Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (2002) **22**, 3–31. Printed in the USA.
Copyright © 2002 Cambridge University Press 0267-1905/01 $9.50

1. CONVERSATION ANALYSIS AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS[1]

Emanuel A. Schegloff, Irene Koshik, Sally Jacoby, and David Olsher

Conversation Analysis (CA) as a mode of inquiry is addressed to all forms of talk and other conduct in interaction, and, accordingly, touches on the concerns of applied linguists at many points. This review sketches and offers bibliographical guidance on several of the major relevant areas of conversation-analytic work—turn-taking, repair, and word selection—and indicates past or potential points of contact with applied linguistics. After covering these areas, we include a brief discussion of some key themes in CA's treatment of talk in institutional contexts. Finally, we discuss several established areas of applied linguistic work in which conversation analytic work is being explored—native, nonnative, and multilingual talk; talk in educational institutions; grammar and interaction; intercultural communication and comparative CA; and implications for designing language teaching tasks, materials, and assessment tasks. We end with some cautions on applying CA findings to other applied linguistic research contexts.

Its name to the contrary notwithstanding, "conversation analysis" (CA) is not concerned with conversation alone. The term "conversation analysis" as used here refers specifically to what some have referred to as "ethnomethodological conversation analysis," a line of work whose earliest contributions are often identified with authors such as Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson, Pomerantz, and others, and not to the literatures also sometimes referred to by that name (or by the term "conversational analysis") associated with such authors as Grice, Gumperz, Hatch, Tannen, and others—some in the applied linguistics community—whose declared intent is to describe conversational uses of language. CA's broader provenance extends to the study of talk and other forms of conduct (including the disposition of the body in gesture, posture, facial expression, and ongoing activities in the setting) in all forms of talk in interaction. To be sure, work so far has suggested that talk in ordinary conversation is the locus of the basic or default practices of talk in interaction, and that talk in specific institutional or functionally specified

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contexts is often characterized by describable modifications of those organizations of practice. But wherever humans engage in talk in interaction, or in interaction in which talk can spontaneously "break out," there will be an orientation by the participants to the practices of talking in interaction. Understanding interaction in such settings can be enhanced by the findings of conversation analysis, and by the research practices underlying those findings. This is to say that "CA" refers to not only a corpus of findings and accounts of talk-in-interaction, but also—perhaps preeminently—to a method of inquiry, one addressed to distinctive data and embodying a distinctive research stance.

A substantial proportion of the research and professional preoccupations of applied linguists and of applied linguistics falls into the domain for which CA resources are well-suited. Whether the area is the properties of native and nonnative language use in a variety of settings and contexts, the organization of discourse and interaction in the classroom and in other pedagogic settings in which teaching and learning are meant to occur, the assessment of such learning, or the like, much of what makes up the substance of these professional and research domains is found in the real world in situations of talk in interaction. Applied linguists can therefore potentially benefit from bringing the resources and tools of conversation analysis to bear on those domains which engage their interest and professional concerns—whether in conversation or in institutionally specific talk. This chapter offers analytical and bibliographical guidance on a few main areas of CA work, and examines their past and potential future intersection with phenomena, problems, and settings of distinctive interest to an applied linguistic constituency. The sections that follow next begin by sketching areas of conversation analytic work and some of their prime bibliographical resources and then suggest areas of potential intersection with applied linguistics. Then we take up some long-standing areas of interest in applied linguistics and suggest some ways in which conversation analytic resources might prove fruitful for them, along with some exemplars of work where this promise may already be bearing fruit.

Some Fundamental Aspects of the Organization of Conversation

Whether speaking their native language or another, whether fluently or not, whether to another or others doing the same or not, whether in ordinary conversation or in a classroom or in the work place or in some other institutionally or functionally specialized situation, there are certain issues all participants in talk-in-interaction will find themselves dealing with. They will, for example, need some way of organizing the order of their participation—usually one person speaking at a time (turn-taking). They will fashion their contributions to be recognizable as some unit of participation—some "turn-constructional unit" (turn organization). They will have practices for forming their talk so as to accomplish one or more recognizable actions (action formation). They will deploy resources for making the succession of contributions cohere somehow, either topically or by

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contributing to the realization of a trajectory of action or interaction (sequence organization). They will avail themselves of practices for dealing with problems in speaking, hearing and/or understanding the talk (the organization of repair). They will select and deploy and understand the words used to compose the talk, and will do that in a timely fashion (word/usage selection). They will do all of this with an eye to their co-participants (recipient design) and to the occasion and context, its normative parameters or boundaries of duration, appropriate activities and their order, etc., (overall structural organization of the occasion of interaction). All of the preceding, and others, compose the preoccupations and major topical areas of Conversation Analysis. It is the premise of this chapter that many of the topics and concerns which preoccupy applied linguists intersect these aspects of the organization of interaction and are shaped by them. The remainder of this section will sketch several of these areas with bibliographical citations, and suggest their potential bearing on applied linguistic interests. Ensuing sections start from the applied linguistic end and touch on work which has drawn on conversation analytic resources.

To begin with, however, it will be worthwhile to underscore a single underlying premise of this work which should be relevant to applied linguists as well. People use language and concomitant forms of conduct to *do* things, not only to transmit information; their talk and other conduct *does* things, and *is taken as doing things*—things such as requesting, offering, complaining, inviting, asking, telling, correcting, and the myriad other actions which talk in interaction can accomplish. By "actions" here we are not referring to physical actions but to ones accomplished through the talk; and we are referring not only to actions with familiar vernacular names like those just mentioned, but recognizable and describable actions without such names (such as "confirming allusions," cf. Schegloff, 1996c). Understanding analytically what action is (or actions are) being done by some unit of talk is not accessible to casual inspection and labeling; it requires examination of actual specimens of naturally occurring talk in interaction and analysis of what they are designed to accomplish by their speakers and understood to have accomplished by their recipients, and what practices implement that design. (This stance toward action is, accordingly, quite distinct from that of speech act theory; cf. Schegloff, 1988a, 1992a, 1992b).

The practices of talking in interaction are grounded jointly in dealing with the contingencies of managing to sustain talking together as an orderly arena of action, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the contingencies of producing and recognizing determinate actions, combinations of actions and sequences of actions. For those trying to understand a bit of talk, the key question about any of its aspects is—w*hy that now* (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973)? What is getting done by virtue of that bit of conduct, done that way, in just that place? This is, in the first instance, the central issue *for the parties to the talk*—both for its construction and for its understanding. And for that reason, it is the central issue for

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

academic/professional students of the talk. If we are to understand language in its contexts of deployment, we need in the first instance to understand how and for what it is deployed by its participants, and how its deployments are understood by them and reflected in their own responsive conduct. The CA literature to which we refer the reader should be appreciated and assessed by reference to this criterion. The examination of empirical materials of interest to applied linguists should be guided by this question: what interactional project, what action that composes it, does some bit of talk embody and exemplify? All the organizations of practice discussed below are meant to provide resources for dealing with this question.

Turn-Taking

The practices of turn-taking organize distribution of opportunities to talk among parties to interaction and constrain the size of turns, by making the possible completion of a turn "transition-relevant." This interactive dimension—in which possible completion can (but need not always) occasion or trigger the start of a next turn by another—has consequences for speakers' construction of turns, and thereby for the form which turns (and their building blocks, "turn-constructional units") take. The main bibliographical resources in this area are Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) on turn-taking and Schegloff (1982, 1996a) on turn organization, but see also Sacks, 1992, Jefferson (1973, 1984), Lerner (1991, 1996, in press) and Schegloff (1999a, 2000a, 2001a).

