Research in English Language Pedagogy (2022) 10(3): 369-388

 DOI: 10.30486/RELP.2022.1961317.1385

Review Article

Reflections on Conversation Analytic Research in ELT

Hamid Allami[1,*], *Fatemeh Mozaffari*[2], *Hossein Ali Manzouri*[1]

[1] Department of English Language Teaching, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

[2] Freelancer.

Submission date: 18 June, 2022 Acceptance date: 31 August, 2022

Abstract

Studying L2 classroom interaction can potentially help teachers and researchers to analyze classroom discourse in order to gain insights into class-based learning and promote teachers' awareness of their teaching. To measure, analyze and describe the interaction and the behavior of participants in classrooms several approaches can be used. One of the most powerful methodologies in Applied Linguistic research and L2 classroom interactions has recently been conversation analysis. This short paper reports on several conversation analytic studies with a focus on English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom discourse and discusses the values of conversation analysis as a reflexive methodology for research on second or foreign language classroom discourse. The implications outlined are for language teaching and learning, classroom interaction, professional development of English language teachers, teacher education, and everyday talk.

Keywords: Classroom discourse, conversation analysis, ELT, professional development, teacher education

Corresponding Author's E- mail: Hamid_allami@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

Talk is the basic form of human sociality or interaction, a crucial activity at the center of our lives through which we share experiences. We chat with friends or do critical matters like when we make policy decisions, communicate internationally, plan a business, or when we learn or teach in the classroom. Talk-in-interaction obviously involves the use of language as an essential component of talk. Therefore, an understanding of how language is used in talk must be central to applied linguistics. Conversation analysis (CA) is one of the applied linguistic approaches to the study of talk or spoken language. In CA, talk is seen as a jointly accomplished activity by both the speaker and the listener.

One of the jointly constructed activities is learning an L2 in the classroom. L2 learning is a consequence of talk-in-interaction, the interaction between the participants who use the spoken language to communicate. This spoken language in the L2 classroom interaction can be studied through CA. However, this interaction differs from casual conversation and other institutional varieties of talk alluding to the fact that in the language classroom language serves two purposes; it is the goal and the means to the achievement of that goal at the same time. Furthermore, language classroom interaction is goal-oriented and contains contributions shaped by specific goals.

Studying L2 classroom interaction thus can potentially help teachers and researchers to analyze classroom discourse in order to gain insights into class-based learning and to promote teachers' awareness of their teaching. To measure, analyze and describe the interaction and the behavior of participants in classrooms several approaches are used within Applied Linguistics including linguistic approach, systemic functional linguistic approach, interaction analysis, discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, conversation analysis, and various other qualitative and quantitative paradigms. A lot of research on L2 classroom interaction adopts linguistic and discourse analyses. Nevertheless, with more studies of social interaction, conversation analysis has been utilized to analyze this type of institutional talk (e.g., Koshik, 2002; Lee, 2006; Seedhouse, 2010; Sert, 2022; Walsh, 2002; Waring, 2009, 2011, 2012). In this line of scholarship, nonstructural aspects of language use or interactional practices such as turn-taking, repair, and sequential organization are treated as an integral part of the participants' language behavior (Wong & Waring, 2010).

We have conducted several conversation analytic studies with a focus on English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom discourse. This short paper presents an account of various implications we have gained from doing conversation analysis. First, a brief overview of the use of CA in L2 research and a summary of the CA studies are provided. Next, our empirical examples of the use of CA in detecting classroom challenges are illustrated. Finally, a number of insights and implications from CA-informed research will be discussed.

2. Literature Review

CA is an approach to the study of social interaction (see Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Psathas, 1995; ten Have, 2007 for a thorough introduction). CA was initially concerned with ordinary interaction and it was then adapted to institutional interactions including classroom interaction. Emerged within the discipline of sociology in the 1960s, CA was developed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, and it was influenced by Garfinkel's ethnomethodology and Goffman's conception of the interaction order. Today CA scholars work in various disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, linguistics, applied linguistics, speech-communication, psychology, interactional sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis.

