CHAPTER SIX

Conversation Analysis, Applied Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition

So far in this monograph I have explicated the organisation of L2 classroom interaction using a CA methodology applied to an extensive database. Although I have considered some issues related to the theory and practice of L2 teaching, I have not so far attempted to relate the study to broader research paradigms, which is the focus of this chapter. The overall aim of this chapter is to consider how CA can be located in and contribute to the research agendas of Applied Linguistics (AL) and Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Following Larsen-Freeman, SLA is seen as a sub-field of AL.

AL draws on multidisciplinary theoretical and empirical perspectives to address real-world issues and problems in which language is central. SLA draws on multidisciplinary theoretical and empirical perspectives to address the specific issue of how people acquire a second language and the specific problem of why everyone does not do so successfully. (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 165).

After introducing the relationship between CA and AL, I consider the latest CA research in the following AL areas: Language teaching task design; Language teaching materials design; Language proficiency assessment design; Disordered talk and speech therapy; Professional discourse; CA in languages other than English; NS-NNS talk; Bilingual and multilingual interaction; Grammar, pragmatics and interaction. A common theme in the research is that competence is co-constructed by the participants rather than being fixed and static. I then critique the current SLA research into recasts and form-focused instruction and suggest that there is a vacant slot in the SLA project which CA is able to fill. I specify the contributions which CA is able to make and demonstrate why it is necessary to subject interactional data to a qualitative, emic analysis prior to quantification. Finally I position CA in relation to social science research methods and concepts such as validity, reliability, generalizability, epistemology, quantification and triangulation.

1.1 Conversation Analysis and Applied Linguistics

Applied Linguistics (AL), by definition, has always focused on applications. CA, by contrast, has only relatively recently begun to look closely at applications of CA (Drew, in press; Heritage, 1999; Hester & Francis, 2001; Richards & Seedhouse, in press; Ten Have, 1999, 2001). In his review of CA at century’s end, Heritage argued that “Part of the claim of any framework worth its salt is that it can sustain ‘applied’ research of various kinds” (Heritage, 1999, p. 73), and he indicated that this aspect might feature prominently in developments within the discipline. There has been a rapid growth of CA studies in institutional settings, following Drew and Heritage’s important collection (1992a), embracing not only traditional professions such as medicine or law (e.g., Heritage & Maynard, in press), but fields such as business (e.g. Boden, 1994), broadcasting (e.g., Clayman & Heritage, 2002) and counselling (Peräkylä, 1995). It was only natural that professional interest should
extend beyond description and towards the potential of such research in terms of training and development interventions, encouraging the emergence of applied CA almost by default.

However, the concept of application is by no means straightforward (Heritage, 1999). According to Richards (in press), the model of application which is most consistent with the nature of CA is that of description leading to informed action. Such a model would represent the primary research as oriented primarily to description, allowing for the possibility of unexpected insights arising from the sort of unmotivated investigation recommended by Sacks. In emphasising description, it would reflect CA’s methodological orientation, implying no fundamental distinction between primary research and research undertaken with a view to possible applications, allowing that both might generate insights with the potential to transform practice.

In terms of application, the emphasis on informed practice would have two important implications. The first of these would be the establishment of a relationship in which CA would be seen as performing an enabling rather than an enacting role in professional development. Instead of thinking in terms of narrow prescription, professionals would be encouraged to consider more broadly the ways in which CA might impact on their practice. For example, the paper by Bloch (in press) discussed below uses CA to reveal the ability of interactants with limited resources to co-construct meaning in dialogue with partners. The second important feature of a focus on informed professional practice is that it allows for the possibility that CA will become involved in describing not only aspects of professional practice but also the processes of training or development that might be associated with these. Markee (in press), for example, shows how CA can be used to reveal aspects of classroom behaviour that may have implications for an approach to teaching using tasks, while Packett (in press) demonstrates how CA can be used as part of the teaching process in order to sensitise trainees to aspects of their professional practice. It is conceivable that over time this aspect of applied CA, which takes it closest to the concerns of AL, is one that will grow significantly.

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 AL. There is currently growing interest within the field of applied linguistics in CA methodology. This is evidenced by a growing number of publications in applied linguistics journals which use a CA methodology (Boyle, 2000b; Carroll, 2000; Hosada, 2000; Jung, 1999; Markee, 1995; Mori, 2002; Seedhouse, 1994, 1997a, 1999a; Wong, 2000a, 2002). Equally, there is growing interest in CA circles in applied linguistics, as evidenced by recent publications by Schegloff in Applied Linguistics (2000b) and by Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby and Olsher (2002) in Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. Schegloff et al. (2002, p. 14) note that “A small but increasing amount of CA and CA-informed research on talk in educational institutions directly addresses issues of interest to applied linguists.” Applied linguistics, which has its roots in language, finds its realisation through action, so a method of inquiry that brings together these two aspects as part of a coherent programme of investigation and description offers a perspective to which applied linguists should be particularly receptive. In this section we consider the latest research and possible future directions for CA research in applied linguistics in areas other than SLA. Each area will be illustrated by reference to research which has an applied dimension and which creates links between the interactional (micro) and institutional (macro) levels in a similar way to this monograph.
The area of languages for specific purposes can be informed by CA research on institutional discourse. Some of the issues and possibilities are discussed in Jacoby (1998a, b) and Koshik (2000). CA methodology can offer a description of the organisation of an institutional setting, for example Atkinson and Drew (1979) and the current monograph. CA can identify sequence organisations which may be vital to the institutional business and which may need to be understood or learnt by novices as part of their induction. An example of a concrete and direct application of CA findings to the English for specific purposes (ESP) classroom is provided by Packett (in press). Packett works with students in Portugal who opt to study English as part of their journalism degree course and who are required to record a face-to-face interview for potential radio broadcast as part of their assessed course work. A key and problematic demand on these trainee interviewers is that they should manage the interaction for the benefit of the overhearing but absent audience. Packett identifies a common insertion action in which the interviewer departs very briefly from the question-answer turn-taking format in order to add a detail to a description given in the prior turn, specifically for the benefit of the absent audience. These insertions, according to Packett, are constitutive of “doing interview” and directly linked to the institutional goal. An insertion action can be seen in line 7 of extract 6.1 below, which is an example of expert data used to teach students.

Extract 6.1

1 Interviewer: .hh you say if you’d had (. ) Jo::hn’s some of John’s (.)
2 > abilities or talents and he’d had some of yours <
3 which were those. Which would he’ve [ liked to ( ) between you
4 Interviewee:                             [ .hh well I think John-                                
5 John er (0.2) John no::w (0.2) having obviously been married to
6 Chris an-an- an- =
7 Interviewer: → =>Chris Evert yah.< =
8 Interviewee: =yeah, and basically living a lot in- in the states …

(15.8.00. BBC On the Ropes)

These insertions are organised so as to only minimally interrupt the question-answer format of the interview and to redress the indexicality of the prior description. It was noted that in the learners' assessed interviews this vital insertion sequence was often absent or delayed, which disrupted the flow of the talk. Both the expert data and the learner data were then used by Packett as classroom materials to demonstrate to students the use of the device in interaction. Packett's paper serves as a model not only for CA-informed pedagogy, but also for CA research in language for specific purposes with the aim of linking sequences to the institutional goal.

Language Teaching Materials Design

Language teaching materials frequently feature dialogues presented on audio or video together with a transcription. Issues relating to authenticity of dialogues are complex and have been hotly debated. However, in many countries around the world, materials writers continue (for a variety of reasons) to invent dialogues. 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. Wong (2002) provides a very clear example of an application of CA to an area of applied linguistics. She identifies four sequence types which typically occur in American English telephone conversations, namely summons-answer, identification-recognition, greeting and how are you? Examining the presentation of thirty inauthentic phone conversations in ESL textbooks Wong (2002, p. 37) finds that the above sequences are "absent, incomplete or problematic." CA research findings, such as the above sequence types, can be fed into future language teaching materials design.

