

# ‘Now we are teachers’: The role of small talk in student language teachers’ telecollaborative task development



Melinda Dooly<sup>a,\*</sup>, Vincenza Tudini<sup>b,1</sup>

<sup>a</sup> GREIP: Grup de Recerca en Ensenyament i Interacció Plurilingües (Research Centre in Teaching and Plurilingual Interaction), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, G5-107 Ciències de l'Educació, Cerdanyola del Vallès, 08193 Barcelona, Spain

<sup>b</sup> Research Centre for Languages and Cultures, School of Communication, International Studies and Languages, University of South Australia, Magill Campus, Magill 5072, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia

Received 31 December 2015; received in revised form 31 May 2016; accepted 16 June 2016

Available online 16 July 2016

## Abstract

While a number of investigations of online language learning behaviours are available, there are currently few ‘micro’ analytic studies that explore the role of different types of small talk to complete institutional tasks online. This study focuses in particular on an institutionally-initiated, out-of-class telecollaborative Skype video exchange between two student teachers based in the US and Spain (studying to become Spanish as Foreign Language and English as Foreign Language teachers, respectively). Building upon Hudak and Maynard's (2011) proposal of four varieties of small talk (topicalized, co-topical, minimal and brief), this study looks at the way in which these student-teachers deploy different varieties of small talk in order to advance towards a mutual, task-oriented goal during Skype sessions held over two days. The study highlights the important role of co-topical talk, which is at the same time pro-social and work-related, in preparing the ground for seemingly ‘off-topic’ topicalized small talk and the achievement of institutional teaching and learning objectives in a hybrid social-institutional setting. It also provides evidence that topicalized small talk may promote creativity and epistemic change, leading to advancement of new ideas for elaboration during work-related talk, and implementation in a real life professional setting.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Small talk; Telecollaboration; Conversation analysis; Social interaction; Institutional interaction; Online interaction

## 1. Introduction

There is evidence that telecollaboration provides foreign language students with opportunities for target language use and intercultural exchange, which is likely to promote learning (Thomas et al., 2013). Online interaction between L1 and L2 speakers of foreign languages, using a range of technological tools, including dyadic and multiparty text, voice and video chat, is a core element of telecollaboration projects. Therefore researchers have begun to explore these interactions from a conversation analytic perspective, in a variety of technological–interactional settings to provide insights on how users

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +34 93 581 3252.

E-mail addresses: [melindaann.dooly@uab.cat](mailto:melindaann.dooly@uab.cat), [melinda.dooly@gmail.com](mailto:melinda.dooly@gmail.com) (M. Dooly), [enza.tudini@unisa.edu.au](mailto:enza.tudini@unisa.edu.au) (V. Tudini).

<sup>1</sup> Tel.: +61 8 83024592; fax: +61 8 83024396.

achieve understanding, affiliation and learning, despite constraints of the medium (cf. Antoniadou, 2011; Dooly, 2011; Dooly and Sadler, 2013; González-Lloret, 2011; Tudini, 2010).

Although a number of investigations of online language learning behaviours are available, there are currently, to the authors' knowledge, few 'micro' analytic studies that account for the importance of different types of small talk to complete institutional tasks online in a telecollaborative setting, in particular in educational contexts. This article aims to take a step in that direction. Following from Hudak and Maynard's (2011) proposal of four varieties of small talk (topicalized, co-topical, minimal and brief), this study aims to explore the transferability of these categories to an online environment by looking at the way in which two student–teachers deploy different varieties of small talk during a telecollaborative exchange in order to advance towards a mutual, task-oriented goal. Specifically, the student–teachers are engaged in a teletandem exchange that allows them to practice their target language (the language they will be teaching) with an L1 speaker of that language; in this case Spanish and English, however, they are expert speakers of both languages. As the selected excerpts deal principally with moments when the participants were using English it could be argued that the exchange is located within an English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) paradigm. For instance, in a business ELF context, Pullin (2010) found that “small talk functions in a number of ways in building, maintaining, and reinforcing rapport and solidarity” (p. 468). The comparison of ELF in education contexts is worth pursuing in a separate study, but is not within the scope of this text.

As will be seen in the analysis, participants use different types of co-topical small talk at the initial phases of the exchange to overcome technological difficulties, become acquainted and find common ground. However the co-topical small talk gradually transitions into (institutionally) goal-oriented talk as participants align more towards their mutual identities as teachers.

Adapting slightly Barab and Duffy's concept of 'activity group' (2000) to the notion of 'activity pair', the authors look at the dyad in this study as “a temporary coming together of people around a particular task” (Barab et al., 2001, p. 49). Within this concept of activity pair, the term activity is not “a disembodied action”; the pair is engaged in contextualized behaviour that aims to transform something (text, artefacts) into an object (e.g. presentation, lesson plans). Commonly these activities are done in-class and, at least for the teacher, there is an implicit understanding that the group members (or pairs) will negotiate how to best achieve the set goals or expectations (usually established by the teacher prior to beginning the group negotiation). Nonetheless, as it has been shown elsewhere, in online tasks, there is frequently a divergence between the teacher's 'task-as-workplan' and the way in which learners may “integrate [activities aimed for content knowledge] into their own learning process” which is often “in a different sequence than anticipated in the task-as-workplan” (Dooly, 2011, p. 83).

Arguably, this is even more so in circumstances such as the one in this study in which the two student–teachers negotiate, collaborate and take ownership of a very loosely constructed activity assignment conducted outside of the classroom and with minimal vigilance from the teachers. In the context under examination, submission of recordings following the sessions and evaluation of final output stemming from the exchange were in fact the only teacher 'control' strategies.

Although the focus is on student–teachers of foreign languages, it is important to highlight that the study looks at interaction that takes place outside of the regular classroom, which arguably adds a dimension of complexity to the interaction. Still, the fact that the student–teachers are completing an activity assigned to them suggests that institutional orientations and professional identities are likely to play a role in participants' deployment of interactional resources to achieve the externally and institutionally imposed goal of task development, as an assessed activity (both in and outside of the classroom). In this sense, our understanding of the participants' orientation during the online interaction is as principally aimed towards a learning-oriented goal. Admittedly, the out-of-class online environment, which involves video interaction via Skype, suggests that a social dimension is also likely to emerge, though this requires more precise investigation than can be done here.

While Heritage (2004) provides criteria for identification of institutional talk, he also points out the complexities of distinguishing institutional from 'ordinary' talk, which may emerge in any setting, institutional or not, with participants using the same interactional resources. Drew and Heritage (1992) also underscore that making distinctions between ordinary and institutional talk is difficult: “there is not necessarily a hard and fast distinction to be made between the two in all instances of interactional events, nor even at all points in a single interactional event” (p. 21). This study however maintains that a focus on small talk may shed some light on this complex phenomenon.

