

# Story-telling and interactional management in Internet-based instructional conversation using English as a lingua franca: Analysis, methodological issues and pedagogical implications

Ivan B. BROWN\* · Simon ELDERTON\*\*

(平成28年3月7日受付；平成28年5月11日受理)

## ABSTRACT

This paper takes up one 22-minute long recorded conversation that took place between two individuals through an international online English conversation coaching service as a specimen of naturally occurring talk-in-interaction. Seven extracts from the conversation are examined using conversation analysis (CA), highlighting a rich variety of specific interactional practices, such as story-telling, topic management, repair and the discursive construction of identities. Of the two participants, one identifies himself as Japanese, while the other identifies herself with a particular south-east Asian country, thus they may potentially be regarded as using English as a lingua franca (ELF). It is argued that, methodological issues notwithstanding, both the raw data and the analyses have potential for incorporation into materials for the teaching and learning of English conversation in a number of sites of language learning in Japan.

## KEY WORDS

conversation analysis (CA)  
intercultural communication

English as a lingua franca (ELF)  
story-telling

identities in talk  
talk-in-interaction

## 1 Introduction

This work is part of a larger project to build up a corpus of recorded and transcribed English conversations involving Japanese and non-Japanese speakers in various situations and contexts. The aims of the project are to identify naturally occurring interactional practices through conversation analysis (CA), and in the longer term to use these data and findings as a basis on which to create materials for the teaching and learning of English conversation and intercultural communication that focus on these practices. We hope that these materials will be used primarily, but not exclusively, in sites of English education located in Japan. Some interactions may occur between Japanese speakers and other non-native speakers of English, in which English is used as a lingua franca, an increasingly common occurrence in the day-to-day intercultural communication that takes place in a globalizing world (Mauranen & Ranta, 2009). From the point of view of ethnomethodological CA, interactional practices in talk-in-interaction may include: the systematics of turn-taking and turn construction; sequences that carry out projects of social action; the interactional repair of problems in speaking, hearing and understanding; topic management and story-telling; openings and closings; the achievement of intersubjectivity and the co-construction of meaning; the negotiated construction of identities; and the negotiation of new localized norms of interaction (Jefferson, 1978; Sacks, 1992; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1978; Schegloff, 2007; Wong & Waring, 2010). In terms of wider implications for intercultural communication (a sense of *applied CA*), these interactional practices may be related to aspects of intercultural communicative competence, such as the requisite knowledge, attitudes and skills for performing effectively and appropriately in intercultural communication (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009), including: the appropriate valuing of and respect for one's own and others' cultural backgrounds; showing empathy; carrying out personal and collaborative projects; being empowered to employ language and other symbolic systems creatively and constructively (Kramsch & Whiteside,

2008); and the interactional initiation or facilitation of the acquisition of new linguistic and cultural knowledge (Byram, 1997). As one step in that project, this paper takes one particular interaction as a case in point, presenting brief analyses and instances of some of the above practices, as a way of shedding light on the possibilities of the remaining work to be done in the wider project. The interaction presented in this paper involved two individuals, one of whom identified himself as Japanese while other identified herself with a particular southeast Asian country. It took place through an Internet telephone connection, as part of an online one-to-one coaching service in English conversation (in one-hour sessions). For this session, however, the Japanese participant, the “client/learner” in the coaching setting, had gained special permission from the “coach” to carry out and record a 22-minute “semi-structured interview” to obtain data for a university assignment related to intercultural communication (but not to CA). Seven extracts of this are presented here, and transcription symbols are explained in the appendix.