Language Proficiency Assessment Design

Previous CA-informed work in this area by Young and He (1998) and Lazaraton (1997) examined the American Language Proficiency Interview (LPI). Egbert points out that "LPIs are implemented in imitation of natural conversation in order to evaluate a learner's conversational proficiency" (Egbert, 1998, p. 147). Young and He's collection demonstrates, however, a number of clear differences between LPIs and ordinary conversation. Firstly, the systems of turn-taking and repair differ from ordinary conversation. Secondly, LPIs are examples of goal-oriented institutional discourse, in contrast to ordinary conversation. Thirdly, LPIs constitute cross-cultural communication in which the participants may have very different understandings of the nature and purpose of the interaction. Egbert's (1998) study demonstrates that interviewers explain to students not only the organisation of repair they should use, but also the forms they should use to do so; the suggested forms are cumbersome and differ from those found in ordinary conversation. He's (1998) microanalysis reveals how a student's failure in an LPI is due to interactional as well as linguistic problems. Kasper and Ross (2001, p. 10) point out that their CA analysis of LPIs portrays candidates as "eminently skilful interlocutors", which contrasts with the general SLA view that clarification and confirmation checks are indices of NNS incompetence, whilst their (in press) paper analyses how repetition can be a source of miscommunication in LPIs.

Future CA research in oral assessment could apply the same approach adopted in Young and He's volume to oral language assessments in other countries around the world. Of particular interest in future research in assessment may be the perspective that communicative competence is not a fixed and static construct, but is variable and co-constructed by participants in interaction. As far as practical applications are concerned, CA research can clarify the advantages and disadvantages of assessment formats and inform the design of assessment tasks (Schegloff et al., 2002).

Disordered Talk and Speech Therapy

It would be fair to say that, within the broad field of AL, speech therapy has been employing CA as a methodology for a longer period and more widely than has the language teaching sector of the field. Furthermore, speech therapists tend to have seen the practical relevance of CA to their investigations and to have adopted the methodology into their mainstream to a far greater extent than in the language teaching sector and in SLA in particular. Bloch (in press) exemplifies applications of CA to the field of disordered talk and speech therapy; see also Goodwin, Goodwin
and Olsher (2002) and Goodwin (2003). Close analysis of conversation between a man suffering from severe dysarthria (a severe speech disorder relating to an acquired neurological condition, in this case motor neurone disease) and his mother reveals how the participants have developed two resources to facilitate interaction: joint turn adaptation to co-construct utterances for meaning, and completion of utterances by the non-dysarthric participant. Bloch explains that the investigation and management of dysarthria have tended to focus solely on the patient's speech, so that "dysarthria has been understood largely in terms of the deviation of speech from culturally acceptable norms." However, broadening the scope by using CA to investigate the co-construction of dialogue with a partner offers new possibilities. It provides complementary information for the assessment process and identifies successful interactional strategies which may be used by others in dialogue with dysarthria patients.

Professional Discourse

CA methodology has spawned studies in a wide variety of professional settings, as evidenced in collections such as Drew and Heritage (1992a) and Richards and Seedhouse (in press), Sarangi and Roberts (1999) and some papers in McHoul and Rapley (2001). Settings covered by CA studies include legal hearings, news interviews, visits by health visitors, phone calls to emergency services and help lines, psychiatric interviews, airplane cockpit talk, mediation and counselling. Gafaranga and Britten's (in press) study exemplifies how CA is able to link interactional sequences on the micro level to the macro level of the institutional goal. Gafaranga and Britten focus on topic initial elicitors such as How are you? or What can I do for you? which occur at the start of medical consultations and which may at first be taken to be insignificant social preliminaries. However, their analysis of 62 consultations shows How are you? to be used in follow-up consultations and What can I do for you? in new consultations. This difference is shown to be institutionally significant in relation to the concepts of continuity of care and the doctor-patient relationship and the authors conclude that "Through orderly openings, doctors and patients talk the institution of General Practice into being." The study neatly captures the reflexive relationship between talk and its social and institutional context which is also the central theme of this monograph.

CA in Languages other than English

Early criticisms that CA was biased as it was based exclusively on English native-speaker interaction are no longer founded as CA studies have been published on talk in a range of languages and including non native speakers. Examples of CA studies in non-pedagogical settings include those in German (Egbert, 1996, in press; Golato, 2000), Finnish (Sorjonen, 1996; Kurhila, 2001, in press), Swedish (Lindstrom, 1994), Danish (Brouwer, 2004), Dutch (ten Have, 1999), Japanese (Hayashi, 1999; Hayashi, Mori & Takagi, 2002; Tanaka, 1999), Chinese (Hopper & Chen, 1996), Korean (Kim, 1999; Park, 1999) and Thai (Moerman, 1988). Such studies reveal similarities and differences in the organisation of talk in different languages which may then feed into comparative and contrastive analyses of two languages, as well as into language teaching materials design. To illustrate this point, Hopper and Chen (1996) compare telephone openings in Mandarin Chinese to those in English. We saw above that there are four sequence types which typically
occur in American English telephone conversations, namely summons-answer, identification-recognition, greeting and "how are you". Hopper and Chen (1996) found some similarities, in that the first three sequences regularly occur in Taiwanese telephone conversations. However, they also identify practices and linguistic resources which have not been identified in European languages. In particular, telephone callers in Taiwan use a variety of greeting tokens to index the state of their interpersonal relationship and intimate callers may speak before the answerer. Such findings can potentially feed into materials design aimed at learners with specific L1s learning specific L2s.

Native Speaker - Non-native Speaker Talk

Interest in the CA analysis of NS-NNS or cross-cultural talk outside the classroom has developed in recent years, including Egbert, in press; Hosoda, 2000; Kurhila, 2001, in press; Seedhouse, 1998a; Wagner, 1996; Wong, 2000a, b, in press. Gardner and Wagner (2004) is a major collection of work in the area of NS-NNS talk and Seedhouse (1998a) provides an overview of how CA methodology can be applied to the study of NS-NNS interaction. The CA study of NS-NNS interaction in non-pedagogic settings has broadened in recent years to include languages other than English, for example German (Egbert, in press; Seedhouse, 1998; Wagner, 1996), Finnish (Kurhila, 2001, in press), Danish (Brouwer, 2004), and Japanese (Hosoda, 2000). The field has also broadened to include the CA study of interaction between NNS and NNS using English as international lingua franca talk (Firth, 1996; Mondada, 2004; Wagner, 1996), and Finnish as international lingua franca talk (Mazeland & Zaman-Zadeh, 2004) as well as studies which compare the identical interactional phenomenon in NNS talk (Wong, 2000a) and in NS talk (Schegloff 2000b) in English. Carroll's (in press) study demonstrates that a CA focus on sequence can sometimes reveal hitherto unnoticed aspects of the talk of non-native-speakers. Japanese speakers of English as a foreign language (particularly at the novice level) often add vowels to word-final consonants, for example: "Oldest child-u is-u (0.21) um:: twenty". Generally, English teachers have treated this as a pronunciation problem, resulting from negative transfer from the L1. Whilst not disputing these origins, Carroll's analysis of his data demonstrates that his subjects were employing vowel-marking as an interactional resource, particularly during forward-oriented repair (Schegloff, 1979) or word search, as in the example below.