As a method, CA can be used in applied linguistics research including second language acquisition (SLA) research. The movement of 'CA for SLA' (Markee & Kasper, 2004; Wong & Waring, 2010) began in the late 1990s (e.g., Firth & Wagner, 1997) and CA-oriented research on SLA has so far found great findings related to interactional practices and interactional architecture of language classrooms (e.g., Jacknick, 2011; Lee, 2006; Seedhouse, 2004; Walsh, 2010; Waring, 2009, 2011, 2012). Discussing the adoption of CA methodology, Walsh (2002) mentioned four reasons: (a) the data are naturally occurring interactions and there is no attempt to fit the data into preconceived categories. (b) The patterns of language are socially constructed by the participants, (c) the rules which operate to ensure that talk is maintained and sustained across the contributions are explained. And (d) the classroom context is regarded as being dynamic; there is a relationship between language use and pedagogical focus. Despite the powerful tools of CA for SLA research, the amount of CA work is still limited in SLA literature. The aim of this paper is to offer reflections on the use of conversation analysis as a tool in identifying ELT problems.

3. Methodology

Adopting a conversation analytic framework, a number of classroom analysis-oriented studies have been conducted in the EFL context. Language teachers' oral questioning practice which constitutes one of the fundamental interactional tools in L2 teaching was basically explored. Much L2 research on teacher questions has been quantitative focusing on identifying question types and their roles in language acquisition and meaning negotiation. Adopting CA and drawing on sociocultural theory, how EFL teachers structure their referential questions across question-answer sequences was initially examined qualitatively. The data for the study were collected through videotaping eleven EFL lessons from seven intermediate-level teachers at four private language schools in Iran. The microanalysis of the transcribed data indicated that EFL teachers vary in their structuring of unfolding sequences. It was also found that although teachers ask lots of open or referential questions, only a small number of these questions tend to provide learning opportunities.

The major findings of our first observation revealed some constructive and obstructive interactional practices of teachers' first- or third-turn moves across the unfolding sequences. For example, when the teachers allocated their questions through nomination; they did not give enough wait-time; interrupted or completed learners' turns of response, they tended to obstruct opportunities. By contrast, when they allocated questions to the whole class; waited longer; prompted learners' initial response through a follow-up question, statement or a continuer, they constructed learning processes to take place.

In our second observation, we explored how EFL teacher questions can scaffold learning processes to take place. The conversation analysis of the data revealed three question types that may provide scaffolded assistance: simplifying questions, marking questions, and asking-for-agreement questions. The results appeared to contribute to understanding how the interactive nature of the questions teachers pose can shed light on the connection between teachers' practices and students' learning across the unfolding sequences.

Our last observation focused on teachers' response interruptions. The sequential analysis of the data demonstrated that teachers tend to interrupt learners' responses in three different ways; they complete learners' turns, expect only closed answers, and give self-elaborated answers. These observational studies have generally provided some insights

into the benefits that can be derived from adopting CA to the study of verbal behavior in L2 classroom interaction.

4. Results

Below are presented extracts indicating how teachers' questions scaffolded assistance to learners where necessary. Furthermore, microanalysis of the extracts is discussed too.

Extract 1. Wait-Time for individual learners and the whole class

1. T: ↓well…↓what do you know about this new disease? ↓Bahram what do you know?
2. L1: danger…it is danger…(1.0)
3. T: Why is it dangerous?
4. L1: ((silence)) (2.0)
5. T: ↓Mani can you answer the question? Why is Coronavirus dangerous?
6. L2: it kill…∘ dies ∘…people die
7. L2: ((silence)) (1.0)
8. T: ↓yes, people can die because of the virus. What are signs of the sick people?
9. L2: ((silence)) (1.0)
10. T: can you think about coughing?
11. LL: ((silence)) (4.0)
12. L3: cough sir, > they very much cough
13. T: ↓yes, they cough a lot. What about other symptoms?
14. LL: ((silence)) (3.0)
15. T: ↓what about fever?
16. LL: ((silence)) (4.0)
17. L4: they fever ∘ high…er∘

In Extract 1, differences in the allocated wait-time for nominated individuals and the whole class are presented. In the above extract, the class is going to read a text about the Coronavirus pandemic. The teacher poses some questions as a warm-up activity. He sometimes nominates learners and asks them directly and at other times he just addresses the whole class. When the teacher poses the question "well…what do you know about this

