



**HAL**  
open science

## Reciprocity 2.0: How reciprocity is mediated through different formats of learners' logs.

Marco Cappellini, Anna-Katharina Elstermann, Annick Rivens Mompean

### ► To cite this version:

Marco Cappellini, Anna-Katharina Elstermann, Annick Rivens Mompean. Reciprocity 2.0: How reciprocity is mediated through different formats of learners' logs.. Redefining Tandem Language and Culture Learning in Higher Education, 2020. hal-02272695

**HAL Id: hal-02272695**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02272695v1>**

Submitted on 28 Aug 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## **Reciprocity 2.0: How reciprocity is mediated through different formats of teletandem learners' logs**

Marco Cappellini<sup>a\*</sup> [Orcid.org/0000-0002-2086-061X](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2086-061X)

Anna-Katharina Elstermann<sup>b</sup> [Orcid.org/0000-0002-5430-972X](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5430-972X)

Annick Rivens Mompean<sup>c</sup> [Orcid.org/0000-0001-6809-8065](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6809-8065)

*<sup>a</sup>Laboratoire Parole & Langage (UMR 7309 CNRS), Aix-Marseille University, Aix en Provence, France; <sup>b</sup>Departamento de Letras Modernas, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Assis, Brazil; <sup>c</sup>Laboratoire Savoirs, Textes, Langage (UMR 8163 CNRS), Lille University, Villeneuve d'Ascq, France.*

\*corresponding author. Bureau A-207, Laboratoire Parole & Langage, 5 avenue Pasteur, 13100 Aix en Provence, France. [marco.cappellini@univ-amu.fr](mailto:marco.cappellini@univ-amu.fr)

Marco Cappellini is associate professor at the department of French as a Foreign Language and at the Speech and Language Laboratory in Aix-Marseille University. He researches computer-mediated communication for language learning and teaching, especially in telecollaborative settings, and more broadly the integration of ICT in language classrooms. He is also interested in learner autonomy for foreign/second language learners

Anna-Katharina Elstermann is associate professor for German as Foreign Language at the Department of Modern Languages at State University of São Paulo. Her research interests are in learner support for language learning in autonomous learning contexts, language learning and teaching in telecollaborative contexts and foreign language teacher education.

Annick Rivens Mompean is full professor of English didactics at Lille University (France) where she is currently in charge of Language Policy. Her research interests include Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL), Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) and learning environments for language learning. She is also interested in the development of autonomy, especially in the context of language resource centres.

## **Reciprocity 2.0: How reciprocity is mediated through different formats of teletandem learners' reflexive logs**

### **Abstract**

In tandem, two principles are of great importance: learner autonomy and reciprocity between the learners. The goal of the present study is to examine learners' logs used in teletandem (i.e. tandem through desktop videoconference) contexts, in order to understand how learners express themselves about the principle of reciprocity. The corpus consists of learners' reflective logs and is composed of three sub-corpora: (1) individual logs written in Word-documents by Brazilian learners of German from a Brazilian-German teletandem; (2) logs of French students on a collective blog from a French-US teletandem; (3) logs of Australian and French students on a collective blog from an Australian-French teletandem. In a qualitative perspective, the study combines content and discourse analysis to build participant-relevant categories of how the principle of reciprocity is implemented and perceived by learners. Moreover, it considers to whom the logs are written, which is meaningful as three different kinds of log formats are used. The aim is to understand and to categorize the representation of the reciprocity principle and of social presence in teletandem sessions. Some extracts correspond to the definitions of the reciprocity principle present in the literature and in addition, new categories have been found that lead us to question these definitions and possibly broaden them.

Keywords: principle of reciprocity, teletandem, logs, blog.

### **Introduction**

Tandem language learning, under its different forms (face to face tandem, etandem, teletandem), has been based on two main principles<sup>1</sup>: the principle of autonomy and the principle of reciprocity. These two principles present a strong imbalance in the literature, since the principle of autonomy has received wide attention while the principle of reciprocity has been widely mentioned as a pedagogical principle, but without thorough research allowing to explore its theoretical underpinnings and its empirical manifestations. This article draws on recent attempts to overcome this gap (Koch 2017a, 2017b) to empirically study how reciprocity is implemented in teletandem and how it is mediated in different formats and environments for learners' metacognition.

First we provide a theoretical discussion of the principle of reciprocity based on

published literature on the topic. Second, we present our methodology and the data we gathered. In the analysis, we observe and discuss phenomena linked to three areas: the original definition of reciprocity, reciprocity and relationship, the influence of the medium and of the audience on the expression of reciprocity.