## 2. The role of small talk

As Mirivel and Tracy (2005) point out, researchers interested in 'institutional talk' have begun to recognize the importance of 'small talk' for “building relationships in which institutional interactants feel comfortable and are able to work well together”. In their study on small talk between medical doctors and patients, Hudak and Maynard (2011) state that

“small talk is a category for varieties of conversational interaction occurring in many settings”, noting that research “has relied heavily on commonsense notions of small talk as social conversation or chitchat, superfluous to the institutional, ‘on-task’ work” (p. 635). Of course the authors are referring specifically to clinical settings, however we feel that their observations can be applied to other institutional settings such as learning environments. [Hudak and Maynard \(2011\)](#) suggest that a simple delineation between on and off-task is not clear given that “what is typically characterized as off-task” (p. 635) (or “small talk”, including but not limited to greetings and personal discussion) often forms part of the exchange that makes up ‘on-task’ sequential talk. These authors argue that traditional assumptions that small talk is peripheral, trivial and unimportant needs to be problematized. Similarly, [Holmes \(2000\)](#) suggests that small talk is an essential instrumental tool for facilitating ‘work talk’.

[Hudak and Maynard \(2011\)](#) propose an “analytically-informed approach to delineating a subgenre of small talk called topicalised small talk (TST)” (p. 635) within institutional talk, based on conversation analysis. These authors define sequences of TST “as those involving a topic shift or change” which are treated by the participants “as a new line of talk that is referentially independent from their institutional identities” (2011, p. 638). Based on their data analysis, the authors distinguished TST from “brief small talk” which occurs when the “topic proffer is met with no uptake” (p. 644). TST is also distinguished from “minimal small talk” that occurs “when a proffer is done across more than one turn but meets with minimal response” with little or “no subsequent collaborative engagement in the topic” (p. 644).

Finally, the authors distinguish TST from “co-topical talk” which is co-constructed between interlocutors as both work relevant and prosocial. The authors argue that different types of small talk are important for subsequent “work-related discourse” because it helps “constitute social relationships that can facilitate instrumental tasks” (p. 650). The willingness to mutually engage in small talk (topical or co-topical) that is neither minimal small talk or only work-oriented implies that the participants are orienting towards the ‘personal’, creating an environment where intimate information can be shared that may help build a social relationship or to “communicate co- membership” that consists of “shared category experience, knowledge, or affiliations (. . .) common interests, acquaintances, activities” (p. 650). Or, as [Hudak and Maynard \(2011\)](#) put it, the participants use small talk to “co-produce the visibility of the ‘ways in which we are alike’” (p. 651).

Along these lines, this study explores the different ways in which two student language teachers use ‘small talk’ to facilitate and negotiate the ‘business at hand’, that is, task development for classroom implementation, within a social technological–interactional setting ([Tudini, 2014](#)). It also considers how small talk is deployed to communicate co-membership both as student teachers of languages (institutional identities) and individuals to advance the task.

### 3. Context of data compilation

This investigation is based on 86 min of voice interaction during two Skype online sessions between Alejandra and Eleanor (names have been changed to protect the identity of the students) held on two different days. While the interactions were in fact video interactions, the software only permitted recording of audio (mp3 format). Participants in fact orient to the video-mediated interaction in their talk, as can be seen in Excerpt 2 below where they discuss their respective visible physical spaces, including furniture. Skype software did not permit recording of text chat interactions either, though there is no evidence from the voice interaction that text chat was used. Participants used email to set up the Skype conversations, and based on the opening sequences of each day’s recordings, were recorded from the beginning of each day’s session (see Excerpt 1 below for the opening sequence on day 1).

The students were studying to become foreign language teachers in their respective universities, one in Barcelona, Spain and the other in Athens, Georgia (USA). In both cases, the telecollaborative exchange was considered an integral part of the course requirements (the exchange was not an add-on or voluntary part of the course).

The Spanish student was in her final year of a 3-year degree to become a Primary Education Teacher, specializing in TEFL; the student from USA was enrolled in a Graduate Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), specializing in Spanish. Her methodology course was also closely linked to her FL teaching internship (*Classroom Methodology and Practice*).

Alejandra is a multilingual speaker of Catalan and Castilian Spanish (she is L1 speaker of both and has studied English as a foreign language). Eleanor is an L1 speaker of English and speaks Spanish as a foreign language (having studied Spanish in the US and studied abroad for one semester in Spain).

Both students were required to design a teaching sequence (duration of 5–8 class sessions) that included a complete design of each lesson plan, teacher instructions for implementation and evaluation strategies (continuous assessment for the activities during the sessions and final evaluation of the whole sequence). The ‘learning-oriented goals’ of the exchange (according to formal instructions by the two university teachers of the course) were to provide

constructive criticism, ideas and feedback to their partner on their teaching sequence design during different phases of its development (initial ideas and outline of possible activities; more fully developed and cohesive design; final version).

The period of telecollaborative exchange in this study was in the first phase, that is, facilitating initial ideas and outline of possible activities. Participants were also asked to contribute to each other's material development through some sort of language production (e.g. record a video giving a description of the local market in the target language of the partner's class). The format and content of the input for the materials were negotiated between the pairs and in accordance with the evolution of the teaching sequence.

#### 4. Data management

Before beginning the exchange, the students were asked their permission to use their recorded data and products stemming from the exchange for research and future teaching materials. The Alejandra–Eleanor pair was chosen for analysis because the recordings were the most complete and intelligible for transcription purposes. After setting up appointments for the Skype interaction via email, the students themselves recorded the data during their online meetings and then decided which data they were willing to submit (they could erase any data they wanted). Software limitations at the time of recording permitted only 15 min to be recorded at one time, hence there were a total of three consecutive 15 min sessions on Day 1, and two 15 min and one consecutive 11 min session on Day 2 of the telecollaborative exchange. While only audio interaction is available for analysis, participants had visual access to their respective partners as presented on screen via the Skype software window, and as confirmed by participant orientations to their respective physical spaces (see Excerpt 2 below).

The students submitted the data they chose to the researchers in audio files through a cloud-sharing folder. All raw data were anonymized before beginning the analysis.

The recordings from both days were transcribed prior to the selection of extracts presented here using the ELAN transcribing tool developed by the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (available for free at <https://tla.mpi.nl/tools/tla-tools/elan/>).

#### 5. Methodology

Building upon [Hudak and Maynard's \(2011\)](#) categorizations of small talk, this study applies Conversation Analysis (CA) to our data to explore whether the categories transfer to a different institutional context, thus expanding the current collection of cases to accommodate online communication, with consideration of associated constraints of the medium of communication. Specifically, the study investigates whether and how the online participants invoke institutional identities, given the goal-oriented interaction, and how the interaction is shaped by their orientation to an institution to achieve this goal. [Angelillo et al. \(2009\)](#) describe their ethnographic process of devising a coding scheme based on what can be seen in CA collections which can then be applied across other cases. Similarly, we follow [Hudak and Maynard's \(2011\)](#) distinctions in order to consider examples of topicalized small talk (TST), co-topical small talk, and brief or minimal small talk, as these are deployed most frequently by participants, and how these are used for relationship building that supports task discussion and development. In the case of TST, the new 'personal' line of talk is referentially independent from their institutional identities, and shows participants' displayed willingness to continue beyond two to six turns, which is otherwise categorized as minimal small talk. Brief small talk is identifiable where there is no uptake of the topic proffer by the interlocutor. Co-topical talk is co-constructed as *both* work relevant and prosocial. The key for the transcripts is included in the [Appendix A](#) (adapted from [Jefferson, 2004](#)).