## 2 Extracts and analyses

Extracts 1 and 2 show Ken and Maria (pseudonyms for the “client/learner” and “coach”, respectively) orienting themselves to the recording situation, at the beginning and end of the recorded 22-minute “interview”. Extract 3 is from about two minutes before the end and shows a more substantial orientation to, indeed a topicalization of, the recording situation and assignment. Interestingly, these extracts also show points of articulation between (a) the participants’ “official” identities as “coach” versus “learner/client”; (b) their more immediate *situated identities* as “interviewer-recorder” versus “interviewee”; (c) Ken’s *transported identity* as a university student, linked through doing an assignment to his interviewer role; and (d) their moment-to-moment *discourse identities* as speaker, listener and most significantly, repairer. Their “official” identities (Schenkein, 1978) are arguably displayed in lines 640–642, in the form of Ken’s perturbation and word search leading into Maria’s embedded correction “stop recording”, followed by Ken’s uptake and appreciation of her correction. The (b)-(d)-type identities are from Zimmerman’s (1998) framework of *discourse identities*, *situated identities* and *transportable identities*, influenced by, though not formally within, membership categorization analysis (MCA) (e.g., Hester & Eglin, 1997; Sacks, 1992). Discourse identities “are integral to the moment-by-moment organization of the interaction” (p. 90), and refer to the most *proximal*, constantly shifting categories such as current speaker, listener, story teller, story recipient, questioner, answerer, repair initiator, and so on. Situated identities “come into play within the precincts of particular types of [communication] situation” (p. 90), where such situations could include television news interviews, patient-nurse or patient-doctor interactions in hospitals and clinics, teacher-student interactions in school classrooms, and various kinds of telephone-based or online service calls. Transportable identities “are latent identities that ‘tag along’ with individuals as they move through their daily routines” (p. 90), which in the context of this interaction could potentially involve such categories as “Filipina”, “Japanese”, “female”, “male”, “twenties” age group, “mother”, “postgraduate university student”, and so on. Zimmerman claims that these are “usually visible”, and assignable (by interlocutor) or claimable (by self) “on the basis of physical or culturally based insignia which furnish the intersubjective basis for categorization” (1998, p. 91). He also makes an important distinction between registering *visible* (or known) indicators of identity and *orienting to* identity (in terms of expected roles and behavior), pointing out that the two phenomena do not always coincide in terms of presence or absence. It is thus necessary, in concurrence with the canonical *emic* principles of ethnomethodological CA, for the analyst to show how participants *themselves* orient to their identities within their actual interaction, instead of supposing and establishing identities for them *a priori*, no matter how “obvious” these identities may seem based on the researcher’s contextual knowledge or “common sense”.

### Extract 1: Beginning of the recording

1 Ken: OKAY. {((*sound of adjusting the mic*))/(1.6)}  
 2 ↑Now I: (0.4) ↓record (0.4) >our conversation,<

3 (0.4)  
4 Maria: °mhm?°

### Extract 2: End of the recording

638 Ken: Ah:. so: (.) it is (0.3) time for recording:?  
639 So (.) yah,  
640 (0.4)  
641 Maria: ↑Ah okay?=  
642 K: =>Our conversation< will:(.)n: >continue but(h)<(.)  
643 yah I'll:(.)hhh er: stop(h) the [record ↑y]eah  
644 M: [Stop recording. ]  
645 K: Recording, thank you. so: (.) wait a minu:te(h)

In Extracts 1 and 2, Ken displays his situated interviewer-recorder identity as being clearly in charge of the operation and timing of the recording (Ex.1: 1–2; Ex.2: 635, 638–639), to which Maria aligns herself as a cooperative interviewee (Ex.1: 4; Ex.2: 637). Extract 3 starts soon after Maria has told three stories about her experiences of paranormal activities, before which Ken somewhat half-jokingly displayed some resistance to them on the basis of their “scariness” and their common dislike of horror movies. Now (Ex.3: 550–552), he explains while laughing how he has to “transcribe this story”, where “have to” hints at a student’s obligation to complete an assignment, and “story” may refer to Maria’s last story, her three stories (singular-plural error), or the whole section of conversation which is being recorded (possibly a slight mistranslation of the Japanese *hanashi*). However, in lines 555 and 560, Maria, without explicitly disagreeing with Ken’s somewhat dispreferred stance toward her stories, uses his looming assignment task as a pivot to: (1) complete the stepwise topic shift away from scary stories about the paranormal and into the positive aspect of their recorded conversation activity; and (2) shape her positive assessments as unmitigated, authoritative ones based on her “expert” knowledge as a conversation coach, her “official” identity, or at least her more long-term situated identity. These articulations between the different layers of identities support Antaki and Widdicombe’s (1998) *Five General Principles* of identities in talk: (1) “for a person ‘to have an identity’ – whether he or she is the person speaking, being spoken to, or being spoken about – is to be cast into a *category with associated characteristics or features*”; (2) “such casting is *indexical and occasioned*”; (3) “it *makes relevant* the identity to the interactional business going on”; (4) “the force of ‘having an identity’ is in its *consequentiality* in the interaction”; and (5) “all this is visible in people’s exploitation of the *structures of conversation*” (p. 3, modified in format). Put simply, there is a continuous symbiosis between orientations to identities, the micro and macro structures of conversation and the consequential unfolding of the social action.