Of the many ways turn-taking and turn organization should matter to applied linguists, we mention only one here. The unmarked value of the transition space is one beat of silence; that is, after possible completion of a turn, a next speaker ordinarily allows one beat of silence to pass before starting a next turn (Jefferson, 1984); departures from that value (shorter or longer) are potentially marked and import-laden. One place where trouble can become apparent—for example, trouble in understanding—is in longer silences at the transition space. Furthermore, depending on the character of the turn which the silence follows, silence can be taken as incipient rejection of, or disalignment from, what preceded it (Pomerantz, 1984; Sacks, 1987; Schegloff, 1988b, 1995). This can be problematic for those with delayed understanding or impaired capacity to start a next turn "on time," and this is one place where orientation to nonnativeness can be invoked, for example, to discount the rejection-implication of delayed next turn start (e.g., Carroll, 2000).

Repair

The practices of repair constitute the major (though not the sole) resource for parties to talk-in-interaction for displaying that they are dealing with trouble or problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding the talk. The main

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

bibliographical resources are Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977); Schegloff (1979, 1987, 1992c, 1997a, 1997b, 2000b); and Jefferson (1974, 1987).

Three points are worth special emphasis in explicating CA's treatment of this area, so apparently relevant to diverse applied linguistic interests:

1. The practices of repair at issue for CA are discursive and interactional, not cognitive. Initiating repair is an action or a move in interaction, one which claims a problem; that is so whatever may cognitively be the case. Displaying a delay before a next word is a move in interaction, quite distinct from some delay in the "speech planning process."

2. The courses of conduct treated as "repair" in CA involve the parties stopping the course of action otherwise in progress—whether turn or sequence or activity—to address a trouble/problem of speaking, hearing or understanding the talk, and resuming that course of action upon completion of the repair segment (either with success in dealing with the trouble or with failure). Undertakings to deal with trouble en passant, without stopping the ongoing activity to do so, are empirically different in various respects (cf. Jefferson, 1987), and are distinct from repair organization.

3. Note in particular the phrase "understanding *the talk*" which appears recurrently in accounts of repair. This is meant to discriminate dealing with problems of understanding the talk (ordinarily the just-preceding talk) from other problems of understanding (e.g., understanding the events, conduct, etc., being described, as compared to understanding the talk describing them).

The importance of points (2) and (3) comes to a focus in one area which is very likely of special interest to applied linguists, and that is talk in pedagogical contexts—whether in formal classrooms or otherwise organized. In such settings, explaining and understanding are very likely to constitute the main line of activity occupying the talk, and problems of understanding and dealing with such problems are endogenous to the core activities of the setting. In language teaching classrooms, trouble in speaking and correcting that trouble may similarly constitute the main line of activity, and not a departure from it. Discriminating the main trajectory of the interaction from temporary suspension of it for repair can be far less clear than in other, nonpedagogical settings. Yet this is crucial for the application of this domain of CA's resources to be warranted. Not every correction is *repair*; not every problem in understanding implicates the operations

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of *repair* for its solution (cf. Koshik, 2001a). Classroom and other overtly pedagogical settings are not necessarily the most inviting settings, or the most relevant ones, for the application of conversation-analytic work on repair. What settings might appeal more?

Among several prima facie candidates we may mention here only a few. What is treated in applied linguistics (as elsewhere) as "fluency/disfluency" refers in substantial measure to a speaker's same-turn self-repair initiation and other problems of progressivity—that is, the practice of "progressing" or advancing the utterance being produced (Schegloff, 1979). What disrupts "fluency" are cut-offs (or self-interruptions), sound stretches, delay markers (such as "uh") and pauses, repeats of earlier said items, and the like. Many of these figure in CA treatments of "same-turn repair," which is not to say that they should all be treated as repair initiators, but does suggest the possibility of useful interchange. Applied linguists often have to deal with trouble in understanding a speaker's talk—the sources of that trouble, ways of displaying that there is trouble, ways of displaying what the trouble is, and ways of undertaking to resolve it. Here CA work on other-initiated repair can be a resource (cf. Schegloff, 2000b; Wong, 2000a), as can work on repair in which already displayed problematic understandings are addressed (cf. Schegloff, 1992c).

Word Selection

The final area of CA work which can be taken up here is that of word selection by speakers in the course of talk in interaction. There are two main lines of inquiry in this area. One examines the deployment of words or multiword usages by reference to other words or usages in the immediate environments of the talk—for example, for its "punning" relationship to that talk (Sacks, 1973) or its sound relationship to the surrounding talk, which can, it appears, even induce mis-speakings (Jefferson, 1996). The other line of work examines the practices for referring within semantic domains, such as person reference, place reference (Schegloff, 1972), measurement formulations (Sacks, 1989), etc. The discussion below is focused on reference to persons; the main bibliographic resources are Sacks (1972a, 1972b, 1992 passim); Schegloff (1991, 1996b, 1997c, 1999b, 1999c, 2001a); and Sacks and Schegloff (1979).

Two aspects of the work in CA on word selection, and person reference in particular, may be of special interest and relevance to applied linguists. First, work on person reference has brought to explicit notice various practices that inform fluent, idiomatic, "competent" language use, but which have no established place in linguistic or pragmatic description, and therefore may easily escape pedagogical attention. For example, there is a preference for "recognitional" reference if possible; that is, if a recipient is figured by a speaker to know the person to be referred to, the speaker should do the reference in a fashion that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

invites and enables such recognition (i.e., by personal name or other recognitional descriptor fitted to the terms of the recipient's recognition of the referent, e.g., "the person sitting next to you;" cf. Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996b). Failure to do so when the recipient was known to be acquainted with the referent can be understood as "withholding." Such practices of talk-in-interaction might well be a proper part of the teaching of a language.

The second point bears on the very conduct of applied linguistic research and discourse itself. As early as the mid-1960s Sacks pointed out that referring to persons by category terms—male/female, child/adult, American/Canadian/ Egyptian/Italian/ Kenyan/ Korean/Russian..., native/nonnative speaker—can be profoundly equivocal (Sacks, 1972a, 1972b,1992; Schegloff, 1991). Since every person who is a member of some category in one of these sets is also a member of a category in each of the other sets, referring to someone as "a woman" is not warranted simply by being, in fact, a woman; that "someone" is also an adult, a native speaker, and the like. The issue is not only factuality; it is *relevance*. (In fact, factuality turns out not always to be required.) When a speaker in conversation refers to someone by a category term, we can then cogently ask—we *need* to ask—what made that category a relevant one for the speaker to use in that context? What was being *done* thereby? The fact that the referent is actually a member of that category is not sufficient; people are actually members of many categories.

And the same issue arises for academic or professional researchers; referring to people being studied by category terms cannot be sufficiently warranted by their actually being members of those categories; the relevance of the categories being used has to be warranted. And for many purposes, the pertinent relevance is *not relevance to the investigator*, but *relevance to the persons being categorized while engaged in the activities being studied*. The emergent issue for applied linguists, then, is: when is it warranted to characterize the persons being discussed as "native" or "nonnative" speakers of the language? When do they—the objects of inquiry—orient to these category memberships? How should that bear on and constrain the usage by the applied linguistic researcher (cf. Hosoda, 2001)?