#### 6. Analysis

##### 6.1. Co-topical small talk: managing the medium

In the dyadic video-interaction under examination, participants' turn-taking is not constrained in the way that generally occurs in institutional contexts (cf. [Heritage, 2004](#)), and resembles ordinary dyadic conversation (cf. [Kasper, 2004](#)), despite its institutional orientation. Specifically, turn types are not pre-allocated and turn-allocation is relatively free, locally managed by the two participants, unlike the asymmetrical turn allocation which is typically controlled by teachers in the classroom for the purpose of teaching ([McHoul, 1978](#)). Because both participants are student teachers their institutional relationship can be seen as symmetrical, and they are relatively free to manage and self-select speakership. Hence institutional turn-taking constraints do not influence the business of task discussion and

development. However, the conversation is technologically-mediated and this must be taken into account. The technology used for communication forms a “constituent part of these interactions” (Liddicoat, 2010, p. 68), as is evident in the openings, interruptions, and closings which need to be both technologically and interactionally accomplished due to constraints of the medium. This is evident in the opening sequence of the student teacher exchange (Excerpt 1), where participants orient to technical issues and use repair as an interactional resource to achieve coherence and understanding between them.

Excerpt 1 *Opening sequence (Day 1)*

1. Alejandra: hi ((laughter)) (1.1) Hello yeah I hear you ((laughter))
2. Eleanor: He:::y
3. Alejandra: FINALLY\ (yeah (laughter))
4. Eleanor: ((inaudible))
5. Alejandra: i'm sorry\ (0.5) what?
6. Eleanor: i said it works
7. Alejandra: yeah: it works
8. Eleanor: kinda .hhh ((giggles))
9. Alejandra: it it works so so but it works\ he he (0.6) ((tap)) ok (0.5)

In Excerpt 1 we can see that the two participants are engaged in dealing with external, technological factors (lack of audibility) that have interposed in the ‘normal’ sequencing of conversation (turns 1–9). During this exchange concerning technological difficulties, the interlocutors engage in what we consider to be a form of co-topical small talk, including mutual laughter (turns 1, 3 and 8), which reinforces verbally expressed relief at achieving communication in the same lines. Technology in fact becomes a regular topic in the participants’ talk, given its occasional unreliability and recording time limits, and the need to open and maintain a communication channel for relationship building and achievement of institutional goals over six sessions (five 15 min and one 11 min).

## 6.2. Attempting Topicalized Small Topic (TST) prior to work talk

Once communication is established in the first session on day 1, in turn 10 we can see that Alejandra makes a topic bid (“is it your house?”) which is related to their visible physical surroundings on screen, hence “referentially independent” from their institutional identities (student–teachers) and an attempt at TST.

Excerpt 2 *Personal topic proffer*

10. Alejandra: is it your house? (0.8)
11. Eleanor: ok ((as if eating)) yeah: this my apartment uhm hm/
12. Alejandra: nice(hhh) this is my sofa\
13. Eleanor: ((laughter))
14. Alejandra: ((laughter)) (0.9) well (.) uhm: (0.3) have you read my: (0.8) teaching/sequence? (0.8) [XX]
15. Eleanor: [XX] (0.6)
16. Alejandra: [that] i sent?
17. Eleanor: [yeah] (0.4) i read what you sent (0.9) XX
18. Alejandra: and:: XX [what ha-]
19. Eleanor: [XX] do you have a recorder going?
20. Alejandra: (0.7) sorry? (0.5)
21. Eleanor: the video recorder? they told us=
22. Alejandra: =yeah i'm recording but just the: the: au:  
the audio
23. Eleanor: oh that's fine i'm sure that's [fine]
24. Alejandra: [yeah] yeah (0.7) if you need it i: i will send it  
to you right?
25. Eleanor: uh huh that'd be (0.2) yeah [that'd] be good
26. Alejandra: [XX]
27. Alejandra: ok so uhm:: wh- where sho(hh)uld we start? uhm:: talking about a uhm  
your/ sequence or mine?



Eleanor hesitates in collaborating to extend Alejandra's proposed line of talk, as there is a long pause both immediately after the question (0.8), prior to her reply in turn 11, and again after Alejandra's comment on her sofa (0.9) following their shared laughter in turns 13 and 14. Hence Alejandra's topic proffer does not go beyond two turns; the first of which consists of Eleanor's brief affirmative response to her question (turn 11) followed by Alejandra's second attempt to generate talk related to a topic independent from the institutional identity (turn 12). Upon Eleanor's lack of uptake of the 'personal' topic, apart from laughter tokens (turn 13), Alejandra deploys hesitation tokens to initiate and transition the talk back to the task-in-process in turn 14: "well (.) uhm: (0.3) have you read my: (0.8) teaching/sequence?" This combination of hesitation tokens "well" and "uhm" combined with three silences, both inter-turn (0.9) and intra-turn (0.3 and 0.8), suggest that a dispreferred utterance is being articulated (Liddicoat, 2011, p.148). "Well" may also mark topic change as a disjunctive that "work[s]" to disengage the forthcoming turn from being tied or connected to, or coherent with, its prior turn (Drew and Holt, 1998, p. 510).

The conversational work associated with the apparently dispreferred disjunctive question may be related to the fact that it is a move away from the interpersonal to a form of request for feedback. Alejandra seeks confirmation that Eleanor has completed the required preparatory pre-meeting work of reading her teaching sequence, indicating that she is aware that the conversation had moved away from the goal of the activity. It also shows how the participants orient to the overall institutional nature of the interaction (as a classroom activity) from the very beginning.

Additionally, this turn signals Alejandra's initiation of an institutional role in a social environment with an unacquainted interlocutor. This utterance also resembles "meeting preparatory talk" (Mirivel and Tracy, 2005, p. 14), described as 'talk that attends to the upcoming meeting' (Mirivel and Tracy, 2005, p.16). This arguably puts Alejandra in the self-appointed institutional role of 'meeting chair' (or at least the one in charge at the moment) to move the task development 'agenda' forward. As Mirivel and Tracy (2005) point out, "a spate of talk sets in motion implications about work roles (..) or the personality, character, and attitudinal attributes taken as going with a particular individual or group" (p. 20).

The conversation overlaps considerably, due to continuing audibility problems (turns 19–22) but the two speakers are quickly able to understand that they both have the necessary artefacts (Alejandra's teaching sequence draft) in order to continue with the original, global task (feedback and discussion of the teaching sequences to lead to general improvement of the drafts). In turn 14, Alejandra, continuing in her role as 'discussion leader', appears to orient the talk towards a 'normatively' required 'next action' "by a subsequent participant" (Heritage, 1997, p. 223) – that is Eleanor should provide Alejandra with feedback about her teaching sequence. However, Eleanor responds with the disjunctive comment "do you have a recorder going?". Arguably, this cannot be seen as small talk, rather it is 'work talk', oriented towards the larger assignment of providing evidence to the university teachers of having carried out the online activity. Turns 24–26 are mutually oriented towards this 'tangential-task', followed by Alejandra's return to the originally proffered topic of the teaching sequence in turn 27. Still, in this turn she is more negotiable towards the co-construction of the task because she offers Eleanor a choice on which teaching sequence they should look at first (different from her previous orientation of the conversation towards feedback on her own teaching sequence in turn 14).