new disease?" he immediately nominates one participant (L1) to answer the question (Line 1). In the next turn (line 2), L1 tries to provide an answer and says "danger…it is danger". The teacher immediately corrects L1 (He used danger instead of dangerous) and poses the next question to him and asks "Why is it dangerous?" L1 does not know the answer and keeps silent for 2 seconds (Line 4). In the next turn (line 5) the teacher nominates another learner (L2) and asks the same question. L2 provides the answer "it kill…dies…people die" but he cannot finish his sentence grammatically and then keeps silent (line 7). After a second, the teacher poses another question and asks "What are signs of the sick people?" (Line 8) where L2 cannot reply. Then, the teacher asks the whole class to answer the posed question by providing a hint (line 10). For the next four seconds, no one provides any answer (Line 11). In the next turn (Line 12) L3 answers "cough sir, they very much cough". To keep on the talk, the teacher continues "yes, they cough a lot. What about other symptoms?" (Line 13). Learners don't provide any answers for three seconds (Line 14) and after that, the teacher trying to scaffold the task and encourage learners to answer says "what about fever?" (Line 15). Then he waits four more seconds but he receives no answers (line 16). Then L4 provides an answer Land says "they fever high" (Line 17). What is evident from this short extract is that whenever a teacher nominates a learner to answer the questions the wait-time he provides is about one or two seconds only (lines 2, 4, 7, 9). This short wait time can be obstructive since it does not provide enough time for the learner to think about the question and provide an answer. However, when the questions are posed to the whole class, the wait time is nearly doubled (11, 14, 16) providing enough time for the learners to come up with some sorts of answers.

Extract 2. Simplifying questions, Marking questions, and Asking-for-agreement questions.

1. T: (reading)…it causes ↑respiratory problems.
2. L4: respiratory means what? ((He does not understand the meaning.))
3. T: ↓Ali what does it mean?
4. L5: ((silence)) (2.0)
5. T: what is respiratory here? > Is that a verb, a noun, or an adjective?
6. L1: ↑adjective before a noun
7. T: ↑perfect. respiratory is an adjective like tall, big, beautiful.

8. T: it comes from the verb RESPIRE meaning to breathe. Now can you guess the meaning?
9. L5: so it is breathe problem?
10. T: ↑aha, very good Ali, breathing problems.
11. LL: breathing problems.
12. T: what are ↑breathing problems? What happens to you?
13. L6: I die…∘ no breathing ∘
14. L3: like coughing…> you very much cough
15. L1: if I don't breathing.. I die… I can't speak.
16. T: ↑yes, if we cannot breathe we will die.
17. L1: ↓we will die, yes.
18. T: Do you AGREE Arash with Bahram? If you don't breathe you DIE?
19. L7: ↑Yes, if everybody can't breathe die.
20. L2: No, I don't die if…$ if…not breathing two …minute $ ((laughter))
21. T: $ good for you $ ((laughter))
22. L5: $ he is fish, if he don't breathe he will not die $ ((laughter))

Extract 2 illustrates how teacher's questions can assist to scaffold learning processes in learners through simplifying questions, marking questions, and asking-for-agreement questions. In Extract 2, the class is reading a text about Corona virus pandemic. Teacher reads "…it causes respiratory problems" (Line 18). L4 signals he does not understand the meaning of the word "respiratory" (Line 19). In the next turn (Line 20) the teacher nominates L5 and ask him about the word where he does not know and keeps silent (Line 21). Then the teacher asks about part of speech of the word (line 22) where L1 says "adjective before noun" (line 24). In the next two lines (24, 25) the teacher explains the meaning of the verb "respire" and asks again the question to check whether anyone has guessed the meaning. With this scaffolding move, one learner (L4) comes with an understanding of the meaning of the word and says "so it is breathe problem?" (Line 26). Therefore, the teacher employs simplifying questions to scaffold learning in his students.

In addition, in this extract, the teacher asks a marking question to scaffold learning. In line 29, the teacher poses the question "what are breathing problems? What happens to you?" to all learners. L1, L6, and L3 provide some answers. However, their answers are

not grammatically correct. Then the teacher himself provides the accurate form of the conditional sentence in line 33 and in the next turn L1 immediately repeats the correct sentence. In the rest of the extract, the teacher uses another type of scaffolding question namely the asking-for-agreement question type. In line 34, the teacher asks "Arash do you agree with Bahram? If you don't breathe you die?". The next turns are allocated to answers provided by L7 and subsequent sentences by others making all laugh. It is evident that the three types of questions posed by the teacher in extract 2 provide considerable learning opportunities for the learners with scaffolding through engaging them in the classroom.

