Signaling a turn at talk: A Conversation Analysis Approach to Teaching Classroom Interactions

journal or publication title	The Journal of Seigakuin University
volume	第32巻
number	第2号
page range	183-203
year	2020-03-15
URL	http://doi.org/10.15052/00003726

〈原著論文〉

Signaling a turn at talk: A Conversation Analysis Approach to Teaching Classroom Interactions

Derek N. CANNING

Abstract

Conducting a conversation is a fundamental skill for second language learners. Lacking in many post-secondary speaking courses, however, is a comprehensive methodology for helping students develop the pragmatic competence necessary to engage in a natural, casual conversation. Conversation Analysis (CA) has generated a lot of interest in second language acquisition (SLA) research for the insights it brings to bear on talk in interaction. CA has shown the means by which participants sequence a conversation; these sequences are teachable. CA can also be utilized on the classroom interactions generated through CA-informed pedagogy. The study here outlines the theoretical justifications for teaching conversation and the utility of CA in doing so. It then analyzes several classroom interactions that demonstrate the efficacy of this approach. The conclusions support those found in other CA SLA studies. Finally, the results suggest that with instruction, learners can apply CA-informed communication strategies to real-time conversations.

Key words: Speaking, Input, Interaction, Conversation Analysis, Oral Communication

Being able to carry on a conversation in a second language (L2) is a primary goal for many learners and a fundamental objective for second language educators. To many learners, the ability to converse in the target language is a benchmark for "knowing" the language. For educators, conversation is not only a key objective, but one of the means by which learners acquire the target language. In studies of the 1980s, much research was done on the role of conversation between native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) as the locus of L2 acquisition. Conversation provides the input, much of it modified, necessary for acquisition. Misunderstandings attendant upon these conversations occasion a degree of negotiation of

基礎総合教育部
論文受理日 2019 年 11 月 6 日

meaning between the speakers. That is, NS and NNS work together in the co-construction of meaning, shaping the input provided by the NS to be comprehensible, and thereby available for acquisition, to the learner. Later studies recognized that not all input necessarily came from NS-NNS interactions. Foreign language classrooms in regions where the target language is not widely spoken often rely on communication between pairs or groups of NNSs in classroom activities.

While the importance of conversation has long been recognized as a learning goal and a site of acquisition, there are issues regarding how it is taught and evaluated. The first is that "conversation" is a nebulous concept that is often left undefined. It is often assumed that having two L2 learners talk at each other will result in a conversation. Another issue is how conversations between learners are evaluated for pedagogic or research purposes. It has been argued that second language acquisition (SLA) researchers are over-reliant on quantitative research methods in this regard.

Conversation Analysis (CA) is a methodological approach that was first developed by Harvey Sacks in the 1960s and later developed by his colleagues Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008). CA is principally concerned with the organization of talk-in-interaction. Through carefully transcribed conversations, analysts determine how turns at talk make relevant subsequent turns by other participants. That is, turns at talk, or turn construction units (TCUs), are regarded as social actions that compel actions in response (Schegloff, 2007; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008). Schegloff gives as an example the utterance, "Would someone like some more iced tea?" which he argues is better understood as the speaker "doing an offer" rather than "talking about ice tea" (Schegloff, 2008, p. 1). The relevant action in response to this utterance would be to accept or deny the offer. Crucially, CA is not concerned with linguistics beyond its relevance to TCUs. It does, however, show how talk-in-interaction: conversations, are constructed by participants. CA research also generates a corpus of transcribed conversations that can be drawn on for a number of other purposes, including qualitative SLA research and pedagogy.

This paper first outlines relevant literature on teaching conversation as a source of input and as an opportunity for the negotiation of meaning. It then traces the history of how early SLA research was taken to task for an over reliance on quantitative measures and a skewed understanding of the social identities of second-language speakers. It then outlines a course of instruction in conversation, based on CA principles, conducted in a first-year Japanese university speaking course. Near the conclusion of the course, CA methodological techniques were used to

examine the talk-in interaction produced by the participants. The data show that learners are able communicators who participate fluently in basic conversations. The data produced in this study show speakers relying on the CA-informed communicative techniques presented in the course of instruction, suggesting that such an approach is a valid method of helping learners become skilled conversationalists.[1]

Literature Review

Why Conversation?

Not long after Krashen argued that comprehensible input was the key factor in language acquisition in the early 1980s, it was suggested that interaction was equally vital. Long's 1981 paper argued that interaction, or the negotiation of meaning, was a necessary condition for the acquisition of a second language (p. 275). A 1987 study by Pica, Young and Doughty built on Long's work by looking at how comprehension through interaction was best facilitated in a classroom context. They compared the effectiveness of simplified teacher talk against the effectiveness of having the learner interact and negotiate the meaning of the instructor's directions during the task. They concluded that the interactional modification of input led to greater comprehension than the simplification of unidirectional instructions (p. 745). A key feature of the Pica et al. and Doughty studies is the assumption that effective negotiation of meaning had to take place between a NS and a non-native speaking NNS learner.