In summary, while in this sequence Alejandra initiates an unsuccessful attempt at TST, which may be described as minimal small talk, she moves fairly early in the conversation to work talk at turn 14, which is eventually responded to but delayed by Eleanor's attending to technological–institutional requirements of the task (recording of their interaction). Alejandra then repairs and re-does her original initiation of work talk in turn 27 as a first pair part question, by asking Eleanor to choose which of their teaching sequences to work on. Hence, in this sequence, technological co-topical talk is combined with work talk, as well as an attempt at affiliative TST, to establish the relationship and conditions for completion of the business at hand.

### 6.3. Moving from work to co-topical talk

As the conversation continues, the institutional talk transitions into co-topical talk related to the teaching sequence and participants' respective timetables.

#### Excerpt 3 *Timetable differences*

28. Eleanor: we can start with yours\ (.) you sent me yours first and i guess what: uhm:  
you said you had changes to yours/

29. Alejandra: (1.3) °u° .hhh (1.3) NO ((laughter)) actually no ((laughing voice)) (0.7) i  
was presenting: (0.5) my: teaching sequence on: °well° (0.3) like two- like two  
weeks ago/ (0.5) [and:]

30. Eleanor: [uhm huh]  
 31. Alejandra: i have figbag- feedback uh: from my teacher/ (0.5)  
 32. Eleanor: right (0.3)  
 33. Alejandra: but::: (0.7) i cannot do any changes (0.5) because:\ i have to wait until november (0.6) to see: (1.2) their project\ (0.6) °ok?° (0.5) [i] have some ideas as as as you read/  
 34. Eleanor: [X] (0.6) uh huh  
 35. →Alejandra: but::: but well (0.5) and it's kinda frustrating ((laughter))  
 36. Eleanor: yeah:  
 37. Alejandra: because they not working at this\ they are uhm: rehearsing a: a play/ for the- yeah\ and they are spending their time on this/ and they don't have anything programmed (1.2) so\ i don't know/ (0.6) what my students are going to work on (0.5) on in november (1.9) you know\ so it's too general/ to program something in detail (0.7)  
 38. Eleanor: yeah: (0.5) [are] are you teaching/ (0.7) the same time that we are? i think we are teaching the 7th through 18th or something like that/  
 39. Alejandra: (1.7) i don't know\ i have uhm (.) the whole month: to go there (.) everyday  
 40. Eleanor: oh you have a month\ (.) we have two weeks\ (.) so we have a half month  
 41. Alejandra: (1.5) uh\ (.) and you have to teach/ like ten sessions?  
 42. Eleanor: yeah we have to teach ten  
 43. Alejandra: i have to teach uh just five  
 44. Eleanor: (0.6) oh: ok\

In turn 28, Eleanor gives a preferred response to Alejandra (they will start with Alejandra's teaching sequence since she sent it first) and then gives a topic bid to Alejandra to discuss the changes she has made since Alejandra first wrote and sent the draft to her. After a pause (1.3) this bid is met by Alejandra's disjunctive response (turn 29) consisting of a sound of exasperation “uf hhh” followed by Alejandra's dispreferred emphatic other repair response “NO” followed by a laughter token and a repeat of the repair, “actually no”. This repair is followed by an account of why she is not ready to move forward with her teaching sequence; her turn includes a series of disjointed sounds and laughter in attempt to “orient [her] co-participant to the presence of a trouble” (Jefferson, 1988, p.422). This ‘troubles talk’ also functions as a form of accounting for the dispreferred responses (cf. Jefferson, 1987). Eleanor's backchannelling displays that she is receptive (turn 30: [uhm huh]) so Alejandra elaborates on the co-topical talk through to turn 37, particularly at turn 35 (indicated with arrows), where she expresses her frustration at being unable to move forward with the next stage of her teaching sequence due to issues at her school. Eleanor appears to orient to this talk as a co-participant, as indicated by her ongoing acknowledgement tokens “uh huh” and “yeah” respectively in turns 34 and 36. However, after providing the feedback token ‘yeah’ in response to Alejandra's ‘trouble talk’, in turn 38 Eleanor transitions the talk to more general timetable-related concerns about the teaching session, which is relevant to the teaching sequence design (exact number of sessions and timing are important for planning).

Hence in Excerpt 2 the work-related talk is interrupted by Alejandra's troubles talk and other co-topical school-related small talk, which is both prosocial and work-oriented. This allows participants to clarify the agenda for their online meeting, share work-related problems and communicate co-membership as teachers, laying a foundation for task development. This excerpt displays how the co-topical small talk, while not directly related to the institutional goal (discussion and recommendations for the teaching sequences) is important in order for the student-teachers to understand each other's teaching contexts as well as establish social rapport (e.g. demonstrating empathy elicited by ‘troubles talk’).

#### 6.4. Co-topical small talk for membership affiliation

Alejandra and Eleanor continue to pursue affiliation and teacher co-membership in the initial moments of their first Skype session through two more episodes of co-topical small talk regarding interruptions to their teaching activities and

work-related commentary on their respective education systems and student age groups. (The turns illustrating a move to a new line of talk are indicated by arrows in Excerpt 4).

Excerpt 4

45. Alejandra: yeah (.) so it's easy for me/ but:
46. Eleanor: yeah
47. Alejandra: in theor(h)y
48. →Eleanor: (0.8) at least it's not december\ (0.5) i don't know about in spain\ (.) but i think here (.) in december: (0.5) schools do all sorts of things for uhm: (0.4) christmas/
49. Alejandra: (0.6) yeah (0.6) yeah
50. Eleanor: i would imagine teaching a unit in december would be very frustrating(h)
51. Alejandra: yeah ((short laughter)) (0.6) [it would be] christmas songs: and\ and this stuff\
52. Eleanor: [X crazy] yeah ((laughter))
53. Alejandra: but i've seen that that: your students are (.) grown up no/ (.) like [teens:]
54. →Eleanor: [yeah] (1.2) we have a lot different\ .hhh (.) the way we do foreign language here in/ the states that i live in/ (.) there's no: money/ to teach foreign language to: (0.6) basically uhm the age that you are teaching them to\ (0.4) so if the school has/ a program for that/ they have to\ (0.7) get the money themselves\ (.) like the parents have to pay for it (0.6) and it's not something that the government or the school: does that make sense? (1.3) it's kind of silly i think because: it'd probably be a lot better: if we taught them when they are younger (0./) so:
55. Alejandra: yeah (0.5)
56. Eleanor: yeah
57. Alejandra: well: (.) there's no money anywhere (.) so: ((laughter))
58. Eleanor: yeah
59. Alejandra: but: at least we have the public schools here
60. Eleanor: uh huh
61. →Alejandra: but welll (.) it's it's (0.5) DIFFERENT what you do and what i (.) have to do because i have to teach (.) CHILDren and we focus on games: and:
62. Eleanor: uhm huh
63. Alejandra: songs [and] things like (laughter)
64. Eleanor: [yeah] (1.3) i WANT to do some games and songs with them but\ (.) if you tell them things like\ i i love to sing\ and i really want to say you know (.) we're going to sing this song because it has: (1.5) these verbs we're working with (.) but they will: (0.7)
65. Alejandra: [yeah]
66. Eleanor: [no:]
67. Eleanor: they're like (.) i don't wanna sing ((slightly nasal tone; imitating whine)) (0.5) i'm like (.) °oh° ((disappointed))

In turn 47 Alejandra's elongation of 'in theory' possibly indicates her 'lead-up' into more troubles talk (Jefferson, 1988), however, in this excerpt Eleanor does not align to the troubles talk premonitory; instead she initiates an entirely new topic in turn 48 concerning typical school activities in December. In short she provides a bid to move into non personal co-topical small talk. This co-topical small talk is co-opted by Alejandra in turn 51 then mutually co-constructed between the two interactants over several turns. This is a co-topical small talk segment in that it is inferentially category-bound to the membership of 'teacher'. Interestingly, this co-topical small talk then segues into yet another co-topical small talk segment concerning the current state of foreign language teaching in each of their countries during which Eleanor takes a longer than usual turn to explain the "silly" policy towards foreign language teaching where she lives (turn 54). Again, mutually constructed co-topical small talk serves to achieve a social relationship, based on their shared membership as (future) teachers.