We have omitted from this part of the chapter some of the most central areas of conversation-analytic inquiry—in particular, sequence organization (Schegloff, 1990, 1995) and the analysis of the formation or construction of actions organized into the sequences which are described in sequence organization (on action formation, cf. inter alia, Drew, 1984; Heritage, 1998; Jefferson, 1993; Pomerantz, 1980; Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 1988c:118–31, 1996c, 1997b). These are no less important to the chapter than the topics which we have addressed, only less tractable to compressed treatment. Their importance extends the point just made in the preceding paragraph. What figures most centrally for the persons

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whose language use we study and hope to contribute to is what they get done by talking, and what they understand about what their interlocutors are getting done. Those actions, organized into interactionally co-produced trajectories of action, are what talk-in-interaction is all about. Language control is relevant to the achievement of actions and the understanding of the actions of others—what are they doing by saying what they're saying and saying it in that way? How can I do what I want to do? Applied linguists might wish to consider focusing on these themes to get to the heart of talking in interaction, just as they should consider the importance of getting at which categories of participation are relevant to the parties who are participating, not to those who are studying the participation. These are issues of disciplined inquiry in the human or social sciences more generally, not limited to applied linguistics. But they apply to applied linguistics as well.

Talk in Institutional Contexts

From the beginning, CA has included in its research data material from so-called institutional settings, such as a suicide prevention hotline (Sacks, 1972a, 1992), group therapy sessions with adolescents (Sacks, 1992), or calls to the police (Schegloff, 1967, 1968), though the practices analyzed were, for the most part, not distinctively institutional ones. Subsequent work has examined talk in a variety of institutional or functionally specialized settings, such as legal settings (e.g., Atkinson & Drew, 1979; Drew, 1992; Manzo, 1993; Maynard, 1984), broadcast media (e.g., Clayman, 1992; Clayman & Heritage, in press; Greatbatch, 1988, 1992; Heritage, 1985; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991), business organizations (e.g., Atkinson, Cuff, & Lee, 1978; Boden, 1994), pedagogical settings (e.g., Koshik, in press a, b; Lerner, 1995; Mori, 2002; Olsher, 2001), research work groups (e.g., Jacoby, 1998c, Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991, in press), medical settings (e.g., Heritage & Maynard, in press; Heritage & Stivers, 1999; Lutfey & Maynard, 1998; Robinson, 1998), emergency dispatch centers (e.g., Whalen & Zimmerman, 1987; Whalen, Zimmerman & Whalen, 1988; Zimmerman, 1984, 1992), airport operations rooms (e.g., Goodwin, 1996; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1996), and counseling sessions (e.g., Peräkylä, 1993, 1995; He, 1995, 1998b), among others.

The key point about talk in such "special" contexts is that one cannot properly understand how the parties come to talk as they do and to understand one another as they do without making reference to special features to which they are oriented—whether legal constraints as, for example, in the case of broadcast news interviews (cf. Heritage, 1985; or Clayman, 1988, 1992, on "neutralism"), or organizational and functional ones, as, for example, in some classroom settings, etc. Institutional talk has often been of special interest to applied linguists because of the bearing of such special contextual features on the special populations with which applied linguists are concerned—as, for example, with second language learners targeted at a special purpose usage, a special purpose which can impinge and have a bearing on how talk in such settings is organized.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We limit ourselves here to only a few points about CA's treatment of such specialized environments of talk-in-interaction. (Among the main bibliographic sources here are Drew and Heritage, 1992b, and Heritage and Greatbatch, 1991.)

First, conversation-analytically speaking, the sheer fact that the physical environment or social occasion in which talk is conducted can be characterized as a courtroom, a hospital, or a TV studio does not render that talk "institutional." As with the earlier mentioned categorization of individuals, it is the *relevance* and *procedural consequentiality* (Schegloff, 1991) of that character (qua courtroom, hospital, etc.) to the participants, manifested in the talk, which underlies its potential bearing on their production and understanding of the talk; if they are not oriented to it, it cannot be shown to be implicated in their construction of the interactional activity For example, in a famous broadcast interview in the late 1980s, an interviewer's interaction with a presidential candidate turned into a verbal confrontation mid-course, though the physical setting and public identities remained constant. But as their practices of talking changed, they progressively showed that they were no longer treating that physical and social context as procedurally consequential for their conduct of the talk (Clayman & Whalen, 1988/89; Schegloff, 1988/89). Treating episodes of talk in interaction as "institutional" involves showing how that institutional character is embodied—is "done"—in the details of the talk and other conduct. As Heritage and Greatbatch (1991) suggest, where a distinctive turn-taking organization (or other such omnipresent organization) is involved, the sheer turn-by-turn development of the talk displays the parties' orientation to the institutional character of the interaction, as in news interviews or courtrooms; in its absence, discrete practices of talking need to be elucidated to warrant the characterization of the interaction as relevantly institutional.

Second, there is no sharp segregation between the practices of ordinary talk and interaction and the practices of talk in institutional settings. People engage in ordinary conversation in institutional settings, e.g., when coworkers chat around the water cooler or intersperse bits of ordinary conversation in the course of task-related institutional interaction, talk which commonly has a bearing on the setting's "business," but which is organized by the practices of ordinary conversation. Institutional activities which have distinctive "speech exchange systems" (Sacks et al., 1974) can also transform themselves into everyday activities, as in the case of the news interview just described or when classroom group work or a business meeting or group therapy session goes off task and turns into small talk. Likewise, specific conversational practices, such as the sequential organization of searching for a word (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986), can emerge in the course of a spate of institutional talk, such as a teacher's grammar explanation during an ESL writing conference (Koshik, in press a). General conversational practices can also be deployed to serve institutionally specific purposes, e.g., when teachers use repair initiation as a pedagogical prompt to get students to self-correct their own language

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

errors, even when the teachers experienced no problem in hearing or understanding the student's talk (Koshik, in press a). And specialized institutional practices of talk (what Levinson, 1979, terms "activity types") can also be deployed (and can be topicalized as such) in everyday settings in order to accomplish specialized tasks. For example, parents can "interrogate" their teenager when she asks for an increase in allowance or comes home after curfew, or can make use of "display question" sequences in the course of reading a storybook to a toddler. Of relevance to applied linguists is the implication that communicative competence includes knowing, to various degrees, when, how, with whom, and when not to use both conversational and institutional practices of talk and interaction in both institutional and noninstitutional settings, and understanding what is being done by users of these various practices in both kinds of settings.

As noted, there do appear to be distinctive practices for various aspects of talk in institutional contexts, which generally involve a reduction and specialization of practices, fitted to the character and focal activities of the institutional setting (Drew & Heritage, 1992a). But much of the talk in institutional settings is the product of the practices of talk in ordinary contexts; resolving overlapping talk, the practices of repair, word selection by reference to recipient design, the practices of turn and sequence construction, and many other practices figure in institutional settings in much the same way as they do in everyday conversation. So the default analytic orientation needs to be to address "institutional" data in much the same way as one addresses talk in unspecialized contexts, while being alert to modifications best understood by reference to participants' orientation to the particular circumstances and constraints of the occasion, whether institutional or functional in character. Limiting one's interest and analytic tool kit only to institutional talk, to a particular domain of institutional talk, or only to practices of everyday conversation can result in missing the complexity of all kinds of talk and interaction and in restricting particular findings to one domain or the other.