### Extract 3: Passing orientation to the recording situation and the assignment

550 (Ken) and I- after:: yah (h)haha .hhh after talking:  
551 .hhh haha I-I- I h(h)ave t(h)o this: .hhh this:  
552 story:, I-I have to: (.) transcribe th(h)is  
553 st(h)ory: (hh) .  
554 Maria: ↑okay,  
555 K: .Hhh  
556 M: But ↑it's ↓goo:d.  
557 K: Y[ah:. ]  
558 M: [I mea]n:(.) you're-  
559 you're <recording: our conver↓sation here:.>=  
560 K: =Yah=  
561 M: =It will help you. .hhh=

In Extracts 4 and 5, Maria and then Ken, respectively, are introducing themselves following Ken's explicit request soon after Extract 1. In lines 30, 32–33 and 35, Maria displays a transportable identity, interspersed with orderly continuers from Ken, aligning himself as a recipient. Through the orientation to this transportable identity, Maria casts herself as potentially quite distinct from Ken. This carries the possibility of triggering subsequent talk as in story telling (Jefferson, 1978), and may be regarded as an instance of employing difference as an interactional resource (Kasper & Omori, 2010). However, this is not taken up at this stage, and Maria makes a bounded (Sacks, 1992) change in subtopic (within her self-introduction) in line 37 with a temporal marker and raised pitch. Alignment in transportable identities follows, clearly referenced with the interlocutor-directed pronoun-centered adverbial phrase “just like you” and the category “student”, thereby stressing what they have in common, in contrast to the distinctiveness of the preceding identity. This pattern is reciprocated in a sense by Ken in Extract 5, as he first draws attention to the distinctive climate and daily life characteristics of the region where he lives, with similarly solicitous rising intonation, but then aligns himself with her as a fellow watcher of movies (a pastime she had mentioned), again using raised pitch to mark a subtopic boundary. This seems to be underlined by his self-repair, cutting off in the middle of “also” (one alignment marker) and replacing it with the sentence-final alignment marker “too”, perhaps in order to emphasize it solicitously with rising intonation. In relation to Extract 4, Extract 5 thus represents a direct and equitable exchange of discourse identities (self-introducer versus introduction recipient), a recycled and attentively structured pattern of transportable identities, and the stable, if somewhat ambiguous, situated identities of two interactants getting acquainted with each other in what can be described, in terms of the overall conversation, as a “pre-topical sequence” (Maynard & Zimmerman, 1984). Although this is not exactly story-telling, the use of the structural resources of a preceding speaker's self-introduction by a subsequent speaker in his or her self-introduction is likely to be the same phenomenon as the recycling of interactional resources observed in “series of stories” (Ryave, 1978). Ken goes further in lines 125–127 to use the identity alignment as a pivot to achieve stepwise topic shift into the first of two humorously ironic stories, this one being about how he fell asleep while watching a movie, gaining some degree of appreciation from Maria.

#### Extract 4: Discourse, situated and transportable identities

30 Maria: I (.) a:m: (0.3) actually a ( ) mother?  
 31 Ken: Mm,=  
 32 M: =I('ve) (.) one daughter: (.) and she: is: .hhh about  
 33 to turn ( ) years old (.) on ↑((month & day))?  
 34 K: [Uh:. ]  
 35 M: [ >Yeah ] that's< next month(h)? Yes?=  
 36 K: =Ah.  
 37 M: Um: .hhh ↑Currently:(.) ↓Um: >Just like you.< I: am:  
 38 (0.3) again. a student.

#### Extract 5: Reversed discourse identities, reciprocation of alignment, and a topically coherent story

115 (Ken) and mm:: >how can I say:< an this ↑area (.) there are:  
 116 a lot(h) of: snow(s)? So: it is difficult to:  
 117 .hhh uhn:: drive? (.) a car?  
 118 (0.5)  
 119 Ken: Be [cause] it is so:  
 120 Maria: [↑Oh: ]  
 121 K: .hhh ah:: dangerous:? (.) slippery?=  
 122 M: =Mm,  
 123 K: .hhh mm .hhh So:. ana my ↑hobby is als- (.) yeah.  
 124 my hobby is: watching movie: too? .hhh an so::(1.5)

125 >yesterday< I: watched(h) .hhh mm Japanese animation,  
 126 (1.6) a- But e-uh: du:ring watching: that movie:  
 127 I .hhh (.)I sle:pt(h), (h)haha [.hhh Yah(h)]  
 128 M: [uhn Hahaha]o-okay

