sequence in which both interactants attempt to produce jokes that create a misunderstanding and a delicate situation.

5.20. Sonia and Heyo, Interaction 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sonia</th>
<th>Heyo: Unfortunately my speakers don’t detect [detectar] your [informal] greetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>439. sonia: no elol</td>
<td>440. Heyo: Quizás todo el mundo quiere escuchar tu canción. porque no estoy cantando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ 441. sonia: no te he llamado idiota en serio</td>
<td>442. Heyo: te he dicho una broma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ 443. sonia: y yo??</td>
<td>444. Heyo: te he dicho una broma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ 445. sonia: y yo!!</td>
<td>446. Heyo: te he dicho una broma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449. sonia: he entendido tu broma</td>
<td>450. Heyo: Muy bien.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sonia, the woman in Spain, is talking to Heyo from a computer in a language lab at her university. They want to try the voice feature of the Messenger since she has a microphone and Heyo has speakers. However she cannot talk loud because everybody can hear her at the lab and all that Heyo can hear is static and noise. Previously, they were engaged in a discussion about Spanish music, and when Sonia advises Heyo to download music, he suggests that she should sing for him and he can record her, to which she humorously refuses. Continuing this humorous tone, Heyo makes a joke in line 436.
by referring back to the previous sequence about her singing. Sonia answers with another joke which includes what may seem like an insult. In the contextual sequence of the interaction this is not an insult though, but rather the use of an impropriety to display closeness and intimacy (Jefferson, 1974, 1980). She also marks the humorous nature of the sequence by orienting to Heyo’s turn (line 436) as a joke, laughing loudly (lol = laughing out loud) after minimally disagreeing with his suggestion. Heyo however orients to her turn (line 437) as an answer to a possible insult (with an upgraded insult) rather than a joke, answering ‘No lo soy’ (I am not [an idiot]). He then addresses a possible problem with his previous turn (436) and carries through a self-repair to completion. Heyo takes two full turns to repair turn 436 by clearly stating and repeating with an expanded explanation that his turn 436 was a joke. At this point Sonia realizes that Heyo has been taking her turns seriously and engages in the repair sequence. She first declares she was also joking, but since the orthographic symbols at the end indicate a question rather than emphasis she replicates the entire turn (rather than just correcting the symbols) with two emphasis exclamation marks. In addition, she provides an explanation of her turn (‘no te he llamado idiota en serio’) and a justification for her action (‘es una forma de hablar’). At this point the repair sequence is closed; they both confirm understanding of the joking nature of the sequence, and move on to a different topic.

The previous example illustrate how although L1 speakers were trying humor as an affiliative move to do ‘being close’, it was not always been interpreted as such. This is probably why this was the least frequent strategy employed, in comparison to sharing personal activities, schedules, and problems; displaying interest and sympathy, and sharing laughter.
Towards the end of the project, the participants of two of the groups had
developed a friendlier relationship than the rest: Meme with Chiso, and Sonia with Heyo.
Their interactions were qualitatively different from the rest, moving in the spectrum of
address behavior from friendly towards “friendlier” or more intimate. Their interactions
were characterized by the use of slang words, improprieties, teasing and language play,
and displays of affection and flirting.

5.6.1. L1 speakers’ use of improprieties and slang

Rudeness, improprieties, and obscenity can be employed to indicate intimacy
(Glenn, 2003; Jefferson, 1974, 1980; Jefferson et al., 1987). Slang is a common practice
among young speakers of the same language and it usually denotes belonging to a group,
subculture, or class of people as a form of affiliation or group identity (Bucholtz & Hall,
2003; Moore, 2004; Thorne, 2005). We can see in this interaction between Heyo and Jess
that students also orient to slang words as being used among friends in certain contexts
(such as a bar).

5.2.1. Heyo and Jess, Interaction 1

82. heyo: Es como las palabras ingleses “dude” y “chick

83. heyo: que usamos solo entre amigos,
84. jess: que significa dude?

85. heyo: pero no son palabras formales.
86. heyo: “Dude” significa hombres, chicos,
87. jess: ah
88. heyo: “Dude, your shirt is awesome!
89. heyo: “chick” significa mujeres jóvenes, como chicas.
90. heyo: “Look at that cute chick.”
91. jess: ok

heyo: It’s like the English words “dude” and “chick
heyo: that we only use among friends
jess: what does dude mean?
heyo: but are not formal words
heyo: “Dude” [dude] means men, boys
jess: oh
heyo: ‘Dude, your shirt is awesome!
heyo: “chick” means young women, like girls.
heyo: ‘Look at that cute chick.”
jess: ok
When Heyo attempts to explain the meaning of the words “dude” and “chick” he provides a translation, examples, and a sociopragmatic explanation of their use. We can see how in line 2 Heyo identifies the use of slang with friends (‘que usamos solo entre amigos’). We could then assume that whenever Heyo encounters slang words in his interaction, he would orient to the L1 speaker as displaying “friendliness”. However, Heyo still has problems identifying this form of affiliation, as in example 5.13 above.

5.6.2. Flirting

The data show several examples of L1 speakers displaying affection, through language play and flirting. It is important to note that on-line chatting is an environment that promotes this type of playfulness because it is ephemeral, moves fast, and it is somehow free from reality (Barnes, 2001; Danet at al., 1996). Therefore, we cannot really assume that participants that engage in this type of language play would also behave in a comparable manner in face to face communication. However, since their relationships are developed exclusively in the medium, it is important to explore this facet of their address behavior too. The participants of two of the groups in the project engaged in ‘flirting’, as a step beyond just being friends or language partners. It is important to know though, that given the pedagogical focus of the interactions, the ‘flirting’ was a very mild version of what online relationships may offer, which can range from language play to cybersex (Barnes, 2001; del-Teso-Craviotto, 2006).
5.6.2.1. Sonia, Mijo, and Heyo

Sonia and Heyo had interacted three times before Mijo, a new Spanish woman, joined their group. The first time that Mijo interacted with Heyo she discovered that he was Japanese. This created a connection between them because she knew quite a lot about Japanese culture, especially in comparison to the other participant, thus affiliating herself culturally with Heyo. She knows a song that uses the Japanese word Sakura (lines 194, 202, 212, 221), she knows Sakura is also a woman’s name (lines 228, 231), she knows other Japanese names (lines 234, 237), she knows and appreciates the food (line 199), her young sister draws Japanese cartoons, for what she knows the Japanese term: ‘manga’ (lines 200, 215), and she even has the Japanese flag in her cell phone (line 211).

See Appendix E for the full interaction.

5.22. Heyo, Sonia and Mijo, Interaction 4 for Sonia, 1 for Mijo

183. heyo: Cuando estudiaba en la Universidad de Tokio, la profesora siempre usaba vosotros.
→ 184. mijo: tu estudiabas en tokio?
185. heyo: Sí.
186. sonia: estudie
187. heyo: Soy de Japón.
188. heyo: Estudié. Gracias.
→ 189. mijo: QUE BIEN!!!!!!!m
→ 190. mijo: me encanta japon!!!!!!!
Several lines omitted

→ 209. heyo: Estoy muy contento de conocer alguien a quien le interesa mi país.
→ 210. mijo: 😊
Several lines omitted

238. heyo: Vivi en Kyoto, Fukuoka y Tokyo antes.
239. sonia: madre mia
→ 240. mijo: que interesante
Both Heyo and Mijo expressed how happy they were to have met each other. Mijo marks her discovery of Heyo being Japanese in line 189 with capital letters and multiple exclamation marks, used in SCMC for emphasis (similar to a raise of volume and intonation in oral interaction). After several turns in which Mijo displays her expertise in Heyo’s culture, Heyo states his happiness to meet someone that is interested in his country. Mijo orients to his statement almost as a compliment since she uses an emoticon which illustrates “blushing”. It is interesting to note that at this point, Sonia has almost withdrawn from the interaction, since such a statement could have constituted an accusation to her, who had already engaged three times with Heyo (and had not been interested on his culture). However, there is no orientation of Sonia to this turn, although she is present in the conversation. Only 6 turns later she engages in a repair sequence initiated by Heyo (line 217 Appendix 1). At the end of the interaction Heyo and Mijo display their contentment to have met each other and commit to meet again soon (Excerpt 5.23).

5.23. Heyo and Mijo, Interaction I (4 for Heyo and Sonia)

250. heyo: Gracias por hablar conmigo.
251. heyo: Estoy muy contento de conocerte, Mijo.
252. mijo: gracias a ti, me alegro mucho de haberte conocido
253. mijo: el sentimiento es mutuo
254. heyo: Muy bien.
255. sonia: te vas ya a acostar?
256. mijo: pues ya nos veremos y si no tranquilo que te mandaré mails

heyo: Thanks for talking to me.
heyo: I am very happy to meet you.
heyo: Very well.
sonia: are you going already to bed?
mijo: we will see each other and otherwise don’t worry I will send you mails [e-mails]
In line 251, Heyo uses a vocative to specifically direct his statements to Mijo. He expresses gratitude and affection /delight (Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986). Mijo’s turn reciprocates his thank you turn, adding an expression of affection (repeating his turn with an upgrade, from ‘muy contento’ to ‘me alegro mucho’). Mijo produces her farewell pre-sequence with a promise to maintain contact either in the Messenger or via email, to which Heyo reciprocates with a more concrete promise which includes specific time frame to be fulfilled (‘esta semana’), even sooner than required by the project (since they only needed to meet once a week). During this short sequence Sonia is ignored by both participants, especially by Heyo who does not orient in any way to her question in line 255, which is never answered. However, Sonia does not hold Heyo in anyway accountable for a dispreferred action (ignoring a direct question), and continues participating in the interaction by helping Heyo self-repair a self-initiated repair sequence (lines 259-264).¹⁹

The interaction ends when Mijo leaves 50 turns later, after an embedded sequence in which a new topic is introduced (how to say good bye in Japanese), and a final closing sequence (Coronel-Molina, 1998). See Appendix 1.

After Mijo leaves the interaction to attend her English class, Sonia decides to skip the class and continue her chat with Heyo. During the rest of this interaction (171

¹⁹ The difference in accountability for missing the second pair part of an adjacency pair between SCMC and Face-to-face conversation is a consequence of the interactional patterns of the medium. Participants are used to “displaced” second pair-parts, but it would be interesting to investigate whether participants in SCMC have a higher tolerance for missing second-pair parts of adjacency pairs.
additional turns), Sonia does ‘being closer’ in multiple occasions, including several sequences in which both Sonia and Heyo tease and joke with each other with shared laughter, displaying closeness. Excerpt 5.24 is an example of this behavior.

5.24. Sonia and Heyo, Interaction 4 (after Mijo leaves in line 311)

384. heyo: escuchan canciones en español,  
385. sonia: eso  
386. sonia: es a lo que me refiero  
387. sonia: que canciones?  
388. heyo: hablo con los estudiantes en la clase.  
389. heyo: canciones salsa de puerto rico y cuba  
→ 390. sonia: y españolas?  
→ 391. sonia: nada?  
→ 392. sonia: muy mal  
393. heyo: jaja.  
394. sonia: fatal  
395. sonia: no me rio!!  
396. heyo: es que no tengo ninguna canción española.  
397. sonia: como que no?  
398. sonia: bajalas de internet  
→ 399. heyo: Sería mejor si cantarás con el microfón luego.  
400. sonia: ni de coña!!  
401. heyo: sí de coña!  
402. sonia: eres muy gracioso!!  
→ 403. sonia: 😂  
404. sonia: va a ser que no!!  
405. heyo: too bad... 😂

Hezo is informing Sonia how he practices Spanish by listening to Spanish songs from Puerto Rico and Cuba. Sonia then initiates a sequence which seems to criticize Hezo for not listening to songs from Spain (lines 390-392). Hezo orients to this sequence as a joke by “laughing”. During the following turns (from line 394 to 398) Sonia seems to seriously continue her reproach (by not producing laughter, and explicitly stating the seriousness of her turn), and Hezo produces an explanation or apology which in Spanish
is commonly marked by “es que…” (Cohen & Shively, 2007). At this point, Heyo is still treating the sequence as humorous and Sonia’s action as a mocking reproach by expanding the sequence with a humorous recommendation, which is also humorously rejected by Sonia, and a sequence-closing third turn, designed “not to project any further within sequence talk beyond itself” (Schegloff, 2007 p. 118). After this sequence both participants engage in shared laughter and continue their teasing with the use of emoticons. This extract illustrate how the students after a few interactions (this was Heyo’s fourth interaction) are able to engage in sophisticated interactional work which requires understanding of the L1 speaker’s actions (and not only the language). The following chapter will present how students developed this interactive competence.

5.6.2.2. Meme and Chiso

Meme and Chiso displayed more than friendship through their interactions. Since their first encounter their interactions have been full of displays of affiliation (shared laughter, language play, use of emoticons, compliments, slang, etc). During their second interaction, both Meme and Chiso stated their desire to travel to the other’s country. It is interesting to note the recurrent sequential structure of these invitations, consistently initiated with a pre-request turn, followed by a pre-emptive offer/invitation\(^{20}\), the preferred response, which eludes “the need for a request altogether by offering that which is to be requested” (Schegloff, 2007, p 90). In this way the participants engage in “offering” which is a preferred action over “requesting” (Schegloff, 1995).

\(^{20}\) “Indeed, requests, offers, and invitations form a set of action types (with associated sequence types) which can be difficult to distinguish from one another. Invitations, this regard, often appear to be a particular sub-class of offers” (Schegloff, 2007, pp 34-35)
5.25. Meme and Chiso, Interaction 2

143. Meme (11:25:01 AM): no entiendo eso de Sus amigas. mi cumple este año es muy largo
→ 144. Chiso (11:25:07 AM): quiero ir contigo
→ 146. Meme (11:25:13 AM): pues ven!!
→ 147. Chiso (11:25:17 AM): 😞

149. Meme (II:25:20 AM): como me gustaria visitar esas playas........
→ 219. Meme (11:33:35 AM): como me gustaria visitar esas playas........
→ 220. Juanjoloci (11:33:35 AM): caundo vienes aqui Meme?
→ 221. Meme (11:33:46 AM): SI PUDIERA, AHORA MISMITO IBA
222. Meme (11:33:59 AM): ajajajajajaja
223. Juanjoloci (11:34:14 AM): este verano esta bien, es parte de tus estudios ingleses
224. Meme (11:34:26 AM): me esta supri-siendo hoy! vuestro espanol es tremendo de bueno
225. Juanjoloci (11:34:29 AM): voy a aprovecharlo
→ 226. Meme (11:34:54 AM): bueno, la verdad es que esta muy lejos, pero no me importaria ir
→ 227. Meme (11:35:02 AM): es una buena excusa para cruzar el planeta
→ 228. Chiso (11:35:02 AM): gracias. Si ven ven
229. Juanjoloci (11:35:30 AM): si gracias, y tu espanol esta perfecta!!!!
230. Meme (11:35:56 AM): oh, vaya... a pesar de la resaca esta perfecto!

→ 231. Meme (II:25:20 AM): como me gustaria visitar esas playas........

→ 219. Meme (11:33:35 AM): como me gustaria visitar esas playas........

The first of these three sequences is initiated in line 144 by Chiso with a pre-request which elicits an immediate invitation/offer from Meme. Although the pre-request seems to project an acceptance to the offer, Chiso’s answer is an extreme visual expression of regret, an emoticon which represents crying. Meme displays understanding of the turn by laughing. The second sequence is this time initiated by Meme with another
pre-request (line 219) which elicits the preferred answer, an offer/invitation from Juanjoloci. When Meme declines the invitation with an expression of wish (Felix-Brasdefer, 2002) marked by capitalized letters and laughter for emphasis, Juanjoloci insists on the invitation, providing Meme with a reason to accept (Garcia, 1992, 1999). At this time, Meme initiates a side-sequence, avoiding this way a second rejection of Juanjoloci’s invitation.

In a third sequence, Meme’s turns in line 226 and 227 are oriented to by Chiso as another pre-request for which he re-utters his previous invitation, this time more directly through the use of informal commands (‘sí ven ven’). Chiso’s offer receives no answer from Meme, who instead orients to the previous interaction with Juanjoloci initiated in line 224. These three sequences are unusual in the sense that when a participant utters a pre-offer which projects an invitation/offer, an acceptance of the invitation is the preferred second-pair part to the offer. However, such an acceptance was not part of these sequences. This may have been due to the difficulty involved in the invitation (to travel to the other side of the world), which is reinforced by the strong regret and wish displayed by the participants when they declined the offer. Drew (1984) points out that speakers may decline invitations by reporting facts that stand in the way of accepting them (‘bueno, la verdad es que esta muy lejos’).

Another place in the interactions where Meme and Chiso’s close relationship was noticeable was in their leave-taking sequences. They were the only participants that used ‘kisses’ to close their interactions, a common practice among good friends and family in Spain, but not among class partners or acquaintances.
5.26. Meme and Chiso, Interaction 5

430. Meme (2:02:15 PM): ok chiso
431. Meme (2:02:21 PM): un besito... hasta mañana!
432. Chiso (2:06:25 PM): si un besito y brazo para ti y nada mas lol! No te creas... ciao te hablo manana

Meme: ok chiso
Meme: a kiss...see you tomorrow!
Chiso: yes a kiss and a hug [abrazo] for you and no more lol! Don’t you... ciao I’ll talk to you tomorrow

These examples have illustrated the address behavior of the L1 speakers and how they do ‘being close’ or ‘being intimate’. However, this was not the case of every L1 speaker’s behavior. The following example illustrates how one L1 speaker did not engage in doing ‘being close’ but rather in doing ‘being distant’.

5.7. Doing ‘being distant’

On the opposite end of the continuum presented above was one L1 speaker who did not display any closeness to the language learners, even when they engaged in interaction during seven occasions. In their third interaction, Jeff, one of the L2 learners, displays closeness to the L1 speaker by joking and displaying interest in his personal life. However, the L1 speaker does not orient to it and considers the conversation “too personal” (‘Se esta convirtiendo en una conversacion personal y no de “trabajo” [sic]’).

5.27. A-m, Vero, and Jeff, Interaction 3

116. 125eff (1:58:18 AM): ok, a-m, debemos encontrar a algunas mujeres
117. a-m (1:58:34 AM): Suissa=Suiza en 125eff125rs.
118. vero (1:58:50 AM): Ok gracias
119. a-m (1:58:55 AM): Lo siento, llevo + de dos años de noviazgo.
120. jeff (1:59:26 AM): verdad?
121. jeff (1:59:31 AM): bueno

Jeff: ok, a-m, should we find some women there?
a-m: Suissa= Switzerland but in Catalan
vero: Ok thanks
a-m: I am sorry, I’ve had a girlfriend for + than 2 years
jeff: really?
jeff: good
122. vero (1:59:31 AM): es bien!!
123. 126eff (1:59:38 AM): bien bien bien
→ 124. vero (1:59:57 AM): Que es su nombre?
125. a-m (2:00:11 AM): Si, soy chico...
126. a-m (2:00:21 AM): Xo, tengo novia.
→ 127. 126eff (2:00:41 AM): cuantos anos tiene?
128. 126eff (2:00:46 AM):
129. vero (2:00:56 AM): xo= que en 126eff 126rs?
→ 130. a-m (2:01:02 AM): Se esta convirtiendo en una 126eff 126rsación personal y no de "trabajo".
→ 131. a-m (2:01:13 AM): 8(
→ 132. 126eff (2:01:15 AM): o es ella muy vieja? :O
133. a-m (2:01:18 AM): xo=pero
134. 126eff (2:01:22 AM): oh, bueno
135.vero (2:01:28 AM): yo quiero viajar a esquiar!!!!!!!!!!

Before this excerpt, Jeff has mentioned finding girls in the trip they are preparing twice. When Jeff, in line 116, invites A-m to find girls on their trip for the third time in the interaction, A-m rejects his invitation (a dispreferred action), providing a reason for his refusal. Both learners orient to his account as a display of intimacy, since he is providing some personal information, and pursue the topic of his girlfriend (Vero asks for her name in line 124, and Jeff asks for her age in line 127). However, the L1 speaker does not seem to orient to this information as an invitation to be intimate, but rather just the explanation of his refusal. He states that the conversation is too personal and therefore those questions are not appropriate for the environment, clearly orienting to the pragmatic focus of the activity as a language learning activity, part of the curriculum, and therefore exempt from personal conversation topics (line 130), displaying his disapproval through the angry emoticon “8(“. Jeff’s comment in line 132, designed as a humorous, to
continue the intimate sequence, arrives almost at the same time that A-m’s angry emoticon. Jeff orients to A-m’s serious talk displaying a ‘change of mind’ token ‘oh’ (Heritage, 1984a) in line 134 and an acceptance token (‘bueno’). Vero also orients to the seriousness of A-m’s comments by re-directing the interaction back to the project topic, which she marks with multiple exclamation marks, an emphatic resource in SCMC to attract the other participants’ attention. From this sequence to the end of their interaction neither the L1 speaker nor the language learners ever initiated a topic that implied any personal information.

5.8. Summary

This chapter has presented, following of Pomerantz and Mandelbaum’s (2004) framework, what resources the L1 speakers employed to do ‘being close’, ‘being intimate’, or ‘being distant’ (see table below). In order to do ‘being close’ L1 speakers shared personal information and engaged in trouble talk, asked for updates of activities mentioned in previous conversations, displayed interest in the L2 speaker, produced sympathy uptakes when presented with trouble talk, explicitly recognized shared knowledge, and joked and shared laughter. To do ‘being closer/intimate’, L1 speakers engaged in flirting and used improprieties and slang, usually in humorous sequences. The chapter also presented examples of how L1 speakers did ‘being distant’ by maintaining the conversation as a language activity without personal involvement. The next chapter will present how the L2 learners engaged in these same interactional practices through the duration of the project.
Table 5.2. Practices that define the L1 speakers’ address behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distant</th>
<th>Acquaintance</th>
<th>Friendly</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Neutral, non-personal topics</td>
<td>o Informal address behavior (tú)</td>
<td>o Informal Address behavior (tú, vocatives)</td>
<td>o Informal Address behavior (tú, intimate vocatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o No shared laughter</td>
<td>o Neutral, non-personal topics</td>
<td>o Sharing reports of one’s activities</td>
<td>o Share personal problems-empathy/sympathy uptake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o No shared laughter</td>
<td>o Asking for updates on the other’s activities</td>
<td>o Use of improprieties, blasphemy, and slang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Discussion of personal problems</td>
<td>o Shared laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Sharing common knowledge</td>
<td>o Language play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Shared laughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6 - STUDENT'S ADDRESS SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

6.1. Introduction

In order to investigate whether there was any variation in the use of informal pronouns and verb morphology (which was the exclusive form used by the L1 speakers), each instance of a second person pronoun (subject, object or prepositional), and verbs that included second person morphology were coded for its formal and informal. In addition, those patterns of interaction similar to those exhibited by the L1 speakers were identified and analyzed. From the data it is clear that the L1 speakers used informal terms of address from their first interaction both when addressing one interlocutor (tú, te, ti, tu, contigo) or several (vosotros, os). The development of the students' address system is then operationalized as the increase of their informal pronouns and verb morphology use accompanied by a decrease of formal use (as in Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003).