CA Research in Areas of Interest to Applied Linguists

This section will focus on specific areas of intersection between applied linguistics and recent CA and CA-informed research. One type of intersection concerns CA and CA-informed research on talk-in-interaction in various contexts, including nonnative talk and talk in educational contexts, which are of special interest to applied linguists. The second intersection concerns ways in which CA research on talk-in-interaction has the potential to inform various domains of interest to applied linguists, such as grammar, intercultural communication, and language pedagogy.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Native, Nonnative, and Multilingual Talk

From the seminal work of Dell Hymes (1972) onward, there has been an ongoing interest among applied linguists in *communicative competence* as a conceptual frame for the range of skills and knowledges involved in understanding and participating in the use of language to accomplish social actions (e.g., Bachman, 1990; Canale, 1983; Canale and Swain, 1980; and Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell, 1995). As a field of sociology, CA has been concerned with describing the interactional practices that are competences of ordinary conversation (Heritage, 1984b). From an applied linguistic perspective, Markee (2000) argues for the importance of *interactional competence* as a collaborative, socially constituted domain of communicative competence that includes practices such as turn-taking and repair. Since CA research is theoretically and methodologically grounded as a study of publicly observable phenomena, the view of competence it supports is one of situated practices rather than psycholinguistic models of learning processes and knowledge structures (Jacoby & McNamara, 1999). CA and CA-informed studies which investigate the conversational competence of second language speakers can help us to understand how the categories of native (NS) and nonnative (NNS) speaker are understood by participants and what practices are specific to this talk as it occurs in natural, as opposed to experimental, settings (Wagner, 1996).

Conversation analytic studies have the potential to bring some clarity to the problematic categories of "native" and "nonnative" speaker. Researchers from a number of different perspectives have either questioned the native–nonnative speaker distinction or challenged the ways in which these categories have been interpreted (e.g., Firth & Wagner, 1997; Kachru & Nelson, 1996; Kasper, 1997). Firth and Wagner's (1997) critique of second language acquisition methodology sparked a fruitful scholarly debate in the *Modern Language Journal* (1997, 1998), centered in part around how these categories are interpreted. Even if it were possible to objectively define these categories, from a conversation analytic perspective the relevance of one's nonnative speaker status may at times be demonstrably oriented to by the use of special practices of talk on the part of the "native" or the "nonnative" speakers, and at other times language expertise and nativeness may be virtually irrelevant (cf. Hosoda, 2001; Jacoby & Gonzales, in press; Jacoby & McNamara, 1999).

At least to some extent, conversation analytic studies of talk involving "nonnative speakers" can reveal that identities related to nativeness and nonnativeness, such as expert and novice language speakers, are locally constituted within the ongoing communication. In studying this talk, we can come to understand how participants themselves understand and express native/nonnative identities, and what special practices of talk may be involved. Hosoda (2001), for example, describes various practices of repair (as well as their nondeployment) that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

display participants' orientation at that moment to the relevance of relative competence in the language, and thereby provide a data-internal warrant for the use of terms such as "native/nonnative speaker" as relevant characterizations of the parties. Such a demonstration of the possibility of empirically warranting such characterizations presents an invitation and challenge to others to address the same or similar issues.

Since the early work by Jordan and Fuller (1975), Gaskill (1980) and Schwartz (1980), CA and CA-informed studies of naturally-occurring nonnative talk have more recently begun to expand in focus and number, including an edited volume of such studies currently in preparation (Gardner & Wagner, 2001). Researchers have looked at NNS-NNS, or *lingua franca,* talk (e.g., Carroll, 2000; Firth, 1996; Wagner 1996) and NS-NNS talk (e.g. Hosoda, 2000; Wong, 2000 a,b) involving both 'native' and 'nonnative' speakers. Two studies which, together, compared interactional phenomena in 'native' and 'nonnative' discourse are Wong's (2000a) study of delayed next turn repair-initiations found in the nonnative English talk of Mandarin speakers, and Schegloff's (2000b) companion article which investigated occurrences of the practice in ordinary, "native" English talk.

Talk in Educational Institutions

A small but increasing amount of CA and CA-informed research on talk in educational institutions directly addresses issues of interest to applied linguists. Markee (2000) explains how this research "can help refine insights into how the structure of conversation can be used by learners as a means of getting comprehended input and producing comprehended output" (p. 44). Markee's (1994, 1995) and Ohta's (2001) work, informed by both CA and discourse analysis and, in Ohta's case, set within a sociocognitive framework, point to possible new avenues of exploration for SLA research. Willey (2001) adds to our understanding of communication strategies by analyzing what researchers have called "appeals for assistance" as used in naturally-occurring classroom talk. He shows how "appeals" that occur during word searches embedded within a student's turn at talk differ from those used to initiate a new sequence.

Even though CA methodology may be appropriate to answer some existing applied linguistic questions, most CA research, including some research on talk in educational institutions, is not built to answer theoretically motivated research questions of the type that applied linguists often ask. However, applied linguists may also usefully be informed by this research, as it addresses issues of how talk in educational contexts is organized, how particular goal-oriented actions are accomplished through this talk, and ways that this talk differs from ordinary conversation and from talk in other educational contexts. Recent CA research on L2 pedagogy has explored a variety of practices. Lerner (1995) focuses on the use

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of incomplete turn-constructional units to structure participation by students in a bilingual elementary school classroom. Koshik (in press a,b) analyzes the functions of particular teacher question types in ESL writing conferences. Mori (2002) studies how instructional design affects ways in which students' talk develops in a Japanese language classroom. Olsher (2001) describes the uses language learners make of special practices for combining talk and gesture in order to facilitate small-group interaction in an EFL class. CA work on other school contexts encountered by language learners includes physics research team interactions (Jacoby & Gonzales, in press), language institute front-desk encounters (Kidwell, 2000), and academic counseling sessions (Guthrie, 1997; He, 1994, 1995, 1998b).

CA research can also illuminate what is going on in particular interactional L2 assessment encounters, not only so as to monitor interrater reliability and potential contamination of oral proficiency scores by interaction with the examiner, but also to discover routine and unique communication practices through which participants co-construct the assessment format itself as well as the actions these practices accomplish (Egbert, 1998; He, 1998a; Marlaire & Maynard, 1990; Lazaraton, 1991, 1997; McNamara, Hill, & May, this volume; Riggenbach, 1998; Young, this volume).

Grammar and Interaction

Despite its origins in sociology, CA research has always had a keen interest in the lexical and grammatical details of everyday and institutional talk. From the syntactic typology of turn-constructional units (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), through discussions of reference terms for persons (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Schegloff, 1996b), lexical phenomena such as "and"-prefacing (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994), "okay" (Beach, 1993, 1995), "uh-huh" (Schegloff, 1982), "yeah" and "mm hm" (Jefferson, 1984), "oh" (Heritage, 1984a), and "actually" (Clift, 1999, 2001), reported speech (Golato, 2000, in press, a, b; Holt, 1996), and the collaborative construction of one turn unit by more than one participant (Lerner, 1991, 1996), CA treats grammar and lexical choices as sets of resources which participants deploy, monitor, interpret, and manipulate as they design turns, sort out turn-taking, co-construct utterances and sequences, manage intersubjectivity and (dis)agreement, accomplish actions, and negotiate interpersonal trajectories as real-time talk and interaction unfold (e.g., Ford, 1993; Ford, Fox, & Thompson, in press, Ford & Wagner, 1996; Fox, 1987; Goodwin, 1979, 1986; Hayashi, 1999, in press; He & Tsoneva, 1998; Heritage & Roth, 1995; Ochs, Schegloff, & Thompson, 1996; Schegloff, 1972, 1979, 1990; Selting & Couper-Kuhlen, in press). Recently, the number of studies has begun to expand and benefit not only from the insights of scholars rooted in CA studies of language use, but also from scholars rooted in linguistic traditions of analysis who have embraced a CA perspective, in some instances under the rubric "interactional

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

linguistics." These scholars discuss not only ways in which 'grammar organizes social interaction,' but also ways in which 'social interaction organizes grammar' and how grammar, itself, can be seen as a mode of social interaction (Schegloff, Ochs, & Thompson, 1996).