In contrast to the studies of NS and NNS interactions discussed above, a 1986 study by Duff empirically analyzed NNS-NNS dyadic conversations. She found that negotiation of meaning did take place, and a number of "clarification techniques" were utilized (p. 172). Another study from 1986 by Porter rated the quantity and quality of NNS-NNS interactions and found that learner to learner interaction contained negotiation of meaning. The researcher argued that "...in considering the value of comprehensible input for second language acquisition, we need to broaden our focus to include the possibility of acquisition through communicative interaction with other learners" p. 219). Brooks argued in a 1991 paper that learners need opportunities to engage other L2 speakers and therein employ the negotiation process in the target language. Brooks also notes that interview style speaking tasks are insufficient for this. Learners need to talk to one another spontaneously, in vernacular conversation (p. 1122).

Conversation is such a quotidian activity that it tends to be taken for granted. Meyer, Blondell and Mall-Grob note a commonly held belief that conversational skill improves naturally,

without dedicated instruction. However, research has shown conclusively that "conversational competence does not develop unaided" (2017, p. 246). Lesson plans and textbooks that are ostensibly dedicated to having students communicate with one another often present language targets and then expect learners to incorporate those targets into natural conversation. Meyer, Blondell, and Mall-Grob note that "many of the materials intended for the acquisition of additional languages largely assume that users are already competent conversationalists in other languages and simply need equivalent lexico-grammatical chunks in a less familiar language or prompts to converse in additional languages" (2017, p. 244).

Speaking lessons that are dedicated to conversational competence should focus on having the learners incorporate new language into a natural flow of speech; a conversation. Lexico-grammatical targets are often presented in classrooms as question and answer pairs without situational context. The tone of the resulting spoken interaction is often interrogative rather than conversational. To counter this, Meyer et al. recommend the introduction of formulaic phrases to achieve conversational goals, including negotiating agreement, topic development, polite sociality and preferred responses. However, issues with how formulaic phrases are selected and presented to learners needs careful consideration.

Often, the lexico-grammatical phrases presented for instruction raise other issues. Many of the phrases, questions, and responses as they are presented, are not derived from an analysis of spoken-language data. Dialogues and exchanges are often presented in idealized sets. They are demonstrated as grammatically mirrored, as in the following example, an example exchange in an exercise on adjectives of location: "A: Where is the laptop? B: It's on the... Where are the headphones? A: They're on the chair" Stemplski, 2007, p. 18). Using idealized grammar in textbooks and lessons fails to present the language as it is spoken, and according to Van Lier (1996), obscures the purpose of the interaction. Grammar drills that purport to be conversations are not pragmatically authentic.

Why Conversation Analysis?

Varonis and Gass recognized in 1985 that NNS-NNS interaction provided opportunities for interlocutors to engage in the negotiation of meaning, or repair. From a database of transcribed conversations, the researchers constructed a model in which repair sequences were regarded as digressions from the conversation. Varonis and Gass categorized indicators that non-understanding had taken place. Their conclusion was that NNS-NNS interactions provide opportunities "to receive input which they have made comprehensible through negotiation"

(1985, p. 87). Furthermore, they argued that NNS, due to "being not yet competent in the domain of the target language" would feel more comfortable in engaging in repair while speaking with another NNS, due to feeling less embarrassed (1985, p. 71). This last conclusion is problematic in that they offer no data, qualitative or otherwise, to support it.

Varonis and Gass's research methods were taken to task in a 1997 paper by Firth and Wagner. Firth and Wagner's criticisms centered on the coding and tallying of types of repair sequences and Varonis and Gass's assumption that NNS-NNS interactions are inherently less embarrassing for participants, both of which they took to be indicative of problems endemic to second language acquisition (SLA). Firth and Wagner's intention was to encourage SLA researchers to balance the cognitive aspects of language acquisitions with its social aspects. They argued that the priority given to "the research practice of coding, quantifying data, and replicating results" (1997, p. 288) neglects an examination of the social dimensions of language. In addition, SLA research, in Firth and Wagners's view, was overly focused on "linguistic deficiencies and communicative problems" (p. 288) rather than studying how learners actually succeed in communicating.