It is important to note that, during the semester of this project, the students did not receive any instruction in class about the use of address forms. It was not part of their curriculum and there was no reference to it in their textbook. In addition, given the isolated geographical location of these students, their contact with L1 speakers of Spanish was reduced to the ones in this project, and their language input was restricted mainly to the language classroom and their Internet-pals (although most of them had access to Internet materials, there is for example no free TV channels with emission in Spanish).

---

Table 6.1 Instances of address forms by language student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Inter</th>
<th># e-turns</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiso</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanjoloci</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vero</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaris</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented two distinctive groups of students (Table 6.1). The first one displayed rather accurate use of the Spanish address system from the beginning of the study, using mostly informal pronouns and verb morphology, with little or no variation, and therefore did not “need” to learn the singular informal address forms (Figure 6.1). This group was formed by Chiso, Heyo, Juanjoloci, Jacy, Nico, and Jana.

---

22 Number of interactions in which the student participate. Several students engaged in fewer interactions than they were expected due mainly to technical problems and compatibility of schedules.

23 E-turns here are each of the entries of a participant in the chat. E-turns provide information on the amount of participation as well as length of the interaction.
The second group displayed large use of formal and informal address forms and overall variability, and therefore, "needed" to learn to use the informal terms of address (Table 6.1). This group included Cal, Kim, Vero, Ben, Amaris, Jeff, Jen, and Ash.

Two distinctive trends appeared in this second group. Some students improved their use of informal address within the 6 weeks, and others did not (Figure 6.2). The most interesting case of learning the informal address forms was Vero’s. Her case will be presented in detail below.
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Figure 6.2. Development of Spanish address for those students who displayed variability at the onset of the study

It is also evident the students' tendency to use informal singular forms (Table 6.1). The plural informal was overall very infrequently used and perhaps avoided, even in interactions with several participants, and in spite of the high frequency of use of this form by the L1 speakers. One student, Heyo, seemed to be the exception since he learned to accurately use the plural informal 'vosotros'. His case will also be analyzed in detail in this chapter.

6.2. Learning the singular informal address system

In concurrence with previous studies (Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003), several students displayed variation in their use of formal and informal address pronouns and
verb morphology from their first interaction. In spite of this variation, only one LI speaker corrected the sociopragmatic use of formal address by the students in his group.

### 6.2.1. Exposed corrections and pragmatic feedback – Vero’s case

Vero was a student from the United States engaged in interaction with A-m, a student in Spain. A third member of the group, Jeff, Vero’s classmate, only participated in two of their seven interactions. The analysis of the data revealed several sequences in which issues of address were apparent to the participants engaged in the conversation.

During their first interaction, which was rather short and took place several weeks into the semester (see Table 3.1), Vero uses the formal pronoun ‘usted’ in turn 3 to initiate the main topic of the conversation, the project-based task. A-m, in turn 5, does an other-repair and provides Vero with an exposed correction (Jefferson, 1987) about the sociopragmatic use of ‘usted’, and demands, with a direct negative command (don’t call me ‘usted’), that she use ‘tú’ instead.

#### 6.1. A-m & Vero, Interaction #1 – Week 1 of project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Text (Spanish)</th>
<th>Text (English)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a-m (1:04:00 AM): Hola, ya he llegado</td>
<td>a-m: Hello, I am here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>vero (1:04:53 AM): Hola</td>
<td>vero: Hello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>vero (1:06:02 AM): Nuestro proyecto deberá planear un viaje. ¿Dónde quiere usted ir?</td>
<td>Vero: Our project will have to plan a trip. Where do you want to go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a-m (1:06:28 AM): Me es indiferente.</td>
<td>a-m: I don’t care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a-m (1:06:43 AM): No me llames de usted.</td>
<td>a-m: Don’t use ‘usted’ with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>vero (1:07:00 AM): Me llamo es Vero</td>
<td>vero: My name is Vero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>a-m (1:07:18 AM): Yo A-m</td>
<td>a-m: I A-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>vero (1:07:52 AM): A-m…Cuánto años tienes?</td>
<td>Vero: A-m… How old are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a-m (1:08:00 AM): 18, y tú?</td>
<td>a-m: and you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>vero (1:08:20 AM): 30</td>
<td>vero: 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

24 In this chapter, pronouns and verb morphemes which indicate formal or informal address have been bolded on the original text (left column) to make them more salient to the reader.
Vero seems to orient to the correction in line 8 when she repairs her error by using the verb in the informal ‘tú’ form. It looks like A-m’s initiated repair was effective in correcting Vero’s inappropriate sociopragmatic use and pragmatic forms of address.

However, their second interaction a week later, also a brief one, disproves this idea. Although Vero starts with the correct form of the verb _estar_ ‘estas’, she switches back to the formal in turn 15 with the use of the pronoun ‘le’ and continues with several verbs in the formal ‘usted’ in turns 17 (‘piensa’ - do you[formal] think), 27 (‘sabe’ – you[formal] know) and 30 (‘puede’ - can you[formal]). However, in this interaction A-m does not orient to Vero’s inappropriate choice and focuses exclusively on the topic, asking her to explain more about the task at hand (line 16, ‘Explain yourself[informal]’).

6.2. A-m and Vero, Interaction #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a-m (11:22:35 AM): Hola</th>
<th>a-m: Hello</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a-m (11:23:23 AM): Bien, I Jeff?</td>
<td>a-m: Well, and [y] Jeff?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several lines omitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>vero (11:33:04 AM): es también....desde que vamos a los Alpes. Quizá te podemos encontrar en España y donde pararía en camino a Suiza? Dos ciudades...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vero: is also... since we go to the Alps. Maybe we can meet you <em>formal</em> in Spain and where would (you) stop <em>formal</em> on the way to Switzerland? Two cities...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>a-m (11:34:39 AM): Explicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>a-m: Explain <em>informal</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>vero (11:35:27 AM): así que piensa acerca de eso para esta noche. Nuestro profesora dijo que tenemos un presupuesto de 6000 dolares cada.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vero: so what do (you) think <em>formal</em> about this for tonight. Our teacher said we have a budget of 6000 dollars each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>a-m (11:36:14 AM): cada persona?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>a-m: each person?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This variation in Vero’s language may be due not only to a lack of control over pragmatic issues but also over pronouns and verb morphology. This evidences the importance of longitudinal data that looks at development not as the fruit of only one interaction but rather an extended progression.
Interaction 3, a much longer interaction that occurred a week later, includes both Vero and Jeff (the two Spanish students) and A-m (the Spanish speaker). In this interaction, Vero's language still presents variation between the use of formal and informal forms. This variation seems to suggest that although she seemed to exhibit some pragmatic understanding of formal and informal address, she lacks control over the linguistic forms. Jeff also exhibits a lack of control over the pragmatic forms. Jeff's variation is evident in the following utterances where he alternates between both forms.

6.3. Jeff interaction 1 - Week 1 of the project

88. j\textit{eff} (1:46:12 AM): pardon, no tengo acentos
89. a\_m (1:46:39 AM): tranquilo. Es "perdon"
90. j\textit{eff} (1:46:49 AM): perdon
91. a\_m (1:46:50 AM): gracias
92. a\_m (1:47:13 AM): Aqui chateando casi no los usamos para ahorar tiempo
93. j\textit{eff} (1:48:19 AM): pero tu usas acentos cuando dijo, "no me llames señor, solo tengo 18"

\textit{Several turn omitted}

→ 101. j\textit{eff} (1:51:10 AM): \textit{tu} esta bromeando? Usted no ha salido de Espana?
   j\textit{eff}: you are joking? You have never left Spain?

Jeff also seems to lack sociopragmatic understanding of Spanish terms of address when he employs the word 'señor' (sir/mister) as illustrated by Episode 3 during his first interaction (the third one for Vero and A-m).

6.4. Interaction# 3 - Week 3 of the project

→ 78. j\textit{eff} (1:44:29 AM): que pasa señor?
79. a\_m (1:44:35 AM): atonito
80. vero (1:44:43 AM): posible...pero no
81. j\textit{eff} (1:45:06 AM): donde vamos?
82. j\textit{eff} (1:45:08 AM): donde
83. j\textit{eff} (1:45:10 AM): donde
84. a\_m (1:45:17 AM): no me digas señor ;), solo tengo 18

\textit{Several turn omitted}

→ 135
85. vero (1:45:35 AM): muy joven
86. a-m (1:46:04 AM): Pues que me hubiesen parido antes!!
→ 87. jeff (1:46:08 AM): puedes beber el alcohol alli tienes 18 anos?
Several turns omitted
→ 97. vero (1:49:55 AM): donde va esquiar entonces?
98. a-m (1:50:04 AM): Hasta ahora era menor y no me dejavan ir tan lejos, y no podiamos ir toda la familia.
99. a-m (1:50:45 AM): fui una vez a esquiar a Andorra.
→ 100. vero (1:51:05 AM): si solamente tu...de donde vas esquiar?
→ 101. jeff (1:51:10 AM): tu esta bromeando? usted no ha salido de Espana?
102. a-m (1:52:07 AM): no, solo a andorra, que esta ni a 20Km. De la frontera de Espana.
103. jeff (1:53:20 AM): pero donde debemos ir para este viaje?
→ 104. a-m (1:53:25 AM): no me llames de usted!!
105. a-m (1:53:52 AM): me da igual.
→ 106. vero (1:54:14 AM): Querris ustedes venir a Suiza?
→ 107. a-m (1:54:19 AM): me enfadare como me volvias a decir usted!!!!!
108. a-m (1:54:32 AM): OK?
→ 109. jeff (1:54:47 AM): ok
110. a-m (1:55:02 AM): XO a que parte, a que sitio?
111. a-m (1:55:11 AM): Xo=pero
→ 112. vero (1:55:32 AM): ok........
113. a_m (1:56:21 AM): Aixis, a Suissa.
114. vero (1:57:34 AM): no se...no conozco suissa...tu?

When Jeff uses the form ‘señor’ (sir) to refer to A-m (we know he is referring to A-m since A-m being a man is a fact known to all participants), A-m starts a repair
sequence with a strong declaration of surprise in turn 79 ('in shock') followed by an
explicit request not to be called 'señor' and a sociopragmatic explanation of why the term
is inappropriate in this context 'solo tengo 18' since they are all young students, and a
symmetrical and informal use is the norm to be followed. Jeff seems to orient to A-m's
other-initiated other-completed repair and corrects his utterance by using the appropriate
form twice in line 87 ('puedes' can you [informal] and 'tienes' do you have [informal])
displaying initial pragmatic understanding. However in line 101, Jeff displays variation
again, using both forms in the same sentence (tu [informal] está [formal]).

During this exchange Vero orients to A-m's pragmatic reason for the need of
informal address forms by using an exclamation in line 85 ('muy joven'). However, she
continues varying both forms, even of the same verb ('va esquiar' in turn 97 and 'vas
esquiar' in turn 100 above) to which A-m orients as still a lack of understanding. Jeff's
explicit use of 'usted' in line 101 triggers a new repair sequence, initiated in line 104 by
A-m again providing exposed correction as to the use of the formal 'usted' ('no me
llameis de usted'!! in turn 104), emphasized this time with two exclamation marks, which
in chat interaction denotes emphasis, much like raising voice and changing intonation in a
face to face interaction. Vero, the next speaker, does not orient to the repair and uses the
formal explicit pronoun 'ustedes' again, to which A-m responds by upgrading his repair
turn to the condition of a threat ('me enfadare como me volvais a decir usted!!!!!!)
followed by five exclamation marks to display emphasis. In addition, A-m self-selects as
the next speaker seeking confirmation of the repair (turn 108) by using the students L1,
seeking guarantee that his repair turn was understood. Jeff confirms understanding in turn
107 (ok) and Vero on her next intervention (turn 112) ‘ok’ and her use of the informal pronoun ‘tu?’ in line 114.

After this episode, the interaction continues for 102 more turns, but only three forms are second person. Vero seems to switch to the use of an inclusive ‘nosotros’ and Jeff reduces his turns considerably and engages mostly in off-topic digressions.

Before the interaction is over Jeff uses a ‘tú’ form again (160. Jeff (2:06:54 AM): 2 de la manana. y tú?) and Vero uses a ‘tú’ form almost at the end of the interaction (198. Vero (2:11:47 AM): Que vas a comer?), but she still maintains her plural formal pronoun (turn 138: y uds?). Both Jeff and Vero’s decrease in the production of formal forms for the rest of the interaction may be seen as an effort to comply with the sociopragmatic norms stated by the Spanish speaker. Vero’s use of the plural pronoun ‘uds’ cannot be seen solely as a lack of comprehension of sociopragmatic rules. In most classroom settings in the United States it is common to use both formal ‘tú’ (with classmates) and formal ‘usted’ (with the teacher, guests, and so on), but when either the teacher or a student refers to more than one person, and keeping with the Latin American norm, the plural form ‘ustedes’ is employed regardless of the formality/solidarity of the context (see table 2.1). As a consequence the form ‘vosotros’ is hardly ever used in the classroom. It is not considered necessary or practical since it is only used in Spain, and the students are aware of this (see Excerpt 6.13). Therefore, at this point, it is difficult to know whether Vero is using ‘ustedes’ as the formal or informal plural form, especially since there is no answer to the turn from either A-m or Jeff, who are engaged in a side interaction, ignoring Vero’s turns.
Interaction 4, between only Vero and A-m, happened only one week after the previous one. Although Vero had previously agreed to use the informal forms with A-m, she reverts back to formal (turns 13 and 15), which triggers a new repair sequence started by A-m. In turn 17, A-m once again provides a very explicit correction, which includes what to do and what not to do (Don’t call me ‘usted’ use ‘tu’ with me). This was A-m’s 4th complaint about Vero’s use of formal address forms.

6.5. Interaction# 4. Week 4 of the project

→ 13. vero (12:47:08 AM): La canción me ______?

14. a-m(12:47:34 AM): Si, la canción que mande el otro día


16. vero (12:49:23 AM): me gusto la canción, oída a algun canciones americanas?

→ 17. a-m(12:49:41 AM): Si, lo vi. :”> Don’t call me [usted], use ‘tu’ with me.

18. a-m(12:50:04 AM): Yo no tengo fotos digitales, si encuentro ya enviare

19. a-m(12:50:16 AM): Ok

20. vero (12:50:20 AM): ok

21. a-m(12:50:38 AM): Que numero de canción era?

→ 22. vero (12:51:51 AM): así que vamos nosotros a vacaciones en los alpes?

Vero: The song you send to me?

a-m: Yes, the song I sent the other day

Vero: Were you the portrait I sent?

Vero: I liked the song. Heard any american songs?

a-m: Yes, I saw it. :”> Don’t call me [usted], use ‘tu’ with me.

a-m: I don’t have any digital photos, if I find any I will send them

a-m: Ok

vero: ok

a-m: What song number was it?

Vero: So we are going on vacation to the Alps? Number 4 Nahero 4.

After the exposed correction in line 17, A-m retakes a different strand of conversation answering Vero’s question in turn 15. It is important to note here that these apparently chaotic, unpredictable, multi-topic conversations are a common feature of SCMC (González-Lloret, 2007; Herring, 1999; Schönfeldt & Golato, 2003). Following Sack’s (1987) preference for contiguity, Vero seems to orient to this new strand rather than the repair turn and they both agree in sending digital pictures when he gets some. In
turn 21 A-m initiates a new topic, abandoning the repair sequence. After this, Vero switches to the use of ‘nosotros’ (we), and there is no other use of second person for more than 40 turns. Although this may seem like an avoidance strategy, Vero is actually explaining what their task is and what type of information they need to find out as a group, and therefore the switch to ‘nosotros’ seems to be in agreement with the topic at hand.

The last repair sequence in the data happens later on in the same interaction. In turn 61, Vero uses the verb ‘tener’ in the ‘usted’ form, and repeats it again in isolation in turn 64.

6.6. Interaction # 4 Week 4 of the project

61. vero (1:10:28 AM): tiene skiis o madero de nieve?  
62. a-m (1:10:41 AM): “madera”  
63. vero (1:10:50 AM): ok  
64. vero (1:10:54 AM): tiene?  
65. a-m (1:10:55 AM): no, no tengo.  
66. vero (1:10:59 AM): no.  
67. vero (1:11:09 AM): necesitamos pagar unos?  
68. a-m (1:11:13 AM): nos tocara alquilarlos  
69. vero (1:12:03 AM): Alquilamos en las montanas entonces.

Several turns ommitted

74. a-m (1:14:05 AM): Alguna vez has visto los toros?  
75. vero: do (you) form-ag have skies or snow wood?  
76. a-m: “madera” [wood]  
77. vero: ok  
78. vero: do (you) have form-ag?  
79. a-m: no, I don’t have. Do you form-ag?  
80. vero: no.  
81. vero: we need to pay for some?  
82. a-m: we will have to rent them  
83. vero: We rent them at the mountains then.

Quite unexpected, rather than initiating a new repair sequence like previously, A-m switches to the use of formal ‘usted’ himself, using it very explicitly in turn 65 (‘no, no tengo. Usted si?’). This switch could be seen as a change in formality register produced as a reaction to another person’s persistence in using the formal, which is a common
practice to establish distance with the interlocutor, or a mocking use of the formal pronoun to imitate and mock the L1 learner's repeated use of formal terms. The fact that the change is maintained for one turn only, since the next turn from A-m addressed directly to Vero (turn 74) is back in the informal form, which suggests that A-m was probably orienting to the overuse of the formal pronoun by Vero rather than shifting registers. Vero does not orient to the use of usted by A-m and answers the question without any sign of surprise, expanding on the topic with another question. A-m does not insist on what could be viewed as an embedded repair (Jefferson, 1987) and the conversation continues on the same topic until the bullfighting topic is introduced by A-m in line 74.

Although Vero does not seem to notice the last repair sequence in Episode 6.6 above, in the rest of the interaction she starts to incorporate more informal verbs and pronouns. Vero's later interactions, until the end of their project, show a progressive change of her linguistic forms towards the use of informal pronouns and verb forms with her interlocutor. This pattern of change is shown in Table 6.2. In her last four interactions, Vero changes her pragmatic use of address forms from chaotic variation to an exclusive use of the informal, the norm established by the Spanish speaker.
Table 6.2 Distribution of formal and informal forms of address for A-m, Vero, and Jeff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Int #</th>
<th>A-m – Spanish speaker</th>
<th>Vero – Spanish student</th>
<th>Jeff – Spanish student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 V-tú 1 pron. tú</td>
<td>1 V-tú 1 pron. usted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Int # 2</td>
<td>1 V-te 1 do pron. os</td>
<td>Int # 2</td>
<td>2 V-tú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Int # 3</td>
<td>9 V-vosotros 2 pron. vosotros 1 pron. tío</td>
<td>Int # 3</td>
<td>4 V-tú 1 v-vosotros 1 pron. tío</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Int # 4</td>
<td>10 V-tú 3 V-te 2 V-vosotros 3 pron. os 1 od pron. Te</td>
<td>1 pron. usted Int # 4</td>
<td>5 V-tú 1 pron. tú 1 poses. tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Int # 5</td>
<td>2 V-vosotros 1 pron. os</td>
<td>Int # 5</td>
<td>2 V-tú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>Int # 6</td>
<td>2 V-tú 1 pron. os</td>
<td>Int # 6</td>
<td>8 V-tú 2 posses. tú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>Int # 7</td>
<td>1 V-tú</td>
<td>Int # 7</td>
<td>3 V-tú 1 pron. ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>Int # 8</td>
<td>1 V-tú 2 pron. os</td>
<td>Int # 8</td>
<td>4 V-tú</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

25 Frequency by type
Figure 6.3 illustrates Vero’s pragmatic development. It shows how Vero’s variation between formal and informal use of pronouns and verb morphology evolved towards the sole use of pragmatically appropriate informal forms of address by the end of the eight-week project. In contrast, Jeff’s variation of address did not improve in the two interactions in which he participated, four weeks apart (Figure 6.4).

Figure 6.3 Vero’s use of formal and informal pronouns and verbs by interaction

Figure 6.4 Jeff’s use of formal and informal pronouns and verbs by interaction
It seems then that although both students received some explicit sociopragmatic feedback, only Vero improved her use of informal address. Possibly because Jeff only engaged twice in interaction during the entire project, which may not have been enough to trigger any change in his use of the Spanish address system.

6.2.2. When the L1 speaker did not provide correction

Most of the students that displayed variation of Spanish address did not receive any feedback on the sociopragmatic use of the forms. The students’ data show a variety of understandings of the address system. Several students’ use of formal and informal address pronouns and verb morphology suggested a lack of pragmatic competence (for example 6.3. above, and 6.7. below) while others displayed some patterns of use.

6.7. Kim & Ivan, Interaction 1

28. kim (12:44:51 PM): que quiere hacer tu profesor para este proyecto?
29. ivan (12:45:14 PM): I DON'T KNOW!
30. ivan (12:45:35 PM): no lo se, porque en la primera parte tengo que hablar en castellano contigo
31. ivan (12:45:46 PM): entonces se supone que te tengo que ayudar a ti
32. kim (12:46:04 PM): ok, we have to make a travel brochure or something.

Kim: what does your infor-sg teacher want to do for this project?
Ivan: I DON'T KNOW!
Ivan: I don’t know, because in the first part I have to speak in Spanish with you infor-sg
Ivan: then I suppose I have to help you infor-sg
Kim: ok, we have to make a travel brochure or something.
Kim: and thank you for your infor-sg help.

In her first interaction Kim employed the forms ‘tu’ and ‘su’ both meaning ‘your’ in the informal and formal within a few turns of difference to address the same interlocutor. Kim’s variation, however, was sporadic (see Table 6.3), suggesting that her variation was probably due to a lack of linguistic competence rather than sociopragmatic understanding.
Table 6.3 Kim’s use of formal and informal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kim’s use of the Spanish address system rapidly evolved towards the sole use of informal address form, and from her interaction 3 she did not use any more formal address (Figure 6.5).