Intercultural Communication and Comparative CA

Another area of research where conversation analysis offers the potential for a useful contribution is the study of intercultural communication and interlanguage pragmatics. While much research on interlanguage pragmatics (e.g., Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993) has been based on data collected with written "discourse completion" surveys, there has been a call for increased attention to the sequential organization (Kasper & Dahl, 1991) of practices with which participants carry out social action through talk. CA studies of speaking practices across languages and cultures can provide a basis for comparison of L2, or language learner, speaking practices with native speaker norms in both L1 and L2. There is an expanding body of research using conversation analysis to study talk-in-interaction in a variety of languages, including German (Egbert, 1996, 1997a, b; Golato, 2000, in press a, b, c), Finnish (Sorjonen, 1996, 2001, in press a, b); Swedish (Lindström, 1994, 1997, 1999); Japanese (Hayashi, 1999, in press; Hayashi, Mori, & Takagi, in press; Tanaka, 1999), Mandarin (Wu, 1997, 2000); Korean (Kim, 1999a, 1999b, 2001a, 2001b; Park, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1999, in press; Suh & Kim, 2001); findings from such studies may inform our understanding of the mother-tongue practices of learners of English from various linguistic backgrounds. Golato (in press c), for example, noted similarities and differences in responses to compliments in English and German, and there is a substantial literature on commonalities and differences between societies in the ways in which conversational openings on the telephone are organized (Godard, 1977; Hopper, 1992; Hopper & Koleilat-Doany,1989; Hopper & Chen, 1996; Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1991; Lindström, 1994; Park, in press; Schegloff, 1968, 1979, 1986, 1993, 2002a, b, c, in press).

However, a caution remains in considering ways that conversation analysis might contribute to interlanguage pragmatics research. While CA studies sequences of actions carried out through naturally-occurring talk based on instances found in the data, interlanguage pragmatics begins with a linguistic pragmatic inventory of speech acts, defined according to speakers' intent, and then looks for the instances of these categories. A strict application of CA to interlanguage pragmatic research may not be wholly appropriate. On the other hand, CA work on familiar social actions such as invitations (Davidson, 1984; Drew, 1984), complaints (Schegloff, 1988a), disputes (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1990), and assessments (Pomerantz, 1984), or unfamiliar actions such as "confirming allusions" (Schegloff, 1996c), as well as work on other aspects of social action and sequential organization of talk-in-interaction such as conversational openings and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

closings (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973), story tellings and participation of recipients (Goodwin, 1984; Jefferson, 1978; Sacks, 1974; Schegloff, 1997d), may offer a broader construal of interlanguage pragmatics as a basis for future research in this field.

Implications of CA Research for Design of Language Teaching Tasks, Materials, and Assessment

CA research has obvious implications for the design of tasks and materials based on "authentic" talk from ordinary conversation and from a wide range of real-life institutional settings in which L2 learners are likely to be involved, both as professionals and as clients. Textbooks using invented dialogue based on intuitions of how certain language functions are accomplished do not always offer students accurate knowledge of language use. Wong's (1984, 2002) research on phone conversations in ESL textbooks exemplifies this discrepancy between textbook language and naturally-occurring talk. She found that most of the ESL text phone conversations which she studied were inaccurate and misleading, both in terms of their organization and the preferences which are displayed in the talk. Wong's research also suggests a fruitful direction for further applied linguistic research. Especially where learners' languages differ, e.g., not all languages share the American English preference for recognition over identification in phone conversations (see citations in the preceding section), it is especially important that textbooks accurately convey how these practices are done in the L2.

CA research on institutional talk also has implications for the design of syllabi, tasks, and materials for learning Language for Specific Purposes (Jacoby, 1998a, 1998b, 2001; Koshik, 2000). Competent and successful special purpose communication is a challenge for anyone, NS or NNS, professional expert or novice, lay person or client. Since most CA research on institutional discourse is not explicitly concerned with NNSs or with externally evaluating and isolating instructable aspects of professional communication, applied linguists and LSP practitioners may need to create their own thoughtful and specific bridges between the findings of CA research and the content of particular LSP courses and materials.

CA research can also inform the design of L2 assessment tasks (e.g., role-plays) as well as clarify the pluses and minuses of particular testing formats (e.g., role-play, group discussion, face-to-face interview, or candidate talking to tape-recorded prompts). CA research also raises fundamental issues regarding the positing of appropriate assessment criteria and the interactional processes through which assessment criteria are applied and negotiated not only by insider members in their own indigenous formal and informal assessment activities but also by outsider language testing experts when actually engaged in the categorizing,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

judging, and rating of particular communication performances in formal assessment settings (Jacoby, 2001; Jacoby & McNamara, 1999).

Cautions in Applying CA Findings

We end this section with a caution about applying findings extracted from conversation analysis literature to other research contexts. CA analyses are grounded on recurrent patterns of talk studied with detailed attention to the specific sequential contexts in which these practices are found. Specific findings should not be used to categorize talk in other settings without investigating whether similar practices are used to accomplish similar actions in the new setting. This is especially relevant for those investigating institutional contexts such as classrooms. As we have seen, CA research on institutional talk, including pedagogical talk, has shown that, although conversational practices of talk are used in institutional settings, both for conversational and institutional purposes, many of the practices of talk in institutional settings have been developed to meet institution-specific goals and are specific to the settings in which they are used. Even small variations in the way a particular turn is designed can reflect the actions these turns are being used to accomplish (Koshik, in press a). Conversely, similarly-formed turns can accomplish different actions in different contexts and even in different sequential contexts within one setting (Koshik, 2001b). These actions can only be discovered by a close, turn-by-turn sequential analysis of the talk. It is therefore especially important that researchers of talk investigate individual practices for what they are being used to accomplish in a particular sequence and setting, rather than relying on categories imported from other, even similar, settings.

Conclusion

Although the areas of intersection between applied linguistics and CA touched on in this review have of necessity been limited, there are indications that the relationship between the two fields is growing. The topics touched on in the present chapter range from the more theoretical and analytical stance which examines the nature of language use and of its acquisition to the more practical one concerned with actual pedagogy, assessment, and the like. One might even venture the suggestion that exposure to conversation-analytic accounts of conversational episodes can itself be a powerful resource in advancing the learning of a language by those with moderate to advanced proficiency in it. This possibility has just begun to be explored (Barraja-Rohan & Pritchard, 1997). There is open terrain for inquiry in this whole area for those who will undertake to bring together the necessary training in CA with engagement with the issues which applied linguistics brings to the fore.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Notes

1. We would like to thank Marianne Celce-Murcia, Fred Davidson, Makoto Hayashi, Numa Markee, and Jane Zuengler for their valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in court: The organisation of verbal interaction in judicial settings*. London: Macmillan.