Varonis and Gass's consideration of repair sequences as parenthetical to communication shows how repair is often regarded as a breakdown in communication, rather than as a strategy that allows the communication to succeed. In Firth and Wagner's words, "misunderstandings and repair sequences... are not aberrations. Rather, they are integral parts of the normal, conversational discourse, regardless of the social identities of the actors involved" (p. 295). Second, the Varonis and Gass coding scheme is unnecessarily rigid, complex, and unwieldy. A taxonomic system like theirs is likely to miss the intricacies and subtleties of conversation. Finally, Varonis and Gass's argument that the status of the speakers as NS or NNS influence the interaction recognizes the social dimensions of interaction. However, assuming that this dynamic always asserts itself in the same way, or that these identities are foremost in the minds of the speakers at all times is problematic.

Firth and Wagner's paper argued for a reconceptualization of SLA that prioritized the study of talk in interaction from the perspective of the participants. This involves abandoning a priori assumptions of the effect of social identities. It further rejects classifying talk as problematic or containing errors. Firth and Wagner recommended an emic perspective on studying talk in interaction. This entails examining the interaction without preconceptions about what constitutes an error or how social identities influence interaction. Identities are relevant only when they are made so by the speakers. Errors are only errors when they are treated as such

by the participants. A 2004 paper by Markee and Kasper supported Firth and Wagner's recommendations and discussed how Conversation Analysis could be utilized as a tool for a "more emically oriented perspective on language learning" (2004, p. 491).

CA can be used in the classroom to analyze how interactions contribute to language acquisition. Markee and Kasper recognize that classroom talk involves a number of different "interrelated speech systems" (p. 492). That is, that there are a number of different nexuses in classroom communication, including, for example, student to student, teacher to student, task communication, and social communication. How these different types of talks are accomplished is not well documented beyond examining them through traditional models of initiation-response-evaluation or question-answer-comment types of sequences between instructor and learner. CA provides a research tool to look in detail at what is being done in other classroom talks. Markee and Kasper stress that CA does not examine the language itself, except as it is used in interaction, nor is it a key to the psychological processes of the participants. We can, however, observe how talk in interaction serves as the material for language acquisition.

Conversation, or talk in interaction, is a pragmatic activity that requires knowledge of the social conventions of the language group. Some elements of these social conventions in conversation are culturally specific, while others, as noted by Huth and Taleghani-Nikazam, are universal. CA can be used to determine how students are oriented to the norms of the target language, and what they transfer from their native languages and cultures (2006). One reason that students find this aspect of communication difficult, according to Bardovi-Harlig (1996), is that they do not receive adequate pragmatic input. Textbook examples of conversations are often derived from the intuition of the author, and not from authentic, colloquial speech. This problem has been identified by other researchers as well. See Huth and Taleghani-Nikazam, Nicholas (2015), and Seedhouse (2004). Nicholas observes that an explicit understanding of the pragmatic norms of the target language are necessary to achieve communicative competence. CA corpora can provide authentic examples of talk and inform a methodology of teaching conversation. It can also be used to analyze learner talk in interaction and to show how it is oriented to the teaching goals of the classroom.

Barraja-Rohan noted in a 2011 paper that CA is a tool for examining "order and social organization" in talk, and, as such, provides a grammar of interaction (p. 480). She instructed an experimental group in concepts of talk in organization drawn from CA research, including response tokens, adjacency pairs, and sociocultural norms. Her goal was to raise learners' awareness of how conversations are co-constructed pragmatically. Crucially, she had learners

employ these strategies in conversations. CA was again used to document learners' talks. Finally, learners then reflected on their conversations. Barraja-Rohan found that learners focused on communicating in their interactions, concomitant with the priorities of "naturally occurring conversations" held by native speakers (p. 499). Furthermore, she noted that the learners displayed facility in several of the "interactional competencies" identified in Kasper's taxonomy (2006).

It is important to note here that classroom talk is both the locus and object of learning. The goal of the course is to teach students how to converse in the target language. However, it is presumed that acquisition is simultaneously occurring through the interaction. As noted earlier in this paper, foundational SLA studies found that input made comprehensible through the negotiation of meaning is fundamental to acquisition. We cannot, however, directly observe how this cognitive process happens in each individual is. CA, as noted by He (2004), is not a theory of learning. It can, however, document how the social construction of talk provides "opportunities for language learning and teaching" (He, 2004, p. 573). Although the negotiation of meaning is regarded by many researchers as crucial to acquisition, He reminds us that we cannot be sure what it is about interaction that drives acquisition. We cannot observe what learners are acquiring by transcribing talk. What we can see is what they are doing.