Figure 6.5 Kim’s use of formal and informal pronouns and verbs by interaction

Unlike Kim, two other students who displayed variety at the onset of the study, Amaris and Ben, never improved their Spanish address use. This may have been related to the fact that they met every time with a different interlocutor and they did not develop any type of relationship, however previous studies have shown that students are able to
develop communicative competence through repeated participation even with different interlocutors (Nguyen, 2003). Another possibility for the lack of development may be that they only engaged in three interactions (although the minimum required was five).

The following table presents Ben's and Amaris use of formal and informal through their three interactions.

Table 6.4 Ben and Amaris' formal and informal use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ben</th>
<th></th>
<th>Amaris</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 1</td>
<td>10 0.59</td>
<td>7 0.41</td>
<td>4 0.8</td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 2</td>
<td>2 0.5</td>
<td>2 0.5</td>
<td>17 0.84</td>
<td>4 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 3</td>
<td>5 0.42</td>
<td>7 0.58</td>
<td>10 0.71</td>
<td>4 0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although both students displayed variation, Amaris' use of formal pronouns and verb morphology was proportionally larger than Ben's. Ben displayed variation in his use which never improved. However, Amaris displayed a stronger preference for the use of formal address (Table 6.4 above). This finding was not surprising to me as teacher of Amaris' class. Amaris was the only student in the class who insisted on using formal address with me as her teacher, in spite of my permission to use informal forms and first name to address me. Her use of formal address never changed during the semester.
Figures 6.6 and 6.7 display the evolution of Ben and Amaris on their use of formal and informal address. Each one interacted only three times. Amaris first and second interaction were one week apart, but her second and third interaction were separated 4 weeks from her first interaction. Ben had difficulty connecting with his
assigned partners on the Internet, and as a result his interactions happened during the last three weeks of the project, with the second and third interaction happening in the same week. Although his third interaction shows improvement of the use of informal address, additional interactions would have been needed to observe any development.

These results seem to support the results from Kim, Vero, and Jeff's data, which suggest that a certain amount of constant interaction is needed in order to develop proficiency in the use of the Spanish address system. It took at least five interactions for Kim, her partner Cal, and Vero to completely drop the use of formal pronouns when addressing their partners (in Spain and classmates).

It is interesting to point here that the L1 of the learner seemed to also be a significant factor for the use of informal address. Ash, a bilingual English/Portuguese speaker, was an interesting case. A first review of Ash's data (Figure 6.8) revealed variation in her use of the Spanish address system.

![Ash's address forms](image)

Figure 6.8 Ash's address use

6.8. Ash, Jen and Oslo Interaction 1
At the beginning of their first interaction, during the greeting sequence, Ash uses informal address (‘Cómo estás?’)(line 2), although soon after she switches to formal address (line 8) “¿Cuántos años tiene?” . Although we could attribute this variation to a lack of control over the verb morphology (especially since the verb morphology for third person singular in line 4 is incorrect), a closer look at her data shows that the variation happens only when addressing the student in Spain and never with her classmate, with whom she always employs informal address forms (Figure 6.9). This was probably due to pragmatic transfer (Kasper, 1992) from Portuguese which also requires the use of formal pronouns with persons that one does not know well (Hutchinson & Lloyd, 2003).
Ash's variation disappeared after her first interaction, except a verb in formal second person plural form in her last interaction (line 28), since after that moment her interlocutor was known to her and she had established a working relationship with him.
6.9. Jen and Oslo, Interaction 3. Week 5 of the project

25. Oslo (10:56:57 AM): bien

→ 28. Ash (10:58:33 AM): cuantas por un coche...saben?

As it will be presented below, the use of formal verb forms when addressing more than one interlocutor was a generalized practice among those students that employed plural address forms.

6.3. Learning the plural informal address system – Heyo’s case

Several students exhibited very little variation in their use of the Spanish address system at the beginning of the study. Two of the students, Jana and Nico, did not exhibit any variation at all. Jana and Nico started their interactions using informal pronouns and verb morphology, and their data did not show any instances of formal address. It is important to note, though, that as most of the students, they did not use the informal plural forms, they restricted themselves to the use of singular forms, directing their utterances mostly to the L1 speaker, and using vocatives to call on any one of the participants. This was a generalized phenomenon among the students who used singular (both formal and informal) pronouns and verb morphology almost exclusively during their interactions, even when there were at least two other participants, and in spite of the frequent use of the informal plural forms by the L1 speakers. The students engaged in the project-based task frequently used the “nosotros” (we) form when pluralizing, even when
their utterances were clearly directed to their partners, avoiding in this way the use of second person plural forms.

6.10. Kim, Cal and Ivan, Interaction 4 Week 5 of the project

51. cal (2:34:31 PM): nosotros tenemos más dinero ahora cal: we have more money now
52. cal (2:34:50 PM): en france, solomente 2,500 cal: in France, only [solamente] 2,500
53. kim (2:35:03 PM): queremos ir a Naples? kim: do we want to go to Naples?
54. cal (2:35:06 PM): en Barcelona y Roma tenemos mas cal: in Barcelona and Roma we have more
55. cal (2:35:28 PM): Si, yo pienso que es muy bonita cal: yes, I think it is very beautiful
56. kim (2:35:33 PM): el tren solo cuesta 20 euros al Naples kim: the train only costs 20 euros to Naples

6.11. Ben, Amaris, Gali & Elena, Interaction 1 Week 1 of the project

25. Ben (9:15:55 AM): Hey, I think we need to add her to our list so that we can go to a conference for all four of us to chat. Ben: Hey, I think we need to add her to our list so that we can go to a conference for all four of us to chat.
26. Gali (9:16:57 AM): podemos esperar por 10 minutos y despues, vamos a invitarla a nuestra conference Gali: we can wait [esperar] 10 minutes and then we are going to invite her to our conference
27. amaris (9:17:26 AM): si. amaris: yes
→ 29. Amaris (9:34:04 AM): ¿Así, acerca de qué queremos hablar? Amaris: So, what do we want to talk about?

6.12. Jen, Ash & Oslo, Interaction #4 Week 7 of the project

→ 73. Jen (11:14:14 AM): no.. espana es bueno. pero necesitamos cortar el precio Jen: no.. Spain is good... but [pero] we need to cut [cortar] the price
75. Oslo (11:14:32 AM): ¿otros paises? Pero si ya no queda casi dinero Oslo: other countries? But we have hardly any money left
→ 76. Ash (11:14:36 AM): okay.. creemos que necesitamos ir a 3 paises? Ash: okay.. do we think that we need [necesitamos] to go to 3 countries?
This avoidance of the plural second person forms contrasts with the frequent use that the L1 speakers did of the vosotros forms (vosotros/as, os, vuestro/a/s, and second person plural verb morphology) as illustrated in Table 6.5.

Table 6.5 Instances of second person forms by the L1 speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th># of turns</th>
<th># of sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-m</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meme</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heyo was the only language student that developed the use of the informal plural address forms. Although Heyo tended to use informal address pronouns and verb morphology, he exhibited some variation during his first interactions. His two first interactions happened with one student in Spain, and therefore required mostly the use of singular forms (tu/usted). During these interactions he still employed some formal verb morphology and several formal object pronouns ('le' and 'su').

Table 6.6 Heyo's use of formal and informal address in person singular contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 1</td>
<td>2 .22</td>
<td>7 .78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 2</td>
<td>6 .3</td>
<td>14 .7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>17 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>34 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>19 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 From the 390 turns, 125, 33%,
27 From these 740 turns, 330, that is 44%, happened in interaction with only 1 interlocutor, a possible explanation for the high number of informal singular instances.
By his third interaction, Heyo exclusively used informal verb morphology and pronouns and maintained its use to the end of the project. See Table 6.6.

Figure 6.11 Heyo's informal and formal use in second person singular contexts

In his third interaction, Heyo worked with two women in Spain. Although he used informal verb morphology and pronouns exclusively when addressing one of his interlocutors (tu), he displayed considerable variation in his use of plural informal address forms. This variation decreased for his next interaction and disappeared in his last interaction.

Table 6.7 Heyo's informal and formal use in second person plural context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Formal-Plural</th>
<th>Informal-Pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 3</td>
<td>2, 0.60</td>
<td>1, 0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 5</td>
<td>1, 0.11</td>
<td>8, 0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3, 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 6.12 Heyo's informal and formal use in second person plural context

In his first interaction with two women in Spain, Heyo displays understanding of the sociopragmatic use of the informal plural form “vosotras” when he identifies this interaction as his first opportunity to practice it (line 25).


15. mijo: es mi nombre, en hebreo xxxx es mar y xxxx pescador, por si te interesa

⇒ 16. heyo: pero no se preocupen
17. mijo: anda

⇒ 18. heyo: no puedo usar “vosotras” bien.
19. mijo: ¿?
20. monica: que quieres decir?

⇒ 21. heyo: Pueden esperar un momento?

22. monica: si
23. monica: no te preocupes
24. heyo: Este es interesante.

⇒ 25. heyo: Porque puedo practicar “vosotras” en lugar de “tú”.
26. mijo: ok
27. heyo: Bueno.

mijo: it is my name, in Hebrew xxxx is sea and xxxx is fisherman, in case you are interested
heyo: but don’t worry
mijo: hey
heyo: I cannot use “vosotras” well
mijo: ¿?
monica: what do you mean?
heyo: Can you wait for a moment?
monica: yes
monica: don’t worry
heyo: This is interesting
heyo: Because I can practice “vosotras” instead of “tú”
mijo: ok
heyo: Good.
28. mijo: cuenta algo
29. heyo: ¿Qué me has dicho, mijo?
30. mijo: que nos cuentes algo
31. mijo: tell us something
32. monica: tienes microfono?
33. mijo: no
34. heyo: Tratais de contar con microfono?
35. heyo: Do (you) try to speak [hablar] with microphone?

mijo: tell us something
mijo: to tell us something
mijo: tell us something
monica: do (you) have microphone?
mijo: no
heyo: Do (you) try to speak [hablar] with microphone?

However, Heyo recognizes his problems using the second person plural form (‘no puedo usar “vosotras” bien’ line 18) and he uses formal plural morphology in the verbs in lines 16 and 21 (no se preocupen- don’t worry, poden (pueden)- you can). In line 34, Heyo uses the informal plural form of verb ‘tratar’ (tratais) for the first time.

Later in the interaction, Heyo explains to his partners that in the United States the teachers often use ‘ustedes’ with the students because it is easier for the students. Both Monica and Mijo recognize ‘ustedes’ as being very proper and formal (lines 178 & 179), and Heyo displays sociopragmatic understanding by emphatically agreeing with them (line 180).

(6.14.)

169. mijo: en plural seria corregidme
170. heyo: De acuerdo.
171. heyo: Tengo que leer mi libro de texto otra vez.
172. mijo: cual?
173. heyo: Es que los estudiantes americanos
174. heyo: usan ustedes con mucha frecuencia.
175. monica: si
176. heyo: Las profesoras usa ustedes también,

mijo: in plural it would be “corregidme”
heyo: all right
heyo: I have to read my textbook again
mijo: which?
heyo: the American students
heyo: use ustedes very frequently.
monica: yes
heyo: the teachers use [usan] “ustedes” also,
177. heyo: porque es más fácil para los estudiantes.
178. monica: sois muy correctos!
179. mijo: pero eso es muy formal
180. heyo: Claro.
181. mijo: los andaluces lo dicen siempre, pero lo normal es vosotros
182. mijo: chateais con gente de otros lugares?
183. heyo: Cuando estudia en la Universidad de Tokio, la profesora siempre usaba vosotros.
184. mijo: tu estudiabas en tokio?
185. heyo: Sí.
186. monica: estudie

Although Heyo seems to understand the sociopragmatic use of the informal address pronouns and its morphology, he has not mastered the linguistic forms (lines 21 and 16 in 6.12 above) and at the end of the interaction, when Heyo uses a direct translation form English in his farewell (have a good evening) he employs formal verb morphology (ustedes) ‘tengan’ (line 266). This result seems to confirm Belz and Kinginger’s (2003) suggestion that several of the learners in their study lacked a domain of the grammatical system after they had understood the sociopragmatic use.

(6.15.)

265. mijo: luego le daré tu dirección, pero ella usa el messenger de hotmail
266. heyo: Tengan buenas tardes.
267. heyo: De acuerdo.
268. heyo: Hasta pronto, Mónica y Mijo!
269. heyo: Y alohal
270. mijo: hasta otra Heyo

mijo: I will give her you address later, but she uses the Messenger in Hotmail
heyo: Have a good evening
heyo: All right
heyo: See you soon, Monica and Mijo!
heyo: and alohal!
heyo: see you Heyo
For his fifth interaction, Heyo worked with two different women in Spain, Luci and Eli, who were working together at one computer. At the beginning of the interaction, after they introduce each other, they start talking about their activities and Heyo uses informal address, even when this is their first interaction, following the address displayed by the L1 speakers at the onset of the interaction (Excerpt 6.16)


1. luci+Eli: por favor conectate para hablar
2. heyo: Hola!
3. luci+Eli: hola
4. heyo: Como estas?
5. luci+Eli: que ilusion nos hace contactar contigo
Several turns omitted
13. luci+Eli: que hora es alli?
→ 14. heyo: Estais en casa o escuela?
15. heyo: Son casi las 11 de la manana.
16. luci+Eli: en casa que son las 11 de la noche
→ 17. heyo: Estais hermanas?
18. luci+Eli: vaya 12 horas de diferencia
19. luci+Eli: no somos amigas
20. heyo: Si.
21. luci+Eli: que bien escribes español
Several turns omitted
33. luci+Eli: es que mi hermano hace triathlon
34. heyo: Fantastico!
35. luci+Eli: lol
36. heyo: Va a visitar la isla Hawaii?
37. luci+Eli: no creo pero ya le gustarla
38. luci+Eli: y a nosotras tambien
→ 39. heyo: Haceis triathlon vosotros?
40. luci+Eli: no nosotras no
41. heyo: O correr, nadar o
42. heyo: bicicleta?
43. luci+Eli: luci correr pero de vez en cuando
→ 44. heyo: vosotras, no vosotros.
45. luci+Eli: y si que me gusta salir con la bicicleta
46. heyo: interesante.

In line 39, Heyo uses the informal plural form of the verb ‘hacer’ (‘haceis’) followed by the explicit subject ‘vosotros’. In line 44, he explicitly self-corrects to the feminine form ‘vosotras’ (since the interlocutors are both women), even when there was no break in communication, as in the case of line 40 when Eli and Luci answer his question ‘no, nosotras no’.

(6.17.)

These data reveal how Heyo’s use of the informal address system developed from initial variation and self-proclaimed difficulty of use, to a constant and abundant use.
when talking to more than one interlocutor. In addition, it is important to point out that he uses the informal plural address form in his first interaction with these two interlocutors, which seems to support the idea that interactional competence can be developed independently of a specific interlocutor (Nguyen, 2003).

6.4. Conclusions: Learning and not learning the Spanish address system

From the results presented above, some general conclusions can be drawn. First, there seems to be a minimum amount of constant interaction needed in order for the language learners to develop proficiency in the use of the Spanish address system. Of Vero and Jeff, the only two students who received specific sociopragmatic feedback about the Spanish address system from the L1 speaker, only one (Vero) improved her use of pronouns and verb morphology until she finally used informal address at the end of the project, after eight weeks of interaction. Although Jeff did receive the same pragmatic feedback, he only participated in two interactions, which did not seem to be enough to remediate his variation between formal and informal address. It is important to note here that the students had no other available opportunities to engage in interaction outside the classroom and this project since there are very few Spanish speakers in this context, and the only access to Spanish media is through Internet (there is no free Spanish TV or radio available). The data also suggest that the rate of development may vary from student to student. It took five interactions for Kim to develop her use of informal address, but eight interactions in eight weeks for Vero.

Second, the student’s command of the address system at the beginning of the study may also be determinant on the rate of improvement. Less initial variation in the
Spanish address system tended to result in a faster shift to informal-only use. Those students who displayed variation but seemed to understand the address system (by using more informal than formal forms) improved their pragmatic address use without explicit feedback from the L1 speakers in Spain, as in the cases of Kim and Cal.

Third, personal beliefs or predisposition can affect learning in this area. In agreement with previous research (Belz and Kinginger, 2002, 2203; DuFon, 1999; Siegal, 1996) which suggests that personal beliefs and attitudes may be significant to allow or hinder development, Amaris’ data, enhanced by ethnographic information, seemed to suggest that some students may be reticent to adopt sociopragmatic rules even when they may be aware of them.

In addition, the students’ L1 may create additional issues which were not really investigated in this study. Ash’s data revealed that pragmatic transfer from her L1, Portuguese, may have been a factor in her initial variation on the use of the Spanish address system (consistent with Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997).

Last but not least, learning seemed to happen when either the interlocutor (in the case of Vero) or the students themselves (in the case of Heyo) made it an explicit point to focus on address forms. SCMC offered the students the opportunity for learning, particularly in the case of Heyo’s self-initiated topicalization of the plural informal address in interactions with the Spanish speaker interlocutors.

In addition to the use of the Spanish pronoun address system (and verb morphology), it was evident that students were employing other resources to establish relationships with their Spanish partners. It was also evident that their relationships with
the L1 speakers evolved from their first to last interaction, even in the cases when the students already employed informal address from the beginning. A Conversation Analysis was applied to investigate what these resources were and how both L1 speakers and students deployed them. The results of the microanalysis will be presented in the following chapter (Chapter 7).
CHAPTER 7 - FROM ADDRESSIVITY TO AFFILIATION: LEARNING TO DO 'BEING CLOSE'

7.1. Introduction

Throughout the project, language students developed several techniques used by the L1 speakers to do 'being close'. This chapter provides answers to the third question in this study: How do L2 learners of Spanish interact with L1 speakers in a synchronous computer-mediated environment? What patterns of interaction do they employ to do 'being close/distant'? Do these patterns change with time? And What is the role of the L1 speaker in any possible development?

The data show that the L2 learners developed interactional resources similar to those employed by the L1 speakers such as share laughter, share personal information and ask for updates on their interlocutors' activities and schedule, uptake and display affiliation when presented with personal problems, and engage in language play and joking. The development of these interactive resources was only possible, however, when the L1 speakers were collaborative and engaged in doing 'being close'.

7.2. Interaction with engaging L1 speakers

As illustrated in the last excerpt of Chapter 5, not all L1 speakers engaged equally in the interactions. Although they all were polite and helped students complete their projects, the relationships they developed with the students varied from distant to very friendly. When the learners engaged in on-line communication with cooperative, interactive L1 speakers, they had the chance to experience and construct sequences that allowed them to develop their interactional competence. This section will present some of
the sequences that reveal how the students developed their capacity to display closeness. In addition to their pragmatic use of pronouns and verb morphology (Chapter 6), this was accomplished through several main practices: shared laughter, provision of personal information, sympathy uptake, display of interest in a ‘personal information sequence’, joking and language play, and use of slang and improprieties.

7.2.1. Learning to share laughter

The data in this study show multiple episodes of shared laughter where two or more interlocutors laugh in the same sequence as a reaction to a previous turn, or when one of the interlocutor jokes and this is followed and oriented to by another interlocutor’s laughter. It is important to point out that because of the nature of the sequencing and turn-taking system in SCMC, an invitation to laughter (Jefferson, 1979) may not always be placed in the same turn or even the immediate next turn, but can be displaced several turns by other threads of conversation.

Laughter is frequent in the data and it is used mainly, although not exclusively, as an affiliative move to build rapport and do ‘being close’. Some of the students shared laughter episodes from their first interaction, like the example below (7.1); others learned to share laughter during the time spent on the project, and some were never exposed to shared laughter in their interactions.

7.1. Chiso and Meme, Interaction 1

| Chiso: soy 24 | Chiso: I am [tengo] 24 |
| Meme: Yo también! | Meme: Me too! |
| Chiso: oh sí! | Chiso: oh yeah! |
| Chiso: soy un hombre también | Chiso: I am a man too |
| Meme: Casi 25, porque el 18 es mi cumple | Meme: Almost 25, because my birthday is on the 18th |
Meme and Chiso found each other in Yahoo! Messenger, and since they had not been able to connect with their assigned partner, they decided to partner up for the project. In this sequence they are getting to know each other, sharing personal information when they discover they are both the same age (lines 39 and 40). When Chiso states ‘I am a man too’, implying that Meme is a man, Meme seems to have already begun writing her next turn as an expansion to her previous turn. Chiso orients to her turn with an exclamation which closes the sequence. Meme’s next turn orients to Chiso’s previous statement starting a “post first” other-initiated repair (line 45) to a problem in Chiso’s production (line 42) which she marks with an initial exclamation “hey” followed by a repair, correcting Chiso’s mistake about her gender. Chiso orients to his mistake and initiates laughter and “making light” of the mistake, displaying to Meme that he takes the mistake as laughable, inviting his co-participant to join the laugh (Glenn, 2003). At this point Meme joins the laugh accepting Chiso’s mistake as laughable. It is interesting that in the next turn Chiso self-correts his representation of laughter to reflect the Spanish spelling displayed by the L1 speaker.
Although Meme initiates a new sequence with a new topic, Chiso orients back to the previous trouble-source initiating a post-sequence in which he displays a lack of knowledge about her name, suggesting her name as the cause of the misunderstanding, displacing the fault for the error to her name. She aligns with the idea of her name having been a source of misunderstanding ("un poco extraño, ya lo sé") which restores Chiso’s lost face. Chiso then in line 54 produces an affiliative positive assessment about her name. Sharing laughter from the first moments, the use of informal address pronouns (with minimal variation by Chiso), and affiliative assessments suggests that Chiso and Meme started developing a friendship during their first interaction, which evolved from that point towards a closer, more intimate relationship.

The next example illustrates how another student, Cal, who did not use laughter at the beginning of the project, learns to share laughter by: 1) marking initiated humorous sequences with explicit laughter tokens, and 2) recognize a candidate laughable and responding with laughter.

Cal and Kim, language learners, are engaged in the project-based task with Ivan, an English student in Spain. They are negotiating where to go as a group for a six week vacation with a limited budget. They need to visit three different places and decide on their flights, hotels, activities, and restaurants (See Appendix C). In their first interaction, the students introduce themselves and start discussing the places they want to visit. They agree to first go to Barcelona, Spain and Ivan is suggesting places to visit and activities to do during their time there. In the following excerpts we can see how Ivan, the L1 speaker, consistently marks his humorous turns with a laughter token (lines 138-139 and
lines 146-148 in Interaction 1; lines 271-272 in Interaction 2; lines 47-48, 71-72, and line 99 in Interaction 3; and 69-70 in Interaction 4). This is consistent with Jefferson’s (1979) idea of post utterance completion laughter particle, where the speaker indicates that laughter is appropriate by laughing him/herself, inviting the recipient to laugh together. In addition, when the student produces a joke or humorous turn, Ivan, the L1 speaker uptakes the turn and either laughs or continues the joke (line 216 in Interaction 1 (7.2), line 56, and line 99 in Interaction 3 (7.4), line 151, and line 154 in Interaction 4 (7.5).

