

Applying conversation analysis to (intercultural) communicative competence and L2 pedagogy: An overview

Ivan B. BROWN* • Masatoshi WATANABE** • Simon ELDERTON***

(平成25年 9 月30日受付；平成25年11月 5 日受理)

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the literature on conversation analysis (CA) as applied to second language acquisition (SLA), foreign language teaching and intercultural communication. It has three main aims: firstly, to give an overview of CA and its principles and characteristics, and draw attention to the progress that has been made in demonstrating the important role that CA can potentially play in SLA and L2 pedagogy; secondly, to argue for the potential of a mutually beneficial relationship between CA (including “pure CA” and “applied CA”) and the pursuit of the development of a coherent model of communicative competence (or intercultural communicative competence); and thirdly, to review and propose ways of applying CA to specific practical aspects of the teaching of English as a foreign language (EFL) and intercultural communicative competence in Japan, including the development of authentic teaching and learning materials. Analyses of recorded conversations are provided to illustrate certain points.

KEY WORDS :

conversation analysis (CA) communicative competence SLA EFL
intercultural communication

1. Introduction

Conversation analysis (CA) is an offshoot of sociology which involves the microscopic analysis of the structure of turn-taking and sequencing in talk-in-interaction, thereby revealing social structures, using audio or video recordings of naturally-occurring conversations. Having started as “pure CA”, in the last two decades “applied CA” has been steadily establishing itself as one of the stable mainstream approaches in research in second language acquisition (SLA) and foreign and second language pedagogy. The number of angles from which CA intersects with SLA has grown to include areas such as the direct observation of interactive competences (including repair and “strategic” and “cross-cultural” or “pragmatic” competences) both in the classroom and in naturally occurring second language interactions outside the classroom, the organization of classroom interaction, the longitudinal observation of development in L2 competency, and even observing “learning” occur during L2 writing conference sessions. In some cases, models of communicative competence, or components thereof, have been evaluated based on CA findings. In addition, some proposals have appeared regarding the production of English language teaching (ELT) syllabi and teaching and learning materials based on findings and examples from CA research, thereby contributing to the body of “authentic” language learning materials. These are most promising developments with significant potential. CA findings have also contributed to research in areas related to intercultural communication (IC), such as the strategic management of identities during talk-in-interaction. By reviewing relevant literature and referring to examples of talk-in-interaction recorded, collected and analyzed by the authors, this paper aims to provide an informative but critical overview of these intersecting trends in CA, SLA and IC research.

* Humanities and Social Studies Education

** Naoetsu Secondary School

*** Niigata College of Nursing

2. Overview of conversation analysis and its applications to the study of second language acquisition

In its ethnomethodological origins, CA is based on Goffman's (1981) work, in that it focuses on the fundamentally social nature of spontaneous real-time interaction, assuming that human interaction is its own system, irreducible to anything else, and Garfinkel's (1967) work, in terms of posing the question of how social rules and norms arise in the first place. Sacks and his colleagues (e.g., Sacks, 1974) combined these in developing the specific analytical techniques CA itself. CA itself, then, focuses on the sequential organization of interactive talk, in which participants respond to previous turns, and inspect next turns to see if their talk has been understood. By recording and transcribing interactions in minute detail (the most common transcription conventions of CA are shown in the appendix, based on Forrester, 2002), CA is based on the premise that sequence and analysis is publicly available to participants and analysts alike. The importance of recordings is significant, since the complex and momentary nature of conversation combined with the selective nature of our memories means that our recollections of the interactional details of conversations are unreliable. CA is concerned with "how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus on how sequences are generated. [...] The objective of CA is to uncover the tacit reasoning procedures and sociolinguistic competencies underlying the production and interpretation of talk in organized sequences of interaction" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998: p.14; cf Kasper, 2006). CA also has a different view of cognition to that of much individual-oriented cognitive psychological research. "Instead, cognition is seen as socially distributed between participants through their publicly displayed interactional conduct. In the process of jointly constructing meaning in sequentially organized talk exchanges, participants make their understandings available to each other, and hence to the analyst, through their actions in the co-produced turn structure, and the specific formats of their actions and turns" (Kasper 2006: p.84). One of the most important disciplines of CA is to avoid theoretical, analytical, or socialized pre-conceptions when analyzing talk:

The analyst must not ascribe to social actors cognitive and affective states and processes, including motivations, beliefs and intentions, unless the participants' interactional conduct warrants such inferences. By the same token, interaction-external social context, [...], may not be invoked as an analytical resource unless the participants demonstrably orient to contextual aspects. More specifically, the analyst is required to demonstrate in what ways exogenous context—including the participants' membership in social and institutional categories—is relevant for the coparticipants and consequential for their interactional conduct at particular moments in the interaction. (Kasper, 2006, p.84)

