



ELSEVIER



Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 199 (2015) 604 – 612

Procedia
Social and Behavioral Sciences

GlobELT: An International Conference on Teaching and Learning English as an Additional Language, Antalya - Turkey

Collaborative construction of online L2 task accomplishment through epistemic progression

Ufuk Balaman^{a*}

^a*Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching, Ankara, 06800, Turkey*

Abstract

Technology-mediated task-based language learning and teaching has long been a research focus (Chapelle, 2001; Gonzalez-Lloret & Ortega, 2014). The focus has mainly been on the task-as-workplan (Ellis, 2003) leaving the process aspect as a research gap (Breen, 1989; Seedhouse, 2005). Therefore, the collaborative and interactional nature of language learning tasks remained largely unexplored or misguided by etic constructs. This study aims to describe the interactional unfolding of online task-oriented collaboration of undergraduate students who are also learners of English as a foreign language (L2). Seven L2 learners have participated on a Google Hangouts video meeting for the study, discussed some clues, and hinted their teammates in order to complete a task collaboratively before the other teams do. The naturally occurring interactions of the participants have been recorded via a screen capture software. A 90-minute long recording has been transcribed and examined using conversation analysis (CA) methodology. As result of a turn-by-turn single case sequential analysis, an emergent recurring pattern has been discovered. It has been found that whenever an unknowing participant's candidate answer is confirmed by a knowing participant, the sequence is expanded and therefore enhanced, and then it functions as an epistemic progression (Gardner, 2007) step which takes the learners to the knowing position through accumulation of knowledge. This finding has showed that the learners close knowledge gaps, construct and accumulate knowledge, and thus accomplish tasks collaboratively through epistemic progression. It has also showed that an investigation into the process aspect of tasks may bring new insights into an understanding of the nature of collaboration occurring in and through online task-oriented interaction.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of Hacettepe Üniversitesi.

Keywords: Task; interaction; conversation analysis; epistemics; language learning

1. Introduction

The interest in the use of technology within the context of foreign language learning and teaching has been a major research concern especially following the advent of the Internet (Chapelle, 2001, 2003; Gonzalez-Lloret & Ortega 2014; Jenks 2014). The most significant impact of the Internet technology has been by means of communication that online tools provide (Jenks, 2014). Although many researchers focused on the merits of online communication for language learning particularly with respect to meaning-focused pedagogical tasks that put the students into interaction (cf. Chapelle, 2001, 2003; Gonzalez-Lloret & Ortega, 2014), only few paid attention to micro-details of social interaction within these online environments (cf. Negretti, 1999; Jenks, 2014). This study examines such social

* Corresponding author. Tel.: 03122978575.

E-mail address: ubalaman@gmail.com

interaction in English as a foreign language using conversation analytic methodology (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013) and adopts a social interactionist perspective (Pekarek Doehler, 2013) on task-oriented L2 interaction to gain a participant-relevant emic perspective (Firth & Wagner, 1997), which can show the resources that the interactants use to make meaning. Conversation analytic constructs such as turn-taking, sequence and preference organization, and repair is used to present such perspective. Given that the interactants' intersubjective co-construction of a socially distributed cognition (Kasper, 2009) is made accessible to the analyst through turns-at-talk (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013) as they engage in the tasks and interact with each other, the main analytic focus is on the micro details of naturally occurring interaction. Therefore, the findings are expected to make an impact on task-based language learning and teaching (TBLT) literature through micro-detailed descriptions of online task-oriented L2 interaction. The main contribution of this study to task-oriented interaction (Seedhouse, 2005a) will be the explication of language learning tasks as a process rather than focusing on them as a workplan (Ellis, 2003) in an environment in which tasks and technology are integrated.