7.2. Cal and Ivan, interaction 1, some turns omitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Cal (2:44:15 PM):</th>
<th>Ivan, are the [los] restaurants expensive [caros]?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Cal (2:44:29 PM):</td>
<td>Un mes es perfecto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Ivan (2:44:39 PM):</td>
<td>depende a que restaurante vayas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Cal (2:45:12 PM):</td>
<td>A mi me gusta beber mucho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Ivan (2:45:23 PM):</td>
<td>En un restaurante normal te puedes gastar comiendo 20-25 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Cal (2:45:25 PM):</td>
<td>Jack Daniels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Ivan (2:45:33 PM):</td>
<td>es relativamente caro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Ivan(2:45:40 PM):</td>
<td>mmmm jack daniels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Cal (2:45:43 PM):</td>
<td>bien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Ivan (2:45:45 PM):</td>
<td>a mi también me gusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Cal (2:45:55 PM):</td>
<td>que tipo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Ivan (2:46:04 PM):</td>
<td>Aunque si te parece caro, puedes ir a comer al mc donalds o burgering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Ivan (2:46:09 PM):</td>
<td>jeje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Kim (2:46:10 PM):</td>
<td>han viajado ustedes en Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Ivan(2:46:12PM):</td>
<td>que tipo? 12 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Cal (2:46:29 PM):</td>
<td>no yo no he estado nunca en Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Cal (2:46:29 PM):</td>
<td>Glen Levet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Ivan (2:46:46 PM):</td>
<td>Absolut Vodka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Cal (2:46:52 PM):</td>
<td>también</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cal: Ivan, are the [los] restaurants expensive [caros]?
Cal: a month is perfect
Ivan: it depends what restaurant (you) go to
Cal: I like drinking very much
Ivan: In a normal restaurant You can spend 20-25 euros eating
Cal: Jack Daniels
Ivan: it's quite expensive
Ivan: mmmm Jack daniels
Cal: good
Ivan: I like it too
Cal: what type?
Ivan: Although if you think it's too expensive, (you) can eat at McDonalds or Burger King
Ivan: hahah
Kim: Have you traveled to Portugal
Ivan: what type? 12 years old
Ivan: no I have never been to Portugal
Cal: Glen Levet
Ivan: Absolut Vodka
Cal: that too
7.3. Interaction 2

146. Ivan (2:47:00 PM): con Red Bull
147. Ivan (2:47:09 PM): energy drink para beber más
148. Ivan (2:47:11 PM): jejej
149. Kim (2:47:18 PM): es muy popular
150. Cal (2:47:20 PM): yo soy el barman
151. Cal (2:47:35 PM): en un restaurante
208. Kim (3:02:21 PM): ivan y cal cuantos años tienen
210. Ivan (3:02:57 PM): yo tengo 19, el dia 2 de abril cumple 20
211. Ivan (3:03:03 PM): Y tu?
212. Cal (3:03:10 PM): Yo tengo 30 años
213. Kim (3:03:29 PM): 22
215. Cal (3:03:50 PM): Sí, yo muy viejo
216. Ivan (3:04:13 PM): hahahaha
217. Kim (3:04:51 PM): en España se puede beber bebidas alcohólicas cuando eres joven

7.4. Interaction 3, Cal and Ivan are chatting, but Kim is not present during this interaction.

45. Cal (11:23:29 PM): nosotros tenemos 12,000 total
46. Ivan (11:23:34 PM): bueno
47. Ivan (11:23:39 PM): barcelona es barata
48. Ivan (11:23:40 PM): jajaj
49. Cal (11:23:55 PM): esta bien que hacemos

Cal: we have 12,000 total
Ivan: good [bueno]
Ivan: barcelona is cheap
Ivan: hahaha
Cal: all right what do we do
50. Ivan (11:24:04 PM): un día se ve la plaza España, para movernos por Barcelona utilizaremos el metro

51. Ivan (11:24:18 PM): Es rápido y cómodo

52. Cal (11:24:28 PM): los datos en Barcelona son May 21 a junio 6

53. Ivan (11:24:34 PM): los bonos se llaman T-10 y valen 6.30€

54. Ivan (11:24:45 PM): muchos días

→ 55. Cal (11:24:52 PM): Bien, más dinero para los discos y alcohol

→ 56. Ivan (11:25:57 PM): ¡jajajaj

→ 57. Ivan (11:25:59 PM): sí sí

58. Ivan (11:26:13 PM): bueno, 1 día de visita a la plaza España

59. Cal (11:26:30 PM): Bien, cuanto cuesta

Several turns omitted


68. Ivan (11:28:13 PM): sí

69. Ivan (11:28:28 PM): podemos quedarnos en su casa y así salen gratis

70. Cal (11:28:33 PM): Necesitamos dormir en las casas de sus amigos

→ 71. Ivan (11:29:10 PM): así más dinero para fiesta

→ 72. Ivan (11:29:12 PM): ¡jajaja

73. Cal (11:29:43 PM): Yo quiero asistir al juego de fútbol también

74. Ivan (11:29:56 PM): ok

Several turns omitted

94. Ivan (11:37:05 PM): día 2 es la zona universitaria

95. Ivan (11:37:30 PM): Pub Desgalc y Tunel Casanova o Costa Breve

→ 96. Cal (11:37:39 PM): esta bien, muchas señoritas y bibliotecas

→ 97. Ivan (11:38:00 PM): ¿bibliotecas????

→ 98. Cal (11:38:01 PM): ¡jajaj


100. Ivan (11:38:23 PM): vale y día 3 de fiesta es Sala Razzmatazz
### 7.5. Interaction 4

| 64. Cal (2:37:11 PM): La comida de Italia es mi favorito | Cal: Italian food is my favorite [favorito] |
| 65. Kim (2:37:12 PM): es la razón yo elegí un poco sitios | Kim: it is the reason I chose a few [unos pocos] places |
| 66. Ivan (2:37:31 PM): sí, la mia también | Ivan: yes, yes, mine too |
| 68. Ivan (2:37:36 PM): pizza, espagueti | Ivan: pizza, spaghetti |
| 69. Ivan (2:37:38 PM): macarrones | Ivan: macaroni |
| 70. Ivan (2:37:39 PM): jajajaj | Ivan: hahahah |

### 7.6. Interaction 5

| 148. Ivan (2:52:02 PM): ya os lo dije, no | Ivan: I already told you didn’t I? |
| 149. Ivan (2:52:05 PM): bailaremos de todo | Ivan: we’ll dance everything |
| 150. Cal (2:52:06 PM): Estoy practicando ahora | Cal: I am practicing right now |
| 151. Ivan (2:52:16 PM): jajaja | Ivan: hahahaha |
| 153. Kim (2:52:39 PM): sí cal, necesitas enseñarme | Kim: yes cal, (you) need to teach me |
| 154. Ivan (2:52:40 PM): jajajja | Ivan: hahahaha |
| 155. Ivan (2:52:20 PM): no pasa nada | Ivan: it’s all right |
| 156. Ivan (2:52:50 PM): para salir saldremos aunque solo bailes tu | Ivan: we’ll go out even if you are the only one who is going to dance |
| 158. Ivan (2:53:05 PM): día 1: pub desglac | Ivan: day 1: pub desglac |

In comparison to the norms displayed by the L1 speaker (Ivan), the language learner (Cal) does not mark his humorous turn with a laughter token (Interaction 1 line 215) although the L1 speaker orients to the humorous nature of the turn as displayed by his laughter token (line 216). A similar sequence can be seen in Interaction 3 (lines 55-56). It is not until line 98 in Interaction 3 that Cal employs a laughter token to mark his joking turn (line 96). Although Cal’s laughter comes after Ivan’s question in line 97.
(‘¿bibliotecas????’) and could be interpreted as the second pair part of an adjacency pair question/answer, there is only one second of difference between turns 97 and 98 (according to the timestamps). It is safe to assume that those sentences were produced at the same time, similarly to overlapping, placing Ivan’s turn between Cal’s joking turn and the laughing token marking his humorous turn. It is interesting to note here that the student is not only producing a laughter token, but he is also imitating the way the L1 speaker “laughs” by using the Spanish convention for laughter in chat rooms (jejeje, or jajaja) rather than the English (hehehe or hahaha) See 7.1 above for another example.

If we compare the Spanish L1 speaker’s orientation to shared laughter with the student’s in the first interactions, we can see considerable difference. Although the L1 speaker consistently uptakes any humorous turn from the students to construct shared laughter (line 216 in Interaction 1; lines 271-272 in Interaction 2; line 56, and line 99 in Interaction 3, line 151, and line 154 in Interaction 4), the student does not produce any uptakes of the L1 speaker’s humorous turns during interactions 1 and 3.

In the first interaction, when the L1 speaker produces a joke and a laughter token (lines 138-139) there is no uptake by either Cal or Kim. Kim in line 140 initiates a new sequence with a change of topic which Ivan follows in a double strand. The first one a second pair part answer to Kim’s question (line 142), and the second one “post-expanding” (Schegloff, 2007a) the previous sequence about alcoholic drinks with a second pair part answer to Cal’s question (‘que tipo’) (line 137). Ivan initiates this post-expanding turn recycling Cal’s turn since this was removed from the first pair part
question by another sequence, orienting to the “nextness” (Schegloff, 2007a) of talk organization.

In the same manner, in interaction 3, when Ivan jokes about Barcelona being a cheap city (line 47) marked by a laughter token (line 48) there is no uptake by the student who redirects their attention to the task at hand (line 49, all right what do we do?). In line 71, Ivan jokes about sleeping in a friends’ house in Barcelona so that they can have more money for partying, marking the statement as humorous with a laughter token (line 72), inviting the learners to join in the laughter. Again in this occasion there is no uptake by Cal, who immediately introduces a new topic in line 73 (‘Yo quiero asistir al juego de futbol tambien’).

It is in interaction 4 that Cal starts displaying his orientation to shared laughter in the same fashion that the L1 speaker has been doing it, by uptaking a humorous turn and either laughing at it or continuing it. In line 68 and 69, Ivan makes a joke about Italian food and Cal uptakes the joke and adds another laughable to the sequence in line 71 (parallel to Ivan’s) marked also by a following laughter token. This is the first time in the interaction that Cal and Ivan are clearly co-constructing and sharing laughter.

Finally, their last interaction shows another, quite long, episode of shared laughter. In line 150, Cal jokes about practicing his dancing while chatting (since they may go dancing in Spain). Ivan orients to the joke by laughing in line 151, and Cal continues the joke about being a very bad dancer in line 152, which he marks with an elongation of the word ‘muy’(very), which is a recognized practice in chatroom discourse used to exaggerate and emphasize a word. Ivan orients to this as another humorous turn.
by laughing in line 154, and adds another comment to the joking sequence (‘no pasa nada, para salir saldremos aunque solo bailes tu’). Cal orients to Ivan’s joke and responds with another laughing token, which closes the sequence. In this way both participants are sharing laughter as a form of doing ‘being close’.

These sequences show that a student engaged in conversation with a cooperative L1 speaker of the language is able to develop his interactional competence, specifically his ability to construct and share laughter as a form of affiliation. As Seedhouse (2004) points out, it is important for learners not only to understand the content of the interaction, but also to analyze what social and sequential actions their interlocutor is performing and “what an appropriate social and sequential action in response would be” (p. 241). These data suggest that an SCMC environment can be a fruitful environment for the development of social interaction in which the students learn to develop interactional competence and learn to do ‘being close’ through shared laughter.

7.2.2. Learning to share personal information

Sharing reports of one’s activities, as a form of affiliation and doing ‘being close’, entails both parties providing information about one’s own schedule, daily life, likes and dislikes, etc. and also asking for updates on the activities and the events on the interlocutor’s life, monitoring closely each other’s schedule and events and displaying understanding and interest for the other’s activities and schedule.

Those students who shared personal information did it from the outset. This seems to suggest that this practice did not develop with time, but was rather encouraged by the L1 speakers by sharing their own activities. The data revealed clear differences on
the amount of personal information provided by the participants between the free conversation interactions and the project-based interactions. The participants engaged in free conversation, both learners and experts, shared personal information with more frequency than those in the project-based groups. This is not surprising since the project-based groups were focused on the completion of the project and dedicated most of their interactions to accomplish this purpose. Nevertheless, some participants in the project-based groups still shared personal information. The exchange of personal information happened mainly at the beginning of the interactions, during leave-takings, and in some off-task sequences. The following are some examples of learners sharing personal information.

7.7. Kim, Cal and Ivan, Interaction 2 for Kim, 1 for Cal

7. Kim (2:10:14 PM): A donde quieres ir para el viaje?

8. Ivan (2:11:33 PM): Yo prefiero un lugar de España

9. Ivan (2:11:44 PM): porque así te puedo ayudar más

10. Kim (2:11:48 PM): ok donde?

→ 11. Ivan (2:11:58 PM): ¿conoces España?

→ 12. Kim (2:12:15 PM): un poco, fui al alhambra, madrid y seville

→ 13. Ivan (2:12:35 PM): jajaja, yo no he estado nunca!


Kim: where do you want to go for the trip?
Ivan: I prefer a place in Spain
Ivan: that way I can help you more
Kim: ok where?
Ivan: do (you) know Spain?
Kim: a little, I went to the Alhambra, Madrid and Seville
Ivan: hahaha, I’ve never been there!
Ivan: wherever you want Barcelona?
Yahoo! Messenger: Cal has joined the conference.

Before Cal joins the conference (line 15), Kim and Ivan engage in a greeting sequence and start discussing their project. Kim utters a question in line 10, designed to focus her previous question in line 7 for which she obtains a general answer. Rather than
producing an answer to the question, Ivan starts a new embedded sequence in line 11 by uttering a question. Kim produces the second-pair part of the adjacency pair question-answer in line 12 and Ivan admits he has never been there, preceded by a laugh token, which constructs his action (lack of travelling experience to very near places) as laughable, a type of self-deprecation (Glenn, 2003). This type of non-minimal post-expansion to a complete adjacency pair “projects at least one further turn” (Schegloff, 2007a, p. 149). However, the language learner does not orient to the possibility of expanding the sequence further, and after a pause Ivan self-selects and orients back to Kim’s earlier turn (line 7) by producing a more specific answer to her question (from a place in Spain, to Barcelona).

During the free-conversation interactions, the provision of personal information and sharing of personal problems was frequent and was intertwined with the rest of the conversation. Both L1 speakers and learners asked personal questions and provided personal information, which lasted through the entire project. Extracts 7.8 and 7.9 illustrates how a L2 learner, Jacy, engaged in the free conversation task, provided personal information to a question initiated by the L1 speaker.

7.8. Jay and Cid, Interaction 2

15. Jacy (8:26:34 AM): si? No sé que cosas te gusta hacer?
16. Cid (8:26:56 AM): escuchar música, ir al cine, navegar por internet, leer
cine, navegar por internet, leer
cine, navegar por internet, leer
17. Cid (8:27:01 AM): muchas cosas
18. Cid (8:27:02 AM): y a ti?
20. Cid (8:28:11 AM): ah! y también me gusta escribir en mi blog
Cid: listen to music, go to the movies, surf the Internet, read
Cid: a lot of things
Cid: and you? inferring
Jacy: reading too, cooking, having parties, paddling, and running
Cid: oh! and I also like writing in my blog
Jacy: what is a blog?
In this extract Jacy provides personal information as a reciprocal exchange sequence (Schegloff, 2007a) to Cid’s previous sequence (lines 16-17) about his preferred activities, initiated in line 18 by Cid with ‘¿a ti?’ occupying a turn alone.

### 7.9. Jacy and Cid, Interaction 5 (see 6.13 for longer sequence)

2. Cid (8:43:57 AM): hola Jacy
3. Cid (8:44:01 AM): ¿tal tu día?
4. Jacy (8:44:47 AM): bien...mi familia y yo salimos a un restaurante para el cumpleaños de mi abuelita...y tú?
   
At the beginning of their last interaction, after a minimal adjacency pair greeting-greeting, Cid initiates a “how are you” (Schegloff, 1986, 2007a) sequence. Jacy then produces a multi-unit turn (line 4) including a response (‘bien’) and a reciprocal (‘¿tú?’). However, although a minimal-answer would have sufficed to complete the sequence, she inserts between her answer and her reciprocal an account of personal information about her weekend with her family (‘mi familia y yo salimos a un restaurante para el cumpleaños de mi abuelita’). This effort suggests the L1 learner’s willingness to share personal information with the L1 participant, a resource to do ‘being close’.

The data also show that it was important for the students not just sharing information, but also remembering such information, displaying an orientation to shared knowledge. In the following example, Chiso holds Meme accountable for not remembering personal information that he had provided in a previous interaction.
7.10. Chiso, Meme, and Juanjoloci, Interaction 3 for Chiso, 2 for Juanjoloci

41. Chiso (11:14:31 AM): es tiempo para almuerzo
→ 42. Chiso (11:14:43 AM): ella tiene 24
44. Chiso (11:14:45 AM): si meme 😊
45. Juanjoloci (11:14:47 AM): no me gustas excusas Meme
46. Meme (11:14:53 AM): si, tengo 24 hasta el lunes
47. Meme (11:14:58 AM): que cumpliré 25!
→ 48. Meme (11:15:00 AM): y vosotros
Several turns omitted
320. Juanjoloci (11:45:43 AM): no, lo siento, no mas bromas
→ 321. Meme (11:45:44 AM): Chiso, cuantos años tienes
322. Chiso (11:45:44 AM): no problema buddy
→ 323. Chiso (11:46:09 AM): ah meme!!!! te dije
→ 324. Chiso (11:46:20 AM): 😊
→ 325. Meme (11:46:26 AM): no, tu no me dijiste
→ 326. Meme (11:46:46 AM): me acordaria de ello
→ 327. Chiso (11:46:52 AM): si soy mismo de ti
330. Meme (11:47:07 AM): "tu eres de la misma edad que yo"
→ 331. Chiso (11:47:08 AM): esta bien tienes muchos companeros
332. Juanjoloci (11:47:13 AM): Cuand0 quieres hablar en ingles puedo conocerte, dime una hora y dia

Juanjoloci: how old are you Meme?
Chiso: it’s time for lunch [almuerzo]
Chiso: she is 24
Meme: ok, Chiso, bone appetite
Chiso: yes meme 😊
Juanjoloci: I don’t like excuses Meme
Meme:yes, I am 24 until Monday
Meme: when I’ll be 25!
Meme: and you guys
Juanjoloci: no, I’m sorry, no more jokes
Meme: Chiso, how old are (you)
Chiso: no problem buddy
Chiso: oh meme!!!! I told you
Meme: no, you didn’t tell me
Meme: I would remember
Chiso: yes I’m same as you
Meme: hahahahaha
Chiso: hahahaha
Meme: "tu eres de la misma edad que yo" 😊
Chiso: it is all right you have many partners
Juanjoloci: when you want to talk in English I can meet [encontrar] you
tell me the time and the day

28 Meme corrects Chiso’s turn in line 327 to “tu eres de la misma edad que yo” = you and I are the same age.
When Juanjoloci asks Meme for her age, it is Chiso who answers his question in line 42, displaying shared knowledge between him and Meme. In line 46, Meme confirms his answer, and elaborates it informing them that her birthday is on that coming Monday. Meme then asks the students to reciprocate and provide their ages, (i.e., personal information) (line 48). However, the learners do not orient to her request and the conversation turns into a humorous sequence, attempting to have an Internet party (Excerpt 7.24). In line 321, Meme asks again for their ages, but this time, she selects Chiso as the next speaker. At this point, Chiso realizes that Meme has forgotten the personal information he shared with her about being the same age in interaction 1 (Excerpt 7.1 lines 39-41), and holds Meme accountable through verbal (‘ah meme!!!! te dije’) and non-verbal (an emoticon) responses in a double turn, marked by exclamations, which in SCMC denotes emphasis. Meme also orients to the importance of shared personal information by denying Chiso’s accusation and contradicting his statement, not accepting accountability (‘no, tu no me dijiste’), a common response to complaints (Boxer, 1993). The second part of her explanation (line 326) seems to overlap with Chiso’s answer to her question (line 327), as it does their following shared laughter (according to the timestamps). Meme then starts a correction sequence of Chiso’s turn. The sequence is closed by Chiso who excuses Meme from remembering, providing her with a justification for her error, orienting again this way to her accountability for not remembering shared information which had occurred in their first interaction.
Asking for updates is considered part of sharing one’s personal activities and displaying interest in the other activities, it also demonstrates shared knowledge as a resource to display friendship and closeness. The data presented few instances of this resource used by the language learners, even in those groups were the L1 speakers employed it frequently (see Chapter 5. - Sharing reports of activities). However, there was one language learner, Jacy, who employed it constantly from her second interaction, usually as part of her opening sequence (Excerpts 7.11 to 7.14).

7.11. Jacy and Cid, Interaction 2

2. Cid (8:21:42 AM): que tal jacy!
3. Jacy (8:22:00 AM): un poco cansada...
5. Cid (8:22:17 AM): no muy mal
7. Cid (8:23:16 AM): mi fin de semana...? muy tranquilo
8. Cid (8:23:25 AM): y el tuyo?
9. Jacy (8:23:38 AM): bien...pase mucho tiempo con mi familia...y remé en el océano
10. Cid (8:23:49 AM): wow!

Jacy: Hello!
Cid: how are you jacy!
Jacy: a little tired
Cid: not too bad
Jacy: and [y] you inter-ag?
Cid: my weekend...? very quiet
Cid: and yours?
Jacy: fine.... I spent a lot of time with my family... and paddled in the ocean
Cid: wow!

At the beginning of the interaction, right after a greeting sequence, Jacy asks Cid about his weekend. Cid’s delay in answering the question (almost one minute by the timestamp), coupled with a recast of her utterance in the singular form (line 7), seems to suggest that there was some difficulty in understanding Jacy’s question which can be interpreted as ‘¿Cómo fue tu fin de semana?’ = How was your weekend? or ‘¿Cómo son tus fines de semana en Toeldo?’ = how are your weekends? How do you spend your weekends?

29 ‘Como fue tu fines de semana?’ can be interpreted as ‘¿Cómo fue tu fin de semana?’ = How was your weekend? or ‘¿Cómo son tus fines de semana en Toeldo?’ = how are your weekends? How do you spend your weekends?
understood as ‘how are your weekends, what do you do on your weekends’, a display of interest for his regular activities, or ‘how was this past weekend’ a request for an update. Cid orients to this last option answering about his past weekend and reciprocating by asking Jacy about hers.