As summed up by Kasper (2006), this approach refers to as "unmotivated looking", though at the same time, one can acknowledge the existence of individual minds and value of cognitive research. CA research has paid particular attention to the area of interactional competences (which may occur in L1, L2 or any available language, to varying degrees). Based on a review by Kasper (2006: p.86) and augmented with recent work by Jenks (2013), these can be seen in participants' ability:

- a) to recognize and produce boundaries between activities, including transitions in interactional openings, closings, and transitions between activities during continued contact;
- b) to take turns at talk in an organized fashion;
- c) to repair problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding;
- d) to format actions and turns, and construct epistemic and affective stance, by drawing on different types of semiotic resources (linguistic, nonverbal, nonvocal), including register-specific resources;
- e) to understand and produce social actions in their sequential contexts;
- f) to co-construct social and discursive identities through sequence organization, actions-in-interaction and semiotic resources; and
- g) to negotiate communicative norms and conventions on-the-fly, especially in novel or unique situations in which there are few or no established norms (Jenks, 2013).

It would be expected that such competences are firstly acquired by and large through one's first language, then further developed and adapted for use in additional languages. In any case, it is not immediately clear

how the notion of “individual competence” sits with CA’s emphasis on socially distributed cognition. As noted above, one may conceive of individual “trait” competences versus socially distributed, situated and emergent competences. CA’s units of analysis range from individual verbal and non-verbal events, to words, phrases, turn-constructual units (TCUs, which can consist of a single event, word, phrase, clause or sentence, or several of these), to adjacency pairs (a pair of turns, usually adjacent, and closely sequentially related to each other, as in, but not limited to, a question followed by an answer), interlinked sequences of adjacency pairs, sections of particular kinds of discursive activity, and whole speech events. As Sidnell (2010: p.504) points out, overall organization of discourse is not independent from TCUs and adjacency pairs, but rather thoroughly interdependent: “This is what I mean when I say the utterance (or the turn-at-talk) is a product of multiple, intersecting, concurrently operative organizations of practice or machineries.” As for overall research approach, Sidnell (*Ibid.*) also summarizes this as beginning with detailed analysis of a single (i.e., case-by-case) instance of interaction, which is elaborated into a formal account of some particular practice or phenomenon, through multiple analyses across instances based on a collection. Extract 1 is an example of a CA transcription.

Extract 1: “How about you?”

(P1, P2 and P3 refer to the three participants; one name has been changed.)

- 1 P1: Let’s talk about movie.
- 2 P2: Yes=
- 3 P3: = ↑ OK?
- 4 (1)
- 5 P3: So (.) what’s your: favorite movie.
- 6 P1: ↑ My favorite movie is (.) mmm (1) Monsters Univer [sity?
- 7 P3: [Oooh
- 8 P2: [hahaha=
- 9 P1: = ↓ Yeah
- 10 P3:→ [why? AH (.) un hahaha]
- 11 P1:→ [>what about you<ah hahaha]
- 12 P1:→ >How about you?<
- 13 P2:→ ↑ me? (.) ↓ um: (.) my ↑ favorite movie ↓ is The Notebook.
- 14 P3: ↑ Oooh
- 15 P2: er>you ↑ know< ↓ er:=
- 16 P3: =< ↑ good ↓ notebook.>=
- 17 P2: =er: it (.) it is: mm: (1)
- 18 P2: its title ↑ (.) in Japanese ↑ ↓ is (.) er: *kimi ni yomu* [*monogatari*]
- 19 P3: [↑ ah]
- 20 P2: >You ↑ know you know?<=
- 21 P3: =>Yeah yeah I know I know yeah yeah yeah<
- 22 P?: ()
- 23 P2: erm I ↑ love (.) ↓ erm:
- 24 (1)
- 25 P2: erm: I ↑ love (.) romance?=
- 26 P3: =[Ooh]
- 27 P1: =[mmm]=
- 28 P2: er (1) so: (.) .hhh
- 29 P3: (clears throat)
- 30 P2: this ↑ movie (.) ↓ is: (1) the best ↓ romance
- 31 P3: ah ha [haha
- 32 P1: [haha

- 33 P2: [↑ ah:
 34 P2:→ mmm (.) how about ↑ you ↓ Chie?
 35 P3: erm ↑ (.) ↑ it's difficult ↓ erm (.)
 36 P3: ↑ I: (.) I like (.) ↓ er (.) Singing in the Rain?