### **Definitions of reciprocity in tandem language learning**

Two recent articles from Koch (2017a, 2017b) aim at providing theoretical foundations to the principle of reciprocity, especially his article on reciprocity in tandem learning (2017a). The second article (2017b) relates reciprocity to contexts of advising and coaching in foreign language learning. In this section, we use his articles as a palimpsest to redraw his arguments in the light of other relevant theoretical references that can subsequently inform our empirical study. We therefore would like to acknowledge the credit for having provided a structured discussion of different arguments that are at stake at the moment.

As a quick search through the literature on tandem confirms, despite the lack of theoretical foundation, the principle of reciprocity appears in every publication and it is largely considered as one of the two main pillars of tandem learning. Brammerts (2002) takes a descriptive stance and asserts that tandem learning takes place within a framework where each partner brings his/her competences into the interaction, and that these competences are the other learner's pedagogical objective. The relationship demands each partner to be engaged and to facilitate, to scaffold the other's learning, in order to expect the same help by the interlocutor.

Other researchers, such as Kötter (2003), take a more directive and normative stance, stating that this principle 'dictates' that the partners benefit equally from the exchange, which is rendered on a practical level by the fact that the amount of time spent using each language should be equal. All the references to the reciprocity principle in the

literature on tandem could be classified according to these two examples: they are rather prescriptive or descriptive. On the practical dimension, the reciprocity principle is then usually associated with the amount of interaction in each language. However, to associate the principle of reciprocity with the division of time in each language is a limitation (Elstermann, 2017, p. 31).

In parallel to tandem learning, in disciplines that deal with conversational interactions and especially in language sciences, reciprocity has taken different, but not unrelated, meanings. In the francophone literature for instance, Bange (1992) develops the concept of reciprocity initially formulated by Schutz (1954) to indicate the perception that each interlocutor has of the other. In other words, in communication each interlocutor projects onto the other a state of general knowledge present before the interaction and a state of understanding of what is happening in the interaction. More recent research has theorized this kind of cognitive phenomenon in terms of alignment (Pickering and Garrod, 2004). Within this model, each interlocutor has a model of the ongoing situation and communication is successful when the models of the interlocutors correspond or, in other terms, are aligned. An important difference with these studies, also underlined by Koch, is that contrary to daily communication, in intercultural communication the frames of reference are not the same (Koch, 2017a, p. 125). Bange (1992), who considered intercultural encounters, observed that this lack of shared knowledge leads to different kinds of conversational adjustments that relate, on the cognitive level, to what he called 'bifocalisation', that is the fact that interlocutors are constantly monitoring if they are aligned, if they understand 'the same thing'.

More linked to tandem learning, Koch's article (2017a) discusses the relationship between the principle of autonomy and the principle of reciprocity. Even if autonomy was linked from the beginning to social interaction, initially mainly with a counsellor

(Holec, 1979), recent studies on autonomy have stressed this dimension further (Benson, 2011; Murray, 2014). Koch notes that the relationship between autonomy and reciprocity may be ambiguous, since on the one hand reciprocity limits autonomy in the sense that the pedagogical objectives of a learner do not necessarily correspond to the partner's expertise. On the other hand, the autonomisation is only made possible through social interaction (Koch, 2017a, p. 119). This reflection runs parallel to Lewis' on the social dimensions of learner autonomy, among which Lewis identifies reciprocity (2014, p. 45). This term is used for the description of autonomous learning communities, in which when a participant contributes to the learning, s/he expects the others to participate in an equal way. These observations lead to a theoretical understanding of the two principles as strictly interrelated in tandem.

After these considerations, Koch (2017a, p. 126-127) concludes with a tentative definition of reciprocity in communication:

Reciprocity is the mode and rhythm of the exchange of information and objects in a given historical sociocultural situation between two or more communicators which bears the obligation to respond to a perceived impulse or gift in a way and time frame that corresponds to an acknowledged convention. It contributes to the building and perception of meaning, social relationship and stratification.

He subsequently identifies five possible dimensions of reciprocity in tandem learning:

- (1) Organisational: interactions are divided into two parts and both languages are used. Collaboration between partners is achieved at best through explicit negotiation or usually through implicit adjustments;
- (2) Intercultural: intercultural differences are treated as conversational topics and each partner explains to the other one element of his/her culture (for a critical

approach to this view of culture in tandem, see also Cappellini & Rivens Mompean, 2015);

- (3) Discursive: during tandem interactions the interlocutors adapt to each other in multimodal ways accomplishing social interactional acts such as turn taking (Sacks et al., 1974) or repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). This dimension relates mostly to co- or para-verbal dimensions of communication and is largely unconscious;
- (4) Semantic: participants negotiate the meaning of words and concepts in order to align their understanding;
- (5) Use of the interlocutor's target language: this dimension relates to the conversational adjustments (Bange, 1992).

Koch concludes his article (2017a) with a call for empirical studies to confirm (and we would add, possibly infirm) this conceptualisation of reciprocity in tandem learning.

