

---

# Classroom Talks: An Introduction

NUMA MARKEE

*Division of English as an International Language  
University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign  
3070 Foreign Languages Building  
707 S. Mathews  
Urbana, IL 61801  
Email: nppm@uiuc.edu*

GABRIELE KASPER

*Department of Second Language Studies  
University of Hawai'i at Manoa  
1890 East-West Road  
Honolulu, HI 96822  
Email: gkasper@hawaii.edu*

---

THIS SPECIAL ISSUE OF *THE MODERN LANGUAGE Journal* follows up on an International Association of Applied Linguistics (AILA) symposium that was also published in the *MLJ*, in which Firth and Wagner (1997) presented a seminal critique of mainstream, cognitive second language acquisition (SLA) studies. They argued that SLA studies need to adopt a more emically oriented (i.e., participant-relevant) perspective on language learning, become more aware of the contextual and interactional dimensions of language use, and broaden its traditional database (p. 286).

The publication of this article was accompanied by and later inspired a series of responses that critiqued these ideas from psycholinguistic perspectives (Gass, 1998; Kasper, 1997; Long, 1997; 1998; Poulisse, 1997) and sociocultural or conversation analysis (CA) viewpoints (Hall, 1997; Liddicoat, 1997, respectively). Broadly speaking, those writers working within a psycholinguistic perspective tended to be rather critical of Firth and Wagner's position, whereas those working from a sociocultural point of view tended to be quite supportive.

The cognitivists essentially argued (to use the words in the title of Kasper's response) that the *A* in *SLA* "stands for acquisition," thus emphasizing that language acquisition and use are theoretically and empirically distinct domains of language. They also tended to challenge the theoretical importance of context, arguing that language learning is essentially a cognitive, context-free phenomenon, so that the putative importance of context in SLA was a claim that needed to be es-

tablished empirically. And they also tended to be unimpressed by Firth and Wagner's calls to study lingua franca contexts or to investigate how learners characterize their roles and identities in and through talk, arguing that such issues simply do not fall within the purview of SLA.

In contrast, the sociocultural commentators provided enthusiastic support for Firth and Wagner's research program, seeing in it a potential basis for the development of an approach to SLA that draws on the theoretical insights of language socialization, social participatory, or Vygotskian, frameworks and that uses the analytical power of CA as a potential methodological resource for SLA (see also Markee, 2000).

In short, this ground-breaking symposium formalized a split between mainstream, cognitive SLA and emergent, sociocultural approaches to SLA. In addition, it provided the impetus for a whole new generation of empirically grounded research into how cognitive SLA might be respecified in sociocultural terms. It is here that the present special issue of the *Modern Language Journal* picks up the dialogue.

How has the intellectual landscape changed since 1997? A number of book-length publications on CA for SLA<sup>1</sup> have either already appeared (Lazaraton, 2002; Markee, 2000) or are awaiting publication (Seedhouse, in press). And the number and quality of colloquia and papers at conferences such as the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) that inform a CA for SLA perspective are growing by leaps and bounds (see Ford & Mori, 2004; Koshik, 2004; Markee, 2004a; Olsher, 2004; Young, 2004). It is, therefore, no exaggeration to say that CA for SLA is making a concerted bid for recognition from the larger community of SLA and applied linguists (Larsen-Freeman, this issue).

To illustrate these developments, we begin this introduction by briefly motivating the use of an unfamiliar term in the title of this special issue, "Classroom Talks." We then provide a brief overview of the six articles that constitute the body of this special issue and also show how the four invited commentaries react to these articles. Finally, we focus on four issues: CA for SLA's emic epistemology, and what CA for SLA has to say (if anything) about the nature of language, language learning, and the identities and roles of learners in SLA. This special issue of *The Modern Language Journal*, therefore, not only documents the current state of the art in CA for SLA, it also points the way to future developments in what may prove to be one of the most radical re-specifications of SLA researchers' theoretical priorities and methodological practices in the history of the field.

#### CLASSROOM TALKS

Conversation analysts have understood classroom talk as a type of institutional talk that is empirically distinct from the default speech exchange system of ordinary conversation (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Whereas ordinary conversation is a locally managed, equal power speech exchange system, teacher-fronted classroom talk is an unequal power speech exchange system, in which teachers have privileged rights to assign topics and turns to learners and also to evaluate the quality of students' contributions to the emerging interaction through other-initiated, second-position repairs (Markee, 2000). Participants exhibit a preference for classroom talk to be organized in terms of initiation-response-evaluation or question-answer-comment sequences (McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). These question-answer-comment sequences are initiated and closed down by teachers, who own the question and comment turns. Learners, however, are responsible for the answer turns in this prototypical classroom sequence.