The previous co-topical small talk provides an opening for Alejandra to get more specific information about the students that Eleanor will be teaching (and thus better contextualize the teaching sequence she is critiquing). Excerpt 5 presents more work-related co-topical talk which transitions into clearly 'task-oriented' talk concerning Alejandra's teaching proposal that her students elaborate a tourist brochure in English for visitors to Barcelona.

#### Excerpt 5

68. Alejandra: (0.5) how old are they?  
 69. Eleanor: (0.8) they are: (.) fifteen (.) sixteen (.) seventeen (1.2) yeah  
 70. Alejandra: mixed ok  
 71. Eleanor: (1.4) they're a mix (.) yeah  
 72. Alejandra: [and how] many are they?  
 73. Eleanor: [XX] don't here (0.5) uhm:: ((smacks lips)) there are: (1.5) multiple cla-  
 there are a couple of classes\ there are four or five classes\ and each class (.) has  
 maybe (.) twenty to twenty-five  
 74. Alejandra: yeah like this like there (0.3) yeah too many  
 75. Eleanor: yeah (0.9) it's a lot of [X] (0.6) i still don't know all their names(h) (0.8)  
 76. Alejandra: ((giggles))  
 77. Eleanor: [i have] to learn all their [names] before i go there ((giggles))  
 78. →Alejandra: [yeah] [me neither] (0.6) yeah (.) it's crazy ((draws in breath)) but well\  
 (.) so my point is that i don't have 'bueno' ((trans. well)) (0.5) well\ (.) anything to  
 plan: (.) because: (0.9) i have to wait\ (.) and then i will spend: from this month/ uh i  
 will spend: like two weeks (.) just observing what they are doing: (.) and thinking  
 about my planning:  
 79. Eleanor: uh huhm  
 80. Alejandra: but because i don't know if by the time i get there/ (.) maybe they: they  
 will have to write something or maybe: they are in the section- well the: (0.5) process  
 of researching/ or: i don't know\ (.) and it's different  
 81. Eleanor: yeah  
 82. Alejandra: the stage of writing/ (.) the stage of: doing a research: on- it's different  
 83. Eleanor: do they do research\ you mean like for (.) in english? (0.5) they write in  
 english?  
 84. Alejandra: no: it's just a: they thing they could do in (.) in Barcelona\  
 85. Eleanor: oh\ ok ((giggles))  
 86. →Alejandra: they're going to split up groups (.) [and] then they're gonna: (.) each  
 group is going to work on one section (0.3) of the:: tourist guide  
 87. Eleanor: OK °hmmm°

Two questions by Alejandra (turns 68 and 72) promote further task development and work-related talk. Specifically, Eleanor provides an answer to Alejandra's question about her pupils' age at turn 69, with talk on this topic extending to turn 71. At turn 72, Alejandra asks another question related to the number of pupils in Eleanor's class. After Eleanor's response, at turn 74 Alejandra co-constructs another category-bound inferential concerning the overburdened teacher with too many students per class. This leads into another short segment of co-topical small talk about the necessary but difficult task of learning all the pupils' names (turns 75 and 77) which is rather abruptly ended by Alejandra in turn 80 wherein she leads the topic back to 'troubles talk' by picking back up on the theme that she cannot implement her planned teaching sequence because the school has changed the timing of activities without consulting her.

Excerpts 4 and 5 therefore provide evidence of co-topical talk where participants pursue co-membership as teachers, and which lays the groundwork for advancing the task, as indicated also when Alejandra momentarily returns to clearly goal-oriented business in Excerpt 5 (turn 86).

#### 6.5. Transition to 'task'-oriented talk

Continuing from Excerpt 5, Excerpt 6 continues Alejandra's line of 'task' oriented talk; this talk lasts for several minutes and contains very few episodes of small talk, with talk focused on Alejandra's students' tourist brochure.

## Excerpt 6

88. Alejandra: yeah (.) like RESTaurants and- this stuff\  
 89. Eleanor: and you said they're: i think you said they're like °six° (.) grade?  
 90. Alejandra: yeah (.) [that's twelve]  
 91. Eleanor: [XXX]  
 92. Alejandra: yeah  
 93. Eleanor: that's twelve? ok that's the thing here\ i think they'll like that\ i think that'll be fun\  
 94. Alejandra: yeah (.) but: my teacher and i/ [(.)] we thought that (.) it could be better if (.) uhm: (0.3) we do it those sections eh: following a different profiles (0.7) like: eh like instead of an adult tourist guide (.) that's adults and just that/  
 95. →Eleanor: uh-huh uh huh  
 96. Alejandra: maybe we could write: like: barcelona for skateboarders: barcelona for graffittis: or\ yeah:  
 97. Eleanor: ((laughter)) i like that a lot

In this extract the participants orient towards discussion of how to develop the tourist guide with Alejandra's students, including Alejandra's focus on specific content of the brochure ('restaurants and this stuff'), accompanied with exchange of relevant information for understanding and critiquing the teaching sequence (year level of the Barcelona students, turn 89; students' ages, turns 90–93). The opinion of Alejandra's mentor teacher is also discussed, which brings a third institutional identity into play in the interaction, corroborating the evidence that this is a goal-oriented institutional episode.

Goal-oriented talk is also evident in Excerpt 7, from the same first session, where there is no small talk at all. The goal-oriented talk starts with specific requirements of the task at the start of the sequence from turn 139.

## Excerpt 7

139. Alejandra: yeah (1.5) °oh well° (0.6) and:: i have to think about the assessment\ (0.7) because:: we've been studying how to assess with rubrics:/ self assessment and peer assessment  
 140. →Eleanor: uhm huhm  
 141. Alejandra: so on (.) and:: (0.8) i would like to: to BUILD with them (.) a questionnaire/ (1.2) or something like that (1) in order to:: (1.5) to ask them/  
 142. →Eleanor: uhm huhm  
 143. Alejandra: what they want to be: their: (1.5) their their written stuff\ (.) their written: production\  
 144. →Eleanor: (1) ok  
 145. Alejandra: (0.5) and tha- tha- those questions (.) like: what do you think that ah: (0.5) good em te- describing text\ (0.6) should be\ (.) and then/ (.) °well° (.) some: features\ [and then]  
 146. →Eleanor: [uhm huhm]

In this excerpt Alejandra has the opportunity to not only explain her draft but also to probe her own ideas (dialogic talk, cf. [Mercer and Littleton, 2007](#)), supported by Eleanor's feedback tokens such as "yeah", or "uh-huh" (see arrowed turns). Once the two participants become 'learning-oriented' or very much focused 'on-task' there are very few incidences of co-topical small talk until towards the end of the exchange on day 1.