## **Methodology**

### ***Research objectives and research questions***

The aim of our study is to deepen the understanding of learners' representations of the reciprocity principle in tandem learning and to categorize them. Based on this research objective, we have formulated the following research questions:

- (1) How do foreign language learners express aspects of reciprocity, which they experienced in their teletandem sessions, in different forms of reflective environments?
- (2) How do the medium and the possible audience influence the reflective writings in the logs?

## ***Contexts***

Our study investigates data from three tandem settings through desktop videoconference projects, i.e. teletandem (Telles, 2009): the teletandem between the State University of São Paulo (Brazil) and the Johannes Gutenberg University (Germany) (Elstermann 2014, 2015, 2017), the teletandem between Lille University (France) and Georgetown University (USA) and the teletandem exchange between Lille University and University of Western Australia (Garcia Moraes et al., 2017). In the three telecollaboration projects, learners had a proficiency level ranging between A1 and C1, as defined by *Common European Framework* (Council of Europe, 2001). In the Brazilian-German project, 14 participants have realised 4 teletandem sessions in average, in the French-American one, there were 32 participants who realised 6 sessions and in the French-Australian one, there were 16 students realising 6 sessions.

## ***Data collection and corpus of analysis***

In the three telecollaboration settings, students had to keep a reflective log about their teletandem sessions. Even if the pedagogical objectives of these logs were the same in the three telecollaborations, their formats were different.

In the Brazilian-German exchange, participants were advised, but not obliged, to work with learner logs to document and accompany their own learning process. The learner log model was prepared with questions in a Microsoft Word document and provided to all participants by email. The learner log could be written in their native language – Portuguese. The addressee of the learner logs was, theoretically the learner him/herself and, practically, the teletandem coordinator. The collected corpus gathers about 19 documents with a total of about 10.000 words.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE



Figure 1. Learner log of the German-Portuguese teletandem project

As for the Lille-Georgetown teletandem, students also had to keep a log. However, this was done within a collective blog, where each student on the French side of the telecollaboration had to post a weekly entry corresponding to his log. Consequently, the addressee of the reflective writing was not only the tutor, but also the entire group of learners on the French side. The aim of the blog was to allow students to share their learning strategies and their impressions, in order to develop their learning strategies and learning resource repertoires (Cappellini, 2015). The 17 students on the French side were allowed to produce their log in French or in English. A large majority of students decided to write in their native language. This resulted in a total sub-corpus of about 68000 words.

INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE

Figure 2. Learner log (blog) of the Lille – Georgetown teletandem project.

The sub-corpus from the Teletandem Lille-UWA presents the same format as the French-American one, but in this case the collective blog was shared on both sides of the telecollaboration. Australian students had to write in French, French students were free to choose the language used. The 16 students participating in the telecollaboration produced a total corpus of about 27000 words.

INSERT HERE FIGURE 3

Figure 3. Learner blog from the Lille-Australian teletandem project.

All the data have been collected directly from the students' logs. For the Brazilian logs, they were reproduced the way they were received by the tutor. As for the two blogs, data (including text, pictures and structure of the exchange) were extracted from the blogs and pasted into word documents.

The following table summarizes the composition of the corpus of analysis:

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Table 1. Corpus of analysis.

### ***Analysis***

In our analysis we have adopted a qualitative approach (Ware & Rivas, 2012), aiming at accessing the students' perspective. In other words, we have analysed our data looking for passages where students talked about their relationship or how they constructed their mutual help for learning. Consequently, we did not start with pre-existing categories (such as Koch's) but tried to infer categories of analysis that are participant-relevant (Paillé & Mucchielli, 2008). The inferential process drew mainly on content analysis (Bardin, 1977) with the sporadic use of discourse analysis, especially to analyse the use of personal pronouns.

On a practical level, each of the authors read the three different sub-corpora and started to produce categories that were later discussed collectively. The collective discussion of categories had two functions: first to have a coherent set of categories covering all the data, i.e. saturating the possibilities of the analysis (Kaufmann, 2008, p. 31); second to move from a thematic analysis (Paillé & Mucchielli, 2008, p. 161) to the construction of "conceptualizing categories" (p. 233). These categories are not only participant-relevant, but they also draw a link with the existing theories and conceptualisations on the topic presented above.

### **Analysis and discussion**

#### ***Reciprocity***

In this first section of our analysis, we present excerpts of the data which corroborate the original definition of reciprocity found in the literature about tandem learning, that is a mainly organizational form of reciprocity (Koch, 2017a). In the data,

we found many examples for the division of time within the sessions and the use of the two languages, but also comments on the way the learners were making decisions jointly about their teletandem partnership and how the partners were able to help each other to meet the needs of the respective learning partner.