Recent work on classroom interaction that occurs during task-based, small group instruction has envisioned classroom talk as a *nexus* of inter-related speech exchange systems rather than as a unified speech exchange system that is characterized by a single set of question-answer-comment practices (Markee, 2000). Hence, the title of this special issue is pluralized as classroom talks. The use of this label captures the insight that psycholinguistically motivated calls for teachers to use small group work in conjunction

with particular types of tasks, questioning strategies, and repairs may also, from a CA perspective, be seen as recommendations to teachers to introduce a broader range of speech exchange systems into the classroom than is possible in lock-step instruction (see also Wagner, this issue).

The potential language-learning-related benefits of drawing on a broad range of speech exchange systems have been well understood for many years now (see Long, Adams, McLean, & Castaños, 1976). But the mechanics of how teachers and learners accomplish these classroom talks are much less well documented. The articles in this special issue not only demonstrate the empirical existence of multiple speech exchange systems in classrooms but also explicate in structural terms how participants move from one speech exchange system to another on a moment-by-moment basis.

#### THE ARTICLES AND COMMENTARIES

In the order in which they appear in this special issue, Mondada and Pekarek Doehler examine classes in French as a second language in Switzerland to articulate the most radical programmatic statement in this issue about what a sociocultural approach to SLA might entail. Their article argues persuasively in favor of a socially distributed view of language learning, in which learning objects are inseparable from the conversational structure of talk-in-interaction in which they are embedded. Young and Miller analyze English interactions in writing conferences in the United States with a view to describing the interactional architecture and participation frameworks of the discursive practice of *revision talk*. They use CA as a methodological tool that is combined with functional-systemic and situated-learning perspectives. These two articles provide the most explicit treatment of language and language learning in this special issue and also emphasize the importance of viewing learners as active participants in the learning process.

Like Young and Miller, all the other contributors focus on various languages and pedagogical interactions that took place in the United States. More specifically, Mori analyzes Japanese classroom talks, during which students shift back and forth between the development of an assigned task and the management of problems associated with their lack of lexical knowledge. Kasper examines German data from a *Gesprächsrunde* (a type of conversation table) to understand how members construct their identities in terms of

social membership categories and statuses that they make relevant to each other on an emerging, moment-by-moment basis. He presents heritage Chinese data, with a view to exploring the uses and nonuses to which CA for SLA might be put in the service of analyzing language learning processes. Finally, Markee analyzes English classroom interactions to show how members move in and out of two types of *zones of interactional transition* (teachers' use of *counter-question* talk and students' deployment of *tactical fronting talk*). This analysis is used to illustrate the fundamentally social nature of classroom talks, and as a source of input for teacher training and development. The commentaries, again listed in the order in which they appear, were written by Gass, Larsen-Freeman, Hall, and Wagner.

The order of the articles and of the commentaries is meant to represent different continua along which these contributions might be placed. For example, Mondada and Pekarek Doehler and Young and Miller are the most explicit about what they think language learning means from a sociocultural perspective, whereas Mori, He, Kasper, and Markee are more circumspect on these matters. Put another way, as Wagner suggests, the first two articles are more concerned with big picture issues in CA for SLA, whereas the other four articles arguably invoke ethnomethodology's practice of unmotivated looking (Psathas, 1995) and develop more technically oriented accounts of classroom talks.

However, we can also discern other patterns and continua in these groupings. For example, as already noted, Mondada and Pekarek Doehler are clearly the most radical exponents of what may be called the strong view of CA for SLA in this issue. This strong view makes no bones about the need to go beyond a research agenda that is inherited in part from cognitive SLA, while the weaker view, represented here by Young and Miller, Mori, He, Kasper, and Markee, is perhaps less apt to reject CA for SLA's roots in cognitive SLA.

Other groupings that suggest themselves include a data-driven versus a theory-driven continuum (see, e.g., Mondada & Pekarek Doehler and Young & Miller, respectively). In addition, all the articles in this special issue (with the exception of Markee) explicitly focus on how participants constitute their roles and identities on a moment-by-moment basis in and through talk-in-interaction. Finally, although all contributors to the special issue adhere to the transcription conventions of CA (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; see Appendix), different authors use different levels

of transcription in their articles. For example, Young and Miller and Mori both incorporate video frame grabs in their transcripts, whereas other authors do not. Nonetheless, as Gass points out, all the transcripts in this special issue are much more detailed than the transcripts that are usually used in mainstream SLA.