The simple and explicit establishment of topic in line 1 gives the impression that the group is conscious of having gathered for the specific purpose of having a discussion, albeit free-flowing and not pre-written, as the pause in line 4 suggests there may be some initial uncertainty about how to proceed. Lines 1 and 2, and lines 5 and 6, are examples of adjacency pairs. Lines 5–13 demonstrate the negotiation of the establishment of turn-taking norms. Participant 3 first notices a problem when her question, “why?” is followed by (actually overlapped) the dispreferred response, “What about you?” exclaiming “AH” in line 10, at which point both P3 and P1 mutually acknowledge the problem with brief laughter. After the laughter subsides, P1 repeats (or rephrases) her question to give P2 answering rights. Having observed the confusion, P2 confirms her turn with “me?”, and proceeds to answer. After the group discusses P2’s favorite movie for a few turns, P2 then switches the answering rights to P3 in line 34, and this time the transition proceeds in a clear and orderly fashion. In sum, these participants have demonstrated their interactional competences, covering almost all of the above-listed (a) to (g). Having let this extract speak for itself, we can now consider the circumstances of the recorded conversation. The three participants were female Japanese high-school students sitting alone in a room in their school, outside lesson time. For all three students, Japanese is their first language and English is a foreign language, though a teacher (who organized the recording event) reported that they tend to show enthusiasm toward studying and speaking English, and that they had participated in an overseas homestay and study trip to the USA. Note that the conversation analysis itself does not involve these background facts. Although the fact that the participants were explicitly asked to hold and record an English conversation may be considered as violating the importance of naturally-occurring interactions in CA, it may also be argued that various kinds of foreign language activities with varying degrees of interactional freedom are a common part of “natural school life”, and that these are genuine human interactions which merit the scrutiny of CA.

Extract 2: “First Greetings”; L2=Akari (changed name).

- 1 L1: Akari::? (1) [(clearing throat)]
 2 [(group laughing)]
 3 L1:→ How do, you greet someone you are meeting (1) for the, first time.
 4 (1)
 5 L2: Ah:: .hh (1) I:: (2) I
 6 (3)
 7 ((group whispering))
 8 L2: *bou* (bow). I *bou* (1) many time.
 9 L1: ((laughs)) Yes, ↑ I ↓ see:: ((laughs))
 10 L2:→ How about (2) >Mariko<_ ((nervous laugh))
 11 (8)
 12 ((some whispering in Japanese))
 13 L3:→ Mm (1) I *bou*. ↑ When I (.) I *metto*: (.) first **time-u**, (1), I *bau* (bow), deeply.
 14 L1: [Ah:]
 15 L2: [Ah:]
 16 L4: [Ah:]
 17 L5: [Ah:]
 18 L3:→ How about Emi?
 19 (1)
 20 L4: Me ↑ too (1) I (1) eh:: (.) eh: (1) ((whispered laugh))
 21 I (5) I (2) will (1) bow (1) deeply (1) ↑ too. (1) How, about you, Marina?

- 22 L5:→ Me ↑ too. (1) I_ (1) I **don'to** (1) shake hands.
 23 L1: [Ah::]
 24 L2: [Ah::]
 25 L3: [Ah::]
 26 L4: [Ah::]
 27 L5:→ I'mu (1) Japanese. (1) ↑ >Japanese< (1) **isu** (1)
 28 >Japanese< (1) are (1) Japanese (.) **don'to** (1) shake hands.
 29 (3)
 30 L5:→ ((*says something in Japanese*)) Sorry:: (1) How about (____)i?

In extract 2, there are some self-initiated recasts such as in lines 5, 8 and 13, which are positive signs of the participants' confidence to build positively on their false-starts. On the other hand, the norms for giving and taking the floor follow a somewhat stiff and repetitive chain of "How about---?" (lines 10, 18 and 30) continuing around the group. One particular interesting feature in this extract is the addition of vowels to certain words, which are highlighted in boldface here, as in lines 13, 22, 27 and 28. Such vowel-marking behaviour by Japanese learners has been reported a number of times (e.g., Carroll, 2005). It is an interactional style transferred from Japanese and has the effect of indicating that more of the current utterance is to follow, thereby prolonging a participant's turn when more time is needed to prepare the next part of the utterance, as is shown by the fact that all of the vowel-marked words in this extract are followed by pauses. This extract shows that it is obviously effective in this situation, in which an English conversation class at a Japanese university were holding their first conversations of the semester in groups of six, using questions from the textbook to initiate sustained interactions. Whether or not this interactional style is desirable for communicating with non-Japanese speakers is a question for intercultural communication research. The topic in this lesson was first impressions, and the students were asking each other the key questions from the textbook, such as line 3. At first sight, it may appear that the students are interacting with each other spontaneously without the physical presence of the teacher, but the repetitive nature of the questioning shows that the students are following what they see as an appropriate classroom pattern, dutifully acknowledging each other's symmetrical turn-taking rights in the question-answer routine.