### *Time and language division*

Many of the (b)log entries describe how the sessions were divided and with which language the teletandem pair started (for French and Portuguese original quotations the translation into English is given in endnotes):

(1) so we did half our session in French and half of it in English.

This excerpt is representative of how learners affirm the organizational reciprocity, which is probably linked to the introductory meeting learners attended.

### *Collective decision making*

Analysis of the data shows that the learners share many moments in which they jointly take decisions about different aspects of their teletandem partnership:

(2) Procuramos desenvolver mais a fala e a compreensão, visto que ambas são as necessidades das duas.<sup>ii</sup>

(3) Regarding each other's mistakes, we kept on writing them to send explanations afterwards since we found out it worked well.

In the case of the Brazilian learner, he/she talks about a learning need both partners have and are willing to offer help on. Excerpt (3) shows how the learners in the Australian-French partnership agreed on a mutual correction system they thought was working well for them.

This collective decision making is a reciprocal action because both learners must be tuned in to the same situation, on which they have to make decisions. The partners have to negotiate their opinions in relation to a specific situation and finally agree on a

certain procedure. However, this does not necessarily mean that both have to agree on the same procedure for each language or each activity.

*How the partners' needs are met by the native speaker*

Another element of reciprocity in relation to learning needs and goal setting is how the learners are able to meet their partner's needs. The following quotations show examples extracted from the data.

(4) they were not taught how to express the future. So she asked me to teach her how to do it, and we spend some time on it.

(5) As for the mistakes, Andie only did a very few that I sent her afterwards. I think this teletandem was useful for her because she really has a great level but doesn't have much opportunity to practice her French. She told me she hadn't noticed any mistake for me.

In both excerpts, the learners try to meet their partner's needs. In excerpt (4) the learner who wrote the log entry agreed on teaching his/her partner the future tense because his/her partner had not learned it yet and wanted to know how this tense works.

Example (5) shows how the partners executed their decisions concerning the correction process and thus tried to meet the need for improvement in the foreign language.

Reciprocity in this aspect of the teletandem learning context is crucial as it affects directly the core of the learning context: a learner detects a learning need and establishes a learning goal he wants to pursue with the help of the native speaker, his/her partner. If the partner does not (even try to) meet those needs, learning is getting harder, frustration may rise and a dropout of the learner is possible. That is why this nuance of reciprocity is frequently described or prescribed in the literature on tandem (Brammerts, 2002; Kötter, 2003 among others).

### *Comparisons on topics and language skills*

The last aspect we found in our analysis, which can be related to definitions in the literature, is the comparison, during teletandem interaction, of different topics, mostly related to the cultures associated with the two countries of the interlocutors.

(6) Fizemos uma comparação com a Alemanha-não imagino isso acontecendo lá, a questão do desrespeito com a mulher...e além da repercussão do caso na mídia em todo o Brasil.<sup>iii</sup>

This excerpt shows a clear example of Koch's fourth dimension of reciprocity, where students discuss intercultural differences and meanings.

Even if comparisons are usually about cultural topics, we have also found a comparison which relates to language skills, as in the following excerpt.

(7) Tu as l'air d'avoir un bon niveau en anglais, a-t-elle (*sic.*) aussi le même niveau que toi en français?<sup>iv</sup>

In this excerpt, students are comparing proficiency level in the respective foreign languages. This phenomenon, which is largely present in (e/tele)tandem settings, has been linked to assessment and autonomy (Cappellini et al., 2016; Garcia Moraes et al., 2017). This topic of comparison is not present in the literature on reciprocity but, in our opinion, it is one that practitioners should be aware of in order to prevent possible inhibitions due to large differences in the proficiency levels in the respective foreign languages.

### ***Reciprocity and relationship***

Beyond these original dimensions of reciprocity, our analysis highlights other dimensions that stand between reciprocity as it is usually referred to in the literature and what might be called intuitively the 'relationship' between participants.

### *Affective and emotional dimensions*

Analysis of the logs showed that learners express their feelings about the contact they have with their partners. Unsurprisingly, this is largely present in UNESP-JGU individual logs and in the Lille3-Georgetown blog, but not in the Lille3-UWA blog, where the partners are also part of the audience. The following excerpts provide examples of this phenomenon:

(8) Mesmo com as dificuldades para falar, nos entendemos bem.<sup>v</sup>

(9) On a plutôt bien accroché, c'est une fille sympa. L'entretien est passé très vite et je lui ai un peu expliqué en quoi consistera la prochaine session.<sup>vi</sup>

In the examples (8) and (9), the Brazilian and the French learners state that, despite the language barrier, partners got along well on the one hand and that contact was established in a satisfying manner on the other hand. These excerpts can be seen as an explicit and, for excerpt (9), a shared reflection about the emotional state of the exchange. We think that this dimension is relevant to the principle of reciprocity in two ways. First, this friendly climate is conducive of involvement and motivation and could therefore foster the will to spend time discussing with each other and to reach successful communication even when linguistic competence falls short. Second, it represents another point of contact between the two main principles of tandem. In fact, authors such as O'Leary (2014) add an emotional dimension to definitions of autonomy. More precisely, O'Leary conceptualises an 'emotional intelligence' which would consist, among others, in the ability to make explicit the emotional dimension of learning, of encouraging one another and of empathizing.