The commentaries are also grouped to suggest a continuum of views that includes a mainstream, cognitive, and interactionist perspective on SLA (Gass), an integrationist-oriented, chaos theory perspective (Larsen-Freeman), a socio-cultural perspective (Hall), and a CA perspective (Wagner). Note that we can again discern other patterns and continua in these groupings. For example, Gass and Wagner are not just on opposite ends of the interactionist and CA for SLA spectrum in the context of this particular special issue. They are two of the most important exponents of strong interpretations of interactionist and CA for SLA approaches to language learning, respectively. Notice also that although Hall and Wagner agree on the socially constituted nature of language and language learning, they do not necessarily agree on what the main priorities of CA for SLA might be. This last observation makes the important point that whatever the emerging CA for SLA agenda turns out to be, it will undoubtedly be quite heterogeneous.

However, as we propose to show shortly, what is really remarkable about these commentaries is that, whatever differences in fundamental theoretical positions the respondents may have, they all agree on the kinds of issues that CA for SLA must confront in the future if it is to be widely accepted as a resource for SLA by researchers who are not already committed to using CA techniques for language learning research.

We now clarify CA's emic stance toward knowledge construction and then take up the issue of what CA for SLA currently has to say, and what it will need to be able to say in the future, about language, language learning, and learners.

## EMIC ANALYSIS

All of the articles in this special issue exemplify an emic approach to knowledge construction and, in particular, explicate meaning in terms of the local context of talk-in-interaction. Judging from the comments of some of the anonymous reviewers of this special issue, this perspective still needs to be explained to the broader audience of applied linguists and SLA researchers.

The proposal to replace the prevalent *etic*, re-

researcher-based data treatments of language learning in cognitive SLA with an *emic*, participant-based perspective refers to an analytical principle of CA (Goodwin, 1984; Heritage, 1995; ten Have, 1999) that invites elaboration in the domain of applied linguistics and second language studies.<sup>2</sup> Although the etic-emic contrast has found its way into qualitative second language research via sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, it is mostly associated with an ethnographic research methodology. Before clarifying how the distinction is understood in CA, it bears pointing out that the concepts are a matter of controversy among ethnographers (e.g., Duranti, 1997; Headland, Pikes, & Harris, 1990).

Coined by analogy with the contrast between *phonetic* versus *phonemic* analysis, Pike (1967) proposed that “the etic viewpoint studies behavior from outside of a particular system, and as an essential initial approach to an alien system. The emic viewpoint results from studying behaviors as from inside the system” (p. 37). Some influential examples of etic approaches to social interaction include Hymes’s (1962) etic grid for the analysis of speech events, Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory, Searle’s (1976) classification of illocutionary acts—and, not least, the three C’s (comprehension checks, clarification requests, confirmation requests) in SLA studies on the negotiation of meaning (Long, 1983).

Considering the intellectual origin of the emics-etics distinction in structuralist (tagmemic) linguistics, it comes as no surprise that the constructs have been assimilated to different disciplinary interests and social scientists’ ontological and epistemological positions (e.g., Headland et al., 1990), resulting in reinterpretations from partly complementary, partly incompatible vantage points.<sup>3</sup>

One difference that merits attention, because it is pertinent to the role of emics in CA, concerns whether an emic view favors mentalist or nonmentalist approaches to social life. True to its structuralist origin, an emic analysis initially sought to discover the internal structure of a linguistic or cultural (or linguo-cultural) system, displayed in social members’ actions and use of categories. In a structuralist perspective, the meaning of an action or category comes about through its relationship to other actions and categories (see also Bilmes, 1988, on the distributional, nonmentalist sense of meaning). Meaning is therefore of an entirely different ontological order from the mentalist constructs of intention or purpose (Bilmes, 1986; Murray, 1990).<sup>4</sup>

It is useful to remember the initial nonmentalist concept of emics because it contrasts in important respects with the versions that subsequently gained currency. The “mentalization of emics” (Murray, 1990, p. 148) is evident in definitions of scholars such as Lett (1990), who proposed that “emic constructs are accounts, descriptions, and analyses expressed in terms of the conceptual schemes and categories regarded as meaningful and appropriate by the native members of the culture whose beliefs and behaviors are being studied” (p. 130).