To this end, task-based interaction in the context of technology requires further attention for an effective integration of tasks and technology. Gonzalez-Lloret and Ortega (2014) identifies five key features for such an integration which combine various theoretical underpinnings of TBLT: (1) primary focus on meaning, (2) goal orientation, (3) learner-centeredness, (4) holism, and (5) reflective learning. The first key feature refers to that even if there is a workplan in terms of language learning goals, it should be hidden and implicit. Goal orientation is task-facilitated orientation of the learners towards a communicative purpose in order to find opportunities to gain "some outcome resulting from task completion" (Gonzalez-Lloret & Ortega, 2014:6). Learner centeredness is the specific emphasis on learner needs and wants. Holism refers to the task and real-world relationship. Finally, reflective learning requires a focus on learners' idiosyncratic experiences of the task, thus "do things with their own words" (p. 6). The task that the participants try to accomplish collaboratively will be discussed in comparison with these features. To lay the ground for a discussion in terms of the task accomplishment process and tasks and technology integration, this paper will first present a literature of review on epistemics in L2 interaction which will provide a better understanding of the task-based interaction that is shaped around epistemic differences of the participants, and then conversation analysis methodology will be described. After the CA analysis of the data, a discussion will follow and the paper will be concluded.

2. Epistemics and L2 interaction

This study focuses on epistemics in interaction as has been mainly shaped by Heritage (2012a, b; 2013a, b) within conversation analytic methodology. Heritage (2013a) defines epistemics in interaction as "knowledge claims that interactants assert, contest and defend in and through turns-at-talk and sequences of interaction" (p. 370). Knowledge claims are an inevitable part of task-based interaction especially when information gaps are at hand. It is possible to understand how the learners position themselves in terms of their knowledge and how they co-construct knowledge with other interactants through a sequential analysis of talk-in-interaction that occurs within a domain or territory of knowledge which consists of positions to be occupied on an epistemic gradient. Their positions on the gradient can vary from K+ (knowing) to K- (unknowing) (Heritage, 2012b), which refers to epistemic status. However, this relative status of knowledge also requires speakers' "moment-by-moment expression" (Heritage, 2013a:377), that is their epistemic stance.

Epistemics in interaction has also been investigated in language classrooms (Sert, 2011, 2013, 2015; Sert & Walsh, 2013; Jakonen & Morton, 2015; Sert & Jacknick, 2015). Sert (2011) focused on how L2 speakers claim insufficient knowledge in the classroom and found out the resources that they use to do such claims. Headshakes were reported to be "the most common verbal indicators of claims of insufficient knowledge (CIK)" (Sert & Walsh, 2013:553). CIKs make an explanation relevant that could bring about an opportunity for understanding. Another significant finding is that when a teacher faces a CIK, he usually allocates the turn to other students (Sert, 2011; Sert & Walsh, 2013). Sert (2013) also showed how information imbalances can be traced in adjacency pairs and sequence organization in his research on "epistemic status checks (ESCs)", which is defined as "a speaker's interpretation of another interactant's state of knowledge, which is initiated when a second-pair part is delayed" (p. 17). ESCs project insufficient knowledge through making it relevant for the analysis of the other students, the teacher, and thus the analyst (Sert, 2013).

Jakonen and Morton (2015) have also made a great contribution to epistemics research on L2 interaction with their study on epistemic search sequences (ESSs). ESSs are peers' or group members' collaborative work to close a knowledge gap. The gap is noticed and treated as "a joint problem" which requires participants to "negotiate

responsibility” in terms of their knowledge. It refers to the status of the participants in the epistemic gradient. ESSs facilitate the collective work to make the difference in the epistemic gradient lesser and lesser between the participants. Along with all the resources that peers use, a request for information positions a member in K- which signals a need for support from the other members. Therefore, the other member(s) of the group should employ all the resources they have or try to find new ways to resolve the gap until the information is provided, which signals the end of an ESS. When the answer or support to K- is not correct (unknowing), it leads to sequence expansion. Similarly, when K- participant disagrees with K+ position in the third turn, it leads to a sequence expansion once again. Jakonen and Morton (2015) also note that ESSs can occur repeatedly during peer interaction, which provides an opportunity for “the accumulation of knowledge”. The description of such an accumulation also serves conversation analytic research in that it can make learning and especially knowing visible. The next section will elaborate on the analytic tools and procedures that conversation analysis offers as a robust research methodology.