### *Mutual interests*

Learners' written reflections show that during teletandem interactions, they spend some part discussing their common interests and hobbies, as in the following examples, taken from the Lille3-UWA blog:

(10) Now, let's get to the core. We spent this whole first Skype conversation dealing with the 1st activity, aiming at learning more about each other. We discovered we had quite a lot of common points. Beyoncé, the sun, languages and travelling are some of the things we both like.

(11) Cette séance m'a ouvert les yeux à de nombreux traits et désirs où goûts que nous avons en commun (la lecture, le jardinage, la nature, les animaux...).<sup>vii</sup>

In these examples, as in others from the two other teletandem projects, it is clear that part of the discussion, especially in the initial stages of the exchange when learners are getting to know each other, is spent not discussing differences possibly related to the intercultural dimension of the exchange, but rather searching for common or mutual interests. Therefore, this phenomenon does not fit clearly in the classical definitions of reciprocity, nor in Koch's five elements of reciprocity in tandem.

This search for common interests is well documented in the literature on telecollaboration, both in formal (Dooly, 2016) and informal (Lamy & Mangenot, 2013) settings. For Lamy and Mangenot, common interests are a fundamental element to support engagement in online communities and make them live, allowing informal learning for participants (p. 211). In a similar vein, Murphy (2014, p. 128) observes that the lack of shared interests leads to the disintegration of online language learning communities. Dooly (2011, 2016) develops the idea that the internet may be conceived of as a 'third space', a space that does not depend on specific cultural norms, but whose norms are developed within the interaction. The discovery of mutual interests is part of the construction of this third / shared space and has been observed by Yang (2011) in

telecollaboration through blogs. Among others, she observes that the discovery of pre-existing common interests (shared space through commonality) was highly conducive of engagement and interaction, even if this did not necessarily lead to discussion of differences.

Drawing on these observations, we think we may interpret our data as a very important moment in the construction of interlocutors' relationship since the exploration of shared and mutual interests allows on the one hand to overcome the lack of common frames in intercultural encounters (see above) and on the other hand to build a sort of platform permitting to further engage in the exploration of cultural differences (second dimension of reciprocity according to Koch). In other words, mutual interests help building a safe environment to compensate for the possible absence of common ground and the resulting uncertainty. This however does not imply that it is the only way, but that it is a possible way to scaffold reciprocity.

At the end of this section, we can summarize that relationship is directly linked to the principle of reciprocity since it is a foundation for it. In the case of the affective dimension, it seems to be conducive of subsequent engagement and sufficient motivation to overcome the limitations in the interlocutors' communicative competences. In the case of mutual interest, the reciprocity is expressed through the building of a safe common ground on which it is possible to deal with the uncertainty of different frames of reference.

### ***The influence of the medium and of the audience***

In this final section, we would like to consider the format of logs, which may influence the expression of the learners. The group format does not affect the expression



of reciprocity itself but has an influence on the global expression of relationship experience, which is why we mention it here.

### *Forms of address and group identity*

We will first consider the different forms of address observed, depending on the medium used. In the following examples, we can observe the expression of a sense of belonging to a group:

#### Lille3-UWA

(12) Bonjour mes chers Télétandemeurs!

(13) Bonjour chers Blogsters :) <sup>viii</sup>

#### UNESP-JGU

(14) Minha pergunta: Mesmo nas interações de português falamos muito em alemão... eu fico um pouco frustrada... o que eu devo mudar?<sup>ix</sup>

Analysis shows that the forms of address change depending on whether they are addressed to the partner, to the group of partners, within the own (blog) group or joining both language groups, leading to the use of “they” in the Lille-Georgetown blog, instead of “we” in the Lille-UWA blog. In a web 2.0 dynamic, this could be linked to how one reconstructs one’s identity within the group (Baldauf et al., 2017), compared to identity only shared with the tutor through the logbook. In fact, we argue that the format not only influences the forms of address but also influences the content in some ways, as the focus may move from personal reflection about one’s learning to general reflections about the general climate (above), with obvious links to facework (Goffman, 1967). In other words, considering that learners reconstruct their identity within the group, they may want to show the more pleasant dimensions of their tandem experience. This may also be linked to a desire for emulation, based upon the comparisons with other pairs. In other words, learners contributing to the same blog seem to co-construct a tandem

relationship that goes beyond the pair and that leads to the development of a (tele)tandem group the students feel they belong to.