Atkinson, J. M., Cuff, M., & Lee, J. (1978). The recommencement of a meeting as a member's accomplishment. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 133–153). New York: Academic Press.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barraja-Rohan, A., & Pritchard, C. R. (1997). *Beyond talk: A course in communication and conversation for intermediate adult learners of English*. Melbourne: Western Melbourne Institute of TAFE Publishing Service.

Beach, W. A. (1993). Transitional regularities for 'casual' "Okay" usages. *Journal of Pragmatics, 19,* 325–352.

Beach, W. A. (1995). Preserving and constraining options: "Okays" and 'official' priorities in medical interviews. In G. H. Morris & R. J. Chenail (Eds.), *The talk of the clinic: Explorations in the analysis of medical and therapeutic discourse* (pp. 259–289). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Boden, D. (1994). *The business of talk: Organizations in action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 2–27). New York: Longman.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1–47.

Carroll, D. (2000). Precision timing in novice-to-novice L2 conversations. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), 67–110.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6* (2), 5–35.

Clayman, S. E. (1988). Displaying neutrality in television news interviews. *Social Problems, 35*(4), 474–492.

Clayman, S. E. (1992). Footing in the achievement of neutrality: The case of news-interview discourse. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work:*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Interaction in institutional settings (pp. 163–198). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, S., & Heritage, J. (in press). *The news interview: Journalists and public figures on the air.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, S. E., & Whalen, J. (1988/1989). When the medium becomes the message: The case of the Rather-Bush encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 22,* 241–272.

Clift, R. (1999). *Grammar in interaction: The case of 'actually'* (Essex Research Reports in Linguistics No. 26). University of Essex.

Clift, R. (2001). Meaning in interaction: The case of 'actually.' *Language, 77,* 245–291.

Davidson, J. (1984). Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 102–128). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P. (1984). Speakers' reportings in invitation sequences. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 152–164). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P. (1992). Contested evidence in courtroom cross-examination: The case of a trial for rape. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 470–520). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992a). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 3–65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds). (1992b). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Egbert, M. (1996). Context-sensitivity in conversation analysis: Eye gaze and the German repair initiator 'Bitte.' *Language in Society, 25,* 587–612.

Egbert, M. (1997a). Schisming: The collaborative transformation from a single conversation to multiple conversations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 30*(1), 1–51.

Egbert, M. (1997b). Some interactional achievements of other-initiated repair in multiperson conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 27,* 611–34.

Egbert, M. (1998). Miscommunication in language proficiency interviews of first-year German students: A comparison with natural conversation. In R. Young & A. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 147–169). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26,* 237–260.

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ford, C. E. (1993). *Grammar and interaction: Adverbial clauses in American English conversations*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, C. E., Fox, B. A., & Thompson, S. A. (Eds.) (in press). *The language of turn and sequence*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Ford, C. E., & Wagner, J. (Eds.) (1996). *Interaction-based studies of language*. [Special issue of *Pragmatics, 6* (3)].

Fox, B. (1987). *Discourse structure and anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gardner, R., & Wagner, J. (Eds.) (2001). *Second language talk: Studies of native and nonnative interaction*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Gaskill, W. (1980). Correction in NS-NNS conversation. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language acquisition research* (pp. 125–137). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Godard, D. (1977). Same setting, different norms: Phone call beginnings in France and the United States. *Language in Society, 6,* 209–19.

Golato, A. (2000). Und ich so / und er so [and I'm like / and he's like]: An innovative German quotative for reporting on embodied actions. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*(1), 29–54.

Golato, A. (in press a). Grammar and interaction: reported discourse and subjunctive in German. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft.*

Golato, A. (in press b). Self-quotation in German: Reporting on past decisions. In T. Güldemann, & M. v. Roncador (Eds.), *Reported discourse: A meeting ground for different linguistic domains*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Golato, A. (in press c). German compliment responses. *Journal of Pragmatics.*

Goodwin, C. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 97–12). New York: Irvington.

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

Goodwin, C. (1986). Between and within: Alternative treatments of continuers and assessments. *Human Studies, 9,* 205–217.

Goodwin, C. (1996). Transparent vision. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 370–404). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1990). Interstitial argument. In A. Grimshaw (Ed.), *Conflict talk* (pp. 85–117). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1996). Formulating planes: Seeing as a situated activity. In Y. Engstrom & D. Middleton (Eds.), *Cognition and communication at work* (pp. 61–95). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, M. H., & Goodwin, C. (1986). Gesture and co-participation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica, 62* (1/2), 51–75.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Greatbatch, D. (1988). A turn-taking system for British news interviews. *Language in Society, 17,* 401–430.

Greatbatch, D. (1992). On the management of disagreement between news interviewees. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 268–301). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guthrie, A. (1997). The systematic deployment of "okay" and "mmhmm" in academic advising sessions. *Pragmatics, 7* (3), 397–415.

Hayashi, M. (1999). Where grammar and interaction meet: A study of co-participant completion in Japanese conversation. *Human Studies, 22,* 475–499.

Hayashi, M. (in press). Postposition-initiated utterances in Japanese conversation: An interactional account of a grammatical practice. In M. Selting & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hayashi, M., Mori, J., & Takagi, T. (in press). Contingent achievement of co-tellership in a Japanese conversation: An analysis of talk, gaze, and gesture. In C. Ford, B. Fox, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

He, A. W. (1994). Withholding academic advice: Institutional context and discourse practice. *Discourse Processes, 18* (3), 297–316.

He, A. W. (1995). Co-constructing institutional identities: The case of student counselees. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 28* (3), 213–231.

He, A. W. (1998a). Answering questions in LPIs: A case study. In R. Young & A. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 101–117). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

He, A. W. (1998b). *Reconstructing institutions: Language use in academic counseling encounters*. Stamford, CT: Ablex Publishing.

He, A. W., & Tsoneva, S. (1998). The symbiosis of choices and control: Toward a discourse-based account of CAN. *Journal of Pragmatics, 29,* 615–637.

Heritage, J. (1984a). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299–345). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (1984b). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. (1985). Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis, Vol. 3,* (pp. 95–119). New York: Academic Press.

Heritage, J. (1998). *Oh*-prefaced responses to inquiry. *Language in Society, 27,* 291–334.

Heritage, J., & Greatbatch, D. (1991). On the institutional character of institutional talk: The case of news interviews. In D. Boden & D. H.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure* (pp. 93–137). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. C., & Maynard, D. W. (in press). *Practicing medicine: Talk and action in primary care encounters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J., & Roth, A. L. (1995). Grammar and institution: Questions and questioning in the broadcast news interview. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 28* (1), 1–60.

Heritage, J., & Sorjonen, M. L. (1994). Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: *And*-prefacing as a feature of question design. *Language in Society, 23,* 1–29.

Heritage, J., & Stivers, T. (1999). Online commentary in acute medical visits: A method of shaping patient expectations. *Social Science and Medicine, 49,* 1501–1517.

Holt, E. (1996). Reporting on talk: The use of direct reported speech in conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 29*, 219–245.

Hopper, R. (1992). *Telephone conversation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hopper, R., & Koleilat-Doany, N. (1989). Telephone openings and conversational universals: A study in three languages. In S. Ting-Toomey & F. Kevizing (Eds.), *Language, Communication and Culture* (pp. 157–179). Newbury Park: Sage.

Hopper, R., & Chen, C. (1996). Languages, cultures, relationships: Telephone openings in Taiwan. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 29,* 291–313.