3. Method

3.1. Conversation analysis

Sidnell (2010) defines conversation analysis as “an approach within the social sciences that aims to describe, analyze, and understand talk as a basic and constitutive feature of human social life”. The analytic focus is on the talk in interaction (i.e. talk-in-interaction). Conversation analytic research is based on four basic principles (Seedhouse, 2005b): “(1) there is order at all points, (2) each contribution to interaction is context-shaped and context-renewing, (3) no order of detail can be dismissed, and (4) analysis is bottom-up and data driven” (as cited in Sert & Seedhouse, 2011). The first principle mainly refers to conversation analytic constructs such as adjacency pairs as the machinery of talk-in-interaction. The second is that interactants’ utterances are what determine and establish the context and they also have an impact to renew it. The third principle is on the micro-analytic nature of conversation analysis. Any kind of details can shape and contribute to the analysis. The final principle is CA’s main contribution to both social sciences and applied linguistics in that it offers concrete paradigm. In contrast with theory-driven top-down analytic procedures, CA directs researchers to focus on micro details projected on the naturally occurring interaction. It requires much effort from the analysts and in return provides a reliable analytic lens on the data.

The main purpose and promise of conversation analytic research is to reflect the emic perspective (participant-relevant) of the interactants, which is usually quite challenging and intricate for the researchers. The interactants analyze the talk they have with others, and then they respond. This adjacently paired exchange is a collaborative product of minute-by-minute analysis of talk-in-interaction by all the interactants involved. Their analysis explicates the machinery of talk-in-interaction for the analysis of third parties because the interaction occurs orderly in terms of turn-design, turn-taking, sequence organization, and repair. The detailed, minute-by-minute, micro-analytic investigation of naturally occurring interaction therefore constitutes the methodology that conversation analysis employs to demonstrate how the interactants themselves analyze the talk-in-interaction. This study applies these analytic agenda and tools to online talk-in-interaction data that is collected following the procedures explained in the next section.

3.2. Data collection procedure

3.2.1. The task

The task that the participants are engaged in is actually an online keyword finding game, which I call web-orienteeering as a metaphorical extension to the sport orienteeering. Orienteers try to find a specific location based on a map, a compass, and some clues which makes it an adventurous game as much as a sport. The task at hand in the study bears some similarities to orienteeering in that the participants try to find a keyword based on some clues and through their collaborative work with their teammates. The task is located on a game screen which contains three visible resources as clues: (1) the title of the question, (2) the written clue, and (3) the visual clue (photo or video). When a participant finds the correct keyword, a green tick appears on his team’s box on the game screen. It is not until all of the participants find the answer that the team passes to the next question. Therefore, the knowing participants should start helping out their teammates to find the correct answer. There is only one rule of the game that is the knowing participants cannot tell the keyword to their teammates directly or imply it in any way to make it obvious for the other participants (e.g. spelling). Instead, they are supposed to add new clues. The participants are allowed to use any online

sources available both on working on the present clues and on adding new ones. The participants are expected to realize these activities on a video chat room that is described below.

3.2.2. *The medium*

The medium in which the participants interact with each other is a synchronous video chat service (Google Hangouts) which allows a room host to invite up to 10 people to a single chat room. The service also offers text chat that can be used complimentary to video chat. Among all the features, there is one that particularly makes it a proper medium for this study. Google Hangouts brings the current speaker of a particular moment of interaction to the front in full screen size. It is of great help for CA researchers because the software itself indicates who takes the turn. Moreover, it makes it quite easy to see the facial expressions of the current speaker, which could be relevant in the analysis. The interaction that is facilitated with the use of Google Hangouts as the medium of communication has been captured via a software, which is uncovered in the following subsection.

3.2.3. *The screen capture software*

The screen activities of the participants has been recorded via an online screen capture software called Screencast-o-Matic. The tool has been embedded in the game screen so that the participants can start it when they visit the gaming platform. The tool does not only record the video chat interaction but it also records all the screen activities that the participants undertake while they are engaged in the task and interaction. The participants have recorded their own screens. Therefore, they have also had an opportunity to stop recording anytime they are uncomfortable. The participants have transferred the recordings after they finished the task. All in all, the tool has both managed to record the online interaction environment with the rich multimodal interactional details and also ensured the privacy of the participants.

3.3. *Participants*

The data has been collected from undergraduate students in an English Language Teaching department in Turkey. The participants are voluntary members of a conversation club based in the department. The age of participants vary from 18 to 24. Their English language proficiency levels vary as well. There are seven participants in the study who have responded to a call for research participation. They have been gathered in a meeting prior to the data collection. They have been informed about the task, medium, and screen capture processes. The participants have agreed to participate after they read and signed the consent forms which assured them that the data would not be shared with the third parties other than research purposes. Then, a guidelines document has been distributed to guide them through the process. The seven participants have been divided into two teams (i.e. four vs. three). The recordings were 180-minutes long. However, the first 90 minutes was the preparation for the game (i.e. meeting on Hangouts, starting the game, etc.). Therefore, a 90-minute long online task-oriented interaction of three participants of the second team is analyzed in the next section.