### *Community of practice in collective blogs*

This kind of group which is co-constructed by teletandem learners in collective blogs shares features of a particular kind of community that has been widely studied in applied linguistics: community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). We consider two main features: sharing learning strategies and objectives and the comparing teletandem sessions.

In the blog format, without any difference between the Lille-UWA and the Lille-GT blogs, learners share their strategies and learning objectives, as in the two next following excerpts taken from a comment on the Lille-GT blog:

(15) Bonjour (author of the post) !

[...] Je vois que tu t'entends bien avec (partner of the author of the post), j'ai lu tes différents articles, il a l'air d'être sympa avec toi et personnellement, je trouve ça cool qu'il te donne des expressions de la vie courante, des abréviations et tout ça peut toujours te servir ! Je crois que je vais demander à (partner of the author of the comment) aussi de faire ça :) Vous avez l'air de bien échanger et c'est important pour découvrir la culture de l'autre. J'espère que tout continuera de bien se passer pour toi !<sup>x</sup>

Beyond observing the affective and emotional dimensions that we have already highlighted, excerpt (15) presents a comparison which leads not only to make the learning practice explicit, but also to the enrichment of such practice as the experience lived by the author of the post feeds the experience of author of the comment. This was one of the reasons why the logs had been originally transferred on a collective blog (Cappellini, 2015). In the dynamics of web 2.0, that can be seen as a way to emphasize the development of autonomy (Cappellini et al., 2017).

The second phenomenon that leads us to argue that collective blogs are conducive of the formation of a community of practice is the comparison of teletandem sessions. This is observed in the post below from the Lille-UWA blog:

(16) Vous avez été efficaces pour arriver à la question de la famille typique. Avec (partner of the author of the comment), nous n'avons même pas eu le temps de finir les questions pour mieux se connaître tellement on avait de choses à dire.<sup>xi</sup>

(17) J'espère que vos prochaines conversations seront tout aussi intéressantes! :D<sup>xii</sup>

In a way which is somewhat similar to the comparison of proficiency levels or to the comparison of the emotional climate, excerpts (16) and (17) show that learners compare the course of their teletandem sessions. In our opinion, this is a way for them to situate their own practice in an area that, especially at the beginning of the exchange, is largely unknown. Reciprocity helps them find landmarks in their learning process, landmarks that may have a reassuring effect as it helps them fix new goals. As such, this phenomenon is to be linked with the search for mutual interests, as it provides information on how to accomplish the teletandem sessions, or at least how they may be accomplished.

These two observations fit in the description that Rivens Mompean (2013, p. 150) makes of community of practices for language centres, which can be adapted to (tele)tandem blogs:

a collaborative space to pool knowledge and provide support via the community of practice that ultimately shares the same doubts and goes through the same phases of discovery.<sup>xiii</sup>

To summarize the different elements observed in this section, data indicate that the format of the blog has an impact on the possible construction of a group presenting characteristics of a community of inquiry, mainly through sharing learning strategies

and objectives and through comparison of teletandem sessions. This group or community is characterized not only by these cognitive phenomena, but also by the construction of a certain group identity and pleasant climate that we have linked to a web 2.0 dynamic. These dimensions go beyond the strict reciprocity principle since they expand on the teletandem pair and construct a wider community which, in turn, impacts the pairs' reciprocity. In fact, the exchange at the level of the group has proven to possibly change the learning strategies and/or to favor expression of support asked to the partner, which is the fifth dimension Koch identified for reciprocity.

## **Conclusions**

At the end of our empirical analysis, we will now consider how it relates to previous theoretical discussions of the principle of reciprocity. Before doing this though, we would like to highlight that our analysis does not consider actual interactions during teletandem sessions, but reflective writings after those interactions. In this sense, our study informs us about the dimensions of reciprocity as reported by students in their written reflections on teletandem sessions. This could explain some differences between theoretical discussion and our empirical analysis.

Our analysis has confirmed empirically the presence of the organizational dimension of reciprocity, which we presented in the section 'Time and language division'. We have also related some log extracts to the semantic dimension ('comparison of topics') and to the use of the interlocutor's target language ('collective decision making', 'helping within the limits...'). We have not found traces that could be linked to the intercultural and to the discursive dimensions as defined by Koch.

Moreover, this study has allowed us to explore the way reciprocity at the micro level can be linked to the meso level of the relationship between groups, which we previously modeled as the bilaterality dimension (Rivens Mompean & Cappellini, 2015). First,

we have seen how reciprocity is more broadly linked to the social relationship, either concerning the affective and emotional dimensions contributing to a friendly climate, or searching for mutual interests in co-constructing an online third space (Dooly, 2011).