Hence Excerpts 6 and 7 provide examples of detailed work-oriented talk for task development, which is different from the instances of co-topical small talk that lead up to and facilitate this sequence.

### 6.6. Laying the foundation for task development

In Excerpt 8, from the third consecutive session on Day 1, the two participants finally go 'off-topic' to engage in topicalized small talk (TST) that begins with Eleanor telling a story from her time spent in Spain (turns 282–295).

Excerpt 8 *The step-counter*

282. Eleanor: → (0.9) but: i think- (1.1) when i- when i was IN spain\ (0.2) i guess i can even tell them this\ i i kept a: uhm- a step counter/ (0.8) so that i could (0.3) a a step counter\ ehm: (0.9) es un:: (0.6) ¿cómo se dice?  
(trans) it's a::: how do you say it?
283. Alejandra: it's a machine/ to to- (0.3)
284. Eleanor: yes (0.5)
285. Alejandra: count the steps? (0.1)
286. Eleanor: YEP uh huh
287. Alejandra: i've seen it ((mirth in voice)) (0.5)
288. Eleanor: yeah\ (0.2) [i::]
289. Alejandra: [i've never have] ((giggles)) (0.1)
290. Eleanor: they were- (0.2) actually here there was a ehm- it was a trend for a while for women like like my mother's age women/ to wear them like to keep track of (1) how many (0.3) STEPS they took\ like how much they walked everyday (0.1)
291. Alejandra: really?
292. Eleanor: kind of silly\ (0.3) but- so she gave me one when i went and i: i kept a journal the whole time i was there and i would write at the top like how much i walked each day/ (0.5) i went to paris one weekend and in one day we walked over- (0.6) ok i'm really bad with kilometers but we walked [twelve]
293. Alejandra: [hee hee]
294. Eleanor: miles: (0.5) which is- a very long distance here(hh) (0.1)
295. Alejandra: yeah(hhh) (0.1)
296. →Eleanor: and so i- i thought that might also be something\ if i could even just- show them some of those\ like- this how much (0.3) you're walking over there (0.4) as opposed to here:\ (0.6) i don't know\ i think i could get some facts on that for them to (speed) if that makes sense (1.3)
297. Alejandra: that's a good idea (0.1)
298. →Eleanor: (0.3) to ME i think that's just- (0.6) that was amazing when i was over there\ (0.6) i came back here and i felt very lazy actually
299. Alejandra: [hee hee]
300. Eleanor: [riding in the] in the car everywhere(hhh) ((giggles)) (0.7)
301. Alejandra: ok\ (1.7)
302. Eleanor: ehm: (0.1)
303. Alejandra: i never thought about this\ (0.6)
304. Eleanor: yeah
305. Alejandra: → so:\ ehm:: Alejandra (0.4) maybe i can interview- (0.7) some people for you
306. Eleanor: that would be great/

Eleanor's story-telling is co-constructed with Alejandra, who provides key vocabulary words and concepts as well as personal anecdotes aligned with the story (she has seen the step-counter but never had one; turns 287 and 289). The TST arguably then leads to Alejandra's idea of carrying out interviews to create a video as part of the materials she can prepare for Eleanor's teaching sequence on sports habits in Spain and the USA.

Specifically, in turn 305, we see an epistemic change as Alejandra revises her initial suggestion to create a video of Spanish habits to include interviews of people about their walking habits. This idea stems from the discussion of intercultural comparisons between US and Spain health/exercise and, in particular, begins with a realization, on both Eleanor's and Alejandra's behalf of just how different certain habits (such as walking versus taking a car; turns 296, 298) are embedded in the two societies ('i never thought about this', turn 303). Alejandra's positive evaluation of Eleanor's initial idea of highlighting these differences ('that's a good idea', turn 297) encourages further task discussion and development as well as including affiliative talk, eventually leading to Alejandra's video interview idea. The TST (Eleanor's visit to Spain, different means of 'getting to places' such as taking a car or walking) are all referentially independent from the 'institutional task' of providing feedback to each other's teaching sequence and designing materials together. At the same time, the TST is mutually accomplished between the two interactants and neither of the participants abruptly return to 'on-task' interaction (as could be seen in other extracts of minimal small talk or co-topical

small talk) and yet the TST results in decisions being made about the type of output Alejandra will contribute to Eleanor's teaching sequence.

In the same final session on Day 1, participants engage in TST about different lifestyles in the US and Spain, especially in relation to exercise.

Extract 9 TST: Travel to London

323. Alejandra: eh:: who's ehm: going from the: (0.5) train station (0.3) to their faculty/  
324. Eleanor: [uh huh]  
325. Alejandra: [by wal] king and it's like (0.4) twenty minutes\ (0.6)  
326. Eleanor: uh huhm (0.6)  
327. Alejandra: yeah (0.9) and they do it\ (0.3) i don't i no\ (0.5) i(hh):: don't- (0.8) °ya no sé que digo° (0.5)  
328. Trans: °i don't know what i'm saying anymore°  
329. Eleanor: ((laughs)) okay(hh)  
330. Alejandra: ((short giggle)) (0.5)  
331. Eleanor: i understood everything\ it was great ((mirth in voice)) (0.7)  
332. Alejandra: >ok< (1.5) [SO]  
333. Eleanor: [wait till] we get to the next conversation and i'm speaking in spanish\ i'll be (0.3) (0.3) very embarrassed\ (0.2)  
334. Alejandra: no\ no\ not to worry\  
335. ((both laugh)) (1.8)  
336. Alejandra: i've never been abroad/ like you (0.7) eh: i've never visit: london\ or: (1.1) °whatever° (0.6) [so]  
337. Eleanor: [i] would love to go to london\  
338. Alejandra: >oh man yeah< (1.5) everybody goes to london here in spain because it's near/ and- (0.6)  
339. Eleanor: uh huhm (0.2)  
340. Alejandra: cheap to visit(hh)  
341. Eleanor: uh huh (0.3)  
342. Alejandra: yeah to fly there is- (0.8) °ehm° (0.7) well° (0.5) like twenty euros/ (1.4)  
343. Eleanor: wow [that] IS cheap\ (1) [that] IS cheap\  
344. Alejandra: [yeah] (0.5) YEAH(hhh) (0.8) with low cost eh: companies/ (0.2)  
345. Eleanor: uh huhm (0.3)  
346. Alejandra: it's really cheap\ (1.6) but: well- i don't have the money\ °hee hee° to go there and- (0.8) stay: at the hotel-  
347. Eleanor: uh huh (1.2)  
348. Alejandra: SO (1.2) i- i try my best\ with english (0.4) hee hee (0.3)  
349. Eleanor: your english is great(hh)  
350. Alejandra: (0.5) no(hh) no(hh)\ (0.5) [bueno\  
351. Trans: well  
352. Eleanor: [YES]  
353. Alejandra: (0.6) ehm:: (0.4) what do you want me to- to do/ (0.3) to interview people/ to record: the streets/ to::

During the TST, Alejandra transitions into meta-talk (in turn 327 she professes her confusion produced by carrying out a conversation in the L2), which leads both participants to orient to reciprocal expert-novice/L1–L2 identities in relation to their use of Spanish and English. In turn 348, Alejandra then transitions into co-topical small talk once again (referencing her role as student–teacher of TEFL) followed by a mutually constructed shift into institutional goal-oriented talk (turn 353) regarding Alejandra's video interview with people of Barcelona for the use of Eleanor's students of Spanish.