4. **Data analysis**

In the extract, the interaction starts after Umr and Ser has found the correct answer and established themselves as more knowledgeable interactants (Heritage, 2012a) with regards to the task. In alignment with the task regulations uncovered above, the knowing interactants are not allowed to tell the answer to the not-yet-knowing teammates directly, but can produce new clues, share them with the unknowing participants (hence hinting), and finally elicit the correct answer. The extract is relatively long. Therefore, I will present the data and the analysis in small fragments.

Extract 1. Oslo - #1

1	Umr:	Mel
2		(1.2)
3	Mel:	NO:: (1.6) i-
4		(1.8)
5		can you err: say me again <u>what</u> ↑can i do:
6		(1.1)
7	Ser:	Mel err: you can use web browsers. you can use googles.
8		you can use youtube dat com-

In line 1, Umr uses an address term to reestablish mutual orientation. After a 1.2 silence, Mel takes Umr's address term as an inquiry for her current epistemic status. Thus, she utters a loud *no* response (line 3) to state that she has not

found the answer. Mel's *no* response is a blocking response (Schegloff, 2007) to Umr's yes-preferring address term to establish mutual orientation. Therefore, Umr's attempt possibly to initiate a giving-a-hint action is blocked. Mel aborts an I-prefaced utterance (line 3) and self-repairs to request for information through formulating a question (line 5). This information request officially positions Mel in the unknowing (K-) status (Heritage, 2012a, b). Umr and Ser are already in the K+ position in the epistemic gradient (Heritage, 2012a, b), thus have epistemic rights to provide new clues to Mel. Possibly because Umr's attempt to establish mutual orientation has been blocked, now Ser selects himself as the next speaker and provides an answer by offering alternative epistemic resources (line 7-8) to clear the ground for the upcoming hinting action. This question-answer adjacency pair shows that mutual orientation has been successfully established (Jenks & Brandt, 2013) between two participants (i.e. Ser and Mel).

Extract 1. Oslo - #2

9 Mel: ye:s (1.6) [now]
 10 Ser: [if] you- if you click on the video
 11 Mel: ye:s. yes now i'm harlem shake
 12 Ser: [yes]
 13 Umr: [yes] [harlem]=
 14 Ser: [harlem]=
 15 Umr: =shake but which harlem shake
 16 (0.8)
 17 Ser: harlem shake [original (1.3) army
 18 Mel: [original (1.3) original army edition

Mel responds with a yes-receipt in line 9. The 1.6 silence after the *yes* response signals the end of the TCU, thus Ser claims the floor. He manages to take the floor following a one-word overlap, and then gives his first hint in line 10. He successfully elicits a candidate answer (*harlem shake*) in line 11. The hinting sequence in lines 10 (*if you click on the video*) and 11 (*now i'm harlem shake*) also shows that the question-answer adjacency pair in lines 5 and 7-8 is a pre-sequence which lays the ground for the interactional project (Schegloff, 2007) of giving-a-hint in the following sequences. Therefore, the establishment of mutual orientation is actually an interactional attempt to initiate and facilitate the underlying project of the ongoing action.

Both of the participants in K+ position confirm the successfully elicited candidate answer with two consecutive overlaps between the lines 12-14. The overlaps show a contest (Jakonen & Morton, 2015; Heritage, 2013a) between the two K+ participants for the claim of epistemic rights to continue doing hinting with a higher epistemic authority, therefore proving to be a more reliable epistemic source. They expand the hinting sequence with the imminent inclusion of an upgrade to the previous hint in a way similar to what Schegloff refers to as enhancement (2007:162). In line 15 Umr manages to take the floor and expands the hinting with an elaboration question to elicit another candidate answer. After 0.8 silence in line 16, Ser claims his epistemic rights back and continues doing hinting (line 17). In contrast with Umr's choice to elicit an answer with a question, Ser directly shares the clue (which is actually apparent on the game screen) with Mel. Mel's response overlaps with and echoes Ser's, which can indicate an uptake of the hint. Because Ser is in K+ position and Mel is in K-, producing the same utterance is actually a preferred answer in this particular sequence.