Other influential notions of emics move still further away from the nonmentalist version. From the perspective of cross-cultural psychology, Berry (1990) noted that an emic approach “helps one to understand individuals in their daily lives, including their attitudes, motives, interests, and personality” (p. 86). Similarly (although focusing on social groups rather than individuals), Duranti (1997) described the “emic view” in contemporary ethnography as “the propensity to achieve sufficient identification with or empathy for the members of the group [being studied]” (p. 85).

Translating epistemology into research methodology, ethnographic methods such as prolonged and persistent observation, both participant and nonparticipant, and open-ended, unstructured, in-depth interviews are the traditional royal road to achieve an emic perspective on a group’s cultural practices and their semiotics. The quality of interview data in particular is seen to hinge on establishing trust and rapport with the participants, a prerequisite for bringing out “authentic accounts of subjective experience” (Silverman, 2001, p. 90). In this frequently encountered sense, emics is not only a mentalist but a thoroughly Romantic<sup>5</sup> notion (Atkinson & Silverman, 1997; Silverman, 1998).

Both the mentalist and the Romantic readings of emics, the quest for “the authentic gaze into the soul of another” (Silverman, 2001, p. 94), are antithetical to CA. CA does not rely on researchers’ rapport with the participants to understand the interactions they analyze—in fact, researchers frequently do not have any personal contact with the interacting parties. Although diametrically opposed to positivist metatheoretical positions and research practices in many (though by no means all) other respects, CA unabashedly maintains the subject-object separation otherwise characteristic of positivist approaches to research (e.g., Guba & Lincoln, 1998). But CA parts company both with (post-, neo-) positivism and mentalist-Romantic epistemologies and

methodologies in its distinct methods of pursuing an emic focus.

CA establishes an emic perspective not by interviewing research participants, but by examining the details of the “procedural infrastructure of situated action” (ten Have, 1999, p. 37), specifically, the orientations and relevancies that participants display to each other through their interactional conduct (Schegloff, 1992). Thus, participant orientations, relevancies, and intersubjectivity are not treated as states of mind that somehow lurk behind the interaction, but as local and sequential accomplishments that must be grounded in empirically observable conversational conduct.

## LANGUAGE

As already suggested, most of the contributors to this special issue (with the exception of Young & Miller) are rather vague about what language is. Where does this vagueness come from? We may attribute this ambiguity in large part to CA’s intellectual roots in sociology and ethnomethodology. More specifically, although Garfinkel and Sacks (1970) recognized in general terms that language occupies a central place in the construction of social order, CA has no special interest in language outside of its deployment in interaction, nor in specifying what it might be. Rather, it is specifically interested in demonstrating how conversation functions as the “primordial site of sociality” (Schegloff, 1987, p. 208).

CA’s lack of interest in defining language in a priori, theoretical terms may seem perverse to researchers who come from linguistic or cognitive backgrounds, or both. However, SLA researchers should not make the mistake of assuming that CA has nothing to say of theoretical interest about the nature of language. For example, CA and the closely related field of interactional sociolinguistics have a long tradition of interest in how syntax for conversation is deployed by members to achieve particular, situated courses of action (Schegloff, 1979; Ochs, Schegloff, & Thompson, 1996; Selting & Couper-Kuhlen, 2001). This perspective implies a grounded, social, and discursive perspective on language, rather than an idealized, cognitive, sentence-level understanding of what language is (Goodwin & Duranti, 1992).

Furthermore, it is a largely unnoticed fact in SLA that CA, in fact, assumes that participants are endowed with an (unspecified) *competence* that allows them to parse language as it is being

produced in real time by interlocutors (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). What this competence actually entails is a matter of increasing controversy in CA for SLA. Indeed, the emerging tendency is for the term *competence* to be avoided altogether and for writers (such as Young & Miller, this issue) to talk about the “interactional architecture of discursive practices.” Put another way, language is the local, collaborative, and intersubjective achievement by members of conventionalized, mutually recognizable, and socially shared linguistic resources.