Extract 6.2

A: what-o what-o interesting-u (0.43) e:to schoo:l-u festival

(Carroll, in press)

According to Carroll, vowel-marking, in delaying the production of some next-item-due, serves to buy the speaker initiating the repair a little more time to achieve self-repair. Furthermore, vowel-marking alerts co-participants to the fact that a search is underway and to their possible role in resolving it. In terms of application, Carroll suggests that training students in the use of interactionally equivalent conversational micro-practices, such as the use of uh and um would be helpful. Furthermore, Carroll's micronanalysis reveals a previously unimagined degree of interactional sophistication in the way these novice NNSs employ their limited
resources. Such CA research, then, reinforces a shift away from a linguistic deficit model focused on individual performance towards a model in which communicative competence is seen to be co-constructed. In this model, many of the interactional competencies of L2 students, non-native speakers and speech-disordered patients can only be revealed through painstaking CA analysis.

Bilingual and Multilingual Interaction

Recent years have seen a growth in the number of studies which have employed a CA approach to bilingual and multilingual interaction and to code-switching in particular (Auer, 1988, 1998; Gafaranga, 2000, 2001; Gafaranga & Torras, 2001, 2002; Mondada, 2004; Sebba & Wootton, 1998; Stroud, 1998; Torras, 2002, in press; Torras & Gafaranga, 2002; Wei, 2002). Wei (2002) provides an overview of the CA approach to bilingual interaction. Torras (in press) demonstrates how CA can be used to portray the reflexive relationship between language preference, social identity and institutional context in relation to bi-/multilingual talk. The study is based on recordings of service encounters in Barcelona in which the use of Castilian, Catalan and English is possible. Her study demonstrates how language choice is locally negotiated by the participants and finds that service providers routinely adopt the linguistic identity enacted by the service seeker. Torras then draws out the implications for training of service personnel in an increasingly globalised world.

Grammar, Pragmatics and Interaction

Although CA’s main interest has been in how social acts are performed via the medium of language, it has always been interested in the reflexive relationship between grammar and interaction and the domain of pragmatics. According to Schegloff et al (2002, p. 15), "CA treats grammar and lexical choices as sets of resources which participants deploy, monitor, interpret and manipulate as they design turns, sort out turn-taking, co-construct utterances and sequences, manage intersubjectivity and (dis)agreement, accomplish actions and negotiate interpersonal trajectories as real-time talk and interaction unfold." A growing number of recent publications have explored the reflexive ways in which grammar organises interaction and in which interaction organises grammar, for example Clift, 2001; Ford, 1993; Ford, Fox and Thompson, 2002; Goodwin, 1996; Hayashi, 1999; Heritage and Roth, 1995; Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson, 1996; Schegloff, 1996.

Recent research by Vinkhuyzen and Szymanski (in press) uncovers a reflexive relationship between grammatical formatting and social/institutional context. They recorded interactions between employees of a local reprographics business and customers who make a request for a copying service at the “drop-off” counter. In the case of small jobs which it is unprofitable for the counter employees to undertake, they generally redirect the customer to the do-it-yourself area. Vinkhuyzen and Szymanski found that "The grammatical formatting of these customer requests sets certain constraints on just how employees construct a non-granting response, and determines in part whether the non-granting can be done as an affiliative response to the request." Essentially, when customers format their requests as self-oriented declaratives that state a customer’s desire or need (e.g., “I’d like (I need) to make three copies of this”), it proved simple for staff to re-direct them to the do-it-yourself area. However, when customers formatted their requests as other-oriented
interrogatives that inquire after the organization’s willingness or capability to produce a document followed by a job description (e.g., “Can you make two copies of this document?”) problems often ensued on the interactional and institutional level, since the staff appeared to be rejecting a request. On the institutional level, this exposes the inherently conflicting goals of many service industries, namely those of making a profit and satisfying diverse customer needs. In terms of applications, in this particular case the authors suggest altering the spatial organisation of the store to guide customers to the appropriate location. Moreover, examination of the interaction of employees who successfully manage non-granting of requests has implications for staff training.

A theme which runs through the above studies is the contribution which CA can make to the study of competence, which has been accepted as fundamental to AL’s interests since the 1970’s, when communicative language teaching shifted attention to issues of communicative competence and how this might be developed through teaching. The communicative competence model proved highly successful in broadening the scope of classroom teaching and applied linguistics. However, it has, like all methods before or since, been based on a deficit model; the purpose of language teaching, it is generally assumed, is to help students develop linguistic knowledge and skills that will enable them to overcome current limitations and develop their communicative competence to the level of the teacher or native speaker. CA offers a very different view of the nature of competence. Instead of working from the static assumption that competence is something that one has a fixed degree of at a point in time, CA provides a means of exploring the variable ways in which such competence is co-constructed in particular contexts by the participants involved. So CA studies such as Bloch (in press), Goodwin, Goodwin & Olsher (2002) and Carroll (in press) portray how interactants with minimal linguistic resources can nonetheless employ these resources skilfully and innovatively in interaction.

AL is inherently multi-disciplinary and does not have a single research paradigm to which all AL research should conform. From the AL perspective, then, CA is one methodology in its array of methodologies which may be brought to bear on problems or issues relating to naturally-occurring spoken language. CA, for its part, is increasing its interest in applications (Heritage, 1999). The above review of the latest research demonstrates that there are no major, insurmountable incompatibilities between CA and AL and that there are many possibilities for fruitful future collaboration.

1.2 CA and Second Language Acquisition

The late 1990s saw a CA-motivated debate on a proposed “re-conceptualisation” of SLA (Firth and Wagner, 1997, 1998; Gass, 1998; Kasper, 1997; Long, 1997; Markee, 2000, 2002; Van Lier, 2000). Kasper’s (1997) reply to CA practitioners Firth and Wagner (1997) notes that they do not provide any specific proposals about how the level of discourse may be incorporated into SLA. In this section, therefore, I will be as specific as possible about the contribution which CA can make to SLA. Since SLA is a broad area, we should first clarify that CA's only possible contribution would be to those areas of SLA which use spoken interaction (both inside and outside the classroom) as data. Some of the criticisms which Firth and Wagner (1997, 1998) make of SLA are as follows: SLA has neglected the social and contextual aspects of language use and their contribution to SLA processes. SLA is becoming a "Hermetically sealed area of study" (1998, p. 92) which is losing
contact with sociology, sociolinguistics and discourse analysis in favour of a psycholinguistic focus on the cognition of the individual. There is an etic rather than emic approach to fundamental concepts. The traditional SLA database is too narrow. Essentially the call is for a holistic approach which includes the social dimension and emic perspectives. Since Firth and Wagner's (1997) article, a number of studies have been published which do incorporate social and contextual dimensions (e.g., Hall & Verplaetse, 2000a; Lantolf, 2000; Ohta, 2001) and which have established a sociocultural school within SLA. So we should note at the start of this section that (in contrast to the situation with AL) there has been controversy concerning whether CA has any role in SLA at all and if it does, what that role should be. In order to exemplify the contribution which CA might be able to make to the project of SLA, we will focus on two areas of strong recent interest in SLA research involving classroom discourse, namely recasts and “focus on form” instruction.

1.3 Recasts

In this section we will focus on SLA research on recasts as an example of SLA work on repair, which is of course an area of potentially significant collaboration between CA and SLA (Markee, 2000). First of all, we need to explicate the CA position on cognition and learning by analysing interaction involving recasts. I argued in Chapter 1 that the linguistic version of CA has become widespread amongst linguists. This underpowered version is certainly unable to portray the level of socially distributed cognition or learning. It is therefore understandable that SLA has sometimes dismissed the possibility of CA having anything to contribute to the study of cognition, learning and hence SLA (e.g., Kasper, 1997; Long, 1997). To practitioners of the ethnomethodological version, however, CA involves the explication of the organisation of socially distributed cognition (Drew, 1995; Schegloff, 1991). The organisations of sequence, turn-taking, preference and repair are employed by interactants in order to display not only their social actions but also their understandings of the other's social actions to each other; these organisations constitute part of the architecture of intersubjectivity. Since this may sound abstract, I will illustrate how this is operationalised in the L2 classroom by examining extract 6.3 below.