Extract 1. Oslo - #3

17 Ser: harlem shake [original (1.3) army
 18 Mel: [original (1.3) original army edition
 19 Umr: YEAP=
 20 Ser: =yeah click- ↑click on it ↑click that link
 21 (2.6)
 22 Mel: uh huh
 23 (4.2)
 24 Ser: if you click-
 25 Mel: YES
 26 Ser: er::
 27 Mel: i see [it
 28 Ser: [ok.

Both K+ interactants confirm Mel's response (line 18) in lines 19 and 20. Ser also produces the same hint (line 20) he produced back in line 10 again. He refers to the *video* as a *link* unlike the previous hinting. The reproduction of the same hint also shows that Mel's first candidate answer in line 11 has not been accepted and requires enhancement. After a 2.6 silence, Mel acknowledges the information conveyed for the second time with the compliance token *uh*

huh (line 22). However, Ser takes Mel's (4.2) silence as a trouble source and reformulates the hint given in lines 10 and 20 once again but with a conditional sentence this time. Mel interrupts Ser with a cut-off and then a loud *yes* in line 25. Her epistemic claim *I see it* in line 27 shows that her expression in line 25 is an announcement of her accomplishment of the task. However, what she finds is not the correct, but a candidate answer (i.e. *norwegian*). As a result, she fails to accomplish the task in this particular moment of interaction.

Extract 1. Oslo - #4

29 Umr: >yes er: [yeah>
 30 Mel: [nor↑wegian
 31 Umr: could you be able to find the country
 32 (0.9)
 33 Mel: norwegian
 34 (1.5)
 35 Ser: the- we need the capital name of
 36 Umr: yeah
 37 Ser: [i mean
 38 Umr: [capital
 39 Ser: capital- what is the [capital
 40 Umr: [↑capital city
 41 Ser: of norway
 42 Mel: capital city of norwegian (0.3) yeah
 43 Umr: yeap
 44 (1.1)
 45 Ser: norwegian- (.)not norwegian (0.4) norway
 46 (1.7)
 47 Mel: norwegian (.)°capital city o::f°
 48 Ser: (she said) \$norwegian\$
 49 (3.9)
 50 Mel: ↑ye:::ah
 51 (3.2)
 52 oslo

Mel's candidate answer in line 30 overlaps with Umr's *yeah* and engenders a trouble in hearing. Thus, Umr asks for clarification with a question (line 31) that is clearly a repairable. Mel does not attend to the repairable and responds the question with her candidate answer (line 33). In line 35, the sequence is expanded again for the same reason with the expansion in line 15: an enhancement (Schegloff, 2007) to the hint and also a confirmation for Mel's candidate answer. Ser gives a new hint in line 35. Then Umr confirms it in line 36. Umr's confirmation initiates another contest between the two K+ participants. In the five following lines (37-41), they get involved in a collaborative hinting project in the form and as part of a collaborative repair sequence that starts in line 35 and ends in line 45 to draw Mel's attention for an upgraded hint to her candidate answer in line 33. Mel repeats the upgraded hint and ends the turn with a confirmation token *yeah* (line 42). In line 42, it is also revealed that Mel assumes *norwegian* is the name of the country that she is guided to find out. Therefore, another trouble source, yet related to the word choice this time, occurs. Umr ignores the repairable and confirms her confirmation in line 43. However, Ser initiates an other-repair and corrects the trouble source explicitly. Mel does not take the correction up and repeats (line 47) her earlier troubled statement in line 42. Her non-uptake of the repair and repetition of repairable utterance once again shows that she is ready to claim her epistemic independence as Heritage (2013a) suggests that repeats can function to do such an action. This signals that she is cognizant of that she is really close to find the correct answer. The non-uptake and repetition also indicate that she is ready to be positioned in K+. This finding is also evident when Ser's mocking statement in line 48 receives no response from Mel. Finally, in line 50, she announces that she has found the correct answer with rising intonation and a stretched *yeah* as an expression of her change of epistemic state (Heritage, 1984). Then, she shares the correct answer *oslo* with her teammates while the game screen takes the team to the next question. It is the end of this part of the task and the extract that has been undertaken in the study. The last section of the paper will first present a discussion based on these conversation analytic findings, then the paper will be concluded.