Extract 3. Self-elaboration, Turn Completion, and Closed Questions

1. T: ↓yes, that's right. ↓Well, do we Iranian celebrate CHRISTMAS?
2. L2: ↑some of the Iranians
3. L5: it's not ↑custom in Iran.
4. T: yes, it is not a custom here in Iran
5. T: (.) I mean… Christmas comes from ↑Christian countries and Iran is mostly a Muslim country.
6. T: ↓oh, you know (.)… these days some Muslim people in Iran celebrate it, too.
7. T: what are IRANIAN celebrations?
8. L1: we …> we celebrate Nowrooz.
9. L4: ↑yes true…
10. T: ↑aha what do you do in Nowrooz?
11. L5: ↓visit grandpa and grandmother
12. T: ↑aha what else?
13. L3: buy new closes ((clothes))
14. T: ↓yes, we visit grandparents, buy new clothes, come together and have fun.
15. L3: ↓yes
16. L5: ↓yes…yes
17. T: well…have you ever painted EGGS for Nowrouz?
18. L2: ↓eh…No
19. T: none of you have ↑ever painted eggs?
20. LL: ((silence)) (2.0)

21. L1: ↓no
22. T: well have you ever jumped over the fire in 4ShanbeSoori?
23. LL: ↑yes…yes

Extract 3 illustrates the teacher's use of self-elaboration, turn completion, and closed questions during a free discussion. In the first turn, the teacher asks whether Iranian people celebrate Christmas (Line 40). While L2 believes some Iranian celebrate Christmas, L5 believes it is not a custom in Iran (lines 41, 42). The teacher in the next turn tries to elaborate on the matter himself (Lines 43, 44) and brings a reason to explain why Iranian people do not observe Christmas (Line 45). Furthermore, he tries to scaffold learning by asking about Iranian celebrations (Line 46). Throughout the next six turns (Lines 47-52) different learners attempt to provide answers. However, in line 53 teacher himself completes the turn and provides a complete answer for the learners. The teacher then turns to ask closed questions (where learners can only answer with yes/no) (Lines 56, 58, 61). For example, he asks them "have you ever painted eggs for Nowrouz?" (Line 56). As it is clear throughout Extract 3 teacher turns function as obstructive rather than constructive to scaffold learning. In the first part of the extract, the teacher uses self-elaboration which obstructs learners' next turns for addressing the question. Later on, he completes learners' turns and poses closed questions both of which function obstructively for scaffolding learning.

In the present study, teachers through turn-taking and various question-answer sequences created both constructive and obstructive conditions for learner participation (Carroll, 2011a; Waring, 2018; Walsh, 2002, 2006; Wu, 1993). The teacher in Extracts 1 and 3 attempted to scaffold learning so that learners can take part in classroom discourse; however, since he did not allocate enough wait-time for the learners to participate fully his attempts did not make a considerable change. As discussed by scholars (e.g., Alavi, 2016; Fagan et al. 1981; Ingram & Elliott, 2016; Rowe, 1986) when teachers increase the wait times to more than three seconds, students are more deeply engaged in participating in the classroom discourse. The increased wait time can offer students opportunities to provide more cognitively driven answers compared to close questions. This benefits teachers too since "they become more adept at using student responses -possibly because they, too, are benefiting from the opportunity afforded by the increased time to listen to what students say" (Rowe, 1986, p. 45).

At some times, the teacher tries to self-answer the question hoping for more learners' participation. As reported recently by Ryan & Forrest (2019) and Smotrova (2013), Zhao (1998) contends that "although saving time, teachers' self-answers led to students' overdependence on teachers" (cf. Xie, 2008, p. 28). Similarly, Hu (2004) argued that teachers self-answered nearly 40% of the questions being asked. As Musumeci (1996) contends "teachers speak more, control the topic of conversation, rarely ask clarification requests, and appear to understand absolutely everything the student say, sometimes before they even say it" (p. 314). This leaves no space to contribute because their major role is to close the sequence and in some cases the whole topic, as soon as possible (Schegloff, 2007). Therefore, as Yaqubi and Pourhaji Rokni (2012) suggest "for teachers to maximize their learners' participation opportunities, they should impede the structuring of self-answering and self-elaboration through extended wait-time implementation" (p. 139).