Second, we have highlighted how a specific format of students' logs, the collective blog, is conducive for the construction of a group identity that present features of a community of inquiry (Lave & Wenger, 1991) linked to Koch's (2017a) fifth dimension of reciprocity.

As for the practical implications of our analysis, we think that it informs us about what is perceived by students and considered relevant for mentioning in their written reflections. In this sense, the results of this analysis, if they are found in other teletandem contexts, may become the basis to different forms of counselling and advice in order for teletandem learners to become aware of other dimensions of reciprocity and to be able to develop metacognition on them.

At the end of our article, we would like to propose a wider definition of the principle of reciprocity that is built on Koch's initial definition (2017a, p. 126):

Reciprocity is the mode and rhythm of the exchange of information and objects in a given historical sociocultural situation between two or more communicators which bears the obligation to respond to a perceived impulse or gift in a way and time frame that corresponds to an acknowledged convention. It contributes to the building and perception of meaning, social relationship and stratification.

Communicative reciprocity can be attained by the search of mutual interests.

Reciprocity is influenced by the affective and emotional dimensions of the relationship between the two partners and possibly more broadly of the group. If a group is formed, reciprocity on the pedagogical level is influenced by the interactions within the group sharing learning strategies and objectives.

## References

- Baldauf, H., Develotte, C. & Ollagnier-Beldame, M. (2017). The effects of social media on the dynamics of identity. *ALSIC*, 20(1). Retrieved from <http://journals.openedition.org/alsic/3004>
- Bange, P. (1992). *Analyse conversationnelle et théorie de l'action*. Paris: Didier.
- Bardin, L. (1977). *L'analyse de contenu*. Paris: PUF.
- Benson, P. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Autonomy*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Harlow: Pearson.
- Brammerts, H. (2002). Principes et objectifs. In B. Helmling (Ed.), *L'apprentissage autonome des langues en tandem* (pp. 19-24). Paris: Didier.
- Calvet Creizet, M. & Orduna, J. (2017). Interactional practices of third language learners: principles and documentation. In H. Funk, M. Gerlach & D. Spaniel-Weise (Eds.), *Handbook for Foreign Language Learning in Online Tandems and Educational Settings* (pp. 217-242). Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.
- Cappellini, M. (2015). Du carnet d'apprentissage individuel aux outils du web 2. *Recherches et pratiques pédagogiques en langues de spécialité*, 34(1), 127-146.
- Cappellini, M., Eisenbeis, M. & Rivens Mompean, A. (2016). Interactions plurielles d'étudiants en autoformation guidée et autonomisation. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 42(4). Retrieved from <http://www.cjlt.ca/index.php/cjlt/article/view/27475/20222>
- Cappellini, M., Lewis, T. & Rivens Mompean, A. (Eds.) (2017). *Learner autonomy and Web 2.0*. Sheffield: Equinox.
- Cappellini, M. & Rivens Mompean, A. (2015). Role taking for the teletandem pair involved in multimodal online conversation. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 5(1), 243-264.
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Dooly, M. (2011). Crossing the intercultural borders into 3rd space culture(s). *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 11(4), 319-337.
- Dooly, M. (2016). 'Please remove your avatar from my personal space'. Competences of the telecollaboratively efficient person. In R. O'Dowd & T. Lewis (Eds.), *Online intercultural exchange. Policy, pedagogy, practice* (pp. 192-208). London: Routledge.
- Elstermann, A.-K. (2014). Peergruppen-Beratung im Lernkontext Teletandem. In A. Berndt & R.-U. Deutschmann (Eds.), *Sprachlernberatung – Sprachlerncoaching* (pp. 45-57). Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.
- Elstermann, A.-K. (2015). Lerner-Support im internationalen Kooperationsprojekt. *Info DaF. Informationen Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, 42, 650-667.
- Elstermann, A.-K. (2017). *Learner Support in Telecollaboration: Peer group mediation in teletandem*. (Doctoral dissertation). Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Bochum.
- Garcia Moraes, D. N., O'Connor, K. & Cappellini, M. (2017). A typology of metacognition: Examining autonomy in a collective blog compiled in a teletandem environment. In M. Cappellini, T. Lewis & A. Rivens Mompean (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy and Web 2.0* (pp. 69-92). Sheffield: Equinox.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual*. London: Penguin.
- Holec, H. (1979). *Autonomie et apprentissage des langues étrangères*. Strasbourg: Editions du Conseil de l'Europe.
- Kapec, P. & Schwienhorst, K. (2005). In two minds? Learner attitudes to bilingualism and the bilingual tandem analyser. *ReCALL*, 17(2), 254-268.
- Kaufmann, J.-C. (2008). *L'enquête et ses méthodes. L'entretien compréhensif*. Paris: Armand Colin.