Extract 6 contains the first substantial story of the conversation, which is also a second attempt at ironic humour, occasioned by an agreement on the dislike of horror movies, and the particularly scary nature of Japanese horror movies. The alignment is re-emphasized in lines 185–187 by Ken's triple agreement marker "yah yah yah", the first-person pronoun "me" with commonality marker "too", repeated with laughter, and the repeated explicit reference to the scariness of Japanese horror movies. Ken then uses this as a pivot to launch his story as a form of topically coherent stepwise topic shift (Sacks, 1992). It is worth noting that it is the second time that Ken launches a story using identity (or interest) alignment as a preface. The crucial ironic contrast necessary for understanding the points of both of these stories is marked rather minimally using only the contrastive conjunction "but" (lines 126 and 187), and as Jefferson (1978) points out, a story's preface can have consequences for its reception. Ken sets the scene for his story with a contrastive category-bound temporal marker ("undergraduate student" and past tense) and elicits Maria's recipientship with a prospective indexical ("strange part-time job"). Maria dutifully aligns herself as story recipient by waiting to the end of Ken's extended turn and providing a topicalizer in line 192, which turns about to be the first of several almost identical continuers ("Okay"). She does not respond to Ken's attempt to self-initiate other-repair of his word search (for "haunted house"), but responds in a new way (203 & 205) to his past-referenced self-categorization of his "stage role" as a ghost, but still does not clearly display understanding of the humorous ironic point of his story. Ken then repeats the crucial contrast with his dislike of horror stories (212–214), to which Maria finally responds with accentuated (raised pitch) laughter, albeit possibly prompted by Ken's own laughter in his trail-off (214). However, Maria makes no comment on the crucial ironic contrast, instead shifting into distinctly non-humorous "teacher talk" (Richards, 2006), from her final "okay" in line 215, through her positive but nonetheless authoritative assessment and summary of only one side of Ken's story.

#### Extract 6: Stepwise shifting into and out of a humorously ironic story

184 (Maria) playing on my min:d. S[o °(ha ha ha) °]  
 185 Ken: [Ah:>yah yah yah], me too<  
 186 me t(h)hoohoo- .hhh ↑Yeah Japanese horror movies:  
 187 so:(.)scary:, .hhh ↑But(h):.hhh when ↑I was ↓a (0.8)  
 188 university students(h)?(.)undergraduate s- ah- ↑n-now  
 189 I'm ↓a: .hhh graduated student(h), (.)But when ↑I was  
 190 a: .hhh undergraduate students? I have ↓a: .hhh eh  
 191 stra:nge:(h) (0.5) part-time job(h)?  
 192 M: Okay?=  
 193 K: =So:: I w- I worked(h) at ahm: amusement park?  
 194 hhh .hhh=  
 195 M: =O [kay? ]  
 196 K: [And speci]fically: I w-worked at(h) a(.)  
 197 ↑ghost ↓house?  
 198 (1.3)  
 199 M: O [kay? ]  
 200 K: [Horror] house:? (h)ha .hhh Ana- I- I was:a(.)ghost?  
 201 .hhh  
 202 (1.9)  
 203 M: G(h)ho [st]

204 K: [s:]=  
 205 M: =oh my go:d=  
 206 K: =Y(h)ahaha-.hhh So [I scare:d ]  
 207 M: [°(ah haha)°]  
 208 K: scare:d(.)many(.)eh:(.)guests?(.) .hhh (h)haha  
 209 .hhh in dark rooms?  
 210 (0.3)  
 211 M: ↑Ah:huh? [(Hn hn) ]  
 212 K: [H(h)aha ] .hhh But I can't(h) watch(h) .hhh  
 213 >Japanese horror movie because< I:(.)I don't like(h)ha  
 214 horror(h)ha .hhh Ha [ha ]  
 215 M: [↑Ha]hahaha .hhh ok [ay:.]  
 216 K: [.hhh]Yah=  
 217 M: =That's: (0.5) goo:d that (0.4) you: try to avoi:d (. )  
 218 ah:m (0.6) ghost storie:s or: >you know<  
 219 scary movie [s..h]hh=  
 220 K: [mm: ]