Concerns that CA cannot in fact demonstrate that learning is taking place are legitimate. These concerns stem from the tension between cognitivist perceptions of acquisition and other researchers, such as Firth and Wagner, who want to study the socially mediated methods of language learning. Larsen-Freeman addressed this argument on the possible applications of CA to classroom research in a 2004 paper. She offers no definitive answer on the possible balance between the two approaches, but doubts that CA can demonstrate conclusively that learning is taking place. She does recognize that for either approach, conversation, or talk in interaction, is "a useful site for learning" (Larsen-Freeman, 2004, p. 605).

In contrast, Mori and Hasegawa claimed in 2009 that analysis of conversation can in fact demonstrate what is being learned, or acquired, by studying what the learners are attending to in the talk. They claim that cognition is manifested in interactive behaviors. The strongest example that they offer of this is word searches, or in CA parlance, an interlocutor's forward-oriented repair, when a speaker tries to mentally access and use a word in talk. This display of cognition is socially situated in the activity of talk, when speakers pause, avert gaze, or vocalize the word search. These types of behaviors demonstrate what the learners are thinking about, attending to, and, presumably, learning. Discovering what they are doing in interaction, goes

the argument, indicates what they are learning.

Word searches are a key aspect of repair identified in CA and are particularly important to SLA. They provide opportunities to study learning in the Vygotskyan sense. That is, beginning with the idea that thought is "symbolically mediated" through language, we can observe in talk how utterances reflect internal mental states (Buckwalter, 2001, p. 382). Buckwalter argues that an analysis of repair sequences can provide insight into the language acquisition process. She outlines how other studies have looked at NNS-NNS talk to identify the way in which the negotiation of meaning is used to work through difficulties in communication. Buckwalter then outlines a number of instances of self-initiated, self-repair (SISR) in dyadic conversations. In these, speakers identified problems in their own utterances and tried to make them more comprehensible. Word searches are an example of this type of repair, and Buckwalter, like Mori and Hasegawa, found many instances of word searches in transcribed NNS-NNS conversations. Buckwalter found that learners used repetition during repair sequences to "gain control of the production task" both in a self-regulatory, cognitive sense as well as in a social sense, that is, repeating a phrase in order to maintain a turn at talk. She argues that, as in findings in CA studies outside SLA (See for example, a discussion in Sidnell, 2010, p. 113), learners preferred self-repair and shows that other-repair, either self-initiated or other-initiated was rare in the data. These findings, she argues, and their similarity to the CA conclusions in other domains, demonstrates the appropriateness of CA in the study of SLA.

Method

This paper is an attempt to demonstrate one way in which CA-informed concepts can be introduced to speaking classes. Furthermore, it attempts to use CA to investigate the talk produced in those classrooms. In keeping with CA's emic perspective, this investigation is exploratory rather than experimental in nature, what is often termed "unmotivated looking" (Hutchby and Woffitt, 2008, p 89). Ideally, the results can then be used to evaluate the effectiveness of classroom techniques, and to inform future program, class, and activity design.

Participants and collection procedure

The data was drawn from two first-year introductory-level university English speaking classes in a Japanese university. The classes were both A-band classes, consisting of students who reached scores of 377 to 760 on the ACE (Assessment of Communicative English) test. The

A-band classes were the second-highest scoring group in the university in that year. The students' conversation skills were, however, elementary. Participants were ranked at level A2 on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages by the instructor. There were 18 participants, and all were volunteers. All but one of the participants were L1 Japanese students, and the remaining was a Chinese L1 speaker. The data was gathered over the course of the final month of classes. Pairs were audio and video recorded while participating in a 90 second conversation task that closely resembled a format practiced over the course of the semester.

Setting

The conversation task was introduced in the second week of a 15-week course. Students engaged in two or three 60-second conversations with a randomly assigned student partner. Students were given formulaic adjacency pairs to open and close the conversations and were free to ask questions of their own choosing during the body of the conversation. Initially, basic questions about daily activities were suggested. The phrases provided were decided upon by the instructor. Students opened the conversations at the instructor's mark and initiated the closing sequence when the timer expired. Over the course of the term, other concepts were introduced to the conversations, and they were lengthened from 60 to 90 seconds. The concepts introduced included: asking follow-up questions; "how about you"; response tokens; changing the subject; asking for clarification. These concepts were drawn from Wong and Waring's 2010 monograph and their discussion of sequencing practices, topic management, conversation openings and closings, and repair practices. No CA terms other than "opening" and "closing" a conversation were introduced to the learners.