In the opening sequence of their next interaction, after the greeting sequence, Jacy produces another request for an update based on previous shared knowledge.


|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|

In line 7, after a greeting sequence, Jacy asks for an update on Cid’s health since he had sent her a message the day before postponing their chat because he was not feeling well. She initiates the request for an update after Cid answers her greeting seeking to extend the sequence further by providing a “downgraded conventional response” (Jefferson, 1980). Cid answers the inquiry in line 10 after a brief self-initiated other repaired embedded sequence.

At the beginning of their interaction, Jacy displays shared knowledge by initiating a sequence with a question confirming Cid’s schedule. Cid produces the second-pair part
of the adjacency pair elaborating the turn with more information. Jacy orients to the statement as a trouble-telling turn and displays sympathy (‘un día largísimo, no?’) marked by an exclamation.


   Jacy: you had school today, didn’t you?

20. Cid (8:48:39 AM): sí... desde las 8.00 am
   Cid: yes... from 8.00am

21. Jacy (8:49:04 AM): wow...un día largísimo no?
   Jacy: wow... a very long day, wasn’t it?

22. Cid (8:49:12 AM): largo, largo, largo
   Cid: long, long, long

Through these sequences, Jacy is able to establish rapport with her interlocutor.

Her requests for updates on activities that implied remembering shared knowledge displays her doing ‘being close’ to her interlocutor.

7.2.4. Learning to uptake

When the language learners volunteered personal information, especially a personal problem, the L1 speakers responded with acknowledgment of the problem and/or a sympathy token, in a sequence ‘problem telling-sympathy uptake’. The data revealed that language students interacting with L1 speakers who shared their problems learned to engage in such a sequence. The clearest case being Jacy, whose partner frequently engaged in trouble-telling (see Chapter 5 - Discussing personal problems). The following sequences illustrate the development of Jacy’s interactional pattern when presented with a personal problem.
In their first interaction, after exchanging greetings, Cid starts with an apology for not having connected before (‘primero de todo, pedirte perdón pero es que he tenido unos problemas’), this turn seems to be produced in overlap with Jacy’s line 3 (‘how are you’) since Cid completes the greeting sequence right after his apology (and there are only two seconds of difference by the timestamp). In line 7, Jacy orients to Cid’s reciprocating question as part of turn 4 rather than his greeting in turn 5 when she answers ‘No tengo problemas’. The preferred response to a statement sharing a personal problem would be another statement expressing sympathy, understanding, or inquiring about the problem. However, Jacy does not produce such a turn and Cid self-selects as the next speaker after a considerably long pause in SCMC (almost a minute on the time stamp). He produces a new turn post-expanding his trouble-telling sequence and
providing another opportunity for Jacy to uptake. However, Jacy’s response is again not a preferred response in this case since it is minimal and does not attend to the problem or sympathize with the speaker. Cid upgrades his troubles by adding another problem to his computer problems, a more serious problem of his father being in the hospital. However, Jacy’s response is very minimal (‘lo siento …’) and Cid’s delayed response (almost 30 seconds by the timestamp) seems to orient to Jacy’s response as incomplete. When Jacy intervenes again in line 13 she initiates a new sequence, marked by a transition (‘bueno…’) closing the previous sequence and initiating a new topic (‘vamos a conocernos’). Cid never receives a sympathy uptake for his multiple problems, in spite of the possibilities that the sequence presents.

Similarly, in their next interaction, when Cid complains about having a lot of homework in his classes, Jacy does not orient to it as a complaint in need of sympathy, she orients to it as a news report, by confirming it and moving to a different, related topic.

7.15. Jacy and Cid, Interaction 2

73. Jacy (8:55:28 AM): si... has leído los libros escrito por Dan Brown? En inglés los libros se llaman "The Davinci Code and Angles and Demons" Este escritor escribe mucho sobre la iglesia catholica

→ 74. Cid (8:56:21 AM): he oído hablar de ellos, pero no los he leido, últimamente no leo mucho... demasiadas tareas en la university

→ 75. Jacy (8:57:45 AM): si... ¿qué año en la universidad estás? Yo soy un "junior" y voy a graduarme el próximo año

Jacy: yes... have_talked_to (you) read the books written by Dan Brown. In English the books are called "The Davinci Code and Angles and Demons" This writer writes a lot about the Catholic church

Cid: I've heard about them, but I haven't read them, lately I don't read much... too much homework at the university

Jacy: yes... what year of the university are_talking_to (you)? I'm a "junior" and I'm going to graduate next year
It is not until their fourth interaction that Jacy starts displaying interest and sympathy when presented with trouble talk as illustrated in the following example.

7.16. Jacy and Cid, Interaction 4

25. Cid (10:01:30 AM): me he retrasado porque un amigo mio tuvo ayer un accidente y me he pasado a verle al hospital

| Cid: I’m late because a friend of mine had an accident yesterday and I went to the hospital to see him |

26. Jacy (10:02:12 AM): que terrible! Qué pasa?

| Jacy: how awful! What’s wrong? |

27. Cid (10:02:30 AM): nada, ya está bien... posiblemente el lunes vuelva a casa

| Cid: nothing, he’s ok now ... he’ll probably go home on Monday |

Several lines omitted

76. Jacy (10:23:24 AM): en la universidad aquí, tenemos que tomar 4 semestres de una lengua...

| Jacy: at the university here, we have to take 4 semesters of a language |

77. Cid (10:23:54 AM): nosotros 4 horas semanales de inglés durante los 3 años

| Cid: we 4 hours a week of English for three years |

78. Jacy (10:24:49 AM): sí muy intensiva!!!

| Jacy: yes very intensive!!! |

When Cid states that he is late because his friend is in the hospital, Jacy orients to it as a problem and this time she produces a preferred answer: a sympathy turn which includes an exclamation to validate the severity of the problem followed by an invitation for elaboration (Boxer, 1993). According to Jefferson and Lee (1980), when after the telling of a problem and a sympathetic response to it, an elaboration, a more emotional turn follows up, this constitutes a moment of intimacy between the interactants. However, we can see that Cid does not produce such a turn, but rather downgrades the problem (‘nada, ya está bien... posiblemente el lunes vuelva a casa’) displaying then a lack of intimacy with Jacy. We can say that Cid and Jacy became friends but never really became ‘closer’ or intimate. Later in the interaction when Jacy complains about taking two years
of a foreign language in line 76, Cid uptakes by sharing his similar experience, a common practice to affiliate with another's problems (Pudlinski, 2005). Jacy orients to this as a new trouble-telling sequence and uptakes by expressing her own feelings about his trouble in line 78 (Pudlinski, 2005), a frequent commiseration response (Boxer, 1993).

Their last interaction illustrates another instance of Jacy uptaking after Cid's trouble-telling as a resource to do 'being close'.

7.17. Jacy and Cid, Interaction 5

2. Cid (8:43:57 AM): hola Jacy
3. Cid (8:44:01 AM): ¿cómo estás?
4. Jacy (8:44:47 AM): bien...mi familia y yo salimos a un restaurante para el cumpleaños de mi abuela...y tú?
5. Cid (8:45:05 AM): realmente mal...
6. Jacy (8:45:17 AM): porque?
7. Cid (8:45:52 AM): llegué de Toledo a las 16.00 h, después me fui a la autoescuela, llegué a mi casa a las 18.00 h, y he estado toda la tarde con dolor de cabeza. Ahora he cenado, y he vomitado.
8. Cid (8:45:57 AM): ¡parezco un zombie!! jeje
10. Cid (8:47:06 AM): mas o menos... con unos grados de fiebre y dolor de estómago.
11. Cid (8:47:16 AM): espero q se me quite esta noche, y mañana estar al 100%
Several lines omitted
14. Cid (8:48:39 AM): si... desde las 8.00 am
15. Jacy (8:49:04 AM): ¡wow...un día largísimo no?
| Cid (8:49:12 AM): largo, largo, largo | Cid: long, long, long |
| Several lines omitted |

| 48. Cid (8:58:00 AM): jeje, suele pasar, en toledo, por ejemplo, cuando llega hay caravana a eso de las 8.00 |
| Cid: hehe, it happens, in Toledo, for example, when I arrive there is traffic backup at about 8.00 |

| 49. Cid (8:58:16 AM): pero luego poco a poco va desapareciendo hasta las 15.ooh |
| Cid: but later Little by Little it disappears until 15.00h |

| 50. Jacy (8:58:35 AM): y las italianas conducen más rápido en sus coches pequenitos |
| Jacy: and the italians drive faster in their tiny cars |

| 51. Jacy (8:58:46 AM): yuck...mucho caravanas |
| Jacy: yuck ... lots of backup |

| 52. Cid (8:58:46 AM): jeje |
| Cid: hehe |

| 53. Cid (8:58:55 AM): muchas caravanas, better |
| Cid: 'muchas caravanas' better |

| 54. Jacy (8:59:04 AM): gracias.. |
| Jacy: thank you |

| 55. Cid (8:59:13 AM): ;) |
| Cid: ;) [winking] |

In this sequence as part of their greeting sequence, Cid's response 'realmente mal...' to Jacy's reciprocating greeting seems to be pre-sequence advance bid for trouble-telling, a 'trouble premonitory' response (Jefferson, 1980). Jacy orients to it as such (rather than as the second part of a greeting sequence) by asking Cid to elaborate on his trouble-telling (line 6).

When Cid tells his problem, Jacy displays understanding with a change-of-state token 'ahhh' (ohhh) (Heritage, 1984), and asks for confirmation of her understanding of his problem (line 9). At this point, the speaker upgrades his state of sickness from a headache to fever and stomach pain. Since Cid self-selects as next speaker, proposing a wish for improvement, Jacy is not provided with an interactional space to produce a sympathy turn, but she agrees with him on his wishes of recovery in the following turn. A bit later in the same interaction, when Cid produces a response to a statement from
Jacy displaying shared knowledge (see 7.14 above), he compliments his answer with a statement which is oriented by Jacy as problem (also given that they are connected at 8:00 pm, Spain time), by producing another sympathy turn composed of an exclamation and a restatement of the problem, confirming the validity of the complaint. Jacy employed this combination of exclamation and restatement of the problem frequently as a resource to produce a sympathy turn. Line 51, later in the interaction is another example.

Jacy also displayed interest when presented with shared report of activities (rather than trouble-talk). In the following example, in their 4th interaction, Jacy is able to distinguish between a simple question and a story preface sequence initiated by the L1 speaker.

7.18. Cid and Jacy, Interaction 4

67. Cid (10:16:31 AM): sueles leer periódicos en español?

→ 68. Jacy (10:16:54 AM): no...porqué?

69. Cid (10:17:36 AM): yo es que me suelo meter en webs de periódicos en inglés y los leo, así practicas lectura (aunque a veces, no entiendas nada=

70. Jacy (10:19:02 AM): una idea buena...a veces mi profesora trae artículos de españa o otras países españoles sobre Pinochet o escritor famosos.

In this excerpt, Cid makes an advance bid to tell about his activities. Jacy orients to his turn not only as a question, but also as a story preface by not only answering the question, line 68 'no', but also by requesting elaboration of his turn (line 68, no...

---

30 'you' here is an impersonal form rather than directed to Jacy
porqué?"), providing Cid with ‘action space’ to deliver his report (Lerner, 1992) and
aligning herself as a story recipient (Jefferson, 1978).

This resource was also learned and used by Juanjoloci, a language student,
through his interactions with Meme, the L1 speaker, and Chiso, another L2 student. The
following excerpts are examples of his change.

We can see that when in their first interaction Juanjoloci presents a problem,
Meme up takes the turn and expresses concern. However, when Meme shares personal
troubles with Juanjoloci, he fails to produce an uptake.

7.19. Juanjoloci and Meme, Interaction 1

    → 16. Meme: Yo acabo de llegar a casa, después
de un día muy duro!
    → 17. Meme: Estoy muy abogiada con todos
los proyectos!!!
    18. Meme: u know
    → 19. Juanjoloci: si
    20. Meme: have u seen my email?
    21. Juanjoloci: ??
    22. Juanjoloci: no lo leído

Several lines omitted

    → 50. Meme: no, la verdad es k hasta las 7.30
    tengo tiempo aunque estoy un poco
cansada y tengo garas de acostarme
    un rato.
    51. Meme: a decir verdad, yo pensaba que a
    estas horas vosotros no podríais
    conectaros, pero a mi me viene
    perfecto
    → 52. Juanjoloci: yo puedo hablar a estas
    horas, si prefieres?
    53. Meme: Juanjoloci?
    54. Juanjoloci: si estoy aqui
    55. Meme: oh, ok
    → 56. Juanjoloci: lo siento, estoy (enfermo)
    → 57. Meme: enfermo?
    → 58. Meme: que te pasa?
    59. Juanjoloci: que significa que te pasa?

    → Meme: I’ve just get home, after a very hard
day!
    → Meme: I am very stressed [agobiada] with
all my projects!!!
    → Meme: you know
    → Juanjoloci: yes, what did (you) do
    → Meme: have u seen my email?
    → Juanjoloci: ??
    → Juanjoloci: I haven’t read it

    → Meme: no, the truth is that until 7.30 I have
time although I am a Little tired and I
need to go to lay down for a while.

    → Meme: to tell you the truth, I thought you
    wouldn’t be able to connect at
    this time, but it’s perfect for me

    → Juanjoloci: I can talk at this time, if you
    prefer?
    → Meme: Juanjoloci?
    → Juanjoloci: yes I am here
    → Meme: oh, ok
    → Juanjoloci: I’m sorry, I’m (sick)
    → Meme: sick?
    → Meme: what’s wrong?
    → Juanjoloci: what does que te pasa mean?
After a greeting sequence and an introduction sequence, Meme presents Juanjoloci with two personal problems, she is tired from a hard day (line 16) and she is stressed with lots of projects (line 17) which she emphasizes with exclamation marks, a common practice in SCMC to stress content, in addition she switches to her interlocutor’s L1 to obtain confirmation or validation of her statement (you know). At this point the preferred answer would be a confirmation of the validity of her complaint, usually including exclamations to signal commiseration. However, all Juanjoloci produces is a very minimal ‘yes’, orienting more to her previous utterance as a question than the end of a problem telling sequence. Similarly, Juanjoloci does not orient to Meme’s initiation of trouble telling in line 5, producing an answer to her alternative thread of conversation (about the time to connect), ignoring her problem telling turn. In contrast, when it is Juanjoloci that initiates a trouble-telling sequence (line 56), Meme does uptake by producing a clarification request and a request for elaboration on the problem (line 58). Similarly, in interaction 2, Juanjoloci still misses the opportunity to uptake after the Meme initiates a trouble-telling sequence.

7.20. Juanjoloci and Meme, Interaction 2

| 49. Meme (7:49:26 AM): yo debería haber terminado el año pasado, pero bueno... | Meme: I should have finished last year, but well...
| 50. Meme (7:49:48 AM): espero terminar en junio, por fin | Meme: I hope to finish in June, finally
| 51. Juanjoloci (7:50:11 AM): y tu carrera especifica?? | Juanjoloci: and your specific carrier?
In line 49, Meme initiates a trouble-telling sequence. The suspensive points at the end of the turn, together with the considerable pause (22 seconds according to the timestamp), suggests this as a transitional space for Juanjoloci to produce some type of commiseration response, exclamation, or request for elaboration. However, since this does not occur, Meme self-selects as next speaker and expands her own turn (line 50) with a statement of wish. At this point Juanjoloci initiates a new sequence by asking a question, steering the topic away from Meme’s problem account into a different topic (line 51).

In the next example, we can see an instance where Juanjoloci is exposed to a trouble-telling/ sympathy uptake adjacency pair produced by Meme and the other language learner, Chiso.

7.21. Juanjoloci and Meme, with Chiso

→ 190. Meme (11:30:48 AM): porque aquí hace FRIO
191. Meme (11:30:52 AM): y mucho
→ 193. Chiso (11:31:07 AM): oh no
→ 194. Meme (11:31:12 AM): solo la del Tajo (rio) y encima esta muy sucio
195. Meme (11:31:22 AM):
196. Juanjoloci (11:31:29 AM): y te gusta nacer delo
→ 197. Chiso (11:31:29 AM): ewwww
199. Meme (11:31:43 AM): nacer delo?
200. Meme (11:31:47 AM): que es eso?

Meme: because it’s COLD here
Meme: a lot
Meme: and there is no beach
Chiso: oh no
Meme: only Tajo’s31 one and it is very dirty
Meme: hahahahaha
Juanjoloci: and you like nacer delo [untranslatable]
Chiso: ewwww
Meme: what?
Meme: nacer delo?
Meme: what’s that?
Juanjoloci: nacer is (to swim)

31 Tajo is the name of the river adjacent to Toledo.

Before this sequence, the learners are talking about going to the beach every day.
Meme tells them how lucky they are to live in Hawaii. In line 190, Meme complains that
Toledo, her city is cold, which she emphasizes with the word in capital letters
(representation of a louder voice in SCMC), and the only beach she has is the one by the
city’s dirty river. Chiso orients to both turns as complaints and displays sympathy by
producing an exclamation for each of her turns (line 193 and line 197), signaling
commiseration as a second-pair parts to the adjacency pair trouble-telling/sympathy
uptake. Juanjoloci, however, does not orient to Meme’s problem and continues the
conversation by asking Meme if she likes swimming (line 196). They then engage in an
other-initiated repair sequence caused by a non existent word used by Juanjoloci. The
sequence continues with the repair of the misunderstanding and there will be no
orientation towards Meme’s problem.

Towards the end of this same interaction, Juanjoloci starts to uptake when Meme
displays trouble.

7.22. Juanjoloci, Meme, and Chiso, Interaction 3

→ 397. Meme (11:57:15 AM): mañana por la
manana tengo un curso en Toledo,
aunque sea domingo.  
Meme: tomorrow morning I have a
class in Toledo, although it’s Sunday

Several turns omitted

→ 403. Chiso (11:58:06 AM): tiene un cruso en domingo!!!!
Chiso: you have a class [curso] on
Sunday!!!!!

404. Juanjoloci (11:58:15 AM): meter la pata???
Juanjoloci: meter la pata?

405. Meme (11:58:18 AM): si
Meme: yes

Meme: hahaha
408. Meme (11:58:38 AM): no!
409. Juanjoloci (11:58:40 AM): quien tiene un curso de domingo, es una lastima
410. Meme (11:58:42 AM): esperad
411. Chiso (11:58:43 AM): hahahahaha
412. Chiso (11:58:59 AM): si que pena
413. Meme (11:59:17 AM): lo sé, pero tengo que hacerlo

In line 397, Meme states her problem (to be able to meet them at the time they had previously arranged because she has class, although it is Sunday). Chiso orients to the problem by transforming her statement in an exclamation, signaling commiseration, and expressing his own feelings about her problem (‘man eso es mierda ’). In this occasion Juanjoloci also orients to Meme’s trouble and reformulates her trouble adding his own feelings towards it (‘es una lastima ’), followed by Chiso’s reformulation of his turn in line 412 (‘si que pena ’).

Finally, in their last interaction, Juanjoloci seems to have learned to consistently uptake when presented with personal trouble by his interlocutor, as illustrated by the following excerpt.

7.23. Juanjoloci and Meme, Interaction 4

15. Meme (6:56:46 AM): ayer tuvimos una ruta de senderismo de 15 kilómetros!
16. Meme (6:57:06 AM): y ahora estoy preparando una presentación para mi clase de mañana
18. Meme (6:57:53 AM): así que no tengo

Meme: I went camping and I’m really tired
Juanjoloci: yes, how was camping?
Yesterday we had a 15 kilometer hike!
Meme: and now I am preparing a presentation for my class tomorrow
😊
Meme: so I don’t have a lot of time to
mucho tiempo para chatear, pero media hora si es posible, si tu quieres

23. Meme (6:58:36 AM): eso si que no me lo esperaba! 😅
24. Meme (6:58:40 AM): jajajaja

Several lines omitted

35. Meme (7:02:00 AM): me ha mandado un mensaje Steve
36. Meme (7:02:21 AM): pobre, ya casi no chateo con él,... debe estar enfadado conmigo por no terminar su proyecto
37. Juanjoloci (7:03:40 AM): el no esta enfadado con ti, esta durmiendo ahora
38. Meme (7:03:46 AM): lol
39. Juanjoloci (7:03:53 AM): es muy tempano por la manana para el

Several turn omitted

172. Meme (7:42:27 AM): si, seria mejor.... mañana tengo que explicar a mis compañeros un capitulo del "Common European Framework"
173. Meme (7:42:40 AM): y estoy un poco asustada, nerviosa..., y preocupada

Meme: Chiso has sent me a message
Meme: poor thing, I have hardly chat with him...he must be angry with me for not finishing his Project
Juanjoloci: he is not angry with you

Meme: lol
Juanjoloci: it is very early in the morning for him

Meme: yes, it would be better...tomorrow I have to explain to my classmates a chapter of the “Common European Framework”
Meme: and I am scared, nervous... and worried
Juanjoloci: it is very hard!!!!

After their greeting sequence, Juanjoloci tells Meme about his weekend and Meme responds by initiating a trouble-telling sequence; she complains that she is very tired because she went camping. Juanjoloci orients to the first part of her turn (going camping) as an advanced-bid to tell a story, rather than to her complain about been tired, by requesting elaboration (line 14) on the activity. In this turn Juanjoloci also displays shared knowledge when he produces a confirmation token (‘si’) at the beginning of the
turn signaling this is not new information, and he already knew about the activity. Meme orients to the request for expansion by providing more information about the activity, but the information chosen emphasizes her previous complaint, providing a reason why she is so tired. She post-expands the sequence with three more turns, first upgrading the reasons for her trouble, including an emoticon to display feeling, and expanding the trouble source with more information. After this long trouble-telling multi-turn first pair part, Juanjoloci orients to her first display of trouble (line 15) by using a strong Spanish exclamation, very unusual in language learners, confirming the validity of her problem (line 19). Meme reacts with surprise to Juanjoloci’s exclamation in a five-turn sequence full of exclamation tokens and non-verbal displays (capital letters, SCMC code, an emoticon, and laughter). A few turns later Meme initiates another trouble-telling sequence in which she questions whether Chiso, the other L2 student, is angry with her because she has not had time to connect with him lately. Juanjoloci orients to the trouble-telling nature of her statement and produces an alternative explanation for Chiso’s absence. When Meme orients to the turn as a joke, Juanjoloci produces another turn reinforcing his previous orientation and does not take Meme’s invitation for laughter, displaying his orientation to his turns as serious. Towards the end of the interaction, Juanjoloci is trying to send a picture to Meme but the file is uploading very slowly, so he suggests he will send it via email instead of waiting for it to upload. In line 172 Meme accepts the offer and starts a new trouble-telling sequence, marked also by the suspensive points. She explains what the trouble is (her project) and how she feels about it (a display of intimacy). Juanjoloci responds to her turn with an emotive assessment, marked by
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multiple exclamation marks for emphasis. These examples show how Juanjoloci developed his interactional competence for producing uptake when presented with personal issues, an interactional resource to do ‘being close’.