Hosoda, Y. (2000). Other-repair in Japanese conversations between nonnative and native speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 11* (1), 39–63.

Hosoda, Y. (2001). Conditions for other-repair in NS/NNS conversation. *The Language Teacher, 25 (11),* 29–31.

Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1991). Opening sequences in Dutch telephone conversations. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 232–250). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–285). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Jacoby, S. (1998a). How can ESP practitioners tap into situated discourse research—And why should we? (Part 1). *English for Specific Purposes News*, 7 (1), 1, 4, 9–10.

Jacoby, S. (1998b). How can ESP practitioners tap into situated discourse research—And why should we? (Part 2). *English for Specific Purposes News*, 7 (2),4–5, 10.

Jacoby, S. (1998c). *Science as performance: Socializing scientific discourse through the conference talk rehearsal.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jacoby, S. (2001). Rethinking English for Science and Technology (EST): What can "indigenous assessment" tell us about the communication culture of science? Manuscript submitted for publication.

Jacoby, S., & Gonzales, P. (1991). The constitution of expert-novice in scientific discourse. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 2*, 149–181.

Jacoby, S., & Gonzales, P. (in press). Saying what wasn't said: Negative observation as a linguistic resource for the interactional construction of performance feedback. In C. Ford, B. Fox, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jacoby, S., & McNamara, T. (1999). Locating competence. *English for Specific Purposes, 18* (3), 213–241.

Jefferson, G. (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica, 9,* 47–96.

Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society, 2*, 181–199.

Jefferson, G. (1978). Sequential aspects of story-telling in conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of converational interatction* (pp. 219–248). NY: Academic Press.

Jefferson, G. (1984). Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset. In V. D'Urso & P. Leonardi (Eds.), *Discourse analysis and natural rhetorics* (pp. 11–38). Padova: CLEUP Editore.

Jefferson, G. (1987). Exposed and embedded corrections. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 86–100). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Jefferson, G. (1993). Caveat speaker: Preliminary notes on recipient topic-shift implicature. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26*(1), 1–30.

Jefferson, G. (1996). On the poetics of ordinary conversation. *Text and Performance Quarterly, 16* (1), 1–61

Jordan, B., & Fuller, N. (1975). On the non-fatal nature of trouble: Sense-making and trouble-managing in lingua franca talk. *Semiotica*, 13, 11–32.

Kachru, B. B., & Nelson, C. L. (1996). World Englishes. In S.L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 71–102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G. (1997). Beyond reference. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 345–359). London: Longman.

Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.) (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13,* 215–247.

Kidwell, M. (2000). Common ground in cross-cultural communication: Sequential and institutional contexts in front desk service encounters. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 11* (1), 17–37.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kim, K. H. (1999a). Phrasal unit boundaries and organization of turns and sequences in Korean conversation. *Human Studies,* 22, 425–446.

Kim, K. H. (1999b). Other-initiated repair sequences in Korean conversation: Types and functions. *Discourse and Cognition, 6* (2), 141–168.

Kim, K. H. (2001a). The Korean topic marker *nun* as tying device: Grounding referents and actions. *Discourse and Cognition, 7* (1), 155–84.

Kim, K. H. (2001b). Confirming intersubjectivity through retroactive elaboration: Organization of phrasal units in other-initiated repair sequences in Korean conversation. In M. Selting & E. Couper-Kuhlen (Eds.), *Studies in interactional linguistics* (pp. 345–372). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Koshik, I. (2000). Conversation analytic research on institutional talk: Implications for TESOL teachers and researchers. *TESOL Research Interest Section Newsletter, 7* (2), pp. 3, 8–11.

Koshik, I. (in press a). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction.*

Koshik, I. (in press b). A conversation analytic study of yes/no questions which convey reversed polarity assertions. *Journal of Pragmatics.*

Koshik, I. (2001a). Teacher practices for oral treatment of student errors in second language writing. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Koshik, I. (2001b). Reinvestigating the category of display questions in ESL pedagogical discourse. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Lazaraton, A. (1991). *A conversation analysis of structure and interaction in the language interview.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Lazaraton, A. (1997). Preference organization in oral proficiency interviews: The case of language ability assessments. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 30* (1), 53–72.

Lerner, G. H. (1991). On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society, 20,* 441–458.

Lerner, G. H. (1995). Turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities. *Discourse Processes, 19,* 111–131.

Lerner, G. H. (1996). On the 'semi-permeable' character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 238–276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lerner, G. H. (in press). Turn-sharing: the choral co-production of talk in interaction. In C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levinson, S. (1979). Activity types and language. *Linguistics, 17,* 365–399. Reprinted in P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 66–100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lindström, A. B. (1994). Identification and recognition in Swedish telephone conversation openings. *Language in Society, 23(2),* 231–52.

Lindström, A. B. (1997). Designing social actions: Grammar, prosody, and interaction in Swedish conversation. PhD dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Lindström, A. B. (1999). Directives and the negotiation of work tasks in the Swedish home help service. In P. Linell, L. Ahrenberg & L. Jönsson (Eds.) *Samtal och Språkanvändning i Professionerna [Conversation and language use in the professions] (pp. 157–168).* Uppsala, Sweden: Association Suedoise de Linguistique Appliquée.

Lutfey, K., & Maynard, D. (1998). Bad news in oncology: How the physician and patient talk about death and dying without using those words. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61,* 321–341.

Manzo, J. F. (1993). Jurors' narratives of personal experience in deliberation talk. *Text, 13* (2), 267–290.

Markee, N. (1994). Toward an ethnomethodological respecification of second-language acquisition studies. In E. E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Research Methodology in second language acquisition* (pp. 89–116). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Markee, N. (1995). Teachers' answers to students' questions: Problematizing the issue of making meaning. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6,* 63–92.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Marlaire, C., & Maynard, D. (1990). Standardized testing as an interactional phenomenon. *Sociology of Education, 63,* 83–101.

Maynard, D. (1984). *Inside plea bargaining: The language of negotiation.* New York: Plenum.

McNamara, T., Hill, K., & May, L. (this volume). Discourse and assessment.

Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics 23 (3).*

Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A., & Thompson, S. A. (Eds.). (1996). *Interaction and grammar.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Olsher, D. (2001). Embodied completion of sequential action in ESL small group work. In R. Gardner & J. Wagner (Eds.), *Second language talk: Studies of native and nonnative interaction.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Park, Y. Y. (1998a). A discourse analysis of contrastive connectives in English, Korean, and Japanese conversation: With special reference to the context of dispreferred responses. In A. Jucker & Y. Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse markers* (pp. 277–300). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Park, Y. Y. (1998b). Interactive grammar: The turn-final use of *nuntey* in Korean and *kedo* in Japanese. In D. Silva (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics,*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Vol. 8 (pp. 45–59). Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Park, Y. Y. (1998c). A discourse analysis of the Korean connective *ketun* in conversation. *Crossroads of Language, Interaction, and Culture, 1,* 71–79.

Park, Y. Y. (1999). The Korean connective *nuntey* in conversational discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31,* 191–218.

Park, Y. Y. (in press). Recognition and identification in Japanese and Korean telephone conversation openings. In K. K. Luke & T. S. Pavlidou (Eds.), *Telephone calls: Unity and diversity in conversational structure across languages and cultures.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Peräkylä, A. (1993). Invoking a hostile world: Discussing the patient's future in AIDS counseling. *Text, 13* (2), 291–316.