The textbook for the course was Helgsen, Wiltshier, and Brown, *English Firsthand 1*, (2018), a speaking textbook with no exercises that explicitly gave guidance on conducting conversation. The text consisted mainly of grammatical sequences, and the speaking exercises involved practicing these without instruction on how to structure these interactions beyond a question and answer format. The conversation task described above was conducted as a warmup to the textbook exercises scheduled for the day's lesson. Only a limited number of adjacency pairs were provided, primarily those for opening and closing conversations. Significantly, these were not drawn from corpora subject to CA, but rather from the instructor's intuition. The number of phrases introduced was kept small in order to minimize the memorization requirements. The resulting interactions, then, were not naturally occurring conversations, as they are described by

Hutchby and Woffitt (2008), but are better understood as institutional talk. The intention was to provide an opportunity for free conversations within a scaffolded format. As mentioned by Bardovi-Harlig (1996), there is a need for explicit instructions in the pragmatics of talk. In this case, that involves an idealized structure with opportunities for freedom of choice in topic.

Results[(2)]

Timing and vowel-marking

Carroll observed in a 2000 study that novice English speakers orient themselves to transition-relevant places (TRPs), moments in the course of a conversation when a speaker signals through grammar, intonation, or other pragmatic means that a new speaker can take a turn at talk. These novice speakers attempt to time their turns to these. The data in this study show similar results in that inter-turn gaps are rare in the data here. The conversations largely conform to the "one at a time" rule in which speakers take turns at talk, timing their entry into the exchange in ways that minimize gaps and overlaps in the interaction (Sidnell, 2010, p. 37). A speaker's predicting when their turn at talk will occur requires that they be cognizant of grammatical and intonational cues given by the other speakers (Carroll 2000, p 75). As in Carroll's study, the conversations produced by the novice speakers in this data are basic, and lack complex turn-construction units (TCPs). Complex turn construction units (TCPs) can be understood in contrast to minimal, two turn sequences. These can occur, according to Schegloff, "in interactional settings... in which the participants are committed to co-presence by an event structure not shaped by the interaction itself" (2007, p.26). The basic, question and answer nature of the talks here can be attributed to the participants being made to converse in an institutional setting. Equally likely is the demands made on a novice speaker's conversational abilities by the task itself. Construction of complex turns at talk are just that, complex; difficult to construct, and likewise difficult to parse, making the anticipation of TRPs more difficult. In the data here, when inter-turn gaps occur, speakers often took action, including gesturing physically for their interlocutor to fill in the gap. This phenomenon receives more discussion later in this paper. What is important to note here is that the speakers often demonstrated the ability to anticipate TRPs, conformed to the no-gap, no-overlap tendency, and can conduct simple conversations with non-complex TCUs.

Another study by Carroll in 2005 argues that vowel-marking can often indicate that the speaker is engaging forward-oriented repair on their own TCU. This could be in a word search,

or mentally searching for a lexical unit not immediately available for recall. Vowel marking is Carroll's term for the lengthening of word-final vowels sometimes made by Japanese-speaking novice learners of English. There are examples of this in the data here, including those in the extracts below, lending support to Carroll's thesis.

Extract 1

07092019HS

7 S: oh whats yakiniku like
8 H: one person eat [hhhh
9 S: [oh I want ((try)) by the way what sweets do you like
10→ H: unh (.) what sweets do you like unh (.) i li:keu >shu cream<
11 S: unh (.9) where=
((circling hand gesture))
12 H: =onh hhhh

Extract 2

07092019SM1

31→ M: mm uh what uh (2.0) by the way uh what did you: eat morning in the morning
32 S: today? I dont have
33 M: really?

Extract 3

07122019PA

18 P: what kind music (.) [do you like
((outstretched hand))
19→ A: [ennh my favorite music isu: (1.5) ani song
20 P: (1.0) anime song?
((inclines head forward))

In Extract 1, H elongates the vowel "i" in line 10, searching for the English equivalent to "shu cream". In Extract 2, the word final vowels in "you" in line 31 are stretched out before M chooses the word "morning", somewhat hesitantly, perhaps as it was a second choice after she failed to recall the word "breakfast". In Extract 3, line 19 A adds /u:/ to the end of the word "is",

prior to a pause and a word search, again, probably in an effort to recall the English word for “ani song”.

Orientation to the learning environment

Other instances of repair in this data demonstrate the learners’ orientation to the learning context. That is, the talk produced shows evidence of the speakers’ awareness that the talk is a learning exercise. This is the “interactional architecture” of the classroom, as identified by Seedhouse, who claims that learners “are always displaying to one another their analyses of the current state of the evolving relationship between pedagogy and interaction and acting on the basis of these analyses.” (2004, 187) Consider the exchange in MY2 lines 8 to 13: M runs into trouble in line 8, Y tries to help in 9, and then they break into Japanese quietly, “suspending” the conversation and then reentering at the point they left. This could be regarded as a parenthetical aside from the English conversation, as described by Varonis and Gass (1985) but when considered in regard to Seedhouse, they are as much digressing from their expected roles as English learners as they are engaging in repair.