Shortly after this, the conversation transitions from co-topical talk concerning the languages of Barcelona to another personally-oriented TST episode about the languages habitually employed by Alejandra's family and boyfriend.

Excerpt 11 *TST about Barcelona's multilingualism and family languages*

417. Alejandra (0.6) yeah(hh) hee hee (1.3) here ehm: in the whole: classes/ the whole lessons in- at the university/ and at the school (0.4) are in catalan\  
 418. Eleanor (1.4) OH/ WOW\ (0.1)  
 419. Alejandra yeah (1.2) yeah\ (0.4) and some cities (0.3) are: (1) ((clicking sound)) catalan is more used than- >in others< (0.7) in anothers like:: (0.8) for example\ here in vilanova: well- (0.9) so so\ fifty-fifty\ (0.6) [because]  
 420. Eleanor [uh huhm]  
 421. Alejandra there lots of eh:: people coming from the south\ (0.4)  
 422. Eleanor uh huhm=  
 423. Alejandra =like:: (0.7) >well< like my grandparents:/ or like-  
 424. Eleanor ((clears throat))  
 425. Alejandra my: boyfriend's  
 426. Eleanor [uh huhm]  
 427. Alejandra [parents:] (0.7) °so well° (0.7) BUT:: >for example< in Cerdanyola/ where is my: my: university/ everybody talks in catalan\ (1.1) [everybody\  
 428. Eleanor [OH:] (1)  
 429. Alejandra AND i'm not really good at this\ (0.7) because my family talks in- in: spanish\ (1.5)  
 430. Eleanor huhm (0.8)  
 431. Alejandra yeah\ (1.3) ((giggles)) (0.1)  
 432. Eleanor is it very different? (2)  
 433. Alejandra ehm:: >not that much<  
 434. Eleanor °huhm°  
 435. Alejandra (1.3) but well\ (1) EHM: (1.3) uh::: about (0.8) [their]  
 436. Eleanor [sorry] (0.3)  
 437. Alejandra (theme) (0.2)  
 438. Eleanor [hee hee]  
 439. Alejandra [no no]  
 440. Eleanor ((giggles))  
 441. Alejandra °it's alright° (0.8)  
 442. Eleanor i have all these questions(hh) ((giggles))  
 443. Alejandra NO i like to explain things to you(hh)  
 444. Eleanor (0.3) ok then\ ((giggles 1.3)) (1.2) [uhm: yeah\  
 445. Alejandra (every) (0.3)  
 446. Eleanor (recording) (0.1)  
 447. Alejandra =but::: (0.7) eh: you want me to (1.1) ask in the XX/ for something specific/ in the XX/ (0.1)  
 448. Eleanor i i would say just- (1.1) how do you\ (0.4) stay:: (1.1) what do you think is important to being healthy\ that's what i'm going to ask (0.4) the kids\ (0.5) a lot (0.5) ehm (0.1)

In this excerpt (11), there is a stretch of talk which is 'technically' off topic in that it deals with Spain's multilingualism, however, arguably this provides a contextualization of Alejandra's teaching sequence and can be seen as co-topical and overlapping to some extent with the teaching sequence planning. This leads into Alejandra's TST about her own and her boyfriend's family's language use (turns 423–429). In turn 432 Eleanor asks a metalinguistic question (comparison of Catalan and Castilian Spanish) which soon transitions into a return to the institutional goal-oriented talk of before (turns 447–448).

Finally, in another TST episode (which takes place on the second day of the telecollaborative exchange), the two participants discuss how their personal views about studying 'health' topics have changed since they were students themselves.

## Excerpt 12. TST on Day 2

73. Eleanor: (...) I did not\ in high school\ (0.6) oo: i would have hated this assignment in high school(hh) actually- ((breaks off in laughter))
74. Alejandra: [((hard laughter))]
75. Eleanor: [i would have hated it\] ((laughter quietens down))
76. Alejandra: sure: me too(hh):: ((both giggle again; slowly quieten down)) eating healthy/ or wha-/=
77. Eleanor: =i dunno-
78. Alejandra: ((sniggers))
79. Eleanor: never know(hh)
80. Alejandra: hee
81. Eleanor: ((quiet laughter))
82. Alejandra: [((laughter))]
83. Eleanor: [i would have felt like it was insulting me ((breaks down into laughter))]
84. Alejandra: hee hee
85. Eleanor: °but you know\° ((quiet laughter))
86. Alejandra: well\
87. Eleanor: hee hee
88. →Alejandra: (kk)now we are teachers(kk)\ (0.2)
89. Eleanor: yeah(hh)\
90. Alejandra: hee hee another perspective (0.3)
91. Eleanor: ha ha ha
92. Alejandra: hee hee hee hee (0.9) ((draws in breath))
93. Eleanor: °yeah\°
94. Alejandra: OK (0.4) NICE: (0.3)
95. Eleanor: so\ (0.8) °i like that:\°=

In the TST in Excerpt 12 the participants mutually accomplish their institutional identity of teachers (turns 88 through 95). Interestingly, even though they are still student–teachers and their talk orients to school student perspectives, they clearly align themselves with the teaching professional community, as highlighted in the arrowed turn 88: “now we are teachers”.

The analysis of sequences in this section reinforces the important role of ‘small talk, including co-topical and TST, during a telecollaborative exchange. The use of TST eventually leads to task development (for instance, the student–teachers get new ideas of materials to add to their teaching sequences, based on their exchange of own experiences). In particular, participants engage in TST to promote the constitution of their social and professional relationship as a basis for epistemic change, learning and task development, including the production of an artefact (a video of interviews on the Barcelona lifestyle for US students).

## 7. Conclusion

This study has applied a CA-based approach to study ordinary and institutional talk within telecollaborative student–teacher interaction between two L1 speakers of respectively English and Spanish, both expert speakers of English, who use mainly English as the medium of communication, with occasional switches to Spanish. Based on analysis of audio transcripts of task-oriented out-of-class telecollaborative Skype (video) interaction between the two student teachers, the participants seem at certain points of the interaction to interweave institutional with ordinary talk. The application of [Hudak and Maynard's \(2011\)](#) categorizations of small talk to this context sheds light on how participants move between personal and professional identities to achieve their institutional goal. While there is evidence of some minimal small talk, TST and co-topical small talk appear to be particularly important interactional resources for the previously unacquainted student teachers to (a) establish mutual membership as ‘teachers’; (b) build mutual trust to be able to provide feedback and create materials for each other; (c) gradually transition into institutional goal-oriented talk; and (d) move the task development forward, for example when TST shifts to work talk, signalling epistemic change and Alejandra's video interview idea for Eleanor's students in the US (Excerpt 8).

