Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 2011, 5 (1), 1-14.

INTRODUCTION: CONVERSATION ANALYSIS IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Olcay SERT* & Paul SEEDHOUSE**

Abstract: This short, introductory paper presents an up-to-date account of works within the field of Applied Linguistics which have been influenced by a Conversation Analytic paradigm. The article reviews recent studies in classroom interaction, materials development, proficiency assessment and language teacher education. We believe that the publication of such a special journal issue is timely, since Conversation Analysis has been one of the most influential methodologies in recent Applied Linguistic research, as can be seen by the growing number of publications appearing in various journals.

Keywords: Conversation Analysis, Applied Linguistics, language learning and teaching, classroom interaction, language teacher education, materials development, language proficiency assessment

Özet: Bu kısa giriş makalesi Konuşma Çözümlemesi yaklaşımından etkilenen Uygulamalı Dilbilim alanındaki çalışmalara dair güncel bir değerlendirme sunmaktadır. Çalışmamız sınıf etkileşimi, materyal geliştirme, dil yeterliliği değerlendirmesi ve yabancı dil öğretmeni yetiştirme gibi çeşitli alanlarda yapılan güncel çalışmaları taramaktadır. İnanıyoruz ki bu özel sayının yayınlanması, Konuşma Çözümlemesinin Uygulamalı Dilbilimde son zamanlarda kullanılan en etkili yöntemlerden biri olması bakımından, zaman açısından çok uygundur; ki bu çeşitli dergilerde sürekli artan bu alandaki makale sayısından anlaşılmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Konuşma Çözümlemesi, Uygulamalı Dilbilim, dil öğrenimi ve öğretimi, sınıf içi etkileşim, öğretmen yetiştirme, materyal geliştirme, dil yeterliliği değerlendirmesi

Introduction

Started by sociologists Harvey Sacks and Emanuel A. Schegloff in early 1960s as a 'naturalistic observational discipline that could deal with the details of social action rigorously, empirically and formally' (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p.289), Conversation Analysis (henceforth CA) aims to 'describe, analyse, and understand talk as a basic and constitutive feature of human social life' (Sidnell, 2010, p.1). As an approach to the study of talk-in-interaction, CA grew out of ethnomethodology as developed by Garfinkel (1964; 1967), which studies 'the common sense resources, practices and procedures through which members of a society produce and recognise mutually intelligible objects, events and courses of action' (Liddicoat, 2007, p.2). Although CA is rooted in Ethnomethodology, which can be used 'to study any kind of human action' (Seedhouse, 2004, p.13), it has its own principles and procedures and focuses exclusively on actions that are manifested through talk[1]. The basic principles of CA, according to Seedhouse (2005), are as follows:

1) *There is order at all points in interaction*: Talk in interaction is systematically organised, deeply ordered and methodic.
2) *Contributions to interaction are context-shaped and context-renewing*: Contributions to interaction cannot be adequately understood except by reference to the sequential environment in which they occur and in which the participants design them to occur.

* PhD candidate, ECLS, Newcastle University, UK, olcay.sert@ncl.ac.uk.
** Professor of Educational and Applied Linguistics, ECLS, Newcastle University, UK, paul.seedhouse@ncl.ac.uk.

[1] Non-verbal communication and gaze can be included if the analysis draws on video-recordings.

> They also form part of the sequential environment in which a next contribution will occur.
> 3) *No order of detail can be dismissed a priori as disorderly, accidental, or irrelevant (Heritage 1984, p.*241): CA has a detailed transcription system, and a highly empirical orientation.
> 4) *Analysis is bottom-up and data driven*: The data should not be approached with any prior theoretical assumptions, regarding, for example, power, gender, or race; unless there is evidence in the details of the interaction that the interactants themselves are orienting to it.
>
> (p.166-67)

The nature of turn-taking in talk-in-interaction is at the heart of CA (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008). Adjacency pairs, repair and preference are other basic notions in relation to interactional organisation. Space precludes a full account of CA methodology here, as our main focus will be contributions of CA to Applied linguistics. For a detailed account of CA methodology, its treatment of data, and the theoretical underpinnings, see Psathas, 1995; Liddicoat, 2007; ten Have, 2007; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008; and Sidnell, 2010. Although focusing on application is the essence of Applied Linguistics, CA has only (relatively) recently developed an applied framework. As Seedhouse (2011) claims, 'the development of an applied dimension in CA and its fundamental concern with language as a form of social action suggest a natural link with applied linguistics' (p.346). Applied linguists, then, can benefit from bringing the resources of CA to bear on different domains (e.g. the organisation of interaction in classrooms and the assessment of learning), which engage their interest and professional concerns (Schegloff et al., 2002).