Extract 6.3

1 T: Vin, have you ever been to the movies? What’s your favorite movie?
2 L: Big.
3 T: Big, OK, that’s a good movie, that was about a little boy inside a big man, wasn’t it?
4 L: Yeah, boy get surprise all the time.
5 T: Yes, he was surprised, wasn’t he? Usually little boys don’t do the things that men do, do they?
6 L: No, little boy no drink.
7 T: That’s right, little boys don’t drink.

(Johnson, 1995, p. 23)

As there is a full analysis of this repeated extract in section Error! Reference source not found., I will focus on lines 4 and 5 only. In line 4 L displays an
understanding of T's turn in line 3. How do we know what the understanding is which L has displayed in line 4? We know this by normative reference to the interactional organisations. There are two kinds of interactional evidence. Firstly, the kind of action which L's turn performs; L confirms T's summary of the sub-topic and contributes new information which develops the sub-topic (the film's plot), and exemplifies what happened in the film's plot (“boy get surprise all the time”). The second piece of evidence is that T's turn in line 5 confirms that L's turn displays a correct understanding of T's turn in line 3. So we know this by reference to the turn-taking system, L having been specifically allocated a turn by the tag question in line 3 and by reference to sequence organisation, which tells us that line 4 is an answer to a question about the plot of the film. In interactional sequences, then, evidence in relation to socially distributed cognition is available and piles up, layer upon layer. The utterance in line 4 is linguistically incorrect, although we can see that the propositional content is clear to T, since T's turn in line 5 displays understanding of the content of L's turn in line 4. T displays understanding by positively evaluating the propositional content of the learner utterance followed by an expansion of the learner utterance into a correct sequence of linguistic forms, using embedded correction in the context of an action of agreement and confirmation. We should also note that T's embedded correction in line 5 also corresponds to Long, Inagaki & Ortega’s (1998) definition of recast as quoted below.

It should be made quite explicit at this point that CA does not claim to be able to establish the cognitive state of individuals in isolation. What it is able to portray and explicate, however, is the progress of intersubjectivity or socially distributed cognition. CA aims to "identify ways in which participants themselves orient to, display, and make sense of one another's cognitive states (among other things)” (Drew, 1995, p. 79). The point is, then, that the interactants in extract 6.3 are displaying to each other (and to the rest of the class and to the analyst) their understanding of each others' utterances by means of and by reference to the organisation of turn-taking, sequence and repair. This demonstrates what Schegloff (1991, p. 152) means by "the embeddedness, the inextricable intertwinedness, of cognition and interaction". The CA analysis not only demonstrates what understandings the interactants display to each other, but also how they do so by normative reference to the interactional organisations. In other words, we gain access to their displays of understanding to each other in the same way that they gain this access, i.e. by reference to the interactional organisations; this is what is meant by developing an emic perspective. Psychology, SLA and CA do not have any means of establishing a direct window into an individual's cognitive state whilst they are engaged in L2 classroom interaction.

We do need to try to conceptualise what this might mean in practice, though; what factors are involved in an individual's cognitive state in such a stream of interaction? Looking at line 4 of extract 6.3, L is not merely producing an utterance in the L2; any utterance is a document on many levels and we saw in section Error! Reference source not found. that L2 classroom interaction in particular operates on a number of levels simultaneously. The utterance is a display of the learner's analysis of the prior utterance of an interactant, it performs a social action in response and it positions the learner in a social system. It displays an understanding of the current context (sequential, social and L2 classroom context) and also renews it. It documents the learner's cognitive, emotional and attitudinal states: Note that this does not mean it gives a direct window into these states. In the specific case of the L2 classroom the
learner's utterance may in addition be delivered in the L2 and may thereby document his/her actual developmental level as well.

So we can see that a part of what is meant by the cognitive state of a learner involved in L2 classroom interaction is inextricably entwined and engaged with the unique sequential, social and contextual environment in which he/she is engaged. It is argued that this part of the individual's cognitive state can be portrayed emically in situ, that is, in that unique sequential environment. This is not to suggest that this provides anything like the whole picture, nor that the methods employed by SLA and psychology are not useful in portraying other aspects of the full picture in relation to cognition. The point to be made, however, is that CA is able to make a major contribution to the SLA project in terms of the portrayal of socially distributed cognition (Markee, 2000, p. 3). Ohta (2001) demonstrates how socially distributed cognition can work in the L2 classroom. Recasts are not necessarily just responses by the teacher to one learner. Ohta shows (by recording and transcribing the private talk of individually microphoned students in a classroom) that other students can use recasts in which they are not personally involved as negative evidence and display uptake in their private talk. Moving the focus back to the general relationship between cognition and interaction, Schegloff (1991, p. 154) suggests that "the structures of interaction penetrate into the very warp" of cognition, so that, for example, an "understanding-display" device (i.e., the next-turn-proof-procedure) is built into the organisation of turn-taking and sequence. In the same way, if we wish to fully understand the processes of cognition in relation to instructed L2 acquisition, it is vital to understand how L2 classroom interaction is organised.

Learning

We will now attempt a CA analysis of learning in relation to extract 6.3 in three stages. Firstly, what can we say about the learner's actual developmental level or current ability in L2? We can note in lines 4 and 6 that his grammatical resources are fairly limited. Nonetheless, the learner is able to make use of these limited resources to nominate a sub-topic (line 2) and develop the sub-topic by exemplifying T's comments (lines 4 and 6). Although it can be challenging for children to interact with the teacher in a classroom setting, even in the L1, we can see that L is able to use the turn-taking and sequence organisations of the L2 proficiently, producing a correct response to a negative tag-question (line 4) and a positive tag question (line 6). As we saw in section Error! Reference source not found., T's turn in line 5 operates on a number of levels. From the learner's perspective, it is not just a matter of understanding the propositional content of what T says in the L2; it is also a matter of analysing what social and sequential action T is performing and what an appropriate social and sequential action in response would be. So we can see that L skilfully manages to co-construct meaning with T in the L2 from his limited grammatical resources.

Secondly, what can we say about the learning environment in terms of input to the language learning process and facilitation of upgrading as a result of the interaction? Line 5 reads: "Yes, he was surprised, wasn't he?" We will break its contribution down into four points. Firstly, the utterance places the sequence within the teacher's overall pedagogical plan for the lesson, which "Was to allow the students to share their ideas and possibly generate some new vocabulary words within the context of the discussion" (Johnson 1995, p. 23). Secondly, it may promote positive affect and motivation in that the teacher engages with the ideas and personal meanings which the learner chooses to share and produces a conversational action of
agreement which validates the utterance. It then demonstrates confidence in the learner by returning the floor to him with the tag question. Thirdly, it makes it possible for the other learners in the class to follow the topic of the interaction and to receive correctly formed linguistic input. There is no evidence in the transcripts as to whether the other learners have done so or not. However, Ohta (2001) shows (by recording and transcribing the private talk of individually microphoned students in a classroom) that students are capable of using recasts in which they are not personally involved as negative evidence and of displaying uptake in their private talk. Fourthly, and most importantly, there is positive evaluation of the propositional content of the learner utterance followed by an expansion of the learner utterance into a correct sequence of linguistic forms or embedded correction. In terms of input, the teacher provides a corrected version of the learner's turns in lines 4 and 6 whilst retaining a focus on meaning. This form of correction and expansion is highly reminiscent of adult-child conversation, (see, for example, adult-child conversation transcripts in Peccei (1994, p. 83), Painter (1989, p. 38). The technique being used by the teacher here is often termed scaffolding (Johnson 1995, p. 75). Ohta defines Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) in relation to SLA in the following terms: "For the L2 learner, the ZPD is the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by individual linguistic production, and the level of potential development as determined through language produced collaboratively with a teacher or peer" (Ohta, 2001, p. 9).