Simplifying questions used by teachers as illustrated in Extract 2 through breaking the task into easier sub-tasks resembles negotiating of meaning where teachers realize the goal of comprehension (Huth, 2011; Clift, 2016; Mehan, 1979; Long, 1983; Pica, 1994; Varonis & Gass, 1985). Therefore, to scaffold effectively and contribute more to the classroom discourse, the teacher tries to build upon student contributions (Gibbons, 2003; Jarvis & Robinson, 1997; McNeil, 2011). Such scaffolded negotiations of meaning can assist teachers in both comprehending learners' problems and boosting learners' accomplishments (McNeil, 2011). The teacher's scaffolding through posing marking questions motivates learners to follow the task and get engaged more effectively which can hopefully lead to more use of the target language (Hosoda & Aline, 2013; McCormick & Donato, 2000; Duff, 2000; Nassaji & Wells, 2000). By asking agreement questions in Extract 2, the teacher attempted to take advantage of engaging all learners and extracting their ideas and words which can trigger student-student interaction in classroom discourse. Studies suggest that such interactions among learners lead to more learning opportunities (Jarvis & Robinson, 1997; McNeil, 2011; Donato, 1994; Ohta, 2001). Looking through the lens of a sociocultural perspective, researchers argued that such interactions the essence of which is using peers' ideas help learners to move from regulation to self-regulation stage (Lantolf, 2006; Ohta, 2001).

5. Discussion & Implications

5.1 Conversation Analysis nad Language Classroom Interaction

Conversation analysis has great implications for L2 teaching and learning. With respect to learning, CA brings a social dimension to classroom learning via relying on authentic naturally occurring spoken interactions to explain its orderliness, sequence organization, and turn-taking. This implies that conversations can be applied to the L2 classroom so that learners can be exposed to real-life language. From a sociocultural perspective, learning takes place through the development of shared understanding (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1985) basically during interactions. In this perspective, L2 learning is viewed as gaining socially distributed knowledge or having participation rather than the acquisition of linguistic knowledge.

However, L2 classroom learners may lack opportunities to engage in social interaction; therefore, it is the responsibility of the teacher to enhance learners' participation. Barraja-Rohan (2011) explained the relevance of conversation analysis to L2 teaching to enhance the learning of L2 conversational skills. To this end, she used CA concepts and features of interactional competence such as turn-taking, preference organization, repair and context successfully to enhance L2 learners' communication.

As far as L2 teaching is concerned, CA has also implications for language teachers as they are expected to use the knowledge of classroom interaction to improve their practices. The systematic investigation of classroom talk-in-interaction led to CA books within the fields of language learning and teaching (e.g. Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004). Drawing on CA framework, Seedhouse (2004) explains the interactional architecture of L2 classrooms and reveals the relationship between pedagogy and interaction as he argued that as the pedagogical focus varies, so the organization of turn and sequence varies. He identified four micro-contexts in language classroom interaction: procedural context, task-oriented context, form-and-accuracy context, and meaning-and-fluency context. Language teachers are thus expected to take notice and adopt this variable approach to classroom interaction in order to enhance learning. Similarly, our own conversation analytic studies revealed interactional practices not noticed through traditional methods of investigation. The findings of our analyses, as mentioned earlier, indicate that the use of different types of teacher questions does not guarantee the improvement of the quantity or quality of classroom interaction. Attention must be paid to teachers' questioning practices in the

course of interactions (teachers' subsequent turns and reactions to the responses). Questions, especially referential ones are interactional tools with important functions in language teaching and learning; as the way they are handled might either construct or obstruct learning opportunities. It is important that teachers use this type of question judiciously, that is, they have to pay attention to the interactional practices.

In fact, the detailed conversation analysis of the lesson interactions will help teachers become aware of the appropriate interactional decisions during interaction with learners to promote students' thinking and communicative abilities while taking into account the objectives of the lesson and their own goals, the students' abilities and motivation, and time available.

5.2 Conversation Analysis and Teacher Professional Development

One way to help teachers improve their professional practices is to help them understand interactional processes taking place during classroom discourse. Walsh (2010) points out three main ways in which an understanding of classroom discourse can be used in second language teacher development. First, any attempt to help teachers understand classroom discourse enhances learning. The use of appropriate questioning strategies found in our studies was designed to increase learner involvement. Second is the importance of teacher development through reflective practices when teachers analyze their own data using recordings from their own lessons. And finally, there is a need to have an emic (insider) perspective on classroom discourse and interactional processes, one that is acquired by teachers themselves than imposed by researchers.