The second half of the bounded topic movement initiated at the end of Extract 6 leads into a subsequent story in Extract 7, in which the roles of different types of turn-constructural unit (TCU) are noteworthy. Maria's utterance in line 221, with its TCU-initial raised pitch and TCU-final direct address, functions (a) as a kind of disjunctive marker to confirm the closing of Ken's previous story, and (b) as the first pair part (FPP) of a summons-answer generic pre-sequence (lines 221–222; Schegloff, 2007, pp. 48–49). This receives a go-ahead from Ken as a second pair part (SPP), leading into Maria's base FPP, a recipient-oriented topic proffer (Schegloff, 2007, pp. 169–171), in lines 223–224. On the basis of Schegloff's (2007) discussion, Maria's use of a summons-answer suggests that she is orienting to her forthcoming topic proffer as potentially problematic, possibly because she has just positively assessed Ken's avoidance of "ghost stories". Her topic proffer seems marked also by her self-repair, completely replacing the format of her question after the first micro-pause. Ken's base SPP, his candidate story, which starts to emerge from lines 229–230, can be described as an expanded response turn, which would be the preferred response to a topic proffer. Before that, however, comes an insertion expansion in lines 225–227, a kind of repair to confirm understanding, of which the oriented-to trouble source is not "paranormal activity" but "experiences". Although Maria repeats her question in line 227, her "yeah" is sufficient as Ken immediately begins a search in line 228.

The interaction during the story itself contains three particularly notable features. One feature is Ken's epistemic mitigation, avoiding committing himself to the factual certainty of the appearance of his grandfather's ghost, or even to his own level of personal conviction. This is evident in phrases such as "I don't remember but" (230), "according to my mother ... I said ..." (251) and "I didn't remember in detail ... clearly" (259–260). A second feature is the typing sound heard in lines 231–232, 262, and 265, which is likely to be Maria, in her "official" coaching capacity, typing corrective feedback to Ken through the online call service. This "official" identity (or outer-layer situated identity) also surfaces in lines 241 and 271–278, in the form of a post-story expansion sequence focused on repair. Maria's other-repair of Ken's construction in lines 267–269 appears at first to be a borderline case between exposed and embedded correction (Jefferson, 1987), and itself involves restarts and self-repair (substitution of "got" with "get"). However, this post-expansion sequence is then itself expanded and the correction topicalized by Ken's orientation to it through his first appreciation in line 273 and Maria's preferred response (or sequence-closing third) in line 274. This is, in turn, expanded in lines 276–278, involving Maria's repeated acknowledgement of Ken's appreciation (or signal of its being unnecessary as her correction can be taken for granted). Finally, a third interesting feature of this story sequence is the interpretation of Maria's utterance "who was dead"

in line 238. It appears to be an initiation of repair related to Ken's utterance of "my grandfather ... who were dead" in lines 233-234. The intonation of Maria's begins flat, only rising at the end. This suggests that it is either a request for confirmation of the fact that his grandfather was dead, through partial repetition of his utterance, or an embedded correction (other repair) disguised as a confirmation request. In either case, Maria's line would be construed as a clausal TCU, "who" being the relative pronoun referring to the elided "grandfather". However, Ken responds in line 240, initially confirming the subject, his grandfather, and only subsequently, as an insertion, repeating the clause to confirm that his grandfather was dead. The first part of Ken's turn, constructed initially as a noun-phrase TCU, seems to display orientation to Maria's utterance as being an interrogative sentential TCU, possibly caused by missing the intonation shape due to his overlap with the first part of Maria's utterance. Nevertheless, he then promptly takes up her offered correction, substituting "were" with "was": "yeah who was dead", which is then also followed by an orientation, through appreciation, to her correction in line 241.