In any case, however we choose to view language, we can observe that potential next speakers routinely predict with exquisite timing when a *turn constructional unit* (TCU)—typically a spate of talk that may vary in length from a word to a clause—is likely coming to an end, thus presenting them with an opportunity to start talking at what Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) called a *transition relevant point* (TRP) in the ongoing talk. Thus, CA implies that clauses, rather than sentences, constitute what linguists would call a *psycholinguistically valid* linguistic unit of analysis for interactants. Furthermore, TCUs are empirically grounded mechanisms that potentially explain how the contextual matrix of conversational structure provides learners with a resource for language learning.

## LANGUAGE LEARNING

As a microsociological approach, CA was not originally designed to analyze language learning. Thus, for SLA researchers, the fundamental issue is what insights CA may (or may not) have to offer SLA studies. The articles in this special issue tend to be quite divided on this question. For example, Mondada and Pekarek Doehler and Young and Miller seek to use CA techniques as methodological tools that are in the service of different sociocultural theories of learning. Other authors (e.g., He) are less confident that CA can be used to demonstrate learning.

The difficulties they allude to are in part methodological. For example, Kasper and Wagner point out that longitudinal research is an underpracticed methodology in current CA for SLA work (though see Young & Miller in this issue, and also Markee, 2004b). Kasper, therefore, calls for the development of a longitudinal perspective as a necessary area of methodological growth in CA for SLA. But perhaps even more problematic for CA for SLA is the fact that, as He and Wagner remind us, CA is a behavioral disci-

pline that cannot provide us with access to participants' internal mental states.

What then can CA potentially say about language learning? Despite the important differences that clearly exist among the contributors that have just been cited, there does seem to be an important measure of general agreement that CA needs to respecify whatever learning is primarily in terms of learning processes that are constructed in and through the talk of participants. We can expect to see this theme developed in more detail in the future as CA and sociocultural theory researchers elaborate their proposals for a potential marriage between these two partners.

Furthermore, the emphasis on treating cognition as a socially distributed, not just as an individual, phenomenon is already current in CA (see Markee, 2000, this issue; Schegloff, 1991). This point of view is also consistent with the general ethnomethodological insight that CA potentially is uniquely placed to uncover the standards of proficiency to which members hold each other (and themselves) accountable in and through talk, particularly over time.<sup>6</sup> This emerging consensus suggests that learning behaviors may usefully be understood as a conversational process that observably occurs in the intersubjective space between participants, not just in the mind/brain of individuals (see in this issue, in particular, Hall, Larsen-Freeman, Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, Wagner, and Young & Miller). Furthermore, this perspective on language suggests that language acquisition and use are so intertwined as to be inseparable (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, this issue).

#### THE ROLES AND IDENTITIES OF LEARNERS

The articles in this special issue are perhaps most explicit about addressing the question of why it is important for SLA to understand how and why learners construct acquisitionally relevant roles and identities in and through their talk (see Larsen-Freeman on this question). It is important to understand here that these identities are quite permeable<sup>7</sup> and are deployed by members on a moment-by-moment basis as a resource for making particular types of learning behavior relevant at a particular moment in a particular interaction. This insight is particularly well developed in the articles by He, Kasper, Markee, and Mori, who all show in their analyses how members construct roles and identities by observably orienting to the sequential, turn-taking, and repair organization of talk-in-interaction. Thus, the

question of how members construct these roles and identities is inextricably intertwined with the idea that context is a local achievement (see the discussion of context in the previous section on emic analysis).

Finally, these articles all demonstrate that learners are active agents, who transform tasks-as-workplans into tasks-as-activities on a moment-by-moment basis (Coughlan & Duff, 1994; Seedhouse, in press). To the extent that these learners' interpretations of teachers' lesson plans result in language-learning-oriented behaviors, we can predict with some confidence that learners actively use the microstructure of interactional language as a resource for acquisition.

#### CONCLUSIONS

To their chagrin, highway engineers know that new freeways routinely become obsolete as soon as they open, because many more drivers than were planned for in the development stage actually use these new routes immediately. In a sense, a similar fate has befallen this special issue. This issue of *The Modern Language Journal* started life as a colloquium at the AAAL 2003 conference. It undoubtedly represents the published state of the art in CA for SLA today. But it has already been overtaken by subsequent developments, including a symposium in Odense, Denmark (Hall, Pekarek Doehler, & Wagner, 2003), and colloquia at AILA (Markee & Wagner, 2002) and AAAL (Markee, 2004a; Young, 2004). Thus, many of the reflections in this introduction and in some of the commentaries in this special issue (in particular, Hall and Wagner) have been prompted not just by the articles in this issue but by interactions at these meetings that have already changed what CA for SLA looks like. This issue is, therefore, as much about what CA for SLA will be, as it is about what it is (or was). The critiques of the respondents published here do not just highlight what the main articles did not say or said inadequately. What is more important, they also motivate ongoing discussion about what the future research agenda of CA for SLA should be. This is a healthy development because it points to the long-term viability of this emerging alternative to mainstream, cognitive SLA studies.