Teachers massively focus on the learning of teaching methods and techniques for many years. Most of them just follow or imitate the fashionable teaching method or technique without any reflective practices. To this end, Walsh (2006, 2011) argues that “reflective practice can be enhanced by making classroom discourse the main focus of the reflection” (p. 137). Teachers’ interaction with students and teacher talk as the most important factors a successful class depends on have always been neglected. In actual teaching, few teachers are aware of the importance of oral interaction and they use it unconsciously. This reflective practice on classroom discourse can be achieved through self-observation, action research, dialogue with others, and above all reading CA works and adopting a CA methodology for analyzing classroom discourse.

CA proposes observation (peer observation or self-observation) and lesson transcripts so that teachers could build their awareness of teaching and thus engage in a process of professional development. Participating in another teacher's class or recording the class is an effective device as it allows teachers to view the interaction of other teachers and students thoroughly. Teachers can also transcribe some segments of the lessons so as to study the recurring behaviors. The transcript is important because it provides a detailed account of the linguistic interaction in the classroom. Unfortunately, some teachers in Iran may not feel comfortable with the idea of being observed by other teachers due to the fear of criticism or judgment which will make them lose face and also due to the uncommon occurrence of recording in some educational systems. Therefore, self-observation seems to be a simpler and more effective approach for the purpose of EFL teachers' awareness raising.

Doing a CA study can improve teachers' awareness toward classroom interaction. CA is able to reveal the various interactional practices that constitute interactional competence: turn-taking, sequencing, overall structuring, and repair (Wong & Waring, 2010). As we utilized observation and transcription as tools for awareness towards classroom interaction, we recommend that teachers record their lessons sometimes and transcribe them to see how they handle classroom discourse.

5.3 Conversation Analysis and Teacher Education

If appropriate interactional practices can bring about desirable educational goals, and lesson transcripts can give EFL teachers an understanding of their classroom interaction, it implies that CA research may be of an effective role for those who are involved in TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) as it focuses on the recording of classroom interaction. Many of the complexities of classroom discourse cannot be taught in teacher training courses and they may not always be evident during observation or videos. However, these subtleties may be revealed by fine-grained CA of lesson transcripts (Seedhouse, 2008; Richards, 2008; Sert, 2022). Therefore, teacher training courses should consider evaluation of classroom discourse and, especially the evaluation by the teacher himself through self-awareness (self-recording) instead of an outsider perspective. Cullen (2001) discussed how transcripts of lessons and analyses of short extracts of classroom discourse can be used to draw teachers' attention to the language teachers use in the classroom.

Teacher educators should bear in mind that teaching is a decision-making process. As such, the teacher educator's task is not to prescribe but to provide information which would serve as a knowledge base for the teachers to draw upon when making their own plans and decisions. One of the most influential research studies on the adoption of applied CA for teaching reflective practice is by Walsh (2006) who developed a Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) framework that identifies different contexts or modes of discourse and the pedagogical aims and interactional characteristics for each. Walsh (2006, 2011) developed the idea of 'Classroom Interactional Competence', which encompasses the features that make the teaching/learning process more or less effective.

5.4 Conversation Analysis and ELT Research

For many years researchers in the area of language learning have neglected classroom interaction, regarding it as a complex and messy source of data. However, conversation analytic works have demonstrated that there is order at all points of L2 classroom interaction. Furthermore, the findings of CA-informed classroom interaction research challenge the assumptions of earlier discourse analytic studies (i.e. Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), which argue that classroom interaction relies on teacher-initiated three-part sequences (Initiation-Response-Feedback/Evaluation). There is a growing body of micro-analytic research which allows us to have a better understanding of the context-sensitive nature of classroom interaction. For example, Waring (2009) detailed how one ESL student manages, in scaffolded interaction with the teacher, to move out of a series of uninterrupted IRFs during a homework review activity. Likewise, Lee (2006) showed how the third positions by the teacher in the question-answer adjacency pairs can be central recourses for language learning. My CA-informed studies similarly indicated that although chains of IRF sequences are common in EFL lessons, teachers can create a balance between respecting the IRF and maximizing learning opportunities through allocating more turns to the students for contribution.

5.5 Conversation Analysis and Everyday Talk

Our awareness of the subtlety and intricacy of everyday communicative processes may enable us to be more effective conversationalists. For this purpose, CA provides far-reaching implications for understanding social interaction and the role of discourse and

communication in everyday life. Using the method of conversation analysis we have learned more about everyday talk which is the "basic and constitutive feature of human social life" (Sidnell, 2010, p.1) and we have become more sensitive to our interactions with people, with our family members, friends, colleagues, and students. According to Goffman (1959), when an individual comes in contact with other people, he/she will attempt to control or guide the impression that others might make of him/her by changing or fixing his/her setting, appearance, and manner.