#### Extract 7: Elicited story with epistemic distancing and identity shifting

221 Maria: =Um (.) ↑ If I may just ask: ↓ you Ken.  
 222 Ken: [Mm]  
 223 M: [Do] ↑ you: ha::ve (.) Have ↑ you ever ↓ experienced(.)  
 224 any (.) paranormal activity?=  
 225 K: =AH:: (0.7) experience?  
 226 (0.4)  
 227 M: Yeah [have you experiences. ]  
 228 K: [uh: : : : ]  
 229 .hhh Wait a minute s:o:: Mhmhm:: .HHH yah: I:'m-  
 230 I don't remember but(h) when ↑ I was a(.) ↑ ch:ild,.hhh  
 231 {(1.5)/((*sound of typing*))}  
 232 M: [mhm?]/((*sound of typing*))  
 233 K: [uh: ] I (1.9) I(.) (k) saw(.).hhh my grandfather?  
 234 (0.6) who were dead(h), .hhh  
 235 (1.2)  
 236 M: [Really?]  
 237 K: [u h : ] yeah [ah when-]  
 238 M: [Who was ] dead?  
 239 (1.2)  
 240 K: Ah my grandfather,(.) >yeah who was< dead(h),(.)  
 241 Ah, thank you.=  
 242 M: =Mhm?  
 243 K: .hhh So:: (0.9) when I was a- (0.6) el- (1.7)  
 244 first grade in elementary school? .hhh  
 245 my grand [father:]  
 246 M: [m h m? ]  
 247 K: was:(h) dead(h)?  
 248 (0.6)  
 249 K: .hhh  
 250 M: Oh my god=  
 251 K: =mm: So:: after: (0.6) >a-yeah according to< (.)  
 252 my (.) mother: .hhh so: (1.4) ah I: I said(h) .hhh  
 253 I: (.) saw: (1.3) the grandfather (.) after:  
 254 M: Mhm?=  
 255 K: =three: days (h) ?

256 (1.0)  
 257 K: Ah [:ah]  
 258 M: [Hoh] really?=  
 259 K: =Yah .hhh(.) so: >↑yeah I didn'-< (.)  
 260 I didn't remember: (.) in detail? ah clearly? .hhh  
 261 K: [but s:o: I (1.0) n:(.) ]  
 262 M: [ ((*sound of typing*)) ]  
 263 K: I gets up(h) (.).hhh in midnight(h)? hhh.hhh  
 264 K: [ and I: ]  
 265 M: [ ((*sound of typing*))/mhm? ]  
 266 K: .hhh (.) saw:: n: my grandfather? hhh.hhh  
 267 in dark room? (0.6) ↑but I didn't(h)=  
 268 M: =mhm?=  
 269 K: =scary: that(h) face? .hhh  
 270 [Yes yeah]  
 271 M: [Ah: you ]didn- you didn't got s- ah you didn't (.)  
 272 get scared.  
 273 K: yah yah yah. .hhh Thank ↓you for [feedba]ck(h)hhh  
 274 M: [°okay°]  
 275 {(1.0)/.hhh}  
 276 K: [ Y a h: ]  
 277 M: [>°(Yeah that's) ]okay?°<  
 278 K: Uhn. .hhh

### 3 Methodological issues

There are three main methodological issues that are salient with respect to this specimen of talk-in-interaction. The first is the issue of the context of the situation and its consequences for the nature of the conversation itself. The two individuals happen to be involved in an interaction with one another because they have been introduced through a transactional online service that was set up to provide, and make a business of, instruction in English conversation. There has been considerable debate about whether or not “authentic conversation” can actually occur in language-focused instructional contexts (e.g., Richards, 2006; Seedhouse, 1996), or indeed any institutional context. As Schegloff (1987) pointed out, the physical location (or technological medium of communication), the setting-related official roles of the participants, or even the intended topic or business, do not ipso facto make these properties-of-setting technically relevant to the talk at any given moment. “It is the talk of the parties that reveals, in the first instance for them, whether or when” these properties are relevant (1987, p. 219). Furthermore, Richards (2006) showed how Seedhouse’s (1996) argument was based on an obscure definition of conversation, and a narrow definition of lesson, and also uses Zimmerman’s (1998) identity framework to categorize four extracts of conversation that took place in a language classroom. The present study has indeed shown, in certain parts of these extracts, that the participants occasionally oriented themselves to their outer-layer “official” situated identities as “conversation coach” and “client/learner”. This may make this particular data unusable for some particular purposes of research, analysis and learning material construction. However, the fact that they also displayed orientations to a range of other identities in their interaction demonstrates an authentic layer of their conversation. Moreover, the proliferation of this kind of online service around the world suggests that it can be regarded as one contemporary setting of human interaction in its own right. Nonetheless, the degree to which they overtly orient to the recording setting at the beginning and end of the recording raises the question of whether this interaction can be regarded simply as interaction between two people, or whether it was affected by their consciousness of possible listeners and readers of



their recording and transcript. Given the increasing necessity of gaining participants' permission in advance to be recorded, this is a somewhat omnipresent issue, and steps need to be taken to encourage participants to be as relaxed as possible about being recorded.