---

#### NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> See Kasper (2002, this issue), and Markee (this issue, in press-a, in press-b) for the origins of this term.

<sup>2</sup> Our thanks to Jack Bilmes and Diana Eades for pointing out references on the emics-etics debate.

<sup>3</sup> As Lett (1990) pointed out, the emic/etic contrast itself is epistemological, not ontological. Note also that the emic/etic distinction is compatible with the realist epistemology embraced by structuralism (Murray, 1990) but difficult to reconcile with a postmodern reflexive stance (Marcus, 1998). Some qualitative researchers dismiss it as largely obsolete (Schwandt, 2001). Others disagree: "When the issues of 'emic' and 'etic' are treated as *passé*, [it appears to me that] the craft of anthropology [is treated] as *passé*" (Hymes, 1990, p. 125).

<sup>4</sup> Echoing Harris (1979), Murray (1990) lamented that "the blurring of distinctions between 'meaning' and 'purpose' has had catastrophic scientific effects" (p. 150).

<sup>5</sup> This use of the term *Romantic* refers to Romanticism, an intellectual and artistic movement in the late 18th and 19th century that emphasized, among other things, the personal, subjective, emotional, and irrational dimensions of experience.

<sup>6</sup> We are grateful to John Heritage for pointing this out during the question-and-answer session of a colloquium organized by Ford and Mori (2004) at the AAAL 2004 conference in Portland, Oregon.

<sup>7</sup> For example, in some data recently collected by Markee, the same individuals in one class called themselves and each other *Prof. X*, whereas in another class, they called themselves and each other by their first names. These different naming practices seem to be one of several resources that members used to achieve different class aims and goals. More specifically, in the first class, members (who were science professors) were learning how to do science through the medium of English in an English for specific purposes (ESP), professional development class. In the second class, they were focusing on the more traditionally language-focused communication tasks used in a General English class.

---

REFERENCES

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1984). Transcript notation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. ix–xvi). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson, P., & Silverman, D. (1997). Kundera's immortality: The interview society and the invention of self. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3, 324–345.

Berry, J. W. (1990). Imposed etics, emics, and derived etics: Their conceptual and operational status in cross-cultural psychology. In T. N. Headland, K. L. Pike, & M. Harris (Eds.), *Emics and etics* (pp. 84–99). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bilmes, J. (1986). *Discourse and behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.

Bilmes, J. (1988). Category and rule in conversation analysis. *IPRA Papers in Pragmatics*, 2, 25–59.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some uni-*

*versals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coughlan, P., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Same task, different activities: Analysis of a SLA task from an activity theory perspective. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 173–193). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Ford, C., & Mori, M. (2004, May). *CA as applied linguistics: Crossing boundaries of discipline and practice*. Paper presented at the American Association of Applied Linguistics conference, Portland, OR.

Garfinkel, H., & Sacks, H. (1970). On formal structures of practical actions. In J. D. McKinney & E. A. Tiryakan (Eds.), *Theoretical sociology* (pp. 337–366). New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

Gass, S. M. (1998). Apples and oranges: Or, why apples are not oranges and don't need to be. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 83–90.

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

Goodwin, C. (1984). Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 225–246). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, C., & Duranti, A. (1992). Rethinking context: An introduction. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactional phenomenon* (pp. 1–42). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1998). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Qualitative research: Theories and issues* (pp. 195–220). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall, J. K. (1997). A consideration of SLA as a theory of practice: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 301–306.

Hall, J. K. (2004). Language learning as an interactional achievement. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 607–612.

Hall, J. K., Pekarek Doehler, S., & Wagner, J. (2003, October). *Symposium on Conversation Analysis and Sociocultural Theory*. Odense, University of Southern Denmark

Harris, M. (1979). *Cultural materialism*. New York: Random House.

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

Headland T. N., Pike, K. L., & Harris, M. (Eds.). (1990). *Emics and etics*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Heritage, J. (1995). Conversation analysis: Methodological aspects. In U. Quasthoff (Ed.), *Aspects of oral communication* (pp. 391–418). Berlin: de Gruyter.

- Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. C. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and human behavior* (pp. 15–53). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Hymes, D. H. (1990). Emics, etics, and openness: An ecumenical approach. In T. N. Headland, K. L. Pike, & M. Harris (Eds.), *Emics and etics* (pp. 120–126). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kasper, G. (1997). “A” stands for acquisition: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 307–312.
- Kasper, G. (2002, March). *Conversation analysis as an approach to second language acquisition: Old wine in new bottles?* Invited talk, SLATE speaker series, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, March 13, 2002.
- Kasper, G. (2004). Participant orientations in German conversation-for-learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 551–567.
- Koshik, I. (2004, May). Making CA research on teacher talk useful for practitioners. Paper presented in colloquium on *CA as applied linguistics: Crossing boundaries of discipline and practice* at the American Association of Applied Linguistics conference, Portland, OR.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2004). CA for SLA? It all depends. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 603–607.
- Lazaraton, A. (2002). *A qualitative approach to the validation of oral language tests*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lett, J. (1990). Emics and etics: Notes on the epistemology of anthropology. In T. N. Headland, K. L. Pike, & M. Harris (Eds.), *Emics and etics* (pp. 127–142). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Liddicoat, A. (1997). Interaction, social structure, and second language use. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 313–317.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 177–193.
- Long, M. H. (1997). Construct validity in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 318–323.
- Long, M. H. (1998). SLA: Breaking the siege. *University of Hawai‘i Working Papers in ESL*, 17(1), 79–129.
- Long, M. H., Adams, L., McLean, M., & Castaños, F. (1976). Doing things with words—Verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations. In J. F. Fanselow & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '76* (pp. 137–153). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Marcus, G. E. (1998). What comes (just) after “post”? The case of ethnography. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research* (pp. 383–406). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Markee, N. P. P. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Markee, N. P. P. (2004a, May). *Conversation analysis for second language acquisition*. Colloquium at the American Association of Applied Linguistics conference, Portland, OR.
- Markee, N. P. P. (2004b, May). The context of context. Paper presented in the colloquium on *Conversation analysis for second language acquisition* at the American Association of Applied Linguistics conference, Portland, OR.
- Markee, N. P. P. (2004c). Zones of interactional transition in ESL classes. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 583–596.
- Markee, N. P. P. (in press-a). Conversation analysis for second language acquisition. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Markee, N. P. P. (in press-b). A conversation analytic perspective on off-task classroom talk: Implications for second language acquisition studies. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying conversation analysis*. London: Palgrave-McMillan.
- Markee, N. P. P., & Wagner, J. (2002, December). *Conversation analysis as an approach to second language acquisition*. Colloquium at the 13th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, AILA, Singapore.
- McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, 7, 183–213.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 501–518.
- Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 536–550.
- Murray, G. F. (1990). Anthropology, evangelization, and abortion: Applications of emics and etics. In T. N. Headland, K. L. Pike, & M. Harris (Eds.), *Emics and etics* (pp. 143–164). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A., & Thompson, S. (1996). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olsher, D. (2004, May). Conversation analysis and the study of interactional competence. Paper presented in the colloquium on *CA as applied linguistics: Crossing boundaries of discipline and practice* at the American Association of Applied Linguistics conference, Portland, OR.
- Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structures of human behavior* (2nd ed.). The Hague: Mouton. (Originally published 1954)
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Poullisse, N. (1997). Some words in defense of the psycholinguistic approach: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 324–328.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.

- Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 12. Discourse and syntax* (pp. 261–286). New York: Academic Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Between macro and micro: Contexts and other connections. In J. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch, & N. Smelser (Eds.), *The micro-macro link* (pp. 207–234). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. R. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Socially shared cognition* (pp. 150–171). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). On talk and its institutional occasions. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 101–134). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Searle, J. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1–23.
- Seedhouse, P. (in press). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Selting, M., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (Eds.). (2001). *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Silverman, D. (1998). *Harvey Sacks. Social science and conversation analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis*. London: Sage.
- Wagner, J. (2004). The classroom and beyond. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 612–616.
- Young, R. F. (2004, May). *Deconstructing the individual in language learning and assessment*. Colloquium at the American Association of Applied Linguistics conference, Portland, OR.
- Young, R. F., & Miller, E. R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conferences. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 519–535.