3. Applying CA to second language acquisition (SLA) and English language teaching (ELT)

As for how CA can be applied to research in second language acquisition (SLA), Kasper (2006) points out that it can deal with two questions: 1) what is the *object* of learning? and 2) what is the *process* of learning? As for the objects of learning for which CA can provide insights, some interactional competences, as described above, may need some further development (e.g., Hellerman, 2007; Ishida, 2006, 2009), or at least application and adaptation, beyond the level used in L1, to deal with the additional burdens of communicating in L2. In addition, longitudinal CA-SLA studies have documented the interactional developmental aspects of acquiring language itself. For example, Hauser (2013) documents through CA how a learner of English first acquires the phrase, "I don't know" as a formula, then over time analyzes it and begins to use the component parts for separate purposes. In other examples, Ishida (2006) investigated the microgenesis of pragmatic competence, and Ishida (2009) specifically focused on changes in the use of 'ne' in the development of interactional competence in Japanese as a second language. Extract 3 shows both emergent development of interactional style and evidence of interactional work on acquiring vocabulary.

Extract 3: "A Friend's Advice"

L2=Akari

- 1 L1: Akari:
 2 (2)

- 3 L2: Oh.
 4 (1)
 5 L1:→ What (.) is the best piece of advice a friend (.) has ever given you?
 6 (3)
 7 ((*Japanese*))
 8 (4)
 9 L2: Mm:: (.) You are: (1)if: (1)Ah (.) “You may be good, teacher.” ((laughs))
 10 L1: ,Oh::..
 11 L2: ((laughs)) >°*Akari ha ii sensei ni nareru to omouyo tte ne*°<
 12 Ah:: “thank you::!” I’m happy: (1)yes: (0.5) and, glad
 13 (1)
 14 L2: I (.) feeled (.) uh:: (.) my friend(.)
 15 →my ↑ friend’s very: (.) accep_(1) acceptance and understanding.
 16 I was happy.
 17 L1: ↑ How ↓ did ,you meet (.) the_(.) the friend.
 18 L2: Ah:: (.) mm:: (.) Ah: (.) the words (.) s_ah (.) mm (.)
 19 →↑ friend who: said this (1) this piece of advice (.) then i:s (.)°*nandakke*° (laughs)
 20 junior high (.) in junior high school.
 21 (1)
 22 L2:→ He moved to:: my school area (1) i:n junior, high school.
 23 (1)
 24 L1: He. ↑ boy?
 25 L2: >GIRL<!=
 26 L1: =>girl<=
 27 L2: And
 28 (1)
 29 L3: girl
 30 L2: And (1) ↑ Now she ↓ have (.) a (.) two babies.
 31 L1: [↑ Oh::!]
 32 L3: [↑ Oh::!] ↑ really! ((laughs))
 33 L2: () mother
 34 L?: Oh:: She has,_(.) Oh: ((laughs))
 35 L1: Wow!=
 36 L2: Yes
 37 L1: So ↑ when (.) ↓ is (.) ↑ When (.) ↓ does (.) she (.) marry.
 38 L2: (Ah::) (.) Mm: (1) First baby is: three years ago:?
 39 (1)
 40 L2: Next (1) Uh::: this year:: Fa_(.) ,May.(1) In May (.) in this year
 41 L3: Ah_(.) Is she married?
 42 L2: Yes:: (1) ↓ She_(.) ↓ uh:: un: ↑ she ↓ i::s: retired, high, school?=
 43 L1: [Oh::]
 44 L3: [Oh::]
 45 L2: [But(1)] I’m very respect (.) her.=
 46 L1: =[Uh]
 47 L3: [Uh]=
 48 L2:→ =In junior ,high .school? She: do a_ uh: homework (.) in (.) morning
 49 L1: Oh.
 50 L2: before go to school. Uh:[OK?]
 51 L1: [° ↑ *shukudai*? °]

- 52 L2:→ Ah: (1) ↑ Housework! ↑ Housework! Before go to school.
 53 L3: Oh
 54 L2: For example (1) wash a dish uh: yes (.) wash a dish. Instead of her mother.
 55 L3: Oh. It's hard.
 56 L2: And she make a dinner for her family.
 57 L3: She::=
 58 L1: =She doesn't (.) She doesn't have her mother?
 59 L2: No. No. (1) Her mother i::s a: *kakan*? uh: nurse nurse.=
 60 L3: Nurse
 61 L2: So mm (.) Night work.
 62 L1: [↑ Oh::]
 63 L3: [↑ Oh::] =
 64 L2: =Yes=
 65 L1: Very busy (.) very hard.
 66 L2: Yes.