It was confirmed by subsequent personal communication with Ken that, although the recording was audio-only, they did in fact have video streams of each other, and that Maria regularly typed written feedback concerning his language use. Although their recorded interaction was originally intended to be a semi-structured interview, it took place as part of a regular paid-for hourly session, and it is possible that Maria still felt duty-bound as an English conversation instructor to provide Ken with some kind of informative feedback. For analytical purposes, it would have been ideal to include the video streams, and indeed, all on-screen activity, in the data. This would have provided useful information about their use of facial expressions and gestures, what was occupying the participants' attention at any given moment, the content of written messages, and the timing of sending and receiving these messages in relation to the spoken interaction. However, it is doubtful whether comprehensive agreement for the recording of such intimate information could have been obtained.

Ethnomethodological CA focuses exclusively on what was actually heard in the talk in interaction, and other kinds of data, such as the researcher's knowledge of the institutional and cultural context and the participants' identities, comments or descriptions about the interaction by the participants themselves is regarded as unreliable and as a distraction from the main business of discovering how the participants actually demonstrate understanding of each other's utterances and communicative behavior during the real-time interaction itself. However, the canonical findings of ethnomethodological, or "pure" CA as provided by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, Gail Jefferson, Anita Pomerantz and other colleagues are largely based on data involving native English speaking participants, and it is debatable whether these findings can be applied to conversations in all cultural contexts. Moerman (1988) is an example of how CA can be combined with ethnography to take account of cultural factors in communicative norms. ten Have (2007) discusses "pure CA", "applied CA" and other disciplinary agendas at length, including a reference to polemic exchanges between two discursive psychologists (Billig, 1999a; 1999b; Wetherell, 1998) and Schegloff (1998; 1999a; 1999b), in which the former took a "not enough" stance (i.e., CA is useful, but cannot fully answer its own classic question with respect to any given piece of discourse—why this utterance here?), whereas Schegloff made an "at least" argument, namely that, any given piece of discourse should be analyzed on its own terms, at least as a first step, to ensure the CA principle of unmotivated looking. Pomerantz (2005) examines how eliciting post-interaction video-stimulated comments from participants can complement the "pure" interactional analyses. These discussions suggest that there may be a systematic way of combining CA analysis, in its own discrete, encapsulated step, with a later consideration of other perspectives, and possibly other kinds of data.

#### 4 Pedagogical implications

Here we argue that this kind of data and analysis has potential for use in English conversation pedagogy in a number of ways. Firstly, it demonstrates, especially for learners who identify themselves as Japanese, how a Japanese user of English can communicate effectively, enjoyably and successfully in English with a non-Japanese other, through a variety of interactional practices, some of which have been previously acquired, while others can be negotiated locally. In particular, it can demonstrate how repair practices can be used by both parties, not only as ways of overcoming linguistic difficulties, but also as an interactional resource (Jefferson, 1974). Moreover, it can demonstrate how such participants can construct identities for themselves through interaction, and use certain identities as an interactional resource. The participants of this particular interaction did not display any orientations to identities specifically related to users of English as a lingua franca, an absence which has been reported elsewhere (e.g., Jenks, 2013). However, it would not be unreasonable to intuitively speculate that the whole of this recorded conversation came about because of Ken's desire to be a more proficient user of English. Out of the many choices he

had to further improve his language skills, he knowingly sought out and paid for a service that employs a non-native instructor to help him move toward his goal. He was aware that all interactions would be defined by intercultural communication between non-native speakers, and therefore must have concluded that learning English through conversation using English as a lingua franca would be an acceptable option. Pedagogically speaking, this can still be a powerful model for learners of how it is possible to use English for various purposes in a wide range of intercultural contexts.

Secondly, this kind of data can be used in certain educational contexts with specific reference to CA. For example, an extract of this particular specimen was recently used in a short “pedagogical data session” during one lesson of an English conversation course for university students. The lecturer distributed printed handouts of the relevant extract of the transcript and played the relevant section of audio several times. The students made individual observations, discussed their observations in small groups, each small group announced the main objects of their discussions, and finally the lecturer coordinated a whole-class discussion of the interactional features the students had noticed. They pointed out features such as particular kinds of repair, turn construction and topic management. In fact, these students aimed to obtain a school English teacher’s license, and this course involved the students learning about the basic principles of CA in order to raise their awareness of the systems of talk in interaction. The students thus collected and transcribed recordings of their own English conversations, giving oral presentations and writing reports about their analyses and personal reflections. Their final reports demonstrated considerable awareness of the details of moment-to-moment interaction, how they might develop their own interactional competences in English conversation henceforth, and how they might exploit their newly found awareness in a practical way in school English education.