What we can see in this extract, then, is how a ZPD is talked into being through the organisation of the interaction. Specifically, we see a neat juxtaposition of the learner's actual developmental level in lines 4 and 6 with the potential level in lines 5 and 7. The SLA literature terms this action a recast and it conforms to Long et al.'s definition of recasts quoted below. So from the perspectives of SLA psycholinguistic theory, L1 acquisition studies and Vygotskyan social constructivist educational theory there is agreement that such sequences are beneficial. A CA analysis demonstrates the same point. The distinctive CA contribution is to show how learning is constructed by the use of interactional resources and to explicate the progress of their learning and their socially distributed cognition or intersubjectivity. From a broader perspective, CA is able to explicate the reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction and hence how learning takes place through the interaction; the monograph as a whole demonstrates this point.

Thirdly, how does the process of instructed L2 learning progress? As we saw in Chapter 5, the canonical way in which an L2 lesson progresses is that the L2 teacher introduces a pedagogical focus and the learners produce specific linguistic forms and patterns of interaction in the L2 in normative orientation to the pedagogical focus. The teacher then evaluates the learners' turns and progresses the lesson in a particular direction on the basis of that evaluation. So in the above extract we can see that the teacher analyses the learner's contribution positively and continues to promote the learner's nominated topic. The point is, then, that we as analysts have access to the same interactional evidence of the learners' learning states as the teachers have as well as access to the steps the teacher takes in reaction to such evidence. In other words, we have access to the same emic perspective of the learning process in interaction to which the teacher has access. This type of evidence of learning may complement the evidence of learning gathered through mainstream SLA studies. Schegloff (1991) demonstrates that CA gives access to socially-distributed cognition. In the same way, CA gives access to socially-distributed language learning processes.
As with cognition, this is only one part of the whole picture, but a useful one nevertheless.

We now move on to consider the SLA treatment of recasts. The quantitative machinery which is often employed in mainstream SLA studies is certainly robust and well-established in terms of validity and reliability in a quantitative paradigm and Long (1997) is right to emphasise the importance of construct validity for quantitative SLA. However, all quantitative practitioners agree that the quality of quantitative output crucially depends on the quality of the data which are fed in. Serious problems can and do arise when discoursal data are fed into quantitative machinery without prior qualitative analysis. As the analyses of extract 6.3 above have demonstrated, any turn at talk in the L2 classroom is inextricably entwined in a complex web of sequence, social action, pedagogy, context, socially distributed cognition and learning. As I demonstrated in Chapter 5, any turn at talk in the L2 classroom has a complex personality and displays simultaneous homogeneity and heterogeneity.

The point to be made here is that it is invalid to homogenise discoursal data by inputting it into quantitative machinery without first having conducted a case by case holistic and emic analysis. This is hardly a new observation; as long ago as 1988, van Lier wrote that he had “consistently warned against studies which isolate superficially identifiable features for quantitative treatment” (van Lier, 1988a, p. 223).5 Judging by the number of subsequent SLA studies which have done just that, however, his warnings appear not to have been taken seriously at all.

In view of this, and because it is probably impossible to explicate in the abstract the grave threat to the validity of the quantitative process of inputting unanalysed discoursal data, it will be necessary to demonstrate this point by examining what I take to be a representative example of quantitative mainstream SLA work in the area of recasts, namely Long, Inagaki and Ortega (1998). This study has been widely cited (e.g., Doughty and Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2001b) as evidence of the effectiveness of recasts. I have also selected this study as, unusually for a mainstream SLA study, it contains transcripts of the task-in-process, which can then be compared with the task-as-workplan. In Long et al.’s (1998) quantitative laboratory study, learners of Japanese and Spanish were supposed to receive either recasts or modelling in relation to two new structures, a post-test revealing recasts to produce more short-term improvement than modelling. According to Long et al. (1998, p. 366):

“Examples 6.4 and 6.5 exemplify use of the target structures in the recast condition:

Example 6.4:
Prompt: A veces
(Sometimes)
Participant: Elena toma a veces cafe,
(Elena drinks sometimes coffee)
Researcher: Elena toma a veces cafe si? uhhuh
(Elena drinks sometimes coffee right? uhhuh)

Example 6.5:
Prompt: La guitarra
(The guitar)
Participant: Pedro tiene la guitarra
(Pedro has the guitar)
Researcher: La guitarra la tiene Pedro, si? uhhuh
If we analyse the data closely, however, we can see that there are four fundamental problems in terms of construct validity in a quantitative paradigm. Firstly, neither example is a corrective recast. In both examples the participant produces a sentence which is morphosyntactically correct, therefore the researcher's subsequent turn cannot possibly be a corrective recast⁶, according to the definition provided by Long et al. in the same article⁷.

Corrective recasts are responses which, although communicatively oriented and focused on meaning rather than form, incidentally reformulate all or part of a learner's utterance, thus providing relevant morphosyntactic information that was obligatory but was either missing or wrongly supplied, in the learner's rendition, while retaining its central meaning. (Long et al., 1998, p. 358)

We must also question in what way the researcher's turns could possibly be construed as “incidental” and “focused on meaning rather than form”; see point four below.

Secondly, the researcher's turns in the two examples are clearly rather different or heterogenous as actions. In example 6.4 the researcher repeats the participant's turn verbatim, whereas in 6.5 she alters the syntactical structure. However, the two different sequences are homogenised as recasts in the quantitative data treatment. Indeed, in order for SLA to quantify interactional phenomena, it must treat them as if they were homogenous. These two examples are presented by Long et al. as typical and no evidence is presented as to the degree of homogeneity or heterogeneity of the discourse produced by the other 28 participants in the Spanish experiment.

The third problem is that discussed by Nicholas, Lightbown and Spada (2001, p. 740) of whether learners are able to recognise recasts as corrective feedback, since it may be "carefully masked by the teacher" (see also Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2002, p. 423). Although the researcher repeats the participant's turn verbatim in example 6.4 and modifies the syntactical structure in 6.5, the ends of both turns are designed in exactly the same way, namely "si? Uhuh". From the participant's perspective, then, the researcher's identical recipient design may make it very difficult to know whether a morphosyntactic correction is intended or not. So there is homogeneity in terms of the recipient design at the same time as heterogeneity in terms of the actions.

Fourthly, there is a major mismatch between intended and actual pedagogy, between task-as-workplan and task-in-process. We can see from the definition above that the researcher's action is supposed to be "communicatively oriented and focused on meaning". Long et al. (1998, p. 365) describe the pedagogy as "communication tasks" and "communicative" (p. 368). However, when we examine the examples, what we actually find is a pre-recorded one-word prompt for the participants to produce a precise string of linguistic forms which is then evaluated for syntactic accuracy by the researcher. In the reference system which I have used in this monograph this is an example of a form and accuracy context and in language teaching parlance it is a structural drill. Extract 6.6 below, by contrast, contains two examples of recasts which do conform to Long et al.'s definition; by comparing these to Long et al.'s two examples we can see just how dissimilar the sequential environments are.
Extract 6.6

1 T: Vin, have you ever been to the movies? What’s your favorite movie?
2 L: Big.
3 T: Big, OK, that’s a good movie, that was about a little boy inside a big man, wasn’t it?
4 L: Yeah, boy get surprise all the time.
5 → T: Yes, he was surprised, wasn’t he? Usually little boys don’t do the things that men do, do they?
6 L: No, little boy no drink.
7 → T: That’s right, little boys don’t drink.

(Johnson, 1995, p. 23)

My argument is that such mismatches are virtually inevitable if there is an etic, top-down specification of pedagogy (task-as-workplan) with no corresponding emic, case by case analysis of the discoursal data (task-in-process) before quantitative treatment. It is normal practice in SLA studies using interactional data to find a concept or construct specified in terms of task-as-workplan but to find that the data is actually gathered from the task-in-process which may be (as in this case) rather different. Often any possible mismatches between the two are not “visible” as most studies do not actually publish examples of their raw interactional data, Long et al.’s study being an exception.