This short introduction to the special issue aims at introducing briefly recent research that has been informed by the resources of CA within the field of Applied Linguistics, with a relatively stronger focus on learning and teaching contexts, and with particular reference to the articles in this issue, where relevant. We will first start with a consideration of instructed learning contexts, as most of the studies published in this volume draw on research carried out in classroom settings. The next section will review a newly emerging field, which seeks to document the practices of language learning by using a micro-analytic approach; namely CA-SLA. This will be followed by the potential offered by a CA research paradigm in relation to; language proficiency assessment, materials design and development, and language teacher education respectively.

Classroom interaction

The first and one of the most influential CA investigations into formal speech-exchange systems in educational settings is McHoul's (1978) study on the organisation of turns in classrooms. By examining a number of violational and non-violational turn transitions for their orderliness, he reveals that 'the social identity contrast "Teacher/Student" is expressed in terms of differential participation rights and obligations' (p. 211). His research called for a systematic investigation of classroom talk-in-interaction, which led to book-length manuscripts within the fields of language learning and teaching (e.g. Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004). Seedhouse's work documents the interactional organisation of second language (L2) classrooms and uncovers the reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction. He stresses the dynamic nature of context by 'exemplifying how the institution of the L2 classroom is talked in and out of being by participants and how teachers create L2 classroom contexts and shift from one context to another' (2011, p.12). The micro-contexts of classroom interaction he identifies are procedural context, task oriented context, form and accuracy context and meaning and fluency context. As the pedagogical focus varies, so the

organisation of turn and sequence varies (Seedhouse, 2005); and a good understanding of this reflexive relationship enables researchers to see that, as Walsh (2002) states, 'where language use and pedagogic purpose coincide, learning opportunities are facilitated' (p.5).

The findings of CA-informed classroom interaction research challenge the assumptions of earlier discourse analytic studies (i.e. Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975), which try to portray classroom interaction by heavily relying on teacher-initiated three-part sequences (Initiation-Response-Feedback/Evaluation). There is a growing body of micro-analytic research which allows us to have a better understanding of the context-sensitive nature of classroom interaction by reporting, for instance, how participants accomplish learning tasks collectively (Pochon-Berger, this issue; Hellermann and Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Mondada and Pekarek Doehler, 2004) or how learners move out of IRF patterns and establish student-initiated participation structures that create speaking opportunities for fellow participants (Waring, 2009). In line with Waring's research, Jacknick (this issue) demonstrates how inverted IRF sequences in ESL classrooms (a student initiates a sequence, the teacher responds, and the student follows-up in the third turn) enable the learners become agents of their own learning, resulting in a student-*directed* (author's emphasis) learning in action. The issue of students becoming agents of their own learning using certain participation devices (which is also evidenced through similar findings by Durus et al. (2010) in EFL classrooms in Germany) highlights the significance of agency in classroom interaction research. The investigation of agency, of course, is not only limited to instructed *language* learning contexts. For example, Mashford-Scott and Church (this issue) show how teachers promote children's agency in early learning environments in Australia.

Although there is an obvious tendency to promote learner-learner interaction and/or to minimise teacher talk/intervention so as to maximise student participation in classroom settings (mostly due to the assumed pedagogical superiority of communicative approaches to teaching and task based learning), a great amount of instructed language learning around the world is still undertaken through traditional ways of teaching dominated by teacher-fronted interaction and controlled by the asymmetrical nature of turn distribution. Therefore, there is still room for further research within the interactional environments of IRF patterns, or the resources the teachers use to elicit student talk, i.e. teacher questions (see Koshik 2010). In this respect, many scholars, using a CA methodology, have reinvestigated teaching and learning practices within three part sequences. Based on 46 hours of ESL classroom instructions, Lee (2007), for example, demonstrates how the third turn carries out the contingent task of responding to and acting on the prior turns while moving interaction forward. Hellermann's (2005) findings show systematic uses of pitch level and contour in triadic dialogue, and provides evidence for a unique action projection of the third part in the three-part sequence (also see Skidmore and Murakami, 2010 and Hellermann, 2003). Also, in a more recent study, Zemel and Koschmann (2011) successfully show how reinitiation of IRF sequences and a tutor's organisation of his ongoing engagement with students encourage a 'convergence between the doers of an action and its recipients' (Schegloff, 1992).

Detailed microanalysis of the features of classroom talk has also been undertaken within the higher education domain, including university seminars (Walsh and O'Keeffe, 2010) and university lectures (Christodoulidou, this issue), as well as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) contexts (e.g. Kupetz, this issue; Evnitskaya and Morton, 2011). In Kupetz's study, multimodality becomes a central focus with regards to how students carry out the interactional activity of explaining, and how this activity is sequentially organised and collaboratively achieved by all participants. It is obvious that recent CA research makes more

use of multimodal analysis, thanks to the advancements in recording technology. With this in mind, researchers started to have a more comprehensive grasp of various visual and non-verbal dynamics of classroom interaction by neatly focusing on, for example, the use of resources like head nods, pointing and gaze in turn allocation and repair (Kääntä, 2010). This multimodal focus in language classrooms has also been used to investigate how recipiency is established (Mortensen, 2009), how a willing next speaker is selected (Mortensen, 2008), and the ways in which round robins are initiated and sequentially managed (Mortensen and Hazel, this issue) while organising and managing tasks.