In this extract the prompt question led to an extended and spontaneous exchange about Akari's friend who had given her some advice. After taking considerable time to come up with a piece of advice that she remembered receiving in lines 7-9, Akari then explained the advice more fully in Japanese, possibly for lack of confidence in the previous utterance, or possibly to make sure her partners understood so that the conversation would at least have a firmly shared meaning and context on which to build. Until the routine follow-up question in line 17 and its answer in lines 18-20, the interactional pattern follows an orderly textbook-led sequence, but after that, Akari's pronoun gender error in line 22 seems to provoke a spontaneous clarification request in line 24, where the error is quickly self-corrected through some quick three-way negotiation to achieve shared meaning and context. From that point onwards, Akari is focused on conveying interesting information about her old friend, whom she respects for enduring hardships, and the other two students are focused on Akari's personal story, and their engagement in this overcomes their self-conscious orderly turn-taking.

Another important sequence of negotiation of meaning takes place in lines 37 to 44, with its resolution further building the context for the rest of the conversation. In line 38 Akari misunderstands the first question about her friend getting married in line 37, but repair is immediately initiated by L3 in line 41, who rephrases the problematic question. From Akari's clear affirmative answer in line 42, we can also deduce, from the whole of that turn, that her friend left high school at the age of 17 to get married, that Akari's second answer is a sequentially preferred response to L3's question, and that L1 and L3 understood this in line 44. Akari's "But" in line 45 implies that she assumes that the group shares disapproval of the act of withdrawal from formal education to get married and have children at such a young age, whether these events are planned or not. In the rest of that utterance and the subsequent turns, Akari endeavors to explain why her friend should be respected.

Although it could be that these students would really prefer to discuss such personal stories in their first language, and although a traditional oral assessment of any of these short extracts of speech would no doubt highlight the many grammatical inaccuracies, over-simplified forms, pauses and so on, the sequences in this conversation show how they, especially Akari, find their own voices in the target language, which is an important part of meaningful output practice in a second language. In addition, a closer examination of Akari's interactions in extract 3 and their context, as well as the wider pedagogical context of the conversations, reveals that Akari achieved a number of significant linguistic developments in this exercise. She was able to practice authentic use of grammatical structures such as the relative clause in lines 19-20 (despite other grammatical errors, it is an identifiable relative clause), target lexical items such as "acceptance", "understanding" and "respect", through real-time peer-feedback and negotiation of meaning practice the comprehension of a question about a person's marital status and revise the semantic distinction between

homework and housework, and finally make some general progress in developing automaticity through output. Given the instructor's personal knowledge of her very limited verbal productive confidence before the course, these are significant and positive steps. In fact, words related to friendship, such as acceptance and understanding had been studied, discussed and drilled earlier in the lesson, so it is not surprising that they were readily available for use here.

As for the question of process, in addition to the emergent processes investigated in the above research, CA has been applied to a number of theoretical frameworks for SLA. Indeed, as Kasper (2006) points out, CA cannot by itself provide a theory of how interactional competences are acquired and how they develop over time. She thus identified and reviewed three such areas that relate appropriately to CA's focus on interaction: Vygotskian sociocultural theory, socialization theory and situated learning. In addition, there is a growing body of CA-based longitudinal SLA research (Brandt, 2013; Broewer & Wagner, 2004; Hauser, 2013; Ishida, 2009; Nguyen, 2011).

Kasper (2006) also reviewed two particular areas in which CA findings can be applied to ELT, in relation to the Interaction Hypothesis and negotiation for meaning (Long, 1996). Firstly, in task-based language teaching (TBLT), some CA studies have revealed inconsistency between the aims of the task and the actual observed interaction, which have implications for communicative language teaching (CLT), TBLT and structured and free practice in presentation-practice performance (PPP). Secondly, CA studies on teacher-initiated recasts, which revealed problematic changes in intended meaning, also have implications for teacher-led recasts and the organization of classroom interaction (e.g., Seedhouse, 2004).