6. Conclusion

Learning an L2 like most human activities occurs in a social context. The ELT scholars who admit the importance of social context in SLA adopt the notion of learning as increasing participation in social activity including classroom talk thus the central question in ELT becomes the organization of talk understanding which is the aim of CA. This short paper aimed at introducing briefly the implications that have been informed by the resources of CA within the field of ELT and Applied Linguistics with a focus on consideration of CA for instructed learning contexts with a particular reference to the CA studies we have done. However, in the literature, the potentials offered by a CA research paradigm are also addressed in relation to language proficiency assessment, materials design and development, and language teacher education (for an introduction see Sert & Seedhouse, 2011). While Sert and Seedhouse presented an up-to-date account of works within the field of Applied Linguistics that have been influenced by a CA paradigm, in this paper we presented our own reflections from CA with particular reference to the CA we employed to investigate EFL classroom interaction.

It is true that CA has major strengths; yet, it must be mentioned that there is ample evidence (Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004) of CA limitations. First, the CA investigation of learning (i.e. language learning) has been criticized. In other words, CA may not be the appropriate tool for language learning) has been criticized. In other words, CA may not be the appropriate tool to study learning directly (He, 2004) though it can contribute to the larger inquiry of learning by investigating learning opportunities (Allwright, 2005; Walsh, 2002, 2006). The other criticism includes problematic procedures of data collection and analysis. One chief problem is the difficulty of recording data because of the noise present in the context as well as getting permission for the recording. Moreover, transcription is

tedious, mechanical, and needs a great deal of accuracy (Markee, 2000). Regarding the data analysis, the potential methodological risk of CA lies in the analyst's inferences and presuppositions.

To sum up, based on implications taken from doing and reading CA-oriented classroom research, we have demonstrated how CA applied in the L2 classroom can raise language teachers' awareness of spoken interaction, and help teachers and even ordinary people to become more effective partners in talk. Inspired by these new insights, more studies of talk in institutional settings will continue to appear in the field of applied linguistics and the upcoming years are likely to see continuing attention to the use of conversation analysis framework for analyzing second language talk and second language learning, classroom language, and language in testing environments.

References

Alavi, M., Yaghubi, B. & Pourhaji, M. (2016). Teacher wait-time and learner initiation: A single case analysis. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 8(18), 1–18.

Allwright, D. (2005). From teaching points to learning opportunities and beyond. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*, 9–32.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., Sorensen, C. & Razavieh, A (2010*). Introduction to research in education.* Rinehart and Winston. Inc.

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

Carroll, D. (2011). Taking turns and talking naturally: Teaching conversational turn-taking. In Houck N, & Tatsuki D (eds) *Pragmatics: Teaching natural conversation*. (pp 91–103) TESOL, Alexandria.

Clift, R. (2016) *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge

Cullen, R. (2001). The use of lesson transcripts for developing teachers' classroom language. *System, 29*(1), 27–43.

Donato, R. (2000). Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 27–50). Oxford University Press.

Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics.* Oxford University Press.

Duff, P. (2000). Repetition in foreign language classroom interaction. In J. K. Hall & L.S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 109–138). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fagan, E. R., Hassler, D. M., & Szabo, M. (1981). Evaluation of questioning strategies in language arts instruction. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 15, 267–273.

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

Gibbons, P. (2003). Mediating language learning: Teacher interactions with ESL students in a content-based classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(2), 247–273.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre.

Hall J., K. & Smotrova, T. (2013) Teacher self-talk: Interactional resource for managing instruction and eliciting empathy. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 47(1), 75–92.

He, A. W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 568–582.

Holliday, A. (2002). *Doing and writing qualitative research.* Sage.

Hosoda Y, Aline D. (2013). Two preferences in question–answer sequences in language classroom context. *Classroom Discourse* 4(1), 63–88

Hu, Q. Q. (2004). A survey on the questioning pattern of college English teachers. *Foreign Language World*, 6, 22–27.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis.* Polity Press.

Huth, T. (2011). Conversation analysis and language classroom discourse, *Language and Linguistics Compass* 5(5), 297–309.

Ingram, J., & Elliott, V. (2016) A critical analysis of the role of wait time in classroom interactions and the effects on student and teacher interactional behaviours, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(1), 37–53.