Extract 4

07122019MY2

5 M: wh(hh)at kind of sports do you like
((covers mouth))
6 Y: (1.0) uh I like basketball very much
7 M: oh basketball
((covers mouth))
8 M: uh (.6) when (6.8) whe::n ((bas)) when do sports eh to (1.9) you: have you?
9 → Y: ° how long°
10 M: nnn nante iu no
11 Y: ((indistinct Japanese))
12 M: have you played it (1.6) basketball
13 Y: how long?
14 M: how long
15 Y: uh (1.2) uh (.8) I play so (.5) nine years

Something similar happens in PA lines 7 to 10 where A uses Japanese to address P’s

understanding of her question, again in a quieter voice. The learners appear to be digressing from their roles, or put another way, reorienting themselves to the interactional architecture of the classroom.

Extract 5

07122019PA

4 P: unh: I will (.) go shopping how bout you
((outstretched hand))
5 A: its (1.8) unh (1.7) I play (.) tennis
((gestures to self, gazes upwards))
6 P: ohh (1.7)
7 A: nto what did you do hh l(h)ast night
8 P: mnn (1.7) eh to [I will
9 → A: [hh °uh uh kino ni kino hh°
((shakes head))
10 P: uh hh I- was hh part time job

Another perspective is that the code-switching, or the use of Japanese to conduct repair on the talk is evidence of the speakers using any and all the resources at their disposal to make meaning clear. Mori and Hasegawa argued in a 2009 study in which students learning Japanese used a katakana pronunciation of English words not usually used as loan words that the incorporation of the L1 into the conversation is evidence of resourceful communication. In the exchanges above, Japanese was used sotto voce to repair the conversation, and in doing so, the speakers were stepping out of their roles. In the following exchange, in contrast, H uses several Japanese words in lines 17 to 20 to convey his meaning. Later, in line 24, his sentence consists entirely of two Japanese words joined by an English copula. After each use of Japanese, there is a receipt token from P who either repeats his Japanese or emphasizes the English as in line 19. It is conceivable that she is emphasizing the English to conform to the interactional architecture, disturbed by H's disregard for it.

Extract 6

07092019PH

12 H: anhh ↑I like unh ramen an:d (.7) gyoza

13　P:　oh (.) gyoza [oh　] ok(hh)ayhh $me too$=
((grooms hair))
14　H:　[unh]　=ramen isu fu fu (.)
((eats bowl of ramen))　((blows on ramen noodles))
15　P:　oh
((nods))
16　H:　very delicious
17　P:　delicious (.) eh what kind o(hh)f ramen (1.0) do you like
((gazes to right))　((gazes at partner))
18 →　H:　↑ohh ramen (.) unnh ramen is all (.) all all zenbu [japanese zenbu
((grabs elbows))　((opens hands))
19　P:　[all kinds of ramen
20　H:　unh
21　P:　okay okay
22　H　toku especially end tonkotsu
((points upwards))
23　P　tonkotsu oh
((nods))
24　H　tonkotsu is asari
((moves hand down front of chest))

Code-switching is not evidence of faulty communicative ability, but rather a communicative resource. How this resource is used is dictated somewhat by the environment, the architecture of the learning space, and the speaker's regard for that architecture.

Physical gestures

In the data, there were multiple instances of a speaker gesturing physically for their interlocutor to take a turn at talk. In some cases, these were predicated by inter-turn pauses, such as the exchange in HH line 15 to 16. HR appears to have regarded HY's turn at 14 to be incomplete and invites him to continue. He obliges with a new line of questioning, about HR's activities the day before. Later, in line 32, HY regards his turn complete with a statement of his appreciation for gyudon and gestures to himself, prompting HR to ask what HY had for lunch. Notably, there is no appreciable inter-turn pause though the turn at line 32 is semantically and

intonationally complete. In both examples, after the physical gesture, the next turn is language that has been practiced or taught in the classroom exercise.

Extract 7

07022019HH

10 HR: I played volleyball (.3) in college
((gazes left)) ((gazes at HR, gestures to floor))
11 HY: colle[ge
12 HR: [volley circle
13 HY: volley circle ah
((touches wrist))
14 HR: volley circle
((nods))
15 → HY: (.3)
((gestures come))
16 HR: what do you do yesterday
((open hand gesture))
.
.
.
30 HR: what lunch box could ((???))
31 HY: ((make)) eh to (.2) gyudon
32 → HR: gyu(hh)don I like
((gestures to self))
33 HY: uh how bout you
34 HR: I (.) lun two lunch ball (.5) rice ball=
((gestures onigiri tilts head))

A similar instance is found in PH lines 10 to 11. H gestures to himself after the receipt token "I see" and a brief pause, and P continues the slowdown in communication by returning the question asked in line 6 "what kind of food do you like" to H.