Peräkylä, A. (1995). *AIDS counselling: Institutional interaction and clinical practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A. M. (1980). Telling my side: 'Limited access' as a 'fishing' device. *Sociological Inquiry, 50,* 186–98.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riggenbach, H. (1998). Evaluating learner interactional skills: Conversation at the micro level. In R. Young & A. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 53–68). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Robinson, J. D. (1998). Getting down to business: Talk, gaze, and body orientation during openings of doctor-patient consultations. *Human Communication Research, 25* (1), 97–123.

Sacks, H. (1972a). An initial investigation of the usability of conversational materials for doing sociology. In D. N. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 31–74). New York: Free Press.

Sacks, H. (1972b). On the analyzability of stories by children. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 325–345). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sacks, H. (1973). On some puns with some intimations. In R. W. Shuy (Ed.), *Report of the Twenty-Third Annual Georgetown Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies* (pp. 135–144). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (pp. 337–353). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1987 [1973]). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 54–69). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sacks, H. (1989). On members' measurement systems. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 22*, 45–60.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*, (2 vols). (Ed. G. Jefferson, with Introductions by E. A. Schegloff.) Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversations and their interaction. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 15–21). New York: Irvington.

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. (1967). *The first five seconds: The order of conversational openings*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist, 70*, 1075–1095.

Schegloff, E. A. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 75–119). New York: Free Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to a 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. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of "uh huh" and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics*. (pp. 71–93). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Human Studies, 9*, 111–151.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Some sources of misunderstanding in talk-in-interaction. *Linguistics, 25*, 201–218.

Schegloff, E. A. (1988a). Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12*, 55–62.

Schegloff, E. A. (1988b). On an actual virtual servo-mechanism for guessing bad news: A single case conjecture. *Social Problems, 35* (4), 442–457.

Schegloff, E. A. (1988c). Goffman and the analysis of conversation. In P. Drew & A. Wootton (Eds.), *Erving Goffman: Exploring the interaction order* (pp. 89–135). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1988/1989). From interview to confrontation: Observations on the Bush/Rather encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 22*, 215–240.

Schegloff, E. A. (1990). On the organization of sequences as a source of 'coherence' in talk-in-interaction. In B. Dorval (Ed.), *Conversational organization and its development* (pp. 51–77). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure* (pp. 44–70). Cambridge: Polity Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Schegloff, E. A. (1992a). To Searle on conversation: A note in return. In J. R. Searle et al. (Eds.), *(On) Searle on conversation* (pp. 113–28). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992b). Introduction, Volume 1. In G. Jefferson (Ed.), *Harvey Sacks: Lectures on Conversation* (pp. ix–lxii). Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992c). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided place for the defence of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*(5), 1295–1345.

Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Telephone conversation. In R. E. Asher (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (pp. 4547–4549). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1995). Sequence organization. Unpublished manuscript.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996a). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52–133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996b). Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics. In B. A. Fox (Ed.), *Studies in anaphora* (pp. 437–485). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E.A. (1996c). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology, 102,* 161–216.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997a). Third turn repair. In G. R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Towards a social science of language: Papers in honor of William Labov. Volume 2: Social interaction and discourse structures* (pp. 31–40). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997b). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes, 23,* 499–545.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997c). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse and Society, 8*(2), 165–87.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997d). 'Narrative analysis' thirty years later. *Journal of Narrative and Life History 7* (1–4), 97–106.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999a). Discourse, pragmatics, conversation, analysis. *Discourse Studies, 1*(4), 405–35.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999b). 'Schegloff's texts' as 'Billig's data:' A critical reply to Billig. *Discourse and Society, 10,* 558–571.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999c). Naivete vs. sophistication or discipline vs. self-indulgence: A rejoinder to Billig. *Discourse and Society, 10,* 577–582.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000a). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society, 29*(1), 1–63.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000b). When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics, 21,* 205–243.

Schegloff, E. A. (2001). Accounts of conduct in interaction: Interruption, overlap and turn-taking. In J. H. Turner (Ed.), *Handbook of sociological theory* (pp. 287–321). New York: Plenum.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Schegloff, E. A. (2002a). Beginning in the telephone. In J. E. Katz & M. Aakhus (Eds.), *Perpetual contact: Mobile communication, private talk, public performance* (pp. 284–299). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2002b). On 'opening sequencing': An introductory note. In J. E. Katz & M. Aakhus (Eds.), *Perpetual contact: Mobile communication, private talk, public performance* (pp. 319–324). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2002c). Opening sequencing. In J. E. Katz & M. Aakhus (Eds.), *Perpetual contact: Mobile communication, private talk, public performance* (pp. 326–385). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (in press). Reflections on research on telephone conversation openings: Issues of cross-cultural scope and scholarly exchange, interactional import and consequences. In K. K. Luke & T. S. Pavlidou (Eds.), *Telephone calls: Unity and diversity in conversational structure across languages and cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53,* 361–382.

Schegloff, E. A., Ochs, E., & Thompson, S. A. (1996). Introduction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 1–51). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 8,* 289–327.

Selting, M., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (Eds.). (in press). *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schwartz, J. (1980). The negotiation for meaning: Repair in conversations between second language learners of English. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language acquisition research* (pp. 138–153). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Sorjonen, M. (1996). On repeats and responses in Finnish conversations. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 277–327). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sorjonen, M.(2001). *Responding in conversation: A study of response particles in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sorjonen, M. (in press a). Recipient activities: The particle "no" as a go-ahead response in Finnish conversations. In C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sorjonen, M. (in press b). Simple answers to yes-no questions: The case of Finnish. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Suh, K. H., & Kim, K. H. (2001). The Korean modal marker *keyss* revisited: A marker of achieved state of intersubjectivity. *Berkeley Linguistic Society, 26,* 271–282.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Tanaka, H. (1999). *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A study in grammar and interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wagner, J. (1996). Foreign language acquisition through interaction—a critical review of research on conversational adjustments. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26*, 215–235.

Whalen, M. R., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Sequential and institutional contexts in calls for help. *Social Psychological Quarterly, 50* (2), 172–185.

Whalen, J., Zimmerman, D. H., & Whalen, M. R. (1988). When words fail: A single case analysis. *Social Problems, 35* (4), 335–362.

Willey, B. (2001). Examining a "communication strategy" from a conversation analytic perspective: Eliciting help from native speakers inside and outside word search sequences. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Wong, J. (1984). Using conversational analysis to evaluate telephone conversation in English as a second language textbooks. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.

Wong, J. (2000a). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/nonnative speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 274–297.

Wong, J. (2000b). The token 'yeah' in nonnative speaker English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33*, 39–67.

Wong, J. (2002). "Applying" conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating English as a second language textbook dialogue. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 40* (2), 37–60.

Wu, R. J. R. (1997). Transforming participation frameworks in multi-party Mandarin conversation: The use of discourse particles and body behavior. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 8* (2), 97–118.

Wu, R. J. R. (2000). Final particles in Mandarin Chinese: A conversation analysis of *A* and *OU*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Applied Linguistics, University of California, Los Angeles.

Young, R. F. (this volume). Discourse approaches to oral language assessment.

Zimmerman, D. H. (1984). Talk and its occasion: The case of calling the police. In D. Schiffrin (Ed.), *Meaning, form, and use in context: Linguistic applications* (pp. 210–28). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Zimmerman, D. H. (1992). The interactional organization of calls for emergency service. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction In institutional settings* (pp. 418–469). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016 Published online by Cambridge University Press