- Koch, L. (2017a). Principles of tandem interaction - Reciprocity. In H. Funk, M. Gerlach & D. Spaniel-Weise (Eds.), *Handbook for Foreign Language Learning in Online Tandems and Educational Settings* (pp. 117-132). Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.
- Koch, L. (2017b). Reziprozität und Beratung. In J. Böcker, C. Saunders, L. Koch & M. Langner (Eds.), *Beratung und Coaching zum Fremdsprachenlernen* (pp. 27-47). Gießen: Gießener Elektronische Bibliothek.
- Kötter, M. (2003). Negotiation of meaning and codeswitching in online tandems. *Language Learning and Technology*, 7(2), 145–172.
- Lamy, M.-N. & Mangenot, F. (2013). Social media-based language learning: Insights from research and practice. In M.-N. Lamy & K. Zourou (Eds.), *Social networking for language education* (pp. 197-213). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, T. (2014). Learner autonomy and the theory of sociality. In G. Murray (Ed.), *Social dimensions of autonomy in language learning* (pp. 37-59). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Murphy, L. (2014). Autonomy, social interaction, and community: A distant language learning perspective. In G. Murray (Ed.), *Social dimensions of autonomy in language learning* (pp. 119-134). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Murray, G. (Ed.) (2014). *Social dimensions of autonomy in language learning*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- O’Leary, C. (2014). Developing autonomous language learners in higher education: A social constructivist perspective. In G. Murray (Ed.), *Social dimensions of autonomy in language learning* (pp. 15-36). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.



- Paillé, P. & Mucchielli, A. (2008). *L'analyse qualitative en sciences humaines et sociales*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Pickering, M. & Garrod, S. (2004). Toward a mechanistic psychology of dialogue. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 27(2), 169-190.
- Rivens Mompean, A. (2013). *Le centre de ressources en langues. Vers la modélisation du dispositif d'apprentissage*. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Editions du Septentrion.
- Rivens Mompean, A. & Cappellini, M. (2015). Teletandem as a complex learning environment: Looking for a model. *DELTA Journal of Education*, 31(3), 633-663.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of turn-Taking in Conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361–382.
- Schutz, A. (1954). *Le chercheur et le quotidien*. Paris: Méridiens Klincksieck.
- Telles, J. A. (Ed.) (2009). *Teletandem - Um contexto virtual, autônomo e colaborativo para aprendizagem de línguas estrangeiras no século XXI*. Campinas: Pontes Editores.
- Ware, P. & Rivas, B. (2012). Researching classroom integration of online language learning projects: Mixed methods approaches. In M. Dooly & R. O'Dowd (Eds.), *Researching online foreign language interaction and exchange* (pp. 107-131). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Yang, Y.-F. (2011). Learner Interpretation of shared space in multilateral English blogging. *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(1), 122-146.

---

<sup>i</sup> Some authors, among which Kapec and Schwienhorst (2005), Telles (2009) and Garcia

Moraes et al. (2017), also add a third principle, which states that languages should be used

---

separately. Calvet Creizet and Orduna (2017) also add a ‘minor principle’ (ibid., p. 209) called the ‘principle of authenticity’, which is related to meaningful interaction.

- ii We try to develop our speaking and listening skills, as they correspond to the needs expressed by both of us.
- iii We made a comparison with Germany - I do not imagine it happening there -, the issue of disrespect with a woman... and beyond the repercussion of the case in the media throughout Brazil.
- iv It looks like you have a good proficiency level in English, does she have the same proficiency level as you in French?
- v Even with our difficulties to talk, we get on well.
- vi We got along pretty well, she is a nice girl. The interview/exchange went by very quickly and I told her a little what next session will consist of.
- vii This session has opened my eyes to many features and wishes or tastes we have in common (reading, gardening, nature, animals...).
- viii Hello dear Teletandemers! Hello dear Blogsters :)
- ix My question: even in the Portuguese part of the interactions we still speak a lot of German... I feel a bit frustrated... what should I change?
- x Hello (author of the post)!  
  
[...] I see that you get on well with (partner of the author of the post), I read your different articles, he seems to be nice to you and personally, I find it cool that he gives you expressions of everyday life, abbreviations and all that can always be useful to you! I think I'll ask (partner of the author of the comment) also to do that :) You seem to be good at exchanging and it's important to discover each other's culture. I hope everything will continue to go well for you!
- xi You have been efficient to discuss the question of the traditional family. With (name of the partner of the author of the comment) we haven't even had the time to finish the questions to know each other, since we had too many things to say.

---

<sup>xii</sup> I hope that your next conversations will be as interesting! :D

<sup>xiii</sup> Our translation from the original : *‘un espace collaboratif pour mutualiser les acquis et apporter un soutien via la communauté de pratiques qui partage finalement les mêmes doutes et passe par les mêmes phases de découverte’*.