Extract 8

07092019PH

6　H:　anh what kind of food do you like

7　P:　I like gyoza

8　H:　o gyoza

9　P:　yes

10　H:　ahhh i see uh ore? (.9) uhh

((gestures to self))

11　P:　how bout you?

((outstretched hand))

12　H:　anhh ↑I like unh ramen an:d (.7) gyoza

As in the previous example, "how about you?" is used to propel the conversation forward after a lull. This phrase was introduced early in the previous semester. Later in the exchange, after the bell sounds, signaling that the speakers should initiate the closing sequence in line 42, there is some back and forth until P signals with her hand in line 45, prompting H to state the first half of the practiced adjacency pair: "I have to go." Pragmatically, it is P that might have initiated the closing sequence first as she showed her awareness of the relevancy of the sequence at 45, but she defers to H and invites him to begin the sequence. The speakers rely on the structure provided by the conversation outline presented in the class rather than using the phrase as it might be in a more "natural" conversation. This suggests that the speakers are behaving as if conforming to a script or relying on the familiarity of a certain number of key phrases/ideas.

Extract 9

07092019PH

41　P:　today I ate chicken with rice

42　P　chicken rice

((bell sounds))

43　H:　yes

44　P:　ooohhh I see

45　H:　ah

((extends hand))

46 P: I have to go

Another example can be found in SM1 lines 15 to 18, in which the participants rely on gestures to elicit expected phrases, apparently under the belief that their partner has missed the TRP.

Extract 10

07092019SM1

13 M: oh (.) oh how long did you play

14 S: about (1.9) unh (2.1) two hours

15 M: two hours wow uh

((pulling motion))

16 S: ((open handed gesture))

17 M: ((nods))

18 S: what did you do last night

19 M: uh (.) I played pokemon go

Not all examples of rehearsed phrases are preceded by a gesture, however. In PA lines 6 to 8, there is an inter turn pause at line 6, followed up by A's question, much used in the classroom exercises, "what did you do last night?"

Extract 11

07122019PA

4 P: unh: I will (.) go shopping how bout you

((outstretched hand))

5 A: its (1.8) (1.7)unh I play (.) tennis

((gestures to self, gazes upwards))

6 P: ohh (1.7)

7 A: nto what did you do hh l(h)ast night

8 P: mnn (1.7) eh to [I will

There is a clear pattern of the speakers relying on phrases introduced and practiced in classroom activities at TRPs in which the flow of the conversation has slowed. In the data,

when one of the speakers fails to take a turn at these points, a gesture can elicit a phrase and allow the conversation to continue. Requests for the other speaker to continue are explicit, but non-verbal. This suggests that, again, the speakers are performing roles, or conforming to the interactional architecture in Seedhouse's phrase.

These techniques can be regarded as communication deficiencies, breakdowns in communication, or they be seen as successful instances of navigating lulls in the talk. The framework provided by instruction on basic techniques informed by CA research, such as asking a simple question, returning the question to the original asker, or initiating an expected adjacency pair, can provide familiar points of reference in the talk that enable the speakers to reorient themselves to the conversation and continue. Speakers provide support to one another through repair sequences either by using Japanese or prompting the next relevant turn with a physical gesture. The speakers are truly co-creating the meaning of the talk and supporting one another's participation and learning in a true cooperative sense.

Discussion and conclusion

Talk in interaction is a fundamental aspect of the SLA classroom. Interactions between learners provide opportunities to practice the language they hope to use outside of the classroom. Interactions require adaptation on the part of all participants. That is, interlocutors need to negotiate meaning with one another to truly achieve mutual understanding, or the co-construction of meaning in interaction. Learner to learner interactions and their attendant negotiations of meaning provide the comprehensible input necessary for acquisition to occur.

Classroom talk on task entails a certain degree of artificiality. It is intended as practice in producing and comprehending forms in the target language. This does not mean that the talk produced must always be clinical, rote, or interrogative in nature. Target forms can be incorporated into talk that resembles a spontaneous conversation. The pragmatic rules of conversations, however, like the grammar of the target language itself, are not always evident. Explicit instruction needs to be given in how to conduct a conversation in a second language that will appear "natural". Conversation Analysis can elucidate the underlying grammar of talk in interaction, which can then be used pedagogically.