5. Discussion and conclusion

The analysis revealed a recurring sequential pattern occurring around the hinting action. The recurring pattern first starts with establishing mutual orientation. The task requires the interactants to multitask in that they should look up online sources, check out the clues on the game screen, and discuss with their teammates on Google Hangouts. The multitasking that the game demands and the lack of psychical co-presence due to the online medium can result in loss

of mutual orientation (Jenks & Brandt, 2013; Jenks, 2014). The interactants, therefore, reestablish mutual orientation repeatedly. In Extract 1, the first segment (#1) is where the interactants establish mutual orientation. Then, K+ participants start doing giving a hint to take their teammate to K+ position. If they manage to elicit a candidate answer, they confirm it. Right after a candidate answer is responded with a confirmation, it makes an expansion (i.e. enhancement) relevant. It is in all cases a non-minimal post-expansion that is referred to as enhancement in this study based on Schegloff (2007) who mentions the term but does not provide much detail. I prefer to call the post-expansions in the analysis as enhancements because they serve as upgrades to previous hints, thus enhancement to previous turns. The segments after the first (#2, #3, and #4) all contain a sequential organization around a recurring pattern (Table 1).

Table 1. The pattern

	#2	#3	#4
	Line(s)	Line(s)	Line(s)
Candidate answer	11	18	33
Confirmation	12-14	19-20	35-36
Enhancement	13-17	20	35-44
	harlem shake	original army edition	norwegian

Each occurrence (candidate answer + confirmation + enhancement) of the pattern shows a checkpoint that the K- interactant passes. The points are also where the change of state occurs in an alternative way to *oh*-prefacing (Heritage, 1984). Consecutive sequences are chained to enable the transition from K- to K+ in a similar way to what Jakonen and Morton (2015) refers to as accumulation of knowledge. The chaining is a process that progresses with an incremental stepwise move. The pattern emerging from the data recurs quite similarly to what Gardner (2007) terms as epistemic progression. Each segment (#2, #3, and #4) is a step in the epistemic progression from K- to K+. Epistemic progression occurring in the recurring pattern is the main finding of the analysis, which can contribute to conversation analytic epistemics research in that it brings new insights into what Heritage (2012a, 2013a) and Jakonen and Morton (2015) assert. Heritage notes that K- answers invites elaboration while K+ answers invites confirmation and sequence closure. The analysis of the extract has showed that it is not K- answers that invite elaboration (i.e. enhancement) but K+ answers.

In terms of the tasks that require stepwise progression such as the one adopted in this study, a knowing answer is just like the checkpoints in a racing video game. It informs you that you have completed a level and you are ready to move on to the next point. Although there is a single correct answer on target, there are a great variety of paths that may lead to the answer. Each hint functions as possible paths and helps the unknowing teammates produce a candidate answer that will eventually take the K- interactant to K+ position. It also refers to that a candidate answer can be a correct answer within its micro-moment of interaction (i.e. indexicality) even if it is not the final answer yet. To this end, the present study adds to epistemics literature in that it brings evidence to a phenomenon which refers to that a K+ answer can invite elaboration as well as a K- answer unlike what Heritage (2012a, 2013a) asserts. Furthermore, it is also K+ answers that lead to sequence expansion according to the analysis unlike what Jakonen and Morton (2015) notes. This study nevertheless aligns with Heritage's (2012a, 2013a) finding that K+ answer invites confirmation given that each candidate answer that is confirmed has led to sequence expansion. The next phenomenon has been found around repair sequences.

Non-uptake of the repair has been another phenomenon that occurs when a K- interactant comes close to change her state to K+. This finding can imply that resistance (i.e. non-uptake) to other repair is a strategy that K- interactants employ to signal their upcoming epistemic independence. As discussed above, change of state has been an integral part of this single case analysis. The literature on change of state relies almost completely on Heritage's (1984) ground breaking book chapter on *oh* as change of state token. In terms of learning with a conversation analytic view, Markee and Seo (2009) suggest that changes of state with *oh*-token could indicate an achievement of language learning behavior, thus a learning opportunity. A larger corpus can bring new insights into the relationship between epistemics and learning.