Far from being peripheral talk, TST therefore appears to be an important device for achieving instrumental goals and is evident especially towards the end of the final session on day 1, when the exchange is also becoming more goal-oriented. However, the need for small talk, as defined in this study, also appears to diminish by day two (only one excerpt, Excerpt 11, presented here), where the interaction is predominantly institutional ‘goal-oriented’ talk, with participants mainly



engaged in the task of critical feedback on each other's teaching sequence, intercultural comparisons, and the production of a video interview related to exercise and lifestyle in Barcelona.

Adding to Hudak and Maynard's (2011) categories of small talk, it can be argued that, due to the medium of the exchange, the co-topical talk in this telecollaborative student–teacher context has provided further possible categorizations of small talk as 'technological' co-topical due to the communication technology's constituent role in the online interactions (Liddicoat, 2010), and 'complaining' co-topical, due to Alejandra's troubles talk (Jefferson, 1988) regarding logistical difficulties in implementing her teaching sequence at her school. While these types of small talk might be considered personal, especially the troubles talk (cf. Jefferson, 1988), they are, nonetheless, always work-related and aligned with participants' identities as student–teachers. Participants' deployment and interweaving of different varieties of small talk make visible the hybrid social–institutional nature of this telecollaborative exchange during online talk-in-interaction. In spite of technical limitations of recording software, this provides preliminary evidence that online telecollaborative small talk facilitates participants' constitution of social and professional relationships, achievement of institutional goals, collaborative learning, and entry into a community of practice.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the reviewers for their insightful comments on the paper which led to considerable improvement of the text. This article was written within the auspices of the research project 'Knowledge for Network-based Education, Cognition & Teaching (KONECT), financed by the Ministry of Science and Innovation: Proyectos I + D del Programa Estatal de Fomento de la Investigación Científica y Técnica de Excelencia (EDU2013-43932-P); 2014–2018.

## Appendix A

(kk)text(kk)	Word spoken with scratchy voice
text/	Intonation rises at end of word
text\	Intonation drops at end of word
text-	Word ends abruptly
°text°	Word spoken more softly than usual
TEXT	Word spoken more loudly than usual
text(hh)	Word ending in chuckle-type sound
text::	Prolonged sound of syllable, the more colons the longer the prolongation
>text<	Words spoken more quickly than usual
<text>	Words spoken more slowly than usual
text=	Latching words
=text	
[text]	Overlapping words
[text]	
XXX	Annotator unable to distinguish words. Approximately 1 syllable per X
(0.5)	Short pause in tenths of a second
(1)	Longer pauses of minimal one second
(text)	Annotator's reasonably sure transcription; some doubts
((text))	Annotator's comments

## References

- Angelillo, Cathy, Rogoff, Barbara, Chavajay, Pablo, 2009. Examining shared endeavors by abstracting video coding schemes. In: Goldman, R., Pea, R., Barron, B., Derry, S.J. (Eds.), *Video Research in the Learning Sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 189–206.
- Antoniadou, Victoria, 2011. Using activity theory to understand the contradictions in an online transatlantic collaboration between student–teachers of English as a Foreign Language. *ReCALL* 23 (3), 233–251. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0958344011000164>
- Barab, Sasha A., Duffy, Thomas M., 2000. From practice fields to communities of practice. In: Jonassen, D.H., Land, S.M. (Eds.), *Theoretical Foundations of Learning Environments*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 25–55.
- Barab, Sasha A., Hay, Kenneth E., Barnett, Michael, Squire, Kurt, 2001. Constructing virtual worlds: tracing the historical development of learner practices. *Cognit. Instruct.* 19 (1), 47–94. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci1901\\_2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci1901_2)
- Dooly, Melinda, 2011. Divergent perceptions of telecollaborative language learning tasks: tasks-as-workplan vs. task-as-process. *Lang. Learn. Technol.* 15 (2), 69–91.
- Dooly, Melinda, Sadler, Randall, 2013. Filling in the gaps: linking theory and practice through telecollaboration in teacher education. *ReCALL* 25, 4–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0958344012000237>

- Drew, Paul, Heritage, John, 1992. *Analyzing talk at work: an introduction*. In: Drew, P., Heritage, J. (Eds.), *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 3–65.
- Drew, Paul, Holt, Elizabeth, 1998. Figures of speech: figurative expressions and the management of topic transition in conversation. *Lang. Soc.* 27, 495–522. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020200>
- González-Lloret, Marta, 2011. Conversation analysis of computer-mediated communication. *Calico J.* 28 (2), 308–325. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11139/cj.28.2.308-325>
- Heritage, John, 1997. Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analyzing data. In: Silverman, D. (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. Sage, London, pp. 161–182.
- Heritage, John, 2004. Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In: Fitch, K.K., Sanders, R.E. (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 103–137.
- Holmes, Janet, 2000. Doing collegiality and keeping control at work: small talk in government departments. In: Coupland, J. (Ed.), *Small Talk*. Pearson Education Limited, Harlow, England, pp. 32–61.
- Hudak, Pamela L., Maynard, Douglas W., 2011. An interactional approach to conceptualising small talk in medical interactions. *Sociol. Health Illn.* 33 (4), 634–653. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9566.2011.01343.x>
- Jefferson, G., 1987. On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In: Button, G., Lee, R.E. (Eds.), *Talk and Social Interaction. Multilingual Matters*, Clevedon, pp. 86–100.
- Jefferson, G., 1988. On the sequential organization of troubles-talk in ordinary conversation. *Soc. Probl.* 35 (4), 418–442. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/sp.1988.35.4.03a00070>
- Jefferson, Gail, 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In: Lerner, G.H. (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 13–31.
- Kasper, Gabriele, 2004. Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *Mod. Lang. J.* 88 (4), 551–567. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-18-x>
- Liddicoat, Anthony J., 2010. Enacting participation: hybrid modalities in on-line video conversation. In: Develotte, C., Kern, R., Lamy, M.N. (Eds.), *Décrire la Conversation en Ligne*. ENS Éditions, Lyon, pp. 37–50.
- Liddicoat, Anthony J., 2011. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. Continuum, London/New York.
- McHoul, Alec W., 1978. The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Lang. Soc.* 7 (2), 183–213. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500005522>
- Mercer, Neil, Littleton, Karen, 2007. *Dialogue and the Development of Children's Thinking: A Sociocultural Approach*. Routledge, London.
- Mirivel, Julien C., Tracy, Karen, 2005. Premeeting talk: an organizationally crucial form of talk. *Res. Lang. Soc. Interact.* 38 (1), 1–34. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3801\\_1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3801_1)
- Pullin, Patricia, 2010. Small talk, rapport, and international communicative competence. Lessons to learn. *BELF J. Bus. Commun.* 47 (4), 455–476. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0021943610377307>
- Thomas, Michael, Reinders, Hayo, Warschauer, Michael (Eds.), 2013. *Contemporary Computer-Assisted Language Learning*. Bloomsbury, London/New York.
- Tudini, Vincenza, 2010. *Online Second Language Acquisition: A Conversation Analysis of Online Chat*. Continuum, London.
- Tudini, Vincenza, 2014. Conversation analysis of computer-mediated interactions. In: Chapelle, C. (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Wiley-Blackwell, Hoboken, NJ.