Conversation Analysis can likewise be used to evaluate the talk in interaction produced in classroom environments. The study here has shown that novice speakers of English are capable of the careful timing necessary to participate in conversations in real time. True, the

conversations produced by these learners are elementary and institutional in nature. Nevertheless, they show evidence of intricate communication strategies, including repair, self or otherwise, on conversations in progress. The speakers also show evidence of being aware that their interactions are pedagogical in nature. While this might seem obvious, given that they are taking place at school, the participants make use of this "architecture" to scaffold the interaction for one another. Finally, the conversations transcribed for this study show a clear pattern of reliance on the CA principles introduced and practiced during the preceding semester. Where conversations slowed down and learners appeared to run out of things to say, they prompted one another to rely on the CA-informed communicative strategies discussed in class. These findings demonstrate the utility of CA in the SLA classroom.

NOTE

(1) Participants in this study signed informed consent release forms that conform to the guidelines provided by TESOL International Association: https://www.tesol.org/read-and-publish/journals/tesol-quarterly/tesol-quarterly-research-guidelines/informed-consent-policy-statement-and-release

(2) Note: Transcription conventions adapted from Jefferson, 2004.

References

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. *Pragmatics and Language Learning 7*, 21–39.

Barraja-Rohan, A. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(4), 479–507.

Brooks, F. B. (1991). Talking and learning to talk in the Spanish conversation course. *Hispania, 74*(4), 1115–1123.

Buckwalter, P. (2001). Repair sequences in Spanish L2 dyadic discourse: A descriptive study. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(3), 380-397.

Carroll, D. (2000). Precision timing in novice-to-novice L2 conversations. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), 67–110.

Carroll, D. (2005). Vowel-marking as an interactional resource in Japanese novice ESL conversation. In Richards, K. & Seedhouse, P. (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 214–234.

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). (n.d.) Retrieved from: https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/level-descriptions

Duff, P.A. (1986). Another look at interlanguage talk: Taking task to task. In Day, R. (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers, 147–181.

Firth, A. & Wanger, J. (2007). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285–300.

Gass, S. (2004). Conversation analysis and input-interaction. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 597–602.

He, A. W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *The Modern*

Language Journal, 88(4), 568–582.

Helgesen, M., Wiltshier, J., and Brown, S. (2018). *English Firsthand 1: 5th Edition*. Singapore: Pearson Education South Asia Pte Ltd.

Huth, T. & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research, 10*(1), 53–79.

Hutchby, Ian & Wooffitt Robin. (2008). *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Informed Consent Policy Statement and Release. (n.d.). Retrieved from: https://www.tesol.org/read-and-publish/journals/tesol-quarterly/tesol-quarterly-research-guidelines/informed-consent-policy-statement-and-release

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Lerner, G.H., *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 13–31.

Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review, 19*(1), 83–99.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2004). CA for SLA? It all depends... *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 603–607.

Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. In Winnitz, H. (Ed.), *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 379*, 259–278.

Markee, N. & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(4), 491–500.

Meyer, S., Blondel, V., & Mall-Grob, B. (2017). Conversational interaction and the development of conversational competence in additional languages in higher education: Considerations for students, language centres, and language policy developers. *CercleS, 7*(2), 239–274.

Mori, J. & Hasegawa, A. (2009). Doing being a foreign language learner in a classroom: Embodiment of cognitive states as social events. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 47*(1), 65–94

Nicholas, A. (2015). A concept-based approach to teaching speech acts in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal, 69*(4), 383–393.

Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(4), 737–758.

Porter, P.A. (1986). How learners talk to each other: Input and interaction in task-centered discussions. In Day, R. (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers, 200–224.

Schegloff, E.A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Stempleski, S. (2007). *Talk time: Student book 1*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Varonis, E.M. & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 6*(1), 71–90.

Wong, J. & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. Abingdon: Routledge.

英語による教室内対話を教えるための会話分析に基づいたアプローチ

キャニング，D. N.

抄　録

会話は，第二ヶ国語の学習者にとって基礎的な技術である。しかし，大学以上の英語スピーキングの授業には，自然で気楽に会話へと参加するために必要な語用論的能力を育てるための，包括的な方法論が欠けている。Conversation Analysis（会話分析）は第二言語習得の研究者の間で，会話の研究に新鮮な見識をもたらすという理由で注目を集めている。会話分析の研究は，それによって会話者が会話を順番に並べるための手段を示した。そのような順番は指導可能である。さらに，会話分析に基づいた教育法を通じて，それ（CA）を授業内での交流に活用することもできる。この研究では，会話を教えることの理論的な正当性と，それを行う際の会話分析の有用性について概説する。次に，このアプローチの有効性を証明するために，実際の授業内における会話分析の結果を紹介する。本研究の結論は，他の第二言語習得の会話研究で発見されたそれを裏付けるものである。最後に，ここでの分析結果は，英語学習者が指導の下で，会話分析を活用したコミュニケーション戦略を実際の会話に用いることが可能であることを示唆している。

キーワード：スピーキング，インプット，インタラクション，会話分析，オーラルコミュニケーション