Classroom interaction has been researched using different methods of inquiry including Discourse Analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis, Systemic Functional Linguistics and various qualitative and quantitative paradigms within Applied Linguistics. CA investigation is relatively new to this field and the outcomes, nonetheless, have been very promising. One should be aware of the fact that different research methodologies, even when applied to the same discoursal data, can reach diametrically opposing conclusions (Seedhouse, 2010). With this in mind, we take the position that CA is well equipped to investigate various dynamics of classroom-talk-in-interaction and shed light upon language teaching and learning practices. The CA investigation of learning (i.e. language learning), however, has not been free of criticism, since mental constructs like understanding and cognition have long been associated with a more cognitive and psycholinguistic approach, which have been the backbone of the mainstream Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research. Firth and Wagner's (1997) arguments challenged the assumptions of cognitivist research and called for (1) sensitivity to contextual and interactional aspects of language use, (2) a broadening of the SLA database and more importantly, (3) an adoption of a more emic and participant-relevant perspective towards SLA research. This has led way to the newly emerging field of CA-SLA and a reconceptualisation of learning as learning-in-action (Firth and Wagner, 2007) and competence-in-action (Pekarek Doehler, 2006).

CA and Language Learning

A recently emerging body of research that applies the ethnomethodological insights of CA to the analysis of second language interactions, and which aims to promote language learning in various contexts, has been labelled CA-for-SLA (Markee and Kasper, 2004). Mori and Markee (2009) distinguish between CA-informed and CA-inspired approaches to SLA. According to them, CA-inspired approaches to SLA 'tend to favor a relatively purist or CA-native approach to the analysis of learning talk (p.2)'. On the contrary, CA-informed approaches to SLA combine it with exogenous theories (e.g. Hellermann (2009) and Firth (2009) use the notion of *communities of practice*). Jenks (2010) brings in further distinctions within the field of CA-for-SLA. He firstly makes a distinction between a strong view and a weak view of CA-for-SLA; the former abandoning the cognitive tradition of SLA research (e.g. Mondada and Pekarek Doehler 2004) and the latter favouring discussion between CA and cognitive traditions. Jenks's further distinctions include data-driven vs. theory-driven/informed CA-for-SLA studies and pure vs. linguistic CA (p. 148-51).

As mentioned in the previous section, CA-for-SLA bases its understanding of learning and competence *on and in action*. According to Pekarek Doehler (2010), 'learning a language involves a continuous process of adaptation of patterns of language-use-for-action in response to locally emergent communicative needs, and the routinisation of these patterns through repeated participation in social activities…and the resulting *competencies* are adaptive, flexible and sensitive to the contingencies of use' (p.107). The construct 'competence', however, is not easy to conceptualise. Young (2008) defines *Interactional Competence* as 'a

relationship between the participants' employment of linguistic and interactional resources and the contexts in which they are employed. It is not an individual phenomenon, but is co-constructed by all participants in a particular discursive practice' (p.101). Development of Interactional Competence, therefore, should be differentiated from earlier definitions of competence (i.e. linguistic, communicative). Markee (2008) proposes three components of Interactional Competence: 1) language as a formal system (includes pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar), 2) semiotic systems, including turn-taking, repair, sequence organization, and 3) gaze and paralinguistic features.

CA provides a means of exploring the variable ways in which competence is co-constructed in particular contexts by the participants involved (Seedhouse, 2011). Two of the most systematic analyses of interactional development from a longitudinal perspective are Hellermann (2008) and Cekaite (2007), which combine CA with a framework of language socialisation. Other longitudinal studies include Young and Miller (2004), Brouwer and Wagner (2004), and Hellermann (2006, 2007). In addition to these, Markee (2008) develops a methodology to track L2 development longitudinally. There are also cross-sectional accounts of learning in which a single or a collection of instances, or a case is analysed. An example of such research is Brouwer (2003), who examines word search sequences between native and nonnative speakers and develops a distinction between word search sequences that act as language learning opportunities and those which do not (also see Lazaraton, 2004 and Mondada and Pekarek Doehler, 2004 for other examples of cross-sectional studies).

Providing evidence of learning is problematic since learning is entwined in the progress of interaction, therefore 'it is very difficult to isolate and extract specific phenomena with certainty' (Seedhouse and Walsh, 2010, p.138). Socially distributed cognition, changes of epistemic stance and configuration of linguistic patterns should be observed through an empirical investigation on turn-by-turn basis to provide robust evidence of learning. More importantly, to have a comprehensive understanding of learning, SLA databases should go beyond formal instructional contexts and include domains where *L2 users* (Cook, 2007) have more flexible opportunities to use the language. The research settings for this broadened sense of learning domains can include workplaces (Firth, 2009) as well as computer-mediated-communication contexts like online voice-based chat rooms (Jenks, 2010). However, we cannot deny the fact that language education is still mostly bound to classroom settings, where there is limited access for learners to use the language they are learning outside of these formal settings (i.e. learners of Turkish as an additional language in England).