## 5 Conclusion

This paper has focused on one specimen of conversation as an extended piece of discourse, to bring to light the range of CA-related features of interactional practices that might be focused on in future analyses. Future analyses should endeavor to locate multiple instances of particular interactional practices across multiple conversations, and where appropriate, correlate instances of particular interactional practices with the oriented-to contexts in which they occur, and finally to further increase validity through input from multiple analysts.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 26370659. The authors would also like to thank the participants who kindly agreed to be recorded and have their interaction transcribed, analyzed and used in research publications, conference presentations and teaching materials. This specimen was presented at a Conversation Analysis Network (*CAN-Kanto*) “data session” (a regular research seminar at which audio-visual and transcription data are shared and discussed) at Otsuma Women’s University on July 11, 2015, and the insightful comments provided by the attendees were very useful and much appreciated. The authors are additionally grateful to the reviewers for their detailed suggestions. Finally, the authors take responsibility for any remaining shortcomings in the paper.

## References

- Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (1998). Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 1–14). London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Billig, M. (1999a). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 543–558.

- Billig, M. (1999b). Conversation analysis and the claims of naivety. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 572-576.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (Eds.) (1997). *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorisation analysis*. Washington DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language and Society*, 2, 181-199.
- Jefferson, G. (1978). Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 219-248). New York: Academic Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 86-100). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-34). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jenks, C. (2013). Are you an ELF? The relevance of ELF as an equitable social category in online intercultural communication. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 13(1), 95-108.
- Kasper, G., & Omori, M. (2010). Language and culture. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 492-527). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2008). Language ecology in multilingual settings: Towards a theory of symbolic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4), 645-671.
- Mauranen, A. & Ranta, E. (Eds.). (2009). *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Maynard, D., & Zimmerman, D. (1984). Topical talk, ritual and the social organization of relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47(4), 301-316.
- Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (2005). Using participants' video-stimulated comments to complement analyses of interactional practices. In H. te Molder & J. Potter (Eds.), *Conversation and cognition* (pp. 93-113). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, K. (2006). 'Being the teacher': Identity and classroom conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 51-77.
- Ryave, A. L. (1978). On the achievement of a series of stories. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 113-132). New York: Academic Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*, (2 vols., edited by G. Jefferson). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1978). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 7-56). New York: Academic Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Between micro and macro: Contexts and other connections. In J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Münch, and N. J. Smelser (Eds.), *The micro-macro link* (pp. 207-34). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Vol 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Reply to Wetherell. *Discourse & Society*, 9, 413-16.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1999a). "Schegloff's texts" as "Billig's data": A critical reply. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 558-72.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1999b). Naivety vs. sophistication or discipline vs. self-indulgence: A rejoinder to Billig. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 577-82.
- Schenkein, J. (1978). Identity negotiations in conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 57-78). New York: Academic Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (1996). Classroom interaction: Possibilities and impossibilities. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 16-24.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 2-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and poststructuralism in

dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9, 387-412.

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

Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Identity, context and interaction. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 87-106). London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

#### Appendix: CA Transcription Symbols Used

Transcription Symbol	Meaning	Transcription Symbol	Meaning
↑ or ↓	shifts into especially high or low pitch	?	interrogative-like rising intonation at the end of an utterance
.	affirmative-like falling intonation at the end of an utterance	,	continuing intonation
.hhh	A row of h's with a dot in front of it indicates an inbreath, without the dot an outbreath.	::	prolongation of immediately prior sound (more :: = longer stretching)
<u>Underline</u>	some unusually marked form of stress (pitch and/or volume; longer = heavier)	[ ]	Overlapping speech: Left is the onset of overlap; right is the end.
UPPER-CASE LETTERS	especially loud relative to the surrounding talk.	°word°	quieter than the surrounding talk
>word<	faster speech, compared to surrounding talk	<word>	slower speech, compared to surrounding talk
(1.4)	elapsed time of a pause or gap (in seconds)	(.)	a brief interval ( $\pm 0.1s$ ) within or between utterances
=	no break or gap (or to emphasize continuity of talk by a single speaker across breaks in the transcript)	((comment))	transcriber's descriptions
( ) or (word)	The transcriber could not hear, or was uncertain about what was said.	wor(h)d	plosiveness, often associated with laughter, crying, coughing, etc.
All of the above symbol uses are based on Jefferson (2004, pp. 24-31)			
{ (°hhh) / (0.2) }	"Curly braces are sometimes used to indicate the duration of a breath or other sound when its effect can be heard as a pause or gap of silence" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 269).		