7.2.5. Joking and language play to display intimacy

The students also learned to engage in joking and language play as a resource to display closeness and intimacy consistently. Their last interactions contained more jokes and language play than their first interactions. Given the restrictions of the medium, this was accomplished through the use of emoticons, orthographic symbols, capital letters, word elongations, and description of actions. The following is an example of Juanjoloci and Chiso celebrating an “Internet birthday party” for Meme.

7.24. Meme, Juanjoloci, and Chiso, Interaction 3 for Chiso, 2 for Juanjoloci

→ 56. Juanjoloci (11:16:00 AM): vamos a hacer una fiesta de cumpleaños por internet!!!!!!!

57. Chiso (11:16:07 AM): si 😜

58. Chiso (11:16:13 AM): trago trago trago!!!!!!

59. Chiso (11:16:19 AM): toma

60. Chiso (11:16:21 AM): jejejej

61. Meme (11:16:30 AM): VENGA, VENGA

In this sequence the students engage in a virtual birthday party for Meme, the L1 speaker, which they accomplish through the use of emoticons (lines 57 and 61), orthographic symbols (line 56 and 58), reduplicative language (lines 58 and 61), word elongation (line 56), action description (lines 58 and 59) and “shouting” (line 61). This
sequence is similar to textual play presented by Danet et al. (1996) which resembled a party in which the participants, not language learners, simulated smoking pot.

The next example illustrates a flirting episode between Chiso and Meme in one of their last interactions. This sequence is full of language play, teasing, laughter, and visual displays that make the interaction lively and enriched (Giese, 1998). Although the sequence is long, I have reproduced it in its entirety to reflect how the language student is interactively competent to co-construct a fast-paced and complex interaction.

7.25. Chiso and Meme, Interaction 4

178. Meme (1:07:05 PM): bueno: if I don't practice any sports at all, I am not able to concentrate in studying, you know?
179. Chiso (1:07:41 PM): oh si Gracias!
180. Chiso (1:07:51 PM): yo tambien
181. Meme (1:08:10 PM): si? tambien eres activo?
182. Meme (1:08:13 PM): tuuuu?
183. Chiso (1:08:33 PM): siiiiiiiiiiiiiii muchisimo
184. Meme (1:08:35 PM): yo creo que "activo" en hawai no es igual que en españa!
185. Meme (1:08:36 PM): lol
186. Meme (1:08:41 PM): jk
187. Chiso (1:08:51 PM): oh si por que no
188. Chiso (1:08:55 PM): 😂
189. Chiso (1:09:19 PM): quieres pelear
190. Chiso (1:09:25 PM): ahhhh punk!!!
191. Chiso (1:09:36 PM): lol
192. Meme (1:09:43 PM): pero quien me va a pegar.... tu?
193. Meme (1:09:51 PM): 😂
194. Chiso (1:10:02 PM): si vente
195. Meme (1:10:36 PM): VOY, VOY
196. Meme (1:10:40 PM): prepareate, tio
197. Meme (1:10:50 PM): lol
198. Chiso (1:10:51 PM): yo move tan

Meme: good: if I don't practice any sports at all, I am not able to concentrate in studying, you know?
Chiso: oh yes Thanks!
Chiso: me too
Meme: really? (you) are inf-sg active too?
Meme: youuuu inf-sg?
Chiso: Yeeeeeexes very very much
Meme: I think that "active" in hawaii is not the same as in spain
Meme: lol
Meme: jk [joking]
Chiso: oh yes why not
Chiso: 😂
Chiso: do (you) want inf-sg to fight
Chiso: ehhh punk!!
Chiso: lol
Meme: but who is going to hit me.... you inf-sg?
Meme: 😂
Chiso: yes come inf-sg over
Meme: I'M COMING I'M COMING
Meme: get inf-sg ready, dude
Meme: lol
Chiso: I move [me muevo] so fast you inf-
rápido tu no puedes pegarme

199. Meme (1:11:09 PM): soy cinturón marrón en karate
200. Chiso (1:11:16 PM): hahahaha estoy preparado
201. Meme (1:11:27 PM): demasiado lento para mi
202. Meme (1:11:37 PM): el alcohol te hace torpe!
203. Chiso (1:11:55 PM): hahahaa
204. Chiso (1:11:57 PM): oh sí
205. Chiso (1:12:25 PM): chistosa
206. Chiso (1:13:04 PM): yo move como un mariposa y pegas como un abeja
207. Meme (1:13:11 PM): lol
208. Meme (1:13:14 PM): muy bueno, tío
209. Chiso (1:13:21 PM): llamame ALI
211. Meme (1:13:36 PM): jajajajaja
212. Chiso (1:13:40 PM): jajajajaja
213. Chiso (1:14:22 PM): alicia
214. Chiso (1:14:24 PM): ?
215. Chiso (1:15:00 PM): ALI fue el boxeador muy famoso en los estados unidos
216. Meme (1:15:01 PM): Alice in Wonderland!
217. Chiso (1:15:05 PM): hahahaha
218. Meme (1:15:08 PM): ya tío, mohamed ali!
220. Chiso (1:15:21 PM): bueno
221. Meme (1:15:21 PM): entiendes el chiste o no?
222. Meme (1:15:26 PM): 😂
223. Meme (1:15:33 PM): porq yo me estoy partiendo!
224. Chiso (1:15:40 PM): hahahaha sorry yo perdí
225. Chiso (1:16:44 PM): are u calling me a girl? huh
226. Chiso (1:16:49 PM): lol

196. Meme: I am brown belt in karate
197. Chiso: hahaha I’m ready
198. Meme: too slow for me
199. Meme: alcohol makes you clumsy!
200. Chiso: hahahaa
201. Chiso: oh really
202. Chiso: funny
203. Chiso: I move [me muevo] like a butterfly and hit like a bee
204. Meme: lol
205. Meme: very good, dude
206. Chiso: call me ALI
207. Meme: ALI? Alice in Wonderland!
208. Chiso: hahahahaha
209. Chiso: hahahahaha
210. Chiso: alicia
211. Chiso: ?
212. Chiso: ALI was the very famous boxer [boxeador] in the United States
213. Meme: Alice in Wonderland!
214. Chiso: hahaha
215. Meme: I know dude, Mohamed Ali!
216. Chiso: YES
217. Chiso: good
218. Meme: do (you) understand the joke or not?
219. Meme: 😂
220. Meme: ‘cause I am cracking up!
221. Chiso: hahaha sorry I lost it [lo perdí]
222. Chiso: are u calling me a girl? huh
223. Chiso: [laughing out loud]

---

32 Reference to Mohamed Ali’s famous line: “I float like a butterfly and sting like a bee”
33 In Spain “Ali” is common short name for Alicia (Alice).
In this sequence, both participants are ‘bantering’ for about 13 minutes. Bantering is a practice common among friends that have known each other for a long time, or siblings and other family members, and it denotes a high level of intimacy. Since Chiso

---

34 This is a direct calque from English into Spanish. Look = mira out = fuera. The Spanish phrase should be ‘Cuidado’ or ‘Atención’.
and Meme had only known each other for a few weeks, this sequence could also be seen as a flirting episode. The sequence starts with Meme teasing Chiso about not being active, which sparks a “joke-threat” from Chiso (‘quieres pelear’) marked by laughter and a vocative with exclamations. At this point, Meme challenges Chiso (line 192) and marks it with an ‘evil face’ emoticon (line 193). Chiso accepts the challenge (‘si vente’), and the ‘virtual play-fight’ starts when Meme “goes over there” (line 195-196). For several turns the text reads as a fight between two contenders moving, attacking, and defending (lines 198-208). When Chiso compares himself with Mohamed Ali, the great boxer, Meme produces a play on words, and transforms ‘ALI’ the boxer, into Alice in Wonderland, a little defenseless girl. Although Chiso shares laughter with Meme in line 212, he initiates a repair sequence of her joking turn (line 213, 214) by explaining what he meant by Ali in his previous turn (line 215). Meme repairs the trouble code-switching to English to translate her previous turn (210). Chiso confirms understanding by laughing. Almost in overlap, Meme also confirms understanding of Chiso’s repair, which is confirmed by Chiso in lines 219 and 220. In line 221, since there is no reference to the previous play on words and joking turn, she asks for confirmation that Chiso has understood her previous turn, displaying again its joking nature by using an emoticon that symbolizes loud laughter and explicitly stating she is laughing hard (‘me estoy partiendo!’). Chiso displays understanding of the joke in line 225 (‘are you calling me a girl? huh’) and shares several turns of laughter with Meme (line 226 and line 229).

At this point they retake up their ‘virtual fight’. Meme continues her play on Chiso being Ali, as in Alice in Wonderland, and utters a new joke about him having to
drink the magic potion before being able to fight her. This turn triggers a new repair sequence, other-initiated by Chiso asking for the meaning of the word ‘pocima’ (magic potion). Meme repairs the sequence by providing Chiso with a definition and a reference to the story, and Chiso displays understanding of the term (line 241) and the joke (line 242, 247). The use of an “angry” emoticon by Chiso in line 244 triggers a repair sequence by Meme, who request confirmation about the joking nature of her turn (line 245). Chiso repairs by confirming the joking nature of the interaction which he marks with laughter. Meme displays alignment with shared laughter (lines 247, 248) and Chiso end the sequence with a statement about the entire activity (‘este es muy divertido’).

This sequence illustrates that a language student, with somewhat limited linguistic ability, is able to engage in complex interaction with a collaborative L1 speaker, including language play, joking, and repairing sequences, and he is able to do ‘being intimate’ with his limited language competence.

7.2.6. Use of slang and improprieties to display intimacy

Although the use of improprieties is one of the resources employed by L1 speakers to display intimacy (Glenn, 2003; Jefferson, 1974; Jefferson et al., 1987), the use of this resource by the language students was almost inexistent in the data, and when the students attempted to use improprieties, it surprised the L1 speaker, as illustrated by the following example, part of Excerpt 7.23 above.

| 20. juanjoloci (6:58:17 AM): ostia, que lejos!! | juanjoloci: holy crap, that is far!! |
24. Meme (6:58:36 AM): eso si que no me lo esperaba! 😬  
Meme: I was not expecting that! 😬

25. Meme (6:58:40 AM): jajajaja  
Meme: hahahaha

When the student uses the word ‘ostia’ as a very appropriate exclamation to confirm the validity of Meme’s previous complaint (having done a 15 kilometer hike the day before), the L1 speaker is highly surprised as displayed by her confirmation request on the word, followed by an all-caps exclamation (used in SCMC for shouting), followed by laughter, a statement about the word being surprising (line 23), and followed by more laughter. Such a surprise for a word commonly used by L1 speakers the age of Juanjoloci, suggests the orientation of the L1 speaker to the pedagogic nature of the activity, and the institutional norms that rule a conversation in a language learning context.

The use of slang (rather than improprieties) was much more accepted, and even encouraged by the L1 speakers. Chiso frequently asked for instances of slang words and incorporated them into his interactions to do ‘being closer’ with Meme, especially the use of vocatives ‘chica’, ‘chiquita’, ‘tía’.

7.26. Chiso and Meme, Interaction 1

→ 259. Chiso: gracias tenga buen dia cheuqita  
Chiso: thank you, have a good day, girl [chiquita]

→ 260. Meme: si , a ti tambien, chico!  
Meme: yes, you too, man  
261. Meme: ALOHA!!!  
Meme: ALOHA!!!

262. Chiso: jajajja  
Chiso: hahahha!!!!

263. Chiso: Aloha!!!!!!  
Chiso: Aloha!!!!!!

264. Meme: ajaja  
Meme: ahaa

35 It literally means ‘boy’, ‘guy’ however its use has been desemantized or grammaticalized. It is used among friends, especially young people. In its plural form ‘chicos’ it translates well into ‘guys’, but the singular form is not used in English with the same affective meaning.
In their first interaction, Chiso marks his farewell with a friendly vocative ‘chiquita’ (girly), although he is still using the formal second person verb (tenga), which displays his pragmatic variation of addressivity. The L1 speaker reciprocates by using a similar, more common vocative (chico), orienting to his display of closeness.

In interaction 2, a brief exchange, Meme uses the vocative most common among young people in Spain (tío, dude).

7.27. Chiso and Meme, Interaction 2

6. Meme (12:18:02 PM): sorry, no puedo, tío. Ya me marchaba
10. Chiso (12:19:26 PM): vale me encanta slang de españa

Meme: Sorry, I cannot, dude. I was leaving.
Chiso: oh. It’s all right.
Chiso: Tío? uncle.
Meme: tío, it is used like chico [man], it’s slang.
Chiso: ok I love slang from Spain.
Meme: if it’s a girl it’s tía.
Chiso: ok tía
Meme: :) Very good!

The use of this lexical item by Meme in line 6 triggers an ‘other-initiated’ repair sequence, which Meme resolves by providing a metalinguistic explanation of the use of the word, and relates it to the term she had previously used with Chiso (line 9 and line 11). Chiso acknowledges the repair displaying understanding by using the term correctly in his next turn (line 12), attaining the L1 speaker’s praise. During the rest of their project, Chiso uses the vocative consistently and accurately, especially at the beginning.

Although the closer translation to tía would be “dudette” (since tío is best translated as ‘dude’), it is not as frequent in use as ‘dude’. More used options are “girl”, or “girlfriend”. In occasions, “dude” can also be used for a woman.
of the interaction during the greeting sequences, and to summon the L1 speaker, two
common places for vocatives (Excerpts 7.28 and 7.29)

7.28. Chiso and Meme, Interaction 3

1. Chiso (12:24:49 PM): oye tia!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

2. Chiso (12:24:56 PM): puedes chatear


4. Meme (12:25:07 PM): si, ahora si puedo... acabo de conectarme


7. Chiso (12:25:55 PM): como estas tia?


9. Meme (12:28:10 PM): donde voy? a ningun sitio, por que?


11. Chiso (12:29:08 PM): lol pense que tu fuiste a un sitio


7.29. Chiso and Meme, Interaction 5


2. Chiso (12:17:01 PM): tia como estas?


4. Meme (12:17:23 PM): I'm a bit busy... and stressed, and you!

5. Chiso (12:17:34 PM): yo tambien

6. Meme (12:18:02 PM): how was your exams

7. Chiso (12:18:29 PM): odio esta semana de los exmenes


9. Chiso (12:19:19 PM): necisito uno mas pero esta bien si no puedes


Chiso: Hey girl!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Chiso: can you chat

Meme: heeeeee

Meme: yes, I can now ....I just got on

Chiso: Nice!!!

Chiso: :D

Chiso: how are (you) girlfriend?

Chiso:girlfriend? Where are (you) going?

Meme: where am I going? nowhere

why?

Meme: [laughing out loud]

Chiso: lol I though that you went somewhere [algun sitio]

Chiso: lol
All these examples have illustrated how the language students developed their ability to display closeness and intimacy with their interlocutors, using some of the same resources that the L1 speakers used. It is important to note though that these resources were deployed in a collaborative environment. It was only when both L1 speakers and language learners engaged in doing ‘being close’ or ‘being closer’ that the students developed their interactional competence.

7.3. Interactions with non-engaging L1 speakers

Although all except one group finished their projects, there was a clear difference in the relationships that were built among L1 speakers and students during the projects. Several of the interactions focused almost exclusively on accomplishing the task, without any personal investment. This orientation towards the interaction as a task constrained the types of sequences in which the language learners were able to engage. The following excerpts are from a group formed by Jana and Nico, two Spanish language students, and Alex, their partner in Spain. They illustrate how the language learners engaged minimally in social interaction and how the L1 speaker controlled and managed the topic and the sequence structure, focusing the interaction completely on the task. The data also show that it was mostly in the opening sequences of the interaction that the students attempted to exchange personal information.

7.3.0. Alex, Nico, and Jana, Interaction 1

1. Alex (10:10:15 PM): buenos días
3. Alex (10:10:20 PM): o buenas tardes

Alex: good morning
Nico: Hello!
Alex: or good afternoon
Jana: good evening
Nico: yes
6. Alex (10:10:58 PM): how's the weather in Hawaii?
7. Alex (10:11:34 PM): it's been raining here for two days
8. Nico (10:12:06 PM): it's been raining here. Also some rain.
9. Jana (10:12:26 PM): in Spain, what time is it?
10. Alex (10:12:48 PM): it is 9:12
12. Alex (10:13:28 PM): whenever (you) want __inter-pl, we can start the project
13. Jana (10:14:25 PM): all right
14. Alex (10:15:23 PM): then let's start
15. Nico (10:15:33 PM): one question- 6,000 dollars for everything? Or for each person?
16. Alex (10:16:08 PM): per person

After a greeting sequence (lines 1 to 5), and a short sequence about the weather and the time difference, it is Alex, the L1 speaker that initiated a sequence, directing the interaction towards the task without any possibility of expanding the two previous sequences. Nico orients to the new topic and poses a question starting a new adjacency pair, relevant to the task. Similarly, in their second interaction it is Alex that directs the interaction to the task in line 10 after their greeting sequence (8.31).

7.31. Alex, Nico and Jana Interaction 2

1. Alex (9:07:13 PM): good morning
2. Jana (9:07:18 PM): hello
4. Alex (9:07:25 PM): how is it going?
5. Jana (9:07:25 PM): how are you?
7. Jana (9:07:30 PM): I am tired
8. Alex (9:07:46 PM): a little sleepy, I just woke up

31 "¿A qué hora es?" is used to ask about the time of an event. "¿A qué hora es el concierto? = what time is the concert?" in this sequence, I translated as "what time is it?" = "¿Qué hora es?" according to the L1 speaker's orientation to the question and his answer.
que me acabo de levantar

9. Alex (9:07:53 PM): jeje

10. Alex (9:08:05 PM): por donde quieres empezar?

11. Jana (9:08:15 PM): si yo 206ambiéin, no dormiste mucho anoche porque tuve un examen hoy

12. Jana (9:08:20 PM): *dormi

13. Alex (9:08:27 PM): a jeje

14. Alex (9:08:35 PM): y que tal el examen ?

15. Jana (9:08:40 PM): mas o menos facil

16. Alex (9:08:46 PM): oye

17. Alex (9:09:00 PM): una pregunta

18. Jana (9:09:25 PM): ?

19. Alex (9:09:26 PM): sois als dos chicas verdad?

20. Jana (9:09:31 PM): soy una chica, si


22. Jana (9:09:35 PM): Nicole es una chica

23. Alex (9:09:48 PM): aaaaah

24. Jana (9:10:03 PM): 😅

25. Alex (9:10:05 PM): es que en español Nico es = a Nicholas

26. Alex (9:10:05 PM): entonces no sabia si eras chico o chica

27. Nico (9:10:07 PM): quizas Jana no me dice alguna cosa ...

28. Alex (9:10:34 PM): teneis fotos?

29. Jana (9:10:53 PM): jeje

30. Jana (9:11:03 PM): no ahora


32. Alex (9:11:21 PM): bueno

33. Nico (9:11:52 PM): si, no ahora – pero luego

34. Alex (9:12:07 PM): ok el 206ambiéin dia nos pasamos fotos

35. Alex (9:12:19 PM): empezamos ya ha hacer el trabajo?

36. Jana (9:12:33 PM): si

37. Nico (9:12:35 PM): si

38. When a user first signs to Yahoo! Messenger, the program allows to see if the desired user id is available or not.
After their greeting sequence, and before any of the other participants can respond to his laughter turn, Alex initiates a new topic posting a question about their task at hand. Jana, the next speaker does not orient to this question however but rather to his previous complaint in line 8 (‘estoy un poco dormido, es que me acabo de 207ambién207’). Jana displays sympathy by sharing similar feelings (Pudlinski, 2005). In her next turn Jana self-repairs a possible trouble sources in her turn (‘dormiste’ rather than ‘dormí’) which she marks with an asterisk, a common practice among language learners in SCMC (González-Lloret, 2007). Alex acknowledges the repair (line 13) and after an adjacency pair of the type question/answer he initiates a new sequence with a multi-turn pre-question, displaying hesitation. The turns include an attention getter (‘oye’), and a mitigator (‘una pregunta’), and the hesitation was also marked by a pause (25 seconds by the timestamp) and oriented to by Jana, who was waiting for the question to come before uttering a “?” , which usually symbolizes lack of understanding in SCMC. Alex’s question, almost overlapping with Jana’s question turn (line 18), starts a new sequence in which Alex and Jana shared laughter (lines 23 and 24), and Nico jokes with Jana (line 27) to which Jana orients with laughter (line 29) but Alex does not orient to Nico’s joke. In line 28 Alex initiates a new topic with a pre-request in line 28 (‘teneis fotos?’). Both students orient to the turn as a question and a pre-request by producing answer (‘no ahora’ ‘sí ahora no’) and a future grant of the request (‘pero luego’). Alex re-formulates the request attaching a time frame for completion and self-selects as next speaker to re-
direct the conversation back to the topic of their project. Both students orient to this request and they start discussing their project. There will be no more conversations involving sharing of personal information for the rest of the interaction.

Similarly, in their last interaction (7.33), Alex, the L1 speaker, controls the topic and steers the interaction towards the completion of the task.

7.32. Alex, Nico and Jena, Interaction 3

1. Jana (10:18:51 PM): lo siento, que estoy tarde
2. Alex (10:18:52 PM): buenos días (noches)
3. Alex (10:19:01 PM): no pasa nada
5. Jana (10:20:03 PM): fui a comprar comida del mercado
6. Alex (10:21:04 PM): empezamos ya o no?
9. Alex (10:21:22 PM): vamos a empezar
10. Alex (10:21:39 PM): el viaje lo empezamos desde España ok?

At the beginning of the interactions, Jana produces an apology for arriving late, accepted by Alex in line 3 (‘no pasa nada’). When Jana provides an explanation or account of her tardiness (‘fui a comprar comida del mercado’), the preferred next turn in a conversation would be a sympathy uptake or a request for more information on the account. However, Alex does not orient to the interaction as a conversation but rather as a task to be completed (‘empezamos ya o no?’ in line 6 and ‘vamos a empezar’ in line 9). In line 10, he starts the task, without confirmation from the learners with a suggestion for the project. The learners minimally agree with him, and the interaction continues with a
discussion of the project. The participants do not engage in 'mundane' conversation for the rest of the project.