CA and Language proficiency assessment

Language Proficiency Interviews (LPIs) have received growing attention among scholars whose research intersects between microanalysis of talk and proficiency assessment (e.g. Kasper and Ross, 2007, 2003, 2001; Brown, 2003; Lazaraton, 2002, 1997; Young and He, 1998; Egbert, 1998). The topics focused by these studies include similarities (Egbert, 1998) and differences (Young and He, 1998) between natural conversations and LPIs, repetition as a source of miscommunication (Kasper and Ross, 2003), and monitoring reliability and validity of LPIs (Galacki, 2008; Ross, 2007; Lazaraton, 2002; Brown, 2003). The CA investigations into language testing also reflect the transition from more traditional (i.e. a tester and a testee) proficiency assessment to tests in different formats, like paired tests and oral language assessment in groups (Gan, 2010) and group discussions (Gan et al., 2008). In addition to these studies, by focusing on the behaviour of two CA-trained raters, Walters (2007) offers a model for iterative, CA-informed Second Language Pragmatics Testing (SLPT) development.

He also investigates L2 oral pragmatic comprehension (Walters, 2009) and provides evidence that the CA-informed test of aural-comprehension measure possesses some utility in SLPT.

Analysing language proficiency assessment interaction data and comparing the data to rater assessments, Sandlund and Sundqvist (this issue) demonstrate that different types of task-related trouble (TRT) reveal diverse understandings of the test task and that 'doing-being a successful task manager' is connected to a moderate orientation to the task and test format. One should also consider the fact that international proficiency tests (e.g. IELTS) are crucial for students and institutions within and beyond higher education system, especially for, but not limited to, mobility of learners. Interactions in IELTS speaking tests have been investigated in order to shed light on various interactional aspects in this domain. Seedhouse and Egbert (2006) examined 137 recorded IELTS speaking tests and noted that 'the interactional organization of the test differs significantly from interaction in classrooms or university settings in that the tests show very few repairs on part of the examiner, even in cases where candidates produce incomprehensible turns' (cited in Sandlund and Sundqvist, this issue, p.94). Furthermore, Seedhouse and Harris (forthcoming) show that topic is a vital construct in the Speaking Test, in which the organisation of topic must be understood as inextricably entwined with the organisation of turn-taking, sequence and repair and as directly related to the institutional goal.

Teaching practices in classrooms and the way Interactional Competence is assessed are mutually related. Does CA-informed research have the potential to overcome the limitations imposed by the L2 curriculum? Or, taking a more direct approach, in what ways can CA be directly applied to the syllabuses of speaking classes and to practices of testing speaking proficiency, which tend to be product-oriented and include various constraints like test-anxiety (Pappamihiel, 2002)? One potential application would be to take a process-oriented, portfolio-based approach. Throughout a semester, in speaking classes, students could be grouped to discuss learner-selected or teacher-led topics and record their own conversations over time. Given basic training on various features of talk-in-interaction and CA transcription practices, the students then can be asked to transcribe selected parts of their interaction and form a portfolio which will be monitored by teachers. This kind of practice will create awareness for students on the different features of their own conversations in L2, and will also inform themselves and the teachers on the different aspects of their interaction, including accuracy and fluency. It is inevitable that the students will eventually be assessed at the end of the semester; but this time, they will be actively involved in the process as (to some extent) agents of their own assessment (and indirectly of learning). Like language proficiency assessments, the use of materials in instructed language learning environments is an integral part of teaching and learning processes. The following section will present the ways CA has investigated, and informed materials design and development.

Materials design and development: what CA can offer

Issues relating to the authenticity of dialogues in language teaching materials are complex and have been hotly debated (Seedhouse 2004, 2005). For Moreno Jaen and Peres Basanta (2009), textbook conversations use artificial scripted dialogues based on someone's intuitions about what people are likely to say or in most cases drawn from written language (p.287). Saraç (2007) explored the beliefs of 100 Turkish pre-service teachers of English on the perceived socio-pragmatic problems of the dialogues in textbooks. She found that the teacher candidates do not trust the current course books used in Turkey. According to Seedhouse (2004), "CA is well positioned to portray the similarities and differences between invented dialogue and naturally occurring interaction, both in terms of ordinary conversation and institutional

interaction" (p.228). In order to develop an understanding of the problems in teaching materials and to bring in insights from CA, many researchers have investigated naturally occurring conversations, for example telephone calls and work place conversations, in an attempt to build links to language classrooms (e.g. Bernsten, 2002; Bowles, 2006; Brown and Lewis, 2003; Wong, 2002).