The purpose of the above discussion is not to challenge the overall validity of Long’s considerable work, nor of the use of quantification in SLA in general. CA does not seek to prohibit quantification - it is premature quantification of discoursal data without prior analysis which it seeks to discourage, or as Schegloff puts it, “We need to know what the phenomena are, how they are organized, and how they are related to each other as a precondition for cogently bringing methods of quantitative analysis to bear on them” (Schegloff, 1993, p. 114). The intention of the above discussion was to propose that if SLA wishes to use naturally occurring discourse as data for quantification and to assure the validity of the process, then it will need to separate its research processes into two stages and to change its focus of analysis from the task-as-workplan to the task-in-process. The first stage would involve the following:

1) Conduct an emic, holistic analysis of each extract as an instance of discourse in its own right.
2) Adopt qualitative, emic concepts of validity, reliability, epistemology etc. in relation to the discourse which it uses for input which are different to and separate from those which it uses for the quantification stage. These concepts are outlined in section 1.5.
3) Any definitions used in the study (including that of the “task”) would have to be generated inductively, bottom-up from the data. In other words, a shift to the task-in-process would be necessary.
4) Adopt a perspective on the homogeneity and heterogeneity of discourse which at present it lacks, together with a model and methodology for analysing these. We saw in the discussion of Long et al.’s data above that it is possible to explicate the degree and type of homogeneity and heterogeneity in discourse.
5) Adopt a perspective on socially shared cognition and learning.
In the second stage the analysed interactional data (e.g. recasts) could be used for quantitative treatment with their construct validity assured. CA is able to provide all that is necessary for the first stage of the process, so there is a clear role or vacant slot which CA can play in that part of the SLA project which relates to interaction. Such a preliminary stage is particularly necessary with phenomena like recasts, which according to the definition above occur incidentally as and when errors occur. Recasts which occur incidentally in the classroom are therefore bound to be unique and heterogenous and would certainly have to be analysed as individual instances before quantification.

1.4 Focus on Form Instruction

Recent work on form-focused instruction (FFI) in SLA (e.g., Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2001b) provides a good example of a possibility for future collaboration between CA and SLA. The argument which will again be developed is that there is a vacant slot in the FFI project which CA is able to fill. FFI adheres to the concept of differentiation in classroom activities, as is evident from Doughty and William's (1998), Ellis's (2001b) and Long and Robinson's (1998) taxonomies or categorisations of the different kinds of pedagogical activities. However, there is a major conceptual problem inherent in the literature on focus on form, namely whose focus is it? Is it the researcher's etic focus, the etic focus of the teacher's task-as-workplan or the learner's emic focus? As Ellis points out,

Conceptualizing FFI in terms of types and options is not unproblematic. The three types of FFI rest on the distinction between focus on form and focus on meaning. The question arises as to how this focus is to be determined. Whose perspective is to be considered? Is the focus to be determined in terms of the researcher's or teacher's intention or in terms of particular learners' response to instruction? …Classroom learners may or may not respond in the way intended. (Ellis, 2001b, p. 26)

Looking at the FFI literature, it seems quite clear that the SLA view it should be the learner's perspective which is the vital one. Long's definition of focus on form is that learners "attend to language as object during a generally meaning-oriented activity" and he notes that "learners need to attend to a task if acquisition is to occur, but … their orientation can best be to both form and meaning, not to either form or meaning alone" (Long, 1996, p. 429). According to Doughty, "The factor that distinguishes focus on form from other pedagogical approaches is the requirement that focus on form involves learners' briefly and perhaps simultaneously attending to form, meaning and use during one cognitive event" (Doughty, 2001, p. 211).

Nowhere in the FFI literature, however, do we find any description of the methodology which SLA researchers are to use in order to identify what the learners' focus is on during the lesson. In order to do this, researchers would have to analyse the classroom discourse and develop an emic perspective in order to ascertain what the learners are focussing on. However, FFI has derived its typology of pedagogical activities in a top-down, etic way from theory and pedagogy (Ellis, 2001b) rather than in a bottom-up, emic way from interactional data. In other words, FFI has been conceptualised in terms of task-as-workplan (before classroom implementation) rather than task-in-process (what actually happens in the classroom). As we saw above in the
recasts example (and as all classroom teachers know), there can be quite a gulf between the two.

There is also now ample evidence in the literature (Coughlan and Duff, 1994; Donato, 2000; Foster, 1998; Ohta, 2000; Mori, 2002) of tasks-as-workplan resulting in different and unexpected tasks-in-process. For example, the FFI literature assumes from an etic theoretical perspective (task-as-workplan) that tasks promote a focus on meaning (Ellis, 2003, p. 3). However, when we look at the interactional evidence in the classroom from the learners' emic perspective (task-in-process), the picture may be very different. Tasks may in some cases promote a focus on meaning, but as we saw in section Error! Reference source not found., learners may document a focus on the accomplishment of the task itself rather than on form or meaning. Alternatively, the learners may go completely off-task (Seedhouse, 1996; Markee, in press).

The only way to establish what learners actually focus on during a task is by a detailed, case by case emic analysis of the entire interactional data for the whole task. Determining the perspectives of others is a fundamentally constructionist or phenomenologist undertaking belonging to the qualitative paradigm (Bryman, p. 2001, p. 20). The point to be made here, then, is that the TBL/SLA project crucially requires an emic methodology to analyse the task-in-process and to ascertain the focus of the participants but has as yet not adopted such a methodology. It would not be sufficient to “sample” task-based interaction. As we have seen throughout this monograph, the focus of L2 classroom interaction can shift instantaneously; see also Sullivan (2000). The only way in which such mismatches can be avoided is to work inductively from the data with an emic perspective to describe the interaction which is actually produced in the language classroom and the learners' focus. From that starting point it is then possible to construct theoretical or pedagogical categories which correspond to the data and any quantitative treatment will have a firm basis and a correspondence between theory and practice, between task-as-workplan and task-in-process.

Perhaps the major contribution which a CA methodology can make is to demonstrate that it is possible for SLA to shift its focus from the task-as-workplan to the task-in-process. In fact Ellis (2001b) and Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen (2001) have already made a start on deriving some instructional categories in FFI from studies of classroom processes. Ellis (2001b, p. 22), for example, derives the constructs pre-emptive and reactive focus-on-form inductively from classroom data. The threat to validity within a quantitative paradigm is too great for SLA to continue to derive constructs etically from the task-as-workplan and then to gather interactional data from a potentially very different task-in-process.

So in this section I have argued that CA is compatible with SLA and can contribute to its project. Following Kasper (1997) I have been very specific about the vacant slots in the area of discourse within the SLA project which CA can fill. CA can provide the first stage in a two-stage multi-strategy research (Bryman, 2001, p. 444) model. CA can contribute to SLA by providing

1. A methodology for analysing and ensuring the construct validity (in a quantitative paradigm) of discoursal data prior to quantification.
2. A methodology for deriving definitions and classifications inductively from discoursal data.
3. A methodology for portraying processes of socially shared cognition and learning.
4. A methodology for the analysis of L2 classroom discourse.
An emic methodology to determine learners' focus which is vital for the FFI project.

CA is in addition able to provide a direct link to the social dimension. SLA has frequently been criticised (Firth and Wagner, 1997; Roberts, 2001, p. 110) for lack of engagement with sociology and sociolinguistics. CA is the interdisciplinary methodology par excellence and as such could ensure that SLA moves out of its allegedly hermetically sealed state and makes connections with other institutional settings.