The data also show that in this group, Alex, the L1 speaker, not only managed the overall topic structure of the interaction, but he also dominated the interaction in number of turns taken, producing consistently more turns than both Nico and Jana combined (Table 7.1 and Figure 7.1). This dominance of the L1 speaker did not allow the language students to propose topics, go off-task, or share personal information. Although they did complete their assignments and produced a good quality artifact, they did not have a chance to develop their interactional resources to do 'being close'.

Table 7.1. Turn allocation for Nico, Jana, and Alex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exchange 1</th>
<th>Exchange 2</th>
<th>Exchange 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nico</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.1 Turn allocation for Nico, Jana, and Alex
A more extreme case of this phenomenon was visible in the group formed by Ash, Jen, language students, and Oslo, the L1 speaker. Their interactions display a clear orientation of the participants, specially the L1 speaker, to the activity as a classroom task, with minimal off-task interaction, basically reduced to greetings and farewell sequences. Ash and Oslo engage in a personal information exchange in their first interaction but this only happens while they are waiting for Jan, the other language student, to appear in the chat environment. Once she appears, the L1 speaker re-directs the interaction back to the project.

7.3.3. Ash, Jen and Oslo, Interaction 1

1. Ash (10:17:29 AM): hola
2. Ash (10:17:33 AM): Cómo estás?
4. Ash (10:18:14 AM): Jen no estás aquí...
5. Oslo (10:18:26 AM): necesitamos hablar con ella

→ 6. Oslo (10:18:31 AM): tienen pensado 210ambí sitio para el trabajo
7. Ash (10:19:14 AM): oh...ok
8. Ash (10:19:36 AM): ¿Cuántos años tiene?
10. Ash (10:20:14 AM): yo tengo 20 años
11. Oslo (10:20:40 AM): aquí estudias?

Ash: hello
Ash: How are you?
Oslo: I am fine
Ash: Jen is [ested] not here
Oslo: we need to talk with her
Oslo: have (you) thought inform-pl of any place for the paper
Ash: oh...ok
Ash: How old are form-ag (you)?
Oslo: 21
Ash: I am 20
Oslo: ¿what do (you) study inform-ag?
Ash: right now, Spanish
Ash: You form-ag live form-ag in what part of Spain?
Ash: Jen and I talked about our project
Oslo: in the valencian community, by the Mediterranean Sea
Ash: oh...good

---

39 Ash and Jen had already met once before without Oslo.
17. Yahoo! Messenger: Jen se ha unido a la conferencia

→ 18. Oslo (10:24:58 AM): que habeis hablado del proyecto

19. Ash (10:25:02 AM): Tenemos que hacer un mirar de un viaje que queremos para tomar. ¿Pensábamos nosotros en en alguna parte como España... que tu sabes lo que este proyecto está acerca de? ¿Tu maestro te dijo?

Yahoo! Messenger: Jen has joined the conference
Oslo: what have (you) talked about the project
Ash: We have to do to look for a trip that we want to do. We were thinking in in some place like Spain... what do you know this project is about? Did your teacher tell you?

In line 3, Oslo answers Ash’s greeting but without reciprocating. Ash then produces a turn marked at the end with suspensive point, which in SCMC is at times used to signal an incomplete sentence. Oslo orients to this by completing her sentence, and he then orients to the task. However, in line 8 Ash orients to the interaction (while waiting for Jen) as a conversation activity, inquiring about her partner’s age. Oslo’s minimal answer contrasts with Ash reciprocating turn produced in a long complete sentence. The ‘conversation’ continues until Yahoo! Messenger announces the entrance of Jen in the conversation. At this point Oslo re-directs the interaction to the task and Ash orients to it providing a detailed answer to Oslo’s question. Oslo’s switch in orientation to the interaction as task and as activity can also be seen in his use of the plural and singular informal address. In line 6, even when he is interacting only with Ash (before Jen joins the chat room), he uses the plural informal ‘teneis pensado’ (have you thought) to include Ash in the ownership of the project. However, when he is engaged in conversation (in line 11) he switches to the informal singular ‘estudies’ (do you study). Similarly, in their next interaction (7.35), Oslo uses the plural informal ‘necesitais’ (you need) when he is only talking to Jen but referring to the task while he uses informal singular ‘espera’ (wait) and ‘tienes’ (do you have) in line 23 to manage the interaction itself.

211
Oslo: Hello
Jen: hello, what's up?
Oslo: (You) need information about the train
Jen: yes please
Oslo: wait a minute
Jen: thanks
Oslo: the train from Madrid to San Sebastian leaves at 2:15 and arrives at 9:30. The price is 34.50 euros per person
Jen: thanks
Oslo: The train from San Sebastian leaves for Barcelona at 10:45 and arrives at 19:15. The price is 35.50 euros/person
Oslo: The train from Barcelona to Valencia leaves at 11:00 and arrives at 13:55. The price is 35.50 euros/person
Jen: Thank you very much [muchas]
Oslo: The train from Valencia to Madrid leaves at 11:20 and arrives at 14:55. The price is 39 euros/person
Jen: How are you?
Jen: When does school end?
Oslo: Fine, and you?
Jen: more or less well
Jen: Exams next week and I have many projects [proyectos]
Oslo: The first of June I start my exams
Jen: late, isn't it?
Jen: Then, do (you) have "holidays" or vacation?
Oslo: Yes, but I start them in July
Jen: right
Oslo: Well it is late here. Do (you) have all the information that you need?
Oslo: Tomorrow I have to wake up early
During the opening sequence of the interaction Oslo and Jen exchange greetings (an adjacency pair) and Jen initiates another sequence of the type “how are you” (Schegloff, 2007) with a first pair-part adjacency pair (‘que pasa?’) projecting a second pair-part answer. However, such an answer is not produced, and instead Oslo initiates a new sequence with a statement about their project (line 3), demonstrating his orientation to the pedagogic nature of the activity and the priority of task-completion over relationship building. In line 13 Jen attempts to revive her preceding greeting sequence in line 2 for which there had been no answer before. This time Jen produces two different questions, opening two different sequences, maximizing this way her chances to receive an answer from Oslo. This starts a sequence about Oslo’s upcoming vacation which Oslo ends with a pre-closing turn starting a leave-taking sequence.

The data show that this orientation to the interaction as task did not change over time for this group. The participants finished their project in four interactions and never really engaged in any social conversation. In their last interaction, we can see that although their greetings are getting longer and they are more personal, there is still no personal information shared among participants.

7.36. Jen, Oslo and Ash, Interaction 4

1. Jen (10:21:18 AM): hola... como estas Jen: hello... how are you...
2. Oslo (10:21:59 AM): hola, yo estoy bien, y tu? Oslo: hello, I’m fine, and you?
   214ambien. Ash no esta aquí, hasta que para 30 minutos
4. Oslo (10:24:02 AM): ¿Tienes grabada la conversación del otro día?
6. Oslo (10:25:23 AM): Envídmela por e-mail, ok? Yo no la pude grabar

In this excerpt, after a short greeting sequence and “how are you” sequence formed by two adjacency pairs, Oslo utters a pre-request as a supportive move to his direct request in line 6 for the transcript of their previous interaction, minimizing the possibility of rejection. After Jen accepts his request, Oslo directs the interaction towards the task initiating a new sequence. The rest of the interaction does not present any instances of sharing personal information during the task or any off-task episodes, which deprived the language learners of the opportunity to engage in “conversation” and more personal interaction.

7.4. Summary

The excerpts of data presented in this chapter have illustrated how language students developed their interactional competence and several resources employed by the L1 speakers to do ‘being close’. Although not all students developed all the resources, we saw how Cal learned to shared laughter, Jacy learned to ask for updates of her partner’s activities, and Juanjoloci and Jacy learned to uptake when presented with personal trouble. The data also showed how several students learned to share personal information
and how they held the L1 speaker accountable when they did not remember shared knowledge. In addition to learning how to do ‘being close’, there were some participants who also learned to do ‘being closer’ or more intimate (like relationships between good friends, family members, boyfriend and girlfriend, etc), while others maintained more distance. For example, Chiso displayed his closeness with his partner through the use of slang, shared laughter, and sequences that incorporated language play. In contrast, the data also revealed that several language learners did not have a chance to develop their interactional competence because their interactions were controlled by the L1 speakers and oriented to almost exclusively as a task activity, lacking of any sequences that might have resembled ordinary conversation (with the exception of greeting and farewell sequences). These findings have important pedagogical implications for the use of SCMC in the language classroom, which will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 8 – DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

8.1. Introduction

This study set out to investigate whether synchronous computer-mediated communication (SCMC) between language students and L1 speakers has the potential to foster their development of L2 address behavior, as well as their interactional competence. In order to accomplish this end, two intact classes of intermediate Spanish students at a US University used Yahoo! Messenger, a computer-mediated communication tool, to meet periodically with L1 Spanish speakers in Spain. One group engaged in free-conversation interaction and the other group in a project-based task which involved deciding on and preparing the itinerary and all relevant information for a trip. Although the project lasted eight weeks, not all students were able to interact once a week with their partners in Spain. Most students engaged in four to five interactions, although one student interacted only twice and one student engaged in eight interactions.

The data were microanalyzed using Conversation Analysis (CA). The initial analysis of the data revealed that students were able to interact effectively with their partners in Spain through SCMC, in spite of constraints and difficulties of the medium. Through CA, the sequential organization of the interaction was analyzed and revealed that students were able to engage in meaningful and organized interaction, allocating turns through a turn-taking system borrowed from oral communication but re-shaped and adapted to SCMC.

In order to study the development of the students’ address system when engaging in SCMC with L1 speakers, all instances of second person pronouns of address (subject,
object and prepositional pronouns), as well as verb morphology marking second person were analyzed in each of the interactions for each of the dyads/groups. A preliminary observation during this analysis was the existence of two groups of students, the ones that displayed variation in their use of the Spanish address system and the ones who knew how to use it from the onset of the study. Another discovery at this point was that the students of this latter group, though already using the address system fairly accurately, were employing other resources to build relationships with their partners in Spain, and some of them were very different from others.

A microanalysis was then conducted to investigate what interactional resources students and their partners were employing to display closeness or distance to their interlocutors (other than the use of informal address forms).

In this final chapter, the main findings are summarized and evaluated. Then, pedagogic implications of the main findings are discussed. Finally, the limitations of the study are acknowledged and areas of future research are suggested.

8.2. The students’ development

By analyzing longitudinally every student’s interaction it was possible to see their development of the Spanish address system. Those students who exhibited variation between the formal and informal address forms at the onset of the study and engaged in multiple interactions with collaborative L1 speakers developed their use of the Spanish address system to the norms exhibited by the L1 speakers; that is, towards the use of informal address pronouns and verb morphology, especially in singular form. However,
students who engaged a few times (four or less) did not develop their address system and exhibited variation or use of formal address throughout the project.

When there was progression, it was not linear and it varied from student to student (as in the studies by DuFon, 1999; Gathercole et al., 2002) depending possibly on the amount of interaction and how close to the norm they were at the onset of the study.

In addition, the data from several participants suggested that there may be an effect of personal predisposition or resistance to the use of certain address forms, as in the case of Amaris and her resistance to use informal address, which matches results by Belz and Kinginger (2003), DuFon (1999), and Siegal (1996). In addition, the students' L1 may also affect development, as in the case of Ash's pragmatic transfer from her L1, Portuguese, a result also found in Perez-Leroux and Glass (1997) and DuFon (1999).

The data also suggest that students developed their address system when they focused explicitly on it, or received explicit feedback from the L1 speaker and sufficient interaction. In addition, the case of Hyeo supported data to previous findings suggesting that students may develop interactional competence independently of the interlocutor (Nguyen, 2003).

Those students that already displayed a high command of the Spanish address system at the onset of the study also developed their interactional competence to display closeness or distance, using a variety of resources that mirrored those of their L1 speaker partners. These resources included: sharing laughter and personal information, discussing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal/distant</th>
<th>Acquaintance</th>
<th>Friendly</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Use of 'usted'</td>
<td>- Use of 'Tú'</td>
<td>- 'Tú' + Name</td>
<td>- 'Tú' + vocatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LL activity only</td>
<td>- LL + conversation activities</td>
<td>- Conversation</td>
<td>- Conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neutral, non-personal topics</td>
<td>- Neutral, non-personal topics</td>
<td>- Personal involvement</td>
<td>- Personal involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Solo focus on task</td>
<td>- Some off-task activities</td>
<td>- Sharing reports of one's activities</td>
<td>- Sharing reports of one's activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No shared laughter</td>
<td>- No shared laughter</td>
<td>- Asking for updates on the other's activities</td>
<td>- Asking for updates on the other's activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neutral, non-personal topics</td>
<td>- Some off-task activities</td>
<td>- Discussion of personal problems</td>
<td>- Discussion of personal problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Solo focus on task</td>
<td>- No shared laughter</td>
<td>- Shared laughter</td>
<td>- Shared laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No shared laughter</td>
<td>- No shared laughter</td>
<td>- Shared common knowledge</td>
<td>- Shared common knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.1 Student's placement in address behavior continuu
personal problems, recognizing shared knowledge and the use of language resources to display intimacy (flirting, and the use of slang and improprieties). Figure 8.1 shows participants' development in the continuum of address behavior from formal to intimate.

8.3. The role of the L1 speaker

The data in this study confirmed previous data that suggested the decisive role of the L1 speaker in expediting the opportunities for acquisition (Stewart, 2000). In contrast to Kurhila's (2005) findings which suggest a minimal orientation of the NS to linguistic form, the data in this study show a variety in amount of attention the L1 speakers placed on linguistic form. Meme, Cid, Mijo, A-m, and Monica provided ample correction and feedback, while Oslo, Ivan, Nico, and Elena did not. Only three NSs engaged in discussion/feedback of sociopragmatic norms (A-m with Vero and Jeff; and Mijo and Monica with Heyo). This difference in results is probably due a difference in participants' orientation to the overall purpose of the activity. While Kurhila's (2005) interactions were non-pedagogic in nature, in this study, the conversations were institutional interactions (Heritage, 1995) part of a language learning institutional context, and both students and L1 speakers oriented often to corrections and feedback as a common and accepted practice in the context.

The role of the L1 speaker was also decisive in the development of interactional competence. We have an example of a L1 speaker who controlled and managed the topic and sequential organization of the interaction, focusing mainly on the completion of the task and depriving the students from the possibility of engaging in 'conversation'. Since the resources to do being close were co-constructed by the participants, as a dynamic achieved activity (Conroy, 1999; Spencer-Oatey, 2000) only when the L1 experts
displayed these resources were students able to engage in them. In order for the students to share laughter, the L1 speaker had to engage in laughter. For the students to uptake and produce sympathy tokens, the L1 speaker had to produce trouble-talk, and in order for the student to display interest in the other person’s schedule by asking for updates, the L1 speaker had to share personal activities and information. Therefore, the role of the L1 experts in the possibility for development of students’ interactive competence was essential, and only those students who engaged with collaborative and interactive partners demonstrated new resources to display closeness, which provides evidence to support the importance of the interactional dimension for language learning (Firth & Wagner, 1997).

This result parallels previous results by Belz and Kinginger (2002, 2003) and DuFon (1999), who also emphasized the importance of socialization for the acquisition of pragmatic forms in their studies.

8.4. SCMC for L2 learning

The results of this study suggest that a synchronous computer-mediated tool (such as Yahoo! Messenger) can be a productive environment for the development of L2 pragmatic competence (the use of the L2 address system) and interactional competence (the ability to display closeness/distance). This study indicates the potential that SCMC has to bring language students together consistently with L1 speakers into authentic real-world contexts of language use (Byram, 1997; Dussias, 2006; Tudini, 2003; Toyoda, 2002; Warschauer & Kern 2000). The data demonstrates that through SCMC students were exposed to sociopragmatic rules of engagement and engaged in interactional practices that are not so common in a language classroom but are frequent in regular
conversation, such as greeting and leave taking sequences, small talk, off-task discussions, joking, slang use...etc (Darhower 2002).

Since this study did not look at any face-to-face interaction, it cannot be claimed that SCMC is in any way superior to oral interaction. However, in a location where the possibility that language students have to engage in real conversation with real L1 speakers of that language is extremely rare, being able to interact on multiple occasions, for extended periods of time (more than two hours at times) and for several weeks with L1 speakers is an important opportunity that needs to be considered as part of the learner’s language education.

Although at the beginning of the project most students were new to Yahoo! Messenger (and SCMC in general), they learned to effectively interact and use the program. As presented in chapter 4, students were able to effectively manage complicated sequential interactions. They also made use of all SCMC conventions such as emoticons, capital letters, punctuation marks, letter elongation, and even adopted SCMC conventions employed by the L1 speakers such as the laughter token ‘jajaja’ (instead of ‘hahaha’). Through this project students gained “the ability to create, manage and participate in effective online communication in a variety of genres and formats” (Warschauer 2006, p. 163). They improved their electronic literacy (Kern, 2006, Warschauer, 1999a, 1999b), or more specifically their “computer-mediated communication literacy” (Warschauer, 2003).

8.5. CA of language learning

In the midst of a debate about whether CA can be employed to show learning (see the 2004 special issue of MLJ) and whether it needs a complementary theory of learning
This study (like Brouwer & Wagner, 2004) has shown that the difference between the learners’ early and later encounters was the emerging of new structures and resources employed. Except for a few students, at the end of the projects students had improved not only their pragmatic competence but several of them had also learned to display closeness through multiple resources, in collaboration with their L1 partners (their only contact with the language outside the language classroom).

In addition, CA revealed that L2 learners are able to design their turns and engage in turn-taking practices, despite their limited linguistic ability, employing multiple interactional resources to achieve understanding (Gardner, 2004; Mori, 2004a; Mori & Hayashi, 2006; Wong 2000, 2004), even in a different medium, such as SCMC. Furthermore, learners are able to compensate the lack of visual and audio clues through the deployment of resources characteristic of SCMC, just as the L1 speakers.

Finally, this study confirms Schegloff et al. (2002) and Seedhouse’s (2004) suggestion that CA offers the potential for useful contribution to interlanguage and intercultural communication studies.

8.6. Pedagogic implications

One of the most important pedagogic implication of this study is the possibility that SCMC offers for language teachers to connect their students with L1 speakers of the target language so that they can engage in real interaction. SCMC could be used as part of the language classroom or outside, for independent learning (as in this study). In a recent study, Sanders (2006) compared SCMC during class time and outside of class
time, and found that production was greater when students met with their own work groups outside of class. The use of SCMC outside of the class would encourage students to become more independent learners and create relationships with a variety of interlocutors, allowing them to engage in a more complex set of sociopragmatic rules of engagement than those offered by the language classroom. I am not saying here that every language teacher should let their students loose to explore any chat environment out there just because it is in the target language. It is important to remember that these students were adults engaged with L1 speakers as part of a telecollaboration project set up by language teachers.

This project included students engaged in two types of activities: free-conversation and a project-based task. Although there were students in both groups who learned to use the Spanish address system and to do ‘being close’, there were some differences between both groups. The students engaged in free-conversation participated in a larger variety of interactional sequences, similar to those encountered outside of the classroom setting. In addition, most of the feedback from L1 speakers occurred in the free-conversation interactions. The reason for this may have been that the participants in the project-based interactions were more focused on task completion and less on language accuracy. These results support the idea that free-conversation has the potential to offer learning opportunities (Kasper, 2004; Mori, 2004; Nakahama, Tyler, & VanLier, 2001). A pedagogic suggestion would then be for language programs to provide occasions for structured informal interaction where collaborative discourse could be constructed with L1 speakers providing important support (Evans, 2003).

---

40 By ‘activity’ I mean a general plan before the students engage in interaction.
Finally, this study also shows that it is possible to investigate language learning through tasks and activities designed to fit the language curriculum, with a specific pedagogic purpose, and not only through experimental lab research (Morl, 2004).

8.7. Limitations of the study

The results of this study are limited by the number of students who participated and the time limit imposed by the design of the study. A larger group of students and a longer period of interaction would have been beneficial for a longitudinal study. A common problem among researchers is the difficulty of maintaining contact with students for longer than one semester, unless the project is departmental in nature. This was the case for this study, since most of the students for this project finished their Spanish studies after this course.

This study could have benefited from more careful partnering of the students and L1 speakers. The formation of the groups was based on students' schedules and possible times to connect to the Internet. In addition, although the project was part of the course curriculum for the Spanish learners, it was completely voluntary for the L1 speakers, and several of them withdraw from the project after experiencing difficulties connecting with their counterparts, which limited the range of interlocutors for the language students. For example, Jacy only had the chance to interact with Cid without the possibility of interaction with more than one L1 speaker at the same time, which limited her possibility of using plural address forms. Chiso and Juanjoloci interacted with Meme together. However, they both directed most of the talk to her as an individual, and therefore there was no use of plural address forms either. The same occurred for Cal and Kim, and Jeff
and Vero. Heyo was the only student who had the chance to interact with two L1 speakers at the same time and the only one that learned to use the ‘vosotros’ form.

8.8. Future research

At the conclusion of this project, several questions for future research are waiting to be investigated. These are some of the lines of possible future inquiry.

8.8.1. Transferability of pragmatic development to FtoF interaction

First, it would be interesting to investigate whether what the students have learned through SCMC is transferable to face-to-face (FtoF) interaction or beyond the particular context of the study. Dussias (2006) found in her study that students who interacted with L1 speakers through SCMC were able to transfer their recently acquired linguistic competence to an Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI). Although OPIs do not resemble ‘normal’ communication or ‘conversation’, the result opens a possibility for new investigation.

Given the positive effects found in other research for instruction on pragmatic development (Jeon & Kaya, 2006), a study like the present one could benefit from examining the differences/similarities in development of students engaged in similar SCMC, but also receiving pragmatic instruction. For example, Liddicoat (2005) found that reflective intervention had a positive effect on the acquisition of French address pronouns by language learners, and also in cross-cultural awareness (although the students never really met any L1 speakers). In line with Packett (2005) and Furstenberg et al. (2001), transcripts of L1 speakers and learners could be used comparatively as classroom material to raise awareness of pragmatic features and sociopragmatic norms.
8.8.2. The use of code-switching in L2 SCMC

The interactions described in this study became at times quite complicated given that both students were able to communicate in Spanish and English. Although the project required that they use Spanish for the interaction, there were multiple instances of code-switching by both the L1 speaker and the student, especially in instances of metatalk (Platt & Brooks, 1994). A closer look at these sequences could help clarify why participants code-switch, how this takes place, and how participants orient to it (Auer, 1984; Wei, 1998). It would also be interesting to explore how the sequential characteristics of SCMC affect the way participants code-switch, and whether they are employing this resource to build a positive environment (Swain & Lapkin, 2000) in which to achieve intersubjectivity (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Brooks, 1992; Brooks & Donato, 1994).