Bernsten (2002) analyses pre-sequences with regards to offers, requests and invitations in ESL textbooks and found out that they do not occur as frequently as in ordinary conversations. Wong (2002) focuses on different types of sequences in phone conversations found in ESL textbooks and compared them to authentic telephone conversations, which showed that the conversations in textbooks are problematic and incomplete. She also (2007) compares the closing sequences of 81 invented phone calls from language teaching materials with those of authentic phone calls and found a similar mismatch. Similarly, Mori (2005) reveals significant differences between the way a question word (dooshite) is used in beginner level Japanese coursebooks and the way it is used in L1 talk. These investigations show that although CA was developed to analyse only *naturally occurring talk*, it can also be used to reveal the potential problems of using invented dialogues in language teaching materials. Therefore, the use of transcriptions of naturally occurring talk with recordings for teaching has been promoted by applied linguists from CA circles. However, this would not always be possible, given that ordinary conversations are not necessarily the best materials for teaching purposes; we should also address the students' needs by also showing examples of scripted conversations that they would enjoy. In this respect, the use of films and TV series could be one possible suggestion, especially for adult learners in L2 classrooms.

Sert (2009) claims that the use of TV series can be an invaluable resource for language teachers by exposing learners to multi-modal texts that contextualise the materials used through various interactional and semiotic, as well as linguistic, resources. After illustrating some differences found in dialogues in a British TV series compared to ordinary talk (e.g. extended wait time and extended mutual gaze in the co-text of Audience Laughter Sound Effect, lack of overlapping talk), he offers a lesson plan that can be engaging for learners of English. Moreno Jaen and Peres Basanta (2009) states that there is considerable potential for researchers, textbook designers and teachers to take advantage of the new millennium DVD technology for embedding context in understanding and interpreting oral interactions as a fundamental prerequisite for improving students' productive conversational skills (p.287). The issue of analysing scripted talk has also been raised by Bowles (this issue). He claims that the existence of poeticity in conversation has consequences for the analysis of dialogue in literature and that CA may have a role to play in this kind of study. As he further puts, 'in classrooms, the reading aloud of literary dialogue is often used for illustrative purposes to "get a text out in the open", with the reading acting as a prompt for subsequent class discussion. Here, the social action of recital contributes in interesting ways to classroom talk and these deserve analysis' (p.167). Since teachers, in most cases, are still playing a central role in language teaching and learning, the following section will briefly introduce CA-informed research on language teacher education.

CA-informed Language Teacher Education

One of the most influential research studies at the intersection of applied CA and reflective practice is by Walsh (2006), who developed a Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) framework that 'identifies different varieties or modes of discourse and the pedagogical aims and interactional characteristics of each' (Seedhouse, 2011). Walsh (2006, 2011) develops the idea of Classroom Interactional Competence, which encompasses the features of

classroom interaction that make the teaching/learning process more or less effective, These features are: (a) maximizing interactional space; (b) shaping learner contributions (seeking clarification, scaffolding, modelling, or repairing learner input); (c) effective use of eliciting; (d) instructional idiolect (i.e. a teacher's speech habits); and (e) interactional awareness. Walsh identifies four classroom micro contexts, referred to as modes.

Managerial mode refers to the way teachers organize the class and move between activities (McCarten, 2007). In managerial mode, the pedagogical goals are to transmit information, to organize the physical learning environment, to refer learners to materials, to introduce or conclude an activity, and to change from one mode of learning to another. In relation to this mode, the identified interactional features are: (1) a single, extended teacher turn, which uses explanations and/or instructions; (2) the use of transitional markers; (3) the use of confirmation checks; and (4) an absence of learner contributions. As for the classroom context mode, the pedagogical goals are to enable learners to express themselves clearly, to establish a context and to promote oral fluency. The interactional features of this mode are extended learner turns, short teacher turns, minimal repair, content feedback, referential questions, scaffolding, and clarification requests. In skills and systems mode, on the other hand, different interactional features are identified; as extended teacher turns, direct repair, display questions, and form-focused feedback. It is obvious that there is a different pedagogical focus in this mode, which is to enable learners to produce correct forms, to allow the learners to manipulate the target language, to provide corrective feedback, and to display correct answers. Lastly, in materials mode, the pedagogical goals are to provide language practice around a piece of material, to elicit responses in relation to the material, to check and display answers, to clarify when necessary and to evaluate contributions. The interactional features are extensive use of display questions, form-focused feedback, corrective repair, and the use of scaffolding.