A description of the interactional organisation of L2 classroom discourse and a model for relating the findings in relation to different sub-varieties of interaction to each other. It is argued that this is of direct relevance as this level of organisation mediates between pedagogy and learning and in effect transforms the task-as-workplan into the task-in-process. This aspect of the CA-for-SLA research agenda is proposed by Markee:

An important strand of future empirical work on the Interaction Hypothesis should specify in qualitative terms how many different classroom talks are attested in second and foreign language classrooms and provide detailed descriptions of how these speech exchange systems are organized. Complementary experimental research should establish through factor analysis and other powerful inferential statistical techniques what contributions different classroom talks make to acquisition. (Markee, 2002, p. 11).

This monograph characterises some L2 classroom contexts or classroom talks and others are characterised in Seedhouse (1996). Finally, it is suggested that some work in a future CA-for-SLA paradigm may (following Kasper, 2002) not be restricted to an agenda defined by existing SLA interests, but rather by unmotivated looking at the data as a discovery procedure and examining issues which emerge from the data. Examples of research focus which have emerged from looking at the data underlying this monograph are the identification of a dual focus on form and meaning (Seedhouse, 1997b) and teachers’ reluctance to give unmitigated negative evaluation in form and accuracy contexts (section 4.6).

1.5 CA as a Social Science Research Methodology

At this point I will attempt to position CA in relation to social science research methods and concepts such as validity, reliability, generalizability, epistemology, quantification and triangulation. The aim of this section is to facilitate mutual understanding between the different paradigms in which CA, AL and SLA operate. A number of points need to be made beforehand. Firstly, qualitative researchers often object that the concepts of validity and reliability derive from quantitative approaches and sometimes propose alternative criteria to be applied to qualitative research; these issues are discussed by Bryman (2001, pp. 31-2). Secondly, as Peräkylä (1997, p. 216) notes, "The specific techniques of securing reliability and validity in different types of qualitative research are not the same." Thirdly, the goal of developing an emic perspective on naturally occurring interaction means that CA has had to develop procedures which are sometimes rather different in many ways to
mainstream research methodologies. Fourthly, Peräkylä (1997, p. 202) notes that, until his own publication, there had been "no accessible discussions available on issues of validity and reliability in conversation analytic studies."

This does not mean that CA practitioners have not been interested in these issues. On the contrary, it may be argued that all CA work has been (on one level) an attempt at a process exposition of what exactly is involved in and meant by ensuring validity and reliability in the analysis of talk. This is clear from Sacks' (1992, volume 1, p. 11) aim to produce "methods (which) will be reproducible descriptions in the sense that any scientific description might be, such that the natural occurrences that we're describing can yield abstract or general phenomena which need not rely on statistical observability for their abstractness or generality." However, CA practitioners have often phrased the discussion in terms which are only accessible to other practitioners, with the unintended result that the CA perspective has often been misunderstood by social science and linguistic researchers. In any case, the point to be understood at the outset is that CA's aim to develop an emic perspective on talk means that many of its assumptions and practices will necessarily be radically different from research methodologies operating in an etic paradigm.

Peräkylä (1997, p. 206) identifies the key factors in relation to reliability as the selection of what is recorded, the technical quality of recordings and the adequacy of transcripts; Ten Have (1999) provides a very detailed account of this area. However, another aspect of reliability is the question of whether the results of a study are repeatable or replicable (Bryman, 2001, p. 29), and the way CA studies present their data is of crucial significance here. Many research methodologies do not present their primary data in their publications and hence the reliability of major sections of the researchers' analyses is not available for scrutiny. By contrast, it is standard practice for CA studies to include the transcripts of the data, and increasingly to make audio and video files available electronically via the Web. Furthermore, the analyst makes transparent the process of analysis for the reader. This enables the reader to analyse the data themselves, to test the analytical procedures which the author has followed and the validity of his/her analysis and claims. In this way, CA analyses are rendered repeatable and replicable to the reader. Also, it is standard practice for CA practitioners to take their data and analyses to data workshops and to send their work to a number of other practitioners for comment before sending them for publication.

We will now consider four kinds of validity in relation to qualitative research: internal, external, ecological and construct validity (Bryman, 2001, p. 30). Internal validity is concerned with the soundness, integrity and credibility of findings. Do the data prove what the researcher says they prove or are there alternative explanations? Many CA procedures which seem strange to non-practitioners are based on a concern for ensuring internal validity whilst developing an emic perspective. In some research methodologies operating in an etic perspective it is legitimate for the analyst to invoke concepts such as power and gender in relation to the extract without needing to demonstrate that the participants themselves are oriented to such concepts. However, the crucial point in developing an emic perspective is that it is the participants' perspective rather than the analyst. How do CA analysts know what the participants' perspective is? Because the participants document their social actions to each other in the details of the interaction by normative reference to the interactional organisations. We as analysts can access the emic perspective in the details of the interaction and by reference to those same organisations. Clearly, the details of the interaction themselves provide the only justification for claiming to be able to develop an emic perspective. Therefore, CA practitioners cannot make any claims beyond
what is demonstrated by the interactional detail without destroying the emic perspective and hence the whole validity of the enterprise.

*External validity* is concerned with *generalizability* or the extent to which the findings can be generalized beyond the specific research context. A typical criticism of qualitative studies is that they are context-bound and therefore weak in terms of external validity. Peräkylä (1997, p. 214) points out that generalizability "is closely dependent on the type of conversation analytic research". Institutional discourse is the subject of the monograph. It is often not appreciated that CA studies of institutional discourse are often analysing on the micro and macro level simultaneously. So, by explicating the organisation of the micro-interaction in an institutional setting, CA studies may at the same time be providing a generalisable description of the interactional organisation of the setting. This is because institutional interaction is seen as rationally organised in relation to the institutional goal (Levinson, 1992, p. 71).

For example, in the case of this monograph, CA analysis has revealed the reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction to be a generalisable, indeed universal feature of L2 classroom interaction because it relates directly to the institutional goal, which is always the same wherever L2 classroom interaction is taking place. All CA studies in effect work on the particular and the general simultaneously; by analysing individual instances, the machinery which produced these individual instances is revealed: "The point of working with actual occurrences, single instances, single events, is to see them as the products of a 'machinery' … to generate formal descriptions of social actions which preserve and display the features of the machinery which produced them" (Benson and Hughes, 1991, pp. 130-131).

*Ecological validity* is concerned with whether findings are applicable to people's everyday life; laboratory experiments in the social sciences can often be weak in terms of ecological validity. CA practitioners typically record naturally occurring talk in its authentic social setting. Furthermore, CA attempts to develop an emic, holistic perspective and to portray how the interactants perform their social actions through talk by reference to the same interactional organisations which the interactants are using. Therefore CA studies tend to be exceptionally strong by comparison to other methodologies in terms of ecological validity. The current study, for example, is based on evidence of what teachers actually do in the classroom, rather than on pedagogical recommendations produced by theorists.

*Construct validity* is a vital concept in positivistic, quantitative, etic paradigm, as we saw in section 1.3. However, in an emic paradigm the question is: whose construct is it? Typically, descriptivist linguists look for etically specifiable methods of description, so that an analyst can match surface linguistic features of the interaction to constructs and categories. In an emic perspective, however, we are looking for organisations to which participants orient during interaction, which is not at all the same thing. The best example of this different orientation is the turn-constructional unit (TCU), as we saw in section 1.3. TCUs are only analysable emically as social actions. They are quite heterogenous in terms of linguistic form and do not correspond in any way to single linguistic categories. In whatever way they are packaged in terms of linguistic form, the point is that social actors are able to recognise them in interaction as complete social actions and hence are able to project when they are likely to end. The “construct” of the TCU, then, is an interactant's construct rather than an analyst's one and it is not etically specifiable.
Lepper (2000, pp. 175-6) suggests that CA research should be accountable in two more ways above and beyond those normal in qualitative research. *Sequential accountability* means that a CA analysis should provide a holistic account of the coherence of a text and *distributional accountability* requires functional explanations as to why a phenomenon occurs in one discourse environment but not another.