APPENDIX

Transcription Conventions

CA Transcription Conventions (based on Atkinson & Heritage, 1984)

IDENTITY OF SPEAKERS

- T: teacher  
 L1: identified learner (Learner 1)  
 L: unidentified learner  
 L3?: probably Learner 3  
 LL: several or all learners talking simultaneously

Note: In some transcripts, first names or other codes are used to identify members.

SIMULTANEOUS UTTERANCES

- L1: [yes  
 L2: [yeh simultaneous, overlapping talk by two speakers  
 L1: [huh? [oh] I see]  
 L2: [what]  
 L3: [I dont get it ] simultaneous, overlapping talk by three (or more) speakers

CONTIGUOUS UTTERANCES

- = a) turn continues at the next identical symbol on the next line  
 b) if inserted at the end of one speaker's turn and the beginning of the next speaker's adjacent turn, it indicates that there is no gap at all between the two turns

INTERVALS WITHIN AND BETWEEN UTTERANCES

- (0.3) (1) (0.3) = a pause of 0.3 second;  
 (1.0) = a pause of one second.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SPEECH DELIVERY

- ? rising intonation, not necessarily a question  
 ! strong emphasis, with falling intonation

yes.	a period indicates falling (final) intonation
so,	a comma indicates low-rising intonation suggesting continuation
go:::d	one or more colons indicate lengthening of the preceding sound; each additional colon represents a lengthening of one beat
no-	a hyphen indicates an abrupt cut-off, with level pitch
because	<u>underlined</u> type indicates marked stress
SYLVIA	capitals indicate increased volume
°the next thing°	degree sign indicates decreased volume
·hhh	in-drawn breath
hhh	laughter tokens

## COMMENTARY IN THE TRANSCRIPT

((coughs))	verbal description of actions noted in the transcript, including non-verbal actions
((unintelligible))	indicates a stretch of talk that is unintelligible to the analyst
. . . . (radio)	single parentheses indicate unclear or probable item
{the text}	indicates a clarification of the meaning of an utterance in the idiomatic translation of talk in a language other than English

## OTHER TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS

Co/l/al	slashes indicate phonetic transcription
→	an arrow in the margin of a transcript draws attention to a particular phenomenon the analyst wishes to discuss

## GRAMMATICAL GLOSSES

COMP	directional or resultative complement of verb
CONJ	conjunction
COP	copula
DUR	durative aspect marker
EMP	emphatic marker
LOC	locative marker
MSR	measure
NEG	negative marker
PERT	perfective aspect marker
POS	possessive
PRT	sentence, vocative or nominal subordinative particle
PTP	pre-transitive preposition
Q	question marker

---

## Associate Editor Heidi Byrnes Wins ACTFL Nelson Brooks Award for Excellence in the Teaching of Culture

---

In recognition of her sustained work in the teaching of culture, Heidi Byrnes received the 2004 Nelson Brooks Award for Excellence in the Teaching of Culture. It was presented to her on Friday, November 18, at the 2004 annual meeting of the American Council of the Teaching of Foreign Languages in Chicago. H. Jay Siskin, chair of the selection committee, praised Byrnes: "In making its decision, the committee cited the outstanding quality of Professor Byrnes' books and articles in the field of culture, as well as the significant scope of her workshops and presentations. Her leadership qualities, especially in the area of higher education, have made her a nationally recognized and esteemed spokesperson for the field. Professor Byrnes' curricular innovations have become a model for reinvigorating the study of language and culture, restoring their place within the tradition of humanistic study. These achievements, along with her longstanding record of service to the larger profession and the passionate support of her colleagues, determined the committee's enthusiastic choice of Professor Byrnes as this year's winner."

Professor of German at Georgetown University, Byrnes is the Associate Editor for *Perspectives* in the *MLJ* and a member of the *MLJ* Editorial Board. We extend to her our sincere congratulations and thank her for her professional leadership.

---

A vertical bar on the left side of the page, consisting of a series of yellow and orange rectangular segments, with a small red diamond at the top.

COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

TITLE: Classroom Talks: An Introduction  
SOURCE: Mod Lang J 88 no4 Wint 2004  
WN: 0436001643002

The magazine publisher is the copyright holder of this article and it is reproduced with permission. Further reproduction of this article in violation of the copyright is prohibited. To contact the publisher:  
[www.blackwellpublishers.co.uk](http://www.blackwellpublishers.co.uk)

Copyright 1982-2004 The H.W. Wilson Company. All rights reserved.