The analysis has showed that the combination of technology and language education is realized in alignment with Gonzalez-Lloret and Ortega's (2014) five features. First, the focus has been primarily on meaning considering that there were not any work-plans or language-learning goals set in advance. Second, goal orientation has also been

observed since the participants needed to interact with each other (i.e. communicative purpose) to accomplish the task as an outcome. Third, learner-centeredness has not really been a concern for the task design procedure because there were not any pre-planned pedagogical objectives. Moreover, the absence of the presence of a teacher as part of task-oriented interaction remarks the learner-centered aspect of the process. Fourth, holism has been provided because collaborative accomplishment of the task itself signals a relationship with real world since collaboration is an integral part of our daily lives. Finally, reflective learning has been enabled with the learner's efforts to close knowledge gaps with their own words. The web-orienting task has been aligned with all five features of Gonzalez-Lloret and Ortega (2014), which refers to an accomplishment of the combination of technology and language education.

Conversation analytic findings on the recurring pattern, change of state, and repair organization were the first points in the discussion, and the main implications of the study. Furthermore, the implications for TBLT in general and task design in particular have cleared the ground for further research. It is also possible to gain a broader view on the nature of being a team with further research. A final implication which is not based on this small corpus but quite promising for future research is the possibility that epistemic progression steps are indeed the steps for L2 learners to make meaning, understand and even learn while they are engaged in such multilayered tasks. Given that the micro-analytic research using CA has proved itself to provide evidence for such concepts, CA methodology promises to bring new insights into each topic discussed in this paper as well as many others.

References

- Breen, M. (1989). The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 187–206). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chapelle, C. (2001). *Computer applications in second language acquisition: Foundations for teaching, testing, and research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chapelle, C. (2003). *English language learning and technology: Lectures on applied linguistics in the age of information and communication technology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), pp. 285-300.
- Gardner, R. (2007). The Right connections: Acknowledging epistemic progression in talk. *Language in Society*, 36(3). 319-341.
- Gonzalez-Lloret, M. & Ortega, L. (2014). Towards technology-mediated TBLT: An introduction. M. Gonzalez-Lloret & L. Ortega (eds.). *Technology-mediated TBLT: Researching technology and tasks* (pp. 1-22). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Heritage & J. M. Atkinson (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (2012a). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1). 1-29.
- Heritage, J. (2012b). Epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1). 30-52.
- Heritage, J. (2013a). Epistemics in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (eds.) *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 370-394). West Sussex: Blackwell.
- Heritage, J. (2013b). Action formation and its epistemic (and other) backgrounds. *Discourse Studies*, 15(5). 551-578.
- Jakonen, T. & Morton, T. (2015). Epistemic search sequences in peer interaction in a content-based language classroom. *Applied Linguistics* 36(1). 73-94.
- Jenks, C. J. (2014). *Social interaction in second language chat rooms*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jenks, C. J. & Brandt, A. (2013). Managing mutual orientation in the absence of physical copresence: Multiparty voice-based chat room interaction. *Discourse Processes* 50(4). 227-248.
- Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: inside the skull or in public view? *IRAL* 47. 11-36.
- Markee, N. & Seo, M. (2009). Learning talk analysis. *IRAL* 47. 37-63.
- Negretti, R. (1999). Web-based activities and SLA: A conversation analysis research approach. *Language Learning & Technology* 3(1). 75-87.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2013). Social-interactional approaches to SLA: A state of the art and some future perspectives. *Language, Interaction, and Acquisition* 4(2). 134-160.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (2005a). Task as research construct. *Language Learning* 55(3). 533-570.
- Seedhouse, P. (2005b). Conversation Analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching* 38(4), 165-187.
- Sert, O. (2011). *A micro-analytic investigation of claims of insufficient knowledge in EAL classrooms*. PhD dissertation, Newcastle University, UK.
- Sert, O. (2013). 'Epistemic status check' as an interactional phenomenon in instructed learning settings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 45(1). 13-28.
- Sert, O. & Seedhouse, P. (2011). Introduction: Conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)* 5(1). 1-14.

- Sert, O. & Walsh, S. (2013). The interactional management of claims of insufficient knowledge in English language classrooms. *Language and Education*, 27(6). 542-565.
- Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Sert, O., & Jacknick, C. M. (2015). Student smiles and the negotiation of epistemics in L2 classrooms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 77. 97-112.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (2013). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. West Sussex: Blackwell.