Considering that effective mentoring sine qua non is an integral part of teacher education, a large number of studies have investigated the effects of mentoring in relation to teachers' practice using a CA framework (Carroll, 2005; Hall, 2001; Lazaraton and Ishihara, 2005; Strong and Baron, 2004). Hall (2001), for example, studies the conversations of academics and teachers, suggesting that teaching, and therefore student learning, are improved through teacher learning and development. Additionally, Carroll (2005) develops a theoretical framework for examining interactive talk and its relationship to professional learning in teacher study groups. By comparing the interactional practices of a trainee teacher and an experienced teacher, Seedhouse (2008) shows how and why the instructions which trainee teachers give manage to confuse students and what experienced teachers typically do right so that the students are able to carry out the required procedures. Lastly, Sert (2010) proposes a workable CA-informed framework to be implemented into language teacher education curriculum in Turkey by combining insights from critical reflective practice, Teacher Language Awareness (Walsh, 2003; Wright, 2002) and effective mentoring.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have argued that CA has been employed in many different ways in Applied Linguistics. CA has been employed to investigate classroom interaction and to develop areas such as teacher training, testing and materials design. It has helped to develop our understanding of how constructs such as learning and competence are realised in interaction. Perhaps its main contributions have been to provide us with a realistic idea of what actually happens in language learning talk and to enable a process account of language learning through interaction.

What are the possible future directions for CA research in the area of language learning and teaching? Seedhouse (2011) suggests that studies will examine a wider range of languages being learnt and taught, using a wider range of teaching practices and activities in a wider range of contexts. Another likely growth area is research into technology-based forms of communication, e.g. webchat and skype and their implications for language learning. It is not yet clear, however, how many of the basic principles of CA can be applied to such a medium. Multimodal methods for data presentation and analysis (see Kupetz, this issue) are sure to be high on the agenda. The nature of data presented in CA studies has always been linked to technological developments and no doubt further developments will have an impact in this area.

References

Bernsten, S. G. (2002). *Using Conversation Analysis to evaluate pre-sequences in invitation, offer and request dialogues in ESL textbooks*. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Bowles, H. (2006). Bridging the gap between conversation analysis and ESP- an applied study of the opening sequences of NS and NNS service telephone calls. *English for Specific Purposes*. 25, 332-357.

Bowles, H. (2011). The contribution of CA to the study of literary dialogue. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*. 5(1), 161-168. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_5_1/bowles.pdf

Brown, A. (2003). Interviewer variation and the co-construction of speaking proficiency. *Language Testing,* 20(1), 1-25.

Brown, T.P. and Lewis, M. (2003). An ESP project: Analysis of an authentic workplace conversation. *English for Specific Purposes*. 22, 93-98.

Brouwer, C. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *The Modern Language Journal,* 87(4), 534-545.

Brouwer, C. E. and Wagner, J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics.* 1(1), 30-47.

Carroll, D. (2005). Learning through interactive talk: A school-based mentor teacher study group as a context for professional learning. *Teacher and Teacher Education*. 21, 457-473.

Cekaite, A. (2007). A child's development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*. 91(1), 45-62.

Christodoulidou, M. (2011). Lexical markers within the university lecture . *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*. 5(1), 143-160. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_5_1/chistodoulidou.pdf

Cook, V. (2007). The nature of the L2 user. In Roberts, L., Gurel, A., Tatar, S. and Marti, L. (eds). *EUROSLA Yearbook*. 7, 205-20.

Durus, N., Ludwig, M., Sert, O., Steinkraus, R. and Ziegler, G. (2010). Turn-initials as learners' participation devices: "turning out" in ELF discourse. *New Insights into the Study of Conversation: Applications to the Language Classroom*. May 26-28, 2010. University of Granada, Granada, Spain.

Egbert, M. (1998). Miscommunication in language proficiency interviews of first-year German students: comparison with natural conversation. In R. Young & A. He (Eds.), *Talking and Testing: Discourse Approaches to the Assessment of Oral Proficiency* (pp. 147-69). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Evnitskaya, N. and Morton, T. (2011). Knowledge construction, meaning-making and interaction in CLIL science classroom communities of practice. *Language and Education*. 25(2), 109-127.

Firth, A. and Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*. 81, 285-300.

Firth, A. and Wagner, J. (2007). Second/Foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a 'reconceptualised' SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*. 91, 800-819.

Firth, A. (2009). Doing *not* being a foreign language learner: English as a lingua franca in the workplace and (some) implications for SLA. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. 47(1), 127-156.

Galaczi, E., D. (2008). Peer-peer interaction in a speaking test: the case of the First Certificate in English examination. *Language Assessment Quarterly. 5*(2), 89-119.

Gan, Z. (2010). Interaction in group oral assessment: A case study of higher- and lower-scoring students. *Language Testing. 27*(4), 585-602.

Gan, Z., Davison, C., and Hamp-Lyons, L. (2008). Topic negotiation in peer group oral assessment situations: A conversation analytic approach. *Applied Linguistics.* 30(3), 315-344.

Garfinkel, H. (1964). Studies in the routine grounds of everyday activities. *Social Problems.* 11, 225-50.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology.* Cambridge: Polity.

Hall, G. (2001). Relationships in a professional development school: Teachers and academics learning together through their talk. *ATEA Conference-Teacher Education: Change of Heart, Mind and Action*. Melbourne 24-26 September 2001, 1-9.