Jacknick, Ch. M. (2011). Breaking in is hard to do: How students negotiate classroom activity shifts. *Classroom Discourse*, 2(1), 20–38.

Jarvis, J., & Robinson, M. (1997). Analyzing educational discourse: An exploratory study of teacher response and support to pupils' learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 18(2), 212–228.

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35 (3), 277–309.

Lantolf, J. (2006). Sociocultural theory and L2. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 67–109.

Lee, Yo-An. (2006). Re-specifying display questions: Interactional resources for language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(4), 691–713.

Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/nonnative speaker conversation and the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126–41.

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

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis.* Erlbaum.

Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(3), 404–427.

McCormick, D., & Donato, R. (2000). Teacher question as scaffolding assistance in an ESL classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 183–203). Erlbaum.

McNeil, L. (2011). Using talk to scaffold referential questions for English language learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28 (3), 396–404.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Harvard University Press.

Musumeci, D. (1996). Teacher–learner negotiation in content- based instruction: communication at cross-purposes? *Applied Linguistics* 17(3), 286–325.

Nassaji, H., & Wells, G. (2000). What's the use of 'Triadic Dialogue'? An investigation of teacher-student interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(3), 376–406.

Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese*. Erlbaum

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44(3), 493–527.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis.* Sage.

Richards, K. (2008). *Professional encounters in TESOL: Discourses of teachers in teaching.* Palgrave Macmillan

Rowe, M. B. (1986). Wait time: Slowing down may be a way of speeding up. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), 43–50.

Ryan, J., & Forrest, L. (2019) 'No chance to speak': Developing a pedagogical response to turn-taking problems, *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, DOI: 10.1080/17501229.2019.1687709.

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

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

Seedhouse, P. (2010). How research methodologies influence findings. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 4(1), 1–15.

Sert, O. (2022). Conversation Analysis in TESOL. In Dikilitaş, K. & Reynolds, K. (eds.). *Research Methods in Language Teaching and Learning* (pp.147–165). Wiley.

Sert, O. & Seedhouse, P. (2011). Introduction: conversation analysis in applied linguistics. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 5(1), 1–14.

Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 4–12.

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

Ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: a practical guide* (2nd ed.). Sage.

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

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press.

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

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Cambridge University Press.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: language in action*. Routledge.

Waring, H. Z. (2008). Using explicit positive assessment in the language classroom: IRF, feedback, and learning opportunities. *The Modern Language Journal,* 92(8), 577–594.

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

Waring, H. Z. (2011). Learner initiatives and learning opportunities in the language classroom. *Classroom Discourse,* 2(2), 201–218.

Waring, H. Z. (2012). "Any questions?": Investigating the nature of understanding-checks in the language class room. *TESOL Quarterly,* 46(4), 722–752.

Waring H. Z. (2019) The what and how of English language teaching: Conversation analytic perspectives. In Gao X. (eds) *Second handbook of English language teaching. Springer International Handbooks of Education*. (pp. 1-18). Springer.

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind.* Harvard University Press.

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

Wu, K. (1993). Classroom interaction and teacher questions revisited. *RELC Journal*, 24(2), 49–68.

Xie, X. (2008). Interaction during teacher-fronted class time of English classes in a Chinese university. Unpublished PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington.

Yaqubi, B. & Pourhaji Rokni, M. (2012). Teachers' limited wait-time practice and learners' participation opportunities in EFL classroom interaction. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, (4)10, 127–161.

Zhao, X. H. (1998). Study of teacher talk in the intensive reading course at a university level. *Foreign Language World*, 2, 17–22.

Appendices

Transcription glossary adapted from Jefferson (1983) with some modifications

(.)	untimed perceptible pause within a turn
CAPS	very emphatic stress
↑	high pitch on word
↓word	lowered pitch
,	phrase-final intonation (more to come)
:	lengthened vowel sound (extra colons indicate greater lengthening)
=	latch (direct onset or no space between two unites)
→	highlights point of analysis
[ ]	overlapped talk; in order to reflect the simultaneous beginning ˚soft˚
	spoken softly/ decreased volume
> <	increased speed
( )	(empty parentheses) transcription impossible
(words)	uncertain transcription
(3)	silence; length given in tenth of a second
$words$	spoken in a smiley voice
(( ))	comments on background, skipped talk or nonverbal behavior
"words"	words quoted, from a textbook for example
T	teacher
L1: L2: etc.,	identified Learner
LL	several learners at once or the whole class