After summarizing some key features of CA how it can be applied, some observations are offered at this point. Firstly, by observing exclusively the sequential mechanics of talk in interaction that are made public, CA focuses on socially distributed, co-constructed use of language, emergence of meaning and interactional competences, rather than individual cognitive states. Secondly, this same focus only on actual interaction means that CA's emic perspective differs somewhat from other branches of ethnomethodology in that qualitative interviews of the participants' own reflections are generally not used, nor do CA researchers participate in any way in the participants' activity. Thirdly, CA does not provide an SLA theory by itself. Fourthly, following on from the previous three points, CA's focus on interaction means that it can be useful for Vygotskian sociocultural theory (SCT), socialization theory and situated learning (also known as "communities of practice"), in which some CA-SLA research has been carried out. The fifth point is that while there has been some heated debate about whether individual-cognitivist or socially-situated approaches are better suited for making progress in SLA research, Kasper (2006) makes the refreshingly pragmatic and ecumenical point that both individual and social aspects of SLA are important for understanding the respective aspects of SLA processes, so the question of which is better is a needless one. The sixth point, however, is that apart from the review of CA applied to SCT, socialization theory and situated learning, Kasper (2006) does not offer an explicit explanation of how CA findings (and those of SCT, etc.) can be integrated with findings of individual cognitive research for the benefit of language teachers, syllabus planners, assessors and other language education policy makers. There are, of course, real challenges in attempting to link findings from research approaches whose ontological perspectives are radically different. Nevertheless, would it necessarily be completely impossible, for example, to plan a large-scale mixed-methods research project which combined CA findings (perhaps in combination with one of the three socially-oriented theories mentioned above) with findings from an individual-based research approach?

Another area in which CA findings have had some influence is the development of language teaching materials, especially the dialogs. Carroll (2010) points out that most model dialogs in modern EFL textbooks are well-intentioned but pale "simulacrams" of conversation, based on "the author's intuitions about conversational naturalness." CA research has demonstrated that we cannot trust our intuition as a research tool for how we organize talk-in-interaction. Even un-written, simulated role-plays have been shown to have variable authenticity (Stokoe, 2013). Overly manicured dialogs can cause learners to have unrealistic expectations of their own interactions with foreigners, hindering the development of their motivation and interaction skills. L2 learners need to be aware of the roles that interactional competencies (a~g, above) play

in their L1 and L2 interactions. Some materials have used movies and TV dramas (e.g., Gilmore, 2011), corpus-based materials (e.g., McCarthy *et al.*, 2006; Tilbury *et al.*, 2010), online lessons based on recordings of interactions in English-speaking countries (e.g., The Marzio School, 2013), and CA-based conversation curricula (e.g., Carroll, 2010; Barraja-Rohan, 2011). Another promising area of development is the growth of CA-based online corpora of English conversations. TalkBank involves mainly “native-speakers”, VOICE (*Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English*) involves mainly European speakers, and ACE (*Asian Corpus of English*, see Kirkpatrick *et al.*, 2011) focuses mainly on speakers from the ASEAN countries.

4. CA, Communicative competence and intercultural communication

Communicative competence, according to Celce-Murcia (2008), includes discourse competence, linguistic competence, formulaic competence, interactional competence, sociocultural competence and strategic competence. Interactional competence, strategic competence and discourse competence as construed in this model may have some obvious relations to the interactional competences identified by CA research, and CA research can also show how learners develop in all of the competences, as mentioned in some of the examples in the previous section. Moreover, CA could play a role in validating, evaluating and even reforming such models. For example, although it must be acknowledged that learners already have interactional, sociocultural, strategic and discourse competence and therefore the necessity of teaching them these things is subject to debate, CA research on classroom discourse (e.g., Seedhouse, 2004) especially in combination with socialization theory (e.g., He, 2003, 2004), can show how foreign language learners are sometimes conditioned into discarding these native competences when using the foreign language in the classroom, making them appear, from the point of view of native-speaker instructors, to lack basic interactional competences. In addition, CA findings on the lexical, syntactic and formulaic features of turn construction (Carroll, 2010) suggest implications for the development of linguistic and formulaic competence. Finally, the many of the extracts and literature discussed so far also suggest that CA can reveal how the development of each area of competence can be intertwined with the processes of other competences.

The interactive competences listed in part 2, especially (e), (f), and adapting and responding to new situations (g), are increasingly important communicative skills in today's globalizing society. MEXT documents refer to developing a positive attitude to communicating with people in a foreign language (2009, p.87), the ability to use English as an international lingua franca (ELF) in a variety of situations (2013; p.2, 10, 55, etc.), intercultural competence (2009, p.290; 2013, p.55, 58) and, as means to achieve this, the improvement of school teachers' English abilities (2013, p.55) and the improvement of curriculum and teaching materials (2013, p.58). According to Corbett (2010, adapted from Byram, 2008), intercultural communicative competence (ICC) includes: (a) knowing the self and the other, (b) knowing how to relate and interpret meaning, (c) developing critical awareness, (d) knowing how to discover cultural information, and (e) knowing how to relativize oneself and value the attitudes and beliefs of others. The two frameworks of “communicative competence” and “intercultural communicative competence” may at first appear to be radically different and difficult to combine in the goals of one research approach. However, the intercultural framework is useful for developing learners' curiosity about other cultures and avoiding cultural prejudices and stereotypes, particularly in terms of the communication styles of cultural others, thereby adding intercultural substance, refinement and flexibility to the pursuit of communicative competence and the sociocultural and interactional elements of Celce-Murcia's model. Furthermore, since “native-speakers” have become the minority among global day-to-day interactions in ELF, the “intercultural speaker” (Byram, 2009) is arguably a more appropriate goal than the “native speaker” in English conversation training.