Hellermann, J. (2003). The interactive work of prosody in the IRF exchange: Teacher repetition in feedback moves. *Language in Society*. 32, 79-104.

Hellermann, J. (2005). The sequential and prosodic co-construction of a 'quiz game' activity in classroom talk. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 37, 919-944.

Hellermann, J. (2006). Classroom interactive practices for literacy. *Applied Linguistics.* 27, 377-404.

Hellermann, J. (2007). The development of practices for action in classroom dyadic interaction: Focus on task openings. *The Modern Language Journal*. 91(1), 83-96.

Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social Actions for Classroom Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hellermann, J. (2009). Practices for dispreferred responses using no by a learner of English. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. 47(1), 95-126.

Hellermann, J., and Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). On the Contingent Nature of Language-Learning-Tasks. *Classroom Discourse*, 1(1), 25-45.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis (2nd Edition)*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jacknick, C. M. (2011). "But this is writing": post-expansion in student-initiated sequences. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*. 5(1), 39-54. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_5_1/jacknick.pdf

Jenks, C. J. (2010). Adaptation in online voice-based chat rooms: implications for language learning in Applied Linguistics. In Seedhouse, P., Walsh, S. and Jenks, C. (eds.). *Conceptualising Learning in Applied Linguistics*. (pp. 147-162), Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Kasper, G., and Ross, S. (2001). 'Is drinking a hobby, I wonder': Other-initiated repair in language proficiency interviews. *Paper presented at AAAL*, St. Louis, MS.

Kasper, G., and Ross, S. (2003). Repetition as a source of miscommunication in oral proficiency interviews. In J. House, G. Kasper & S. Ross (Eds.), *Misunderstanding in social life. Discourse approaches to problematic talk,* (pp. 82-106). Harlow, UK: Longman/Pearson Education.

Kasper, G., and Ross, S. (2007). Multiple questions in oral proficiency interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 39*,* 2045-2070.

Kääntä, L. (2010). *Teacher Turn-allocation and Repair Practices in Classroom Interaction: A Multisemiotic Perspective.* Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä.

Koshik, I. (2010). Questions that convey information in teacher-student conferences. In, Freed, A.F. and Ehrlich, S. *"Why do you ask?" The function of questions in institutional discourse.* 159-186. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kupetz, M. (2011). Multimodal resources in students' explanations in CLIL interaction. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*. 5(1), 121-141. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_5_1/ kupetz.pdf

Lazaraton, A. (1997). Preference organization in oral proficiency interviews: The case of language ability assessments. *Research on Language and Social Interaction.* 30(1), 53-72.

Lazaraton, A. (2002). *A qualitative approach to the validation of oral language tests.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lazaraton, A. (2004). Gesture and speech in the vocabulary explanations of one ESL Teacher: A microanalytic inquiry. *Language Learning.* 54(1), 79-117.

Lazaraton, A. and Ishihara, N. (2005). Understanding second language teacher practice using microanalysis and self-reflection: A collaborative case study. *The Modern Language Journal*. 89(4), 529-542.

Lee, Y. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 39, 180-206.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation Analysis*. New Jersey: Routledge.

Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics. 29,* 404-427.

Markee, N. and Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal.* 88, 491–500.

Mashford-Scott, A. and Church, A. (2011). Promoting children's agency in early childhood education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*. 5(1), 15-38. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_5_1/mashford-scott_church.pdf

McCarten, J. (2007). *Teaching Vocabulary: Lessons from the corpus, lessons from the classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McHoul, A. (1978). The Organization of Turns at Formal Talk in the Classroom. *Language in Society. 7*, 183-213.

Mondada, L. and Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*. 88(4), 501-518.

Moreno Jaen, M., and Perez Basanta, C. (2009). Developing conversational competence through language awareness and multimodality: the use of DVDs. *ReCALL*. 21(3), 283-301.

Mori, J. (2005). Why Not Why? The Teaching of Grammar, Discourse, Sociolinguistic and Cross-Cultural Perspectives. *Japanese Language and Literature*. 39(2), 255-289.

Mori, J. and Markee, N. (2009). Language learning, cognition, and interactional practices: An introduction. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. 47(1), 1-9.

Mortensen, K. (2008). Selecting next-speaker in the second language classroom: How to find a willing next-speaker in planned activities. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 5(1), 55-79.

Mortensen, K. (2009). Establishing recipiency in pre-beginning position in the second language classroom. *Discourse Processes*. 46(5), 491-515.

Mortensen, K and Hazel, S. (2011). Initiating round robins in the L2 classroom – preliminary observations . *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*. 5(1), 55-70. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_5_1/mortensen_hazel.pdf

Pappamihiel, N. E. (2002). English as a second language students and English language anxiety: Issues in the mainstream classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English.* 36(3), 327-355.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2006). Compètence et langage en action. *Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquèe.* 84, 9-45.

Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). Conceptual changes and methodological challenges: on language, learning and documenting learning in conversation analytic SLA research. In Seedhouse, P., Walsh, S. and Jenks, C. (eds.). *Conceptualising Learning in Applied Linguistics*. (pp. 105-126), Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Pochon-Berger, E. (2011). A participant's perspective on tasks: from task instruction, through pre-task planning, to task accomplishment. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*. 5(1), 71-90. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_5_1/pochon-berger.pdf

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ross, S. (2007). A Comparative Task-in-Interaction Analysis of OPI Backsliding. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 39, 2017-2044.

Sandlund, E. and Sundqvist, P. (2011). Managing task-related trouble in L2 oral proficiency tests: contrasting interaction data and rater assessment. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*. 5(1), 91-120. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_5_1/sandlund_sundqvist.pdf

Saraç, H.S. (2007). Öğretmen adaylarının 8. Sınıf İngilizce ders kitabındaki diyalogların etkinliği konusunda inançları: toplumedim sorunları. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi (Kastamonu Journal of Education)*. 15(1), 401-410.

Schegloff, E. A. and Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica.* 7, 289-327.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*. 97(5), 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E.A., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S. and Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation Analysis and Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 22, 3-31.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation Analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*. 38(4), 165-187.

Seedhouse, P. (2008). Learning to Talk the Talk: Conversation Analysis as a Tool for Induction of Trainee Teachers. Chapter in Garton, S. & Richards, K. (Eds.) *Professional Encounters in TESOL* (pp. 42-57) Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Seedhouse, P. (2010). How research methodologies influence findings. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*. 4(1), 1-15. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_4_1/seedhouse.pdf

Seedhouse, P. (2011). Conversation Analytic Research into Language Teaching and Learning. In Hinkel, E. (Ed.) *The Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning,* Volume II (pp. 345-363). Routledge.

Seedhouse, P. and Egbert, M. (2006). The interactional organisation of the IELTS speaking test. *IELTS Research Reports*.6, 161-206.

Seedhouse, P. and Harris, A. (in preparation). Topic Development in the IELTS Speaking Test. IELTS Research Reports.

Seedhouse, P. and Walsh, S. (2010). Learning a second language through classroom interaction. In Seedhouse, P., Walsh, S. and Jenks, C. (eds.). *Conceptualising Learning in Applied Linguistics*. (pp. 127-146), Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Sert, O. (2009). Developing Interactional Competence by Using TV Series in "English as an Additional Language" Classrooms. *Enletawa Journal*. 2, 23-50.

Sert, O. (2010). A Proposal for a CA-Integrated English Language Teacher Education Program in Turkey. *Asian EFL Journal (Special Issue on English Language Teacher Education and Development: Issues and Perspectives in Asia, ed. Eva Bernat)*. 12(3), 62-97.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis- an introduction*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sinclair, J.M. and Coulthard, R.M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.

Skidmore, D. and Murakami, K. (2010). How prosody marks shifts in footing in classroom discourse. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 49(2-3), 69-77.

Strong, M. and Baron, W. (2004). An analysis of mentoring conversations with beginning teachers: suggestions and responses. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 20, 47-57.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis (2nd Edition)*. London: Sage.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or Obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*. 6(1), 3-23.

Walsh, S. (2003). Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom. *Language Awareness*. 12, 124-42.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Walsh, S. and O'Keeffe, A. (2010). Investigating higher education seminar talk. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*. 4(2), 141-158. Retrieved from http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_4_2/walsh_okeeffe.pdf

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in action*. Oxon: Routledge.

Walters, F. S. (2007). A conversation-analytic hermeneutic rating protocol to assess L2 oral pragmatic competence. *Language Testing*. 27(2), 155-183.

Walters, F. S. (2009). A Conversation Analysis-Informed Test of L2 Aural Pragmatic Comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly*. 43(1), 29-54.

Waring, H. Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback): A single case analysis. *Language Learning*. 59(4), 796-824.

Wong, J. (2002). Applying Conversation Analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating dialogue in English as a second language textbooks. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. 40, 37-60.

Wong, J. (2007). Answering my call: A look at telephone closings. In Bowles, H. & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Conversation Analysis and language for specific purposes,* (pp. 271-304), Bern: Peter Lang.

Wright, T. (2002). Doing language awareness: Issues for language study in language teacher education. In Trappes-Lomax, H. and Ferguson, G. (Eds.), *Language in Language Teacher Education*. (pp. 113-130). London: John Benjamin.

Young, R. F. (2008). *Language and interaction: a resource book*. Oxon: Routledge.

Young, R.F. and He, A. (eds.) (1998). *Talking and testing: discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Young, R. F. and Miller, E. R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *The Modern Language Journal.* 88, 519–535.

Zemel, A. and Koschmann, T. (2011). Pursuing a question: reinitiating IRE sequences as a method of instruction. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 43(2), 475-488.