In relation to *epistemology*, CA is based on ethnomethodology, whose fundamental principles are described in chapter one. From a broader perspective, ethnomethodology can be located (Lynch, 2000) in a phenomenological paradigm, which considers that "it is the job of the social scientist to gain access to people's 'common-sense thinking' and hence to interpret their actions and their social world from their point of view." (Bryman, 2001, p. 14). Ethnomethodology's ontological position can be associated with constructionism or the belief that "social phenomena and their meanings are constantly being accomplished by social actors. It implies that social phenomena and categories are not only produced through social interaction but that they are in a constant state of revision" (Bryman, 2001, p. 18).

The short and simple way to present the CA attitude to *quantification* would be to state that CA is a qualitative methodology which tries to develop an emic perspective, so quantification is generally of peripheral interest to CA practitioners. However, given that one aim of this section is to develop mutual understanding between on the one hand linguists and SLA researchers (who often quantify interaction) and CA practitioners, a more detailed explanation is necessary. In order to introduce the CA attitude to quantification we will examine Schegloff's (1968) study of sequencing in conversational openings. Schegloff examined 500 instances of openings of telephone calls to a disaster (emergency) centre of the American Red Cross. In the first instance he established a norm which worked perfectly for 499 of the calls, namely that the answerer speaks first. The only deviant case was as follows:

**Extract 6.7**

(Police makes call)
Receiver is lifted and there is a one second pause
Police: hello.
Other: American Red Cross.
Police: hello, this is Police Headquarters (.). er, Officer Stratton

(Schegloff, 1968, p. 1079)

Now in a quantitative paradigm one would simply say that a norm which worked for 99.8% of cases was an extremely good one and leave it at that. However, the CA approach is rather different as it is trying to uncover the norms to which participants are orienting and the emic logic or rational basis for their actions. Deviant cases are particularly helpful in this regard and should be explored in detail. The deviant case here pushed Schegloff to a deeper analysis resulting in the identification of a summons-answer sequence which works for all 500 cases. The telephone ring functions as the summons, to which the overwhelming next action is a response by the receiver of the call. In the deviant case the response is not immediately provided and therefore the caller repeats the summons, this time in verbal form. It should also be noted that the deviant case analysis resulted in the formulation of a more elegant adjacency pair norm rather than single speaker norm.
This is also a good example of a CA account which is both particularised and generalised. The specific features of individual cases (particularly deviant cases) are investigated in depth and are used to build a general account of a phenomenon or interactional organisation. It has often been mistakenly reported that quantification is prohibited in CA. However, informal or methodological quantification has been widely used from the beginnings of CA. Schegloff et al. (1977), for example, report self-correction as “vastly more common than other-correction”. The classic statement of the CA position on quantification is Schegloff (1993), which warns specifically against premature quantification in relation to superficially identifiable interactional phenomena. In section 1.3 we saw an example of this from the SLA literature. We can only understand the organisation of the interaction and its emic logic by detailed analysis of individual instances and premature quantification of superficially identifiable and decontextualised phenomena will tend to divert our attention from this. As Schegloff (1993, p. 114) puts it, “Quantification is no substitute for analysis.” Nevertheless, Heritage (1999, p. 70) considers the likelihood that CA will become more quantitative during the next period of its development and cites three CA studies in which quantification has proved vital to establishing the nature of an interactional practice. There are, according to Heritage (1995, p. 404) a number of possible uses for statistics in CA:

- As a means of isolating interesting phenomena.
- As a means of consolidating intuitions which are well defined, but where the existence of a practice is difficult to secure without a large number of cases.
- In cases in which independent findings about a conversational practice can have indirect statistical support.
- In almost all cases where a claim is made that the use or outcome of a particular interactional practice is tied to particular social or psychological categories, such as gender, status etc. statistical support will be necessary.

Readers who have followed the argument thus far will have realised that, give the emic goal of CA, there is no substitute for detailed and in-depth analysis of individual sequences; interviews with participants, questionnaires, etc. are not able to provide this, which is why triangulation is not normally undertaken. "Experience shows that participants may not afterwards 'know' what they have been doing or why, and furthermore tend to justify their behaviour in various ways ... CA tries to analyse conduct 'in its own setting'.” (Ten Have, 1999, p. 33). The aim, then, is to portray the emic orientations of the participants in situ at a particular point in the interaction, rather than from outside the interactional sequence. However, as noted in section Error! Reference source not found., there is currently a movement to integrate CA and ethnography, the relationship being first CA, then ethnography. So CA and triangulation are generally compatible and may be mutually reinforcing, with the caveats stated above. It is not that any of these practices are off-limits to CA practitioners but rather that they should be prioritising their time on serious, detailed and in-depth analysis.

Finally, I should make quite clear that CA is not being presented as a methodology which could “revolutionise” Applied Linguistics or SLA. CA’s scope is limited to the study of naturally-occurring spoken interaction. I have been very specific about the areas in which CA can contribute to existing research agendas and processes. I have also been careful to reveal compatibilities with existing research.
methodologies and to demonstrate how CA can work with them on a multi-strategy research agenda.

1.6 Chapter Summary

After discussing the relationship between CA and AL, I reviewed the latest CA research in the following AL areas: Language teaching task design; Language teaching materials design; Language proficiency assessment design; Disordered talk and speech therapy; Professional discourse; CA in languages other than English; NS-NNS talk; Bilingual and multilingual interaction; Grammar, pragmatics and interaction. A common theme in the research is that competence is co-constructed by the participants rather than being fixed and static. I then critiqued the current SLA research into recasts and form-focused instruction and suggested that there is a vacant slot in the SLA project which CA is able to fill. I specified the contributions which CA is able to make and demonstrated why it is necessary to subject interactional data to a qualitative, emic analysis prior to quantification. Finally I positioned CA in relation to social science research methods and concepts such as validity, reliability, generalizability, epistemology, quantification and triangulation.

This chapter has tried to demonstrate that CA is not (as often assumed) incompatible with other approaches such as AL, SLA, CDA, ethnography and psychology, as well as with quantification and triangulation. The point (following Silverman, 1999) is that doing CA first then provides a warrant for invoking the relevance of contextual factors and constructs, which is helpful to other methodologies. CA necessarily has a number of unusual characteristics precisely because it aims to develop an emic perspective. Nonetheless, we have seen that it has many features in common with mainstream qualitative social science research methodologies.

1 Keith Richards has contributed to the writing of this section.
2 See Young (2002).
3 Ellis et al's (2002, p. 423) definition of recast: "This consists of a reformulation of either the whole or part of the student's utterance containing an error in such a way as to maintain the student's intended meaning."
4 Although we do not have access to all of the cues which the teacher does, e.g. non-verbal ones.
5 See also Schegloff, 1993.
6 Moreover, one of the aims of Long et al.'s study (pp. 358-9) is to investigate whether learners can use recasts as negative evidence. Clearly, negative evidence can only be used by learners in relation to grammatically incorrect sentences.
7 Note also Ellis et al's (2002, p. 423) definition of recast: "This consists of a reformulation of either the whole or part of the student's utterance containing an error in such a way as to maintain the student's intended meaning."
8 Ellis et al's (2001, pp. 283-4) definition of focus on form: "Focus on form can be seen as having five criterial features:
1. It occurs in discourse that is primarily meaning-centred.
2. It is observable (i.e., occurs interactionally).
3. It is incidental (i.e., it is not preplanned).
4. It is transitory.
5. It is broadly focused (i.e., several different forms may be attended to in the context of a single lesson)."
9 Also abbreviated as FonF in Doughty and Williams (1998).