CA can also show how people develop intercultural communicative competences. For example, Yuan (2010) showed how identities can be negotiated and stereotypes challenged in talk in interaction, Jenks (2013a) examined to what degree non-native English speakers use ELF as an equitable category in interaction, Laihonon (2008) used CA to elucidate the emergence of language ideologies in interviews, Jenks (2013b)

showed how intercultural speakers negotiate the establishment of new norms of interaction on the fly, and Yamaguchi (2009) employed CA and sociolinguistics to pinpoint instances of non-understanding to hypothesize cultural models. As with communicative competence models, these CA findings may play a role in refining models of intercultural competence and intercultural communicative competence, highlighting the developmental processes, facilitating the progress from the state of being “list models” (Matsuo, 2012).

5. Conclusion

Some promising developments of CA intersecting with SLA, ELT and intercultural communication have been reviewed. However, caution is needed about generalizations based on limited numbers of cases, possible intervening or mediating features, and assumptions regarding which (cultural) set of interactive norms English learners should be aiming at. In the case of ELT, we need to consider the growing importance of ELF, dynamic conceptualizations of culture(s) and speech communities, critical cultural awareness, the development of localized interactional norms on the fly and the creative processes of intercultural interaction (Durant & Shepherd, 2009; Matsuo, 2012). CA may be able to inform the critical appraisal of models of communicative and intercultural communicative competence. If a given model and its components can be validated with CA, CA should arguably be able to demonstrate the relationships (and overlaps) between the components, and longitudinal CA may be able to illuminate the processes of the development of competence. On the other hand, aspects of ICC may also feed into the CA-SLA and CA-ELT paradigms. When native-speaker instructors (even those who are expert in CA) assess learners as having low interactional competence, we need to be ready to reflect on ourselves and at least consider the possibility that it may be the native-speaker’s intercultural competence which is in fact deficient. As for using CA for the development of authentic teaching materials, we should be aware of whether we are using native-speaker (even Anglo-Saxon)-centric norms, or ELF and intercultural speaker-related principles as a basis for ELT syllabus design. Further data collection and meta-analysis of CA intersecting with intercultural communicative competences is required.

References

- Barraja-Rohan, A-M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research* 15(4), pp.479-507.
- Brandt, A. (2013). ‘Seeing learning’ in interaction: An overview of CA approaches to longitudinal SLA research. Presentation given at JALT Osaka Chapter Special Event, 7 September 2013.
- Brouwer, C. E., & Wagner J. (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1 (1), pp.29-47.
- Byram, M. (2009). *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship: essays and reflections*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Carroll, D. (2005). Vowel marking as an interactional resource in Japanese novice EFL conversation. In K. Richards & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Applying Conversation Analysis*, (pp.214-234). Houndsmill: Palgrave.
- Carroll, D. (2010). Conversation analysis and language teaching: a call to action. In T. Greer (Ed.) *Observing talk: conversation analytic studies of second language interaction*, (pp.7-24). Tokyo: JALT Pragmatics SIG.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2008). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E. Alcon Soler & M. P. Safont Jorda (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning*, (pp.41-57). Springer Science+Business Media.
- Corbett, J. (2010). *Intercultural language activities*. Cambridge University Press.
- Durant, A. & Shephard, I. (2009). ‘Culture’ and ‘communication’ in intercultural communication. *European Journal of English Studies* 13(2), pp.147-162.
- Forrester, M.A. (2002). *How to do conversation analysis: a brief guide*. Department of Psychology, University of Kent, UK.

- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gilmore, A. (2011). "I prefer not text": Developing Japanese learners' communicative competence with authentic materials. *Language Learning* 61(3), pp.786-819.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hauser, E. (2013). Stability and change in one adult's second language English negation. *Language Learning* 63(3), pp.463-498.
- He, A.W. (2003). Linguistic anthropology and language education. In *Linguistic anthropology of education*, S.Wortham & B.Rymes (Eds.), (pp.93-119). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- He, A.W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese classroom. *Modern Language Journal* 88, pp.551-567.
- Hellerman, J. (2007). The development of practices for action in classroom dyadic interaction: Focus on task openings. *Modern Language Journal*, 91(1), 83-96.
- Ishida, M. (2006). Interactional competence and the use of modal expressions in decision making activities: CA for understanding microgenesis of pragmatic competence. In K.Bardovi-Harlig, C.Felix-Brasdefer and A.Omar (Eds.) *Pragmatics and Language Learning* (Vol.11) (pp.1-28). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawaii.
- Ishida, M. (2009). Development of interactional competence: Changes in the use of 'ne' in L2 Japanese during study abroad. In H. T. Nguyen and G. Kasper (Eds.) *Talk-in-Interaction: Multilingual Perspectives* (pp.351-385). Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawaii.
- Jenks, C. (2013a). Are you an ELF? The relevance of ELF as an equitable social category in online intercultural communication. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 13(1), pp.95-108.
- Jenks, C. (2013b). *Interactional Competence vs. Pragmatic Competence, and "Seeing Learning" in Interaction*. Presentation given at JALT Osaka Chapter Special Event, 7 September 2013.
- Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review* 19, pp.83-99. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kirkpatrick, A. et al. (2011). *The ACE Manual: Data Collection and Transcription for the Asian Corpus of English*. The Hong Kong Institute of Education Library.
- Laihonen, P. (2008). Language ideologies in interviews: a conversation analysis approach. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(5), pp.668-693.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.Richie & T.Batia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp.413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Matsuo, K. (2012). A critique of Michael Byram's intercultural communicative competence model from the perspective of model type and conceptualization of culture. *Human Sciences Research Bulletin of Fukuoka University*, pp.347-380.
- McCarthy, M., McGarten, J. & Sandiford, H. (2006). *Touchstone* (textbook series). Cambridge University Press.
- MEXT. (The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport, Science and Technology) (2009). 高等学校学習指導要領解説－外国語編－英語編. [Upper Secondary School Course of Study: Foreign Languages-English]
- MEXT. (2013). 第2期教育振興基本計画. [The Second Basic Plan for the Promotion of Education]
- Nguyen, H. thi (2011). A longitudinal microanalysis of a second language learner's participation. In G.Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 Learning as Social Practice: Conversation-Analytic Perspectives*, (pp.17-44). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- The Marzio School (2013). Real English® www.realenglish.com (Accessed September 15, 2013).
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974) A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, pp.696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Vol 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004) The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective. *Language Learning, Special Issue (Language Learning Monograph Series)*. (Malden, MA: Blackwell)
- Sidnell, J. (2010). Conversation analysis. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics and language education*, (pp.492-527). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Stokoe, E. (2013). The (in) authenticity of simulated talk: comparing role-played and actual interaction and the implications for communication training. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46(2), pp.165-185.
- Tilbury, A., Clementson, T., Hendra, L. A. & Rea, D. (2010). *English Unlimited* (textbook series). Cambridge University Press.

- VOICE (2013). *The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English* (version 2.0 online). Director: B. Seidlhofer; Researchers: A. Breiteneder, T. Klimpfinger, S. Majewski, R. Osimk-Teasdale, M-L Pitzl, M. Radeka. <http://voice.univie.ac.at> (Accessed September 15, 2013).
- Wong, J. & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. New York: Routledge.
- Yamaguchi, M. (2009). Non-understanding as a heuristic to hypothesizing cultural models: A meta-oriented sociolinguistic strategy. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13(3), pp.387-410.
- Yuan, Y. (2010). Stereotypes and interaction: some strategies used in identity negotiation. In T. Greer (Ed.) *Observing talk: conversation analytic studies of second language interaction*, (pp.7-24). Tokyo: JALT Pragmatics SIG.

Appendix:

CA Transcription Conventions			
Transcription Element	Meaning	Transcription Element	Meaning
↑ or ↓	Marked rise (or fall) in intonation	:::	Sounds that are stretched or drawn out (number of :: indicates the length of stretching)
Underlining	Used for emphasis (parts of the utterance that are stressed)	[]	Overlaps, cases of simultaneous speech or interruptions.
UPPER-CASE LETTERS	Indicate increased volume (note this can be combined with underlining)	°word °	Shown when a passage of talk is noticeably quieter than the surrounding talk
.hhh	A row of h's with a dot in front of it indicates an inbreath. Without the dot an outbreath	=	When there is nearly no gap at all between one utterance and another
(comment)	Analyst's comment about something going on in the talk	(.)	Small pauses
>word<	Noticeably faster speech.	<word>	Noticeable slower speech
?	Rising intonation at the end of an utterance	(1.4)	Silences (time in secs)
,	Continuing intonation	.	Closing or stopping intonation

Adapted from Forrester (2002, p.11)