8.8.3. Repairs, correction, and feedback

CA research in this area suggests that in asymmetrical interactions (difference in language competence) the participants avoid engaging in repair sequences unless necessary to achieve mutual understanding (Brouwer et al., 2004; Hosoda 2006; Wong 2005), much in the same way that L1 speakers. Ware and O'Dowd (2008) found that even when participants were instructed to provide feedback and were trained to do so, only about 14% of their words in interaction were related to language related episodes, and as little as .003% when the decision to provide feedback was left to them, even when language students in their study showed a strong preference for an inclusion of a focus on grammar.
However, the data in the present study displayed many instances of participants orienting to language correctness, and engaging in “exposed correction” (Jefferson, 1987), even when they clearly displayed understanding of the message. This seems to reflect the participants’ orientation to the pedagogic nature of the activity as a language learning activity.

Hall (2007a) points out a possible misunderstanding of the terms ‘correction’ and ‘repair’ in SLA and CA studies, especially of those that focus on classroom interaction and particularly in Seedhouse’s (2004) idea of CA repair in pedagogically oriented interactions. She defends a distinction between “instructional correction and CA correction as a type of CA repair” (p. 521) based on whether it is trouble in speaking and hearing that triggers the correction. For Hall, instructional correction also includes the provision of feedback, usually as part of an IRF sequence. When attempting to classify sequences in this study using Hall’s (2007a) distinction, I found that some of them were difficult to categorize in one or the other, in part due to the bilingual, L2 nature of the interaction. After a closer look at some of the sequences in the collection, I identified three different sequences: repairing sequences, corrections, and feedback sequences. A microanalysis would help identify these sequences to discover whether they are actually different and how the students understand and respond to them.

8.8.4. Compliments and identity in SCMC

The data in this study presented interesting sequences of other interactional practices to display affiliation and accomplish intersubjectivity that were not considered for this dissertation that I believe are worth exploring. For example the use of ‘I know’ token (Conroy, 1999), topic management (Häggkvist, 2002) and compliments. I believe it
would be worthwhile exploring how compliments are achieved cross-culturally in SCMC, following CA studies (of F2F communication) by Pomerantz (1978), Golato (2005), and Huth (2006).

Last but not least, Heyo’s identity in the online chatroom seemed to be very different from his real world persona. Although he was regarded as funny by his partners in Spain, he claims to be a boring person in real life, who has even been called “monotonous” (see Appendix F). I believe it would be interesting to study how he constructs his online identity (funny, witty, smart, well-traveled, multilingual…) which seems to be very different from what he says other people think of his real persona. There is a substantial body of work on identity and media environments (see e.g. Barnes (2005) for an account), but there is hardly any research on L2 learner’s identity construction on the Internet, which opens a large field of study.

The topic of SCMC for the acquisition of L2 pragmatic and interactive competence is still largely understudied. Longitudinal studies are especially needed, as well as studies that employ microanalytical approaches to the data.
APPENDIX A- EXAMPLES OF EXPLANATIONS OF THE SPANISH ADDRESS SYSTEM

Over simplistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>España</th>
<th>Argentina, Uruguay y otros</th>
<th>México, ColombiaPerú ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tratamiento informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tú</td>
<td>vos</td>
<td>tú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vosotros/as</td>
<td>ustedes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tratamiento formal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usted</td>
<td>ustedes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Overcomplicated

Variation in Spanish pronouns - Grammatical differences
Second person (background)

Spanish has three second person singular pronouns tú, usted and vos. Tú is informal (for example, used with friends) and usted is formal (for example, used with older people).

In several countries, however, the formal Usted is used to denote a closer personal relationship. Some Chileans, for instance, not only employ Usted to address from child to parent, but also from parent to child. In Ecuador and Colombia Usted is used among close friends, and many times even between couples. Some countries like Cuba privilege the use of Tú even in very formal circumstances. Meanwhile, in other countries, the formal vs. informal use of second-person pronouns are used to denote authority. In Peru, its military for example, senior officers will use Tú to speak to their subordinates, while junior officers will only use Usted to address their superior officers.

The replacement of Tú by the archaic Vos in Argentina and Uruguay is almost universal, and is used by all to address all, regardless of social status or age. In Ecuador, Vos coexists with Tú and Usted, and all three are used just as widely. The choice of pronoun to be used, however, is a complex matter in Ecuador, and depends on the participants’ likeness in age and/or social status. Based on these factors, the addressee can assess himself as being an equal, superior or inferior to the addressee, and the appropriate choice of pronoun to be employed can then be made. Ecuadorians generally use Vos among familiarized equals, or by superiors [in both social status and age] to inferiors; Tú among unfamiliarized equals, or by a superior in age but inferior in social status; and Usted by both familiarized and unfamiliarized inferiors, or by a superior in social status but inferior in age.

Vos can also be heard among some speakers of the State of Chiapas in Mexico, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Costa Rica, the Department of Antioquia in Colombia, and in various other regions of other South American countries.

This change in the pronoun brings along a change in the second person of the verb. “Tú eres / Tú vienes” becomes “Vos sos / Vos venís”. In Uruguay Vos and Tú are used concurrently, though Vos is much more commonplace. In both cases the verb is conjugated as Vos (“Vos querés / Tú querés”, rather than “Vos querés / Tú quieres”).

---

41 These are only examples of explanations of the topic and the content may not necessarily be completely accurate.
**Second person plural**

In Standard European Spanish the plural of Tú is vosotros and the plural of Usted is Ustedes. In Latin America both the plural of Tú and Usted are ustedes. This means that speaking to a group of friends a Spaniard will use vosotros and a Latin American will use ustedes. In some parts of Andalusia, the use is what they call ustedes-vosotros: ustedes is combined with the verbal forms for vosotros.

**Second person singular**

There is wide variation as when tú and usted can be used. For example, in most of Colombia, Tú is very rarely used and seen almost as offensive, so even close friends become usted. In non-educated variants, Sumercé is used instead of usted. It comes from Su Merced ("His/Her Mercy", which is similar to the root of Usted, Vuestra Merced, "Your Mercy", abbreviated as Vd.). The plural is Sumercés, from Sus Mercedes, and therefore, it uses the same tense as Usted. In Cuba, on the other hand, Usted is seldom used, and Tú is preferred.

**Voseo**

Roughly a third of Latin American speakers of Spanish replace the singular pronoun Tú by Vos. This also affects verb conjugations, which are replaced by forms related with the plural vosotros, either without the diphthongization of those forms or without the final s. This originated because an influence of French (where even if the singular 2nd person is Tú, when talking to someone with respect Vous [2nd person plural] is used). When irregular verbs are observed it is obvious that vos conjugations are related to the vosotros forms. Vosotros is a derivation of vos y otros ("you and others"), when the inherited vos lost the plural meaning.

Using Vos instead of Tú is called voseo. The term voseo also applies when a pronoun other than Vos is used but the verb immediately following is nonetheless conjugated according to the norms of Vos: hence “Tú subís, Tú deís, Tú querís” is still considered voseo. Voseo occurs in all of Argentina and Uruguay and is regarded as the national standard and is used in public discourse, the media, film and television. Vos is also the most prominent form in Ecuador and it is seen as the unofficial standard, along with Usted and the lesser used Tú, but it is not used in public discourse, the media or television. Vos can be heard throughout most of Chile, Paraguay, Bolivia, and a small part of Peru, but in these places it is reproached as sub-standard and the speech of the uneducated and ignorant. It is also used as the unofficial standard in limited regions of Colombia (Antioquia) and Venezuela (Maracaibo), Central America and Mexico (Chiapas).

Voseo is informal in most countries, but in Argentina is the only form for second person singular, used by cultivated speakers and writers, in television, publicity, and even in translations from other languages.

---

42 As pointed by one of my committee members, in Paraguay the use of ‘vos’ is not considered sub-standard, and the middle and upper classes use ‘vos’.
APPENDIX B – INSTRUCTIONS TO START A YAHOO ACCOUNT

Cómo abrir una cuenta en Yahoo! y comenzar a usar el MESSENGER

1- Entra en http://www.yahoo.es Los estudiantes que YA tengan cuenta pinchan en MESSENGER a la derecha (o esperan a los otros). Los que no tienen cuenta, entran a la derecha en INFO DE CUENTA.

A la izquierda elegir “RESGISTRADME” Sigue los pasos. Es fácil. Rellena la información y ENVÍALA.

Para instalar MESSENGER, desde http://es.messenger.yahoo.com/ (o desde el primer sitio al que entraste también) entra en instalar el Messenger, y sigue los pasos.
2- Cuando ya esté instalado, se abre con el icono de Yahoo! Messenger en tu pantalla.

Mete el ID de Yahoo! y la contraseña.

3- En CONTACTOS, elige AÑADIR CONTACTOS.

4- **UNO DE LOS ESTUDIANTES DE CADA GRUPO** incorpora la dirección de sus compañeros y de los estudiantes en España.
Los otros estudiantes reciben entonces un correo invitándolos y deben aceptar. La próxima vez que abran el Messenger verán que están los cuatro.

Todos los que estén conectados (en cada grupo) pueden hablar a la vez, sin interrupciones externas. 😊
APPENDIX C - PROYECTO INTERNACIONAL – UN VIAJE

Para este proyecto internacional vamos a usar Yahoo! Messenger para conectarnos con nuestros compañeros en España. Tenéis 6 semanas para completar el proyecto.

El proyecto consiste en preparar un viaje de vacaciones para este verano durante 1 mes. Tenéis 6,000 dólares para gastar y queréis visitar al menos 3 países diferentes. Debéis decidir y negociar todos los detalles en ESPAÑOL.
- Dónde queréis ir
- Qué medio de transporte vais a usar
- Qué tipo de alojamiento
- Qué tipo de viaje es: cultural, de aventura, de descanso,....

El resultado a entregar debe ser una descripción DETALLADA del ITINERARIO del viaje como las que se incluyen en un panfleto de viaje (ver ejemplo al otro lado):
- Lugares a visitar
- Tipo de transporte (con detalles como tipo de línea aérea, horarios de salida y llegada, precio, ...)
- Tipo de alojamiento (con detalles como tipo de habitación, precio y dirección y teléfono)
- Actividades (dónde, tipo de actividad, equipo necesario, quien la organiza/contrata, ...)

El proyecto final debe llegar a la profesora como una sola unidad, NO EN PARTES, así que alguien debe ser el encargado de mandar el producto final.

La información debe ser real y deben incluir las fuentes (sources) dónde encontraron la información (direcciones de Web, agencia de viajes, ...).

Recuerdadespués de cada sesión TODOS los estudiantes del grupo deben ir a su archivo y enviar la conversación a la profesora para obtener nota por el trabajo hecho. (VER INSTRUCCIONES SOBRE COMO USAR EL MESSENGER)

El proyecto debe estar en formato de WORD (puede incluir fotos u otro tipo de gráficos) y debe incluir los nombres de todos los componentes del grupo.

Si tenéis cualquier tipo de pregunta mandadme un mensaje por correo, o me podéis preguntar en clase.
APPENDIX D- AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Pragmatics and Interaction

Investigator: Marta Gonzalez-Lloret, Ph.D, Candidate SLS Department.
Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Gabriele Kasper
Department of Second Language Studies

Purpose of this Research: This study investigates whether language interaction through CMC environment helps to acquire L2 pragmatics.

What You Will Be Expected to Do: To be a participant in this research, all you need to do is complete the assessments created to measure pragmatic competence. Allow the researcher to use the data of your CMC interactions with total anonymity for research, presentation and publication purposes. Your name will never be associated with any of the interactions at any time.

Your Rights
To Confidentiality. Your anonymity will be preserved at all times. Your names will be deleted from both assessments and substituted by numbers before storage. Your names will never be used at any time.

To Ask Questions at Any Time. You may ask questions about the research at any time. Call the investigator at (808) 956-XXXX. You may withdraw from the study at any time, and you may require that your data be destroyed, without any consequences or loss of compensation.

Benefits. Your data will be very valuable for future students of Spanish.

Possible Risks. There are no risks involved in the study.

Signature
I certify that I have read and understand the above, that I have been given satisfactory answers to any questions about the research, and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation in the research at any time, without any prejudice or loss of benefits or compensation.

I agree to be a part of this study with the understanding that such permission does not take away any of my rights, nor does it release the investigator or the institution (or any agent or employee thereof) from liability for negligence.

If I cannot obtain satisfactory answers to my questions, or have comments or complaints about my participation in this study, I may contact: Committee on Human Studies (CHS), University of Hawaii, 2540 Maile Way, Honolulu, HI 96822. Phone: (808) 956-5007.

_________________________ (print your name) ________________ (date)
_________________________ (signature)
APPENDIX E- INTERACTION 4 HEYO, SONIA, AND MIJO

Heyo, Sonia, and Mijo, Interaction #4

183. heyo: Cuando estudiaba en la Universidad de Tokio, la profesora siempre usaba vosotros.

184. mijo: tu estudiabas en Tokio?

185. heyo: Sí.

186. sonia: estudie

187. heyo: Soy de Japón.

188. heyo: Estudie. Gracias.

189. mijo: QUE BIEN!!!!!!!

190. mijo: me encanta japon!!!!!!

191. heyo: Bueno, sí y no.

192. sonia: claro

193. heyo: Me gusta mi país,

194. mijo: me se una cancion

195. heyo: tenemos una cultura muy unica.

196. sonia: por eso comes tanta comida japonesa!!!!

197. mijo: empieza Sakura, Sakura.... y lo demás no lo se!!!!

198. heyo: Tenemos muchos platos sabrosos.

199. mijo: si, si, la tempura!!! ummmmm

200. mijo: mi hermana pequeña dibuja manga

201. mijo: lo hace muy bien

202. heyo: Eso es.Sakura, sakura es la cancion muy antigua y muy conocida.

203. heyo: ¡Qué interesante!

204. mijo: solo me se los sonidos de una estrofa, es q viene en una cancion de Bon Jovi

205. heyo: No sabía que Bon Jovi canta una frase de la cancion japonesa.

206. mijo: me hace mucha ilusión que seas japoneses, estaba deseando conocer alguno

207. sonia: cuando te fuiste de Japon?

208. mijo: bueno, lo hace una japonesa y luego empieza la cancion, como se llamaba.... Tokio road, creo

209. heyo: Estoy muy contento de conocer alguien a quien le interesa mi país.

210. mijo: 😊

211. mijo: tengo la bandera en mi movil....

212. heyo: Me has escrito que tu hermana leyó una manga que se llama Tokio road?¿

213. heyo: when I was studying [estudiaba] at the University of Tokyo, the teacher always used vosotros.

214. mijo: you were studying in Tokyo?

215. heyo: yes

216. sonia: I studied

217. heyo: I am from Japan

218. mijo: GREAT!!!!!!!

219. mijo: I love japan!!!!!

220. heyo: Well, yes and no.

221. sonia: of course

222. heyo: I like my country

223. mijo: I know a song

224. heyo: we have a unique culture

225. sonia: that's why you eat so much Japanese food!!!!!

226. mijo: it starts Sakura, Sakura... and I do not know any more!!!!

227. heyo: we have very good dishes

228. mijo: yes yes, tempura!!! ummmmmmm

229. mijo: my younger sister draws manga

230. mijo: she is good

231. heyo: Correct. Sakura, sakura is the very old and known song

232. heyo: How interesting!!

233. mijo: I only know the sounds of one verse, it is part of a song by Bon Jovi

234. heyo: I didn't know Bin Jovi sings a verse from a Japanese song

235. mijo: it is very exciting that you are Japanese. I was dying to meet someone Japanese

236. sonia: when did you leave Japan?

237. mijo: well, it is a Japanese lady and then he starts the song, how was it called... Tokyo road, I think

238. heyo: I am very happy to meet someone interested in my country

239. mijo: 😊

240. mijo: I have the ring tone in my cell phone

241. heyo: You have written tan your sister read a manga called Tokyo road?¿
214. mijo: ¿? no
215. mijo: mi hermana DIBUJA manga, dibujos japoneses
216. heyoe: ¿Qué significa el verbo dibujar?

217. sonia: pintar
218. heyoe: De acuerdo.
219. sonia: draw
220. heyoe: Interesante.
221. mijo: la canción de Bon Jovi donde viene la estrofa de la canción japonesa se llama Tokio Road
222. heyoe: Hay muchos chicos japoneses a quien gustan los dibujos de mangas.
223. heyoe: Oh.
224. heyoe: De acuerdo.
225. mijo: si logro escanear alguno luego te lo mando
226. heyoe: Sakura significa cerezo, lo conoces?
227. mijo: no
228. mijo: creia que era un nombre
229. sonia: heyoe, cuando fuiste de Japón?
230. heyoe: Es el árbol del cerezo.
231. mijo: es un nombre de chica, no?
232. heyoe: Sí, también, Mijo.
233. heyoe: Sonia,
234. mijo: me gusta el nombre de Etsuko
235. sonia: DIME
237. mijo: ¿significa Etsuko?
238. heyoe: Viví en Kyoto, Fukuoka y Tokio antes.
239. sonia: madre mia
240. mijo: que interesante
241. heyoe: Es un nombre muy común entre chicas japonesas,
242. heyoe: pero no sé qué significa.
243. heyoe: espera.
244. mijo: ok
245. heyoe: Estuko significa “felicidades” y “estar contenta.
246. sonia: Mijo, vamos a ir a clase?
247. mijo: ok
248. heyoe: según mi diccionario japonés.

249. heyoe: Bien.
250. heyoe: Gracias por hablar conmigo.
251. heyoe: Estoy muy contento de conocerte, Mijo.
252. mijo: gracias a ti, me alegro mucho de haberte conocido
253. mijo: el sentimiento es mutuo
254. heyo: Muy bien.
255. sonia: te vas ya a acostar?
256. mijo: pues ya nos veremos y si no tranquilito que te mandaré mails
257. heyo: Te buscaré luego este semana en el messenger.
258. heyo: Perfecto.
259. heyo: Invita a tu hermana si le interesa charlar.
260. heyo: si le interesas charle.
261. heyo: si le interesan charla.
262. sonia: charlar
263. heyo: Invita a tu hermana si le interesa charlar. gracias.
264. sonia: de nada
265. mijo: luego le daré tu dirección, pero ella usa el messenger de hotmail
266. heyo: Tengan buenas tardes.
267. heyo: De acuerdo.
268. heyo: Hasta pronto, Sonia y Mijo!
269. heyo: Y aloha!
270. mijo: hasta otra Heyo
271. sonia: bueno nos vemos otro día
272. sonia: aloha
273. sonia: como se dice adiós en japones?
274. heyo: matane!
275. sonia: matane!!
276. heyo: muy bien.
277. mijo: matane, matane! ¿qué significa?
278. heyo: adiós.
279. heyo: se usa "sayonara" también, pero
280. heyo: es muy formal.
281. mijo: ok
282. sonia: Sayonara es lo típico que escuchamos en las películas
283. heyo: es que te gustan películas tristes donde la mujer separa del hombre,
284. sonia: por qué?
285. heyo: mientras a él ya le gusta ella.
286. mijo: ¿?
287. heyo: "sayonara" suena muy triste.
mijo: ah
sonia: ah!!
heyo: implica que no vemos luego.
mijo: mmm, no eso es exact.
sonia: implica que no nos vemos luego
heyo: pero es muy formal y suena un poco triste.
sonia: si
heyo: "matane" es más positiva.
sonia: la verdad que suele decirse con ese sentido
heyo: es decir que esperan verlos otra vez.
mijo: ahora sí q me voy!!!! que empieza la clase en 3 minutos!!!!!
sonia: vale
sonia: lol
heyo: claro.
mijo: Matane Heyo!!!!
heyo: Matane Mijo!!!
sonia: te llevaras el microfono el proximo dia?
heyo: Lo buscaré.
sonia: será chulo poder usarlo
heyo: Sí. Será chulo y "cool".
sonia: vale
sonia: lo!
sonia: que vas a hacer ahora?
sonia: are you taking the microphone next time?
sonia: It'll be cool to use it
heyo: Sí. Será chulo y "cool".
sonia: ok
sonia: lol
sonia: what are you going to do now?
Yahoo! Messenger: MIJO SALIÓ DE LA CONFERENCIA.
APPENDIX F – HEYO’S IDENTITY

Sonia and Heyo, Interaction 4 (see 5.24 for the interaction)

312. heyo: Sería mejor si cantarás con el microfono luego.
313. sonia: ni de coña!!
314. heyo: sí de coña!
315. sonia: eres muy gracioso!!
316. sonia:

→ 312. heyo: It would be better if you would sing with the microphone.
→ 313. sonia: no way!!
→ 314. heyo: yes way!
→ 315. sonia: (you) are infor-sg very funny!
→ 316. sonia: 😄

Sonia and Heyo, Interaction 2

→ 233. sonia: eres muy cachondo!!
234. heyo: Cachondo?
235. sonia: no se la traducción
→ 236. sonia: gracioso
237. heyo: A, sí?
238. heyo: Es el mejor adjetivo que he recibido.
239. sonia: lol
→ 240. heyo: Mucho mejor que monotonoso,
241. heyo: immature
242. sonia: MONOTONO
243. heyo: impaciente,
244. heyo: monotono. gracias.
245. sonia: jaja
246. heyo: ¿cómo se dice immature en español?
247. sonia: te dicen que eres monotono?
248. heyo: Sí.
→ 249. heyo: Vivo una vida sencilla.
250. sonia: inmaduro
→ 251. heyo: Estudio mucho en biblioteca y cafés.
→ 252. heyo: Cocina mismos platos todos los días,
253. heyo: cocino.
254. sonia: comes siempre lo mismo?
255. heyo: No voy a muchas fiestas

→ 233. sonia: you are very funny
→ 234. heyo: Cachondo?
→ 235. sonia: I don’t know the translation
→ 236. sonia: funny
→ 237. heyo: Oh, yes?
→ 238. heyo: It is the best adjective that I have received
→ 239. sonia: lol
→ 240. heyo: Much better than monotonous [monótono]
→ 241. heyo: immature
→ 242. sonia: MONOTONO
→ 243. heyo: impatient
→ 244. heyo: monótono, thanks
→ 245. sonia: jaja
→ 246. heyo: how do you say immature in Spanish?
→ 247. sonia: they tell you infor-sg (you) are infor-sg monotonous?
→ 248. heyo: Yes
→ 249. heyo: I have a simple life
→ 250. sonia: inmaduro
→ 251. heyo: I study a lot in library and coffee-shops
→ 252. heyo: I cook [cocino] same dishes everyday
→ 253. heyo: I cook
→ 254. sonia: do you always eat the same?
→ 255. heyo: I don’t go to many parties

241
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