


2009

Practices for Dispreferred Responses Using "No" by a Learner of English

John Hellermann
Portland State University

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/ling_fac

 Part of the [Applied Linguistics Commons](#), and the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Citation Details

Hellermann, J. (2009). Practices for Dispreferred Responses Using "No" by a Learner of English. *International Review of Applied Linguistics In Language Teaching (IRAL)*, 47(1), 95-126. doi: 10.1515/iral.2009.005

This Article is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Applied Linguistics Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Practices for dispreferred responses using *no* by a learner of English

JOHN HELLERMANN

Abstract

Responding in a manner that does not align with an action or affiliate with a stance implicated in just prior talk is potentially sensitive work. Conversation Analysis (CA) has shown that participants orient to the sensitive nature of sequences of talk used to project responses that do not align, or, are dispreferred (Pomerantz 1984) in some way. This paper examines such responses, especially with the use of no tokens. The talk comes from the interactions of one adult learner of English in a language learning classroom over the course of five ten-week terms. The findings show that the participant's use of no (for other-correction, third-position repair, and multiple sayings) is oriented to by peers as appropriate for the classroom community of practice. Learning, it is suggested, may be seen in the learner's orientation to the preference for affiliation when doing negative responses.

1. Introduction

In the past decade or more, a number of researchers interested in issues in the area of Applied Linguistics (language learning, immigration and identity among others), have begun using methods from conversation analysis (CA) focusing on interactions among participants who are using a language that they might not consider their first or strongest language. This research has investigated differences between practices for interactants classified as 'native' and 'non-native' speakers (Hosoda 2001, 2002; Wong 2000), how identity is reified through talk-in-interaction (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998; Egbert 2005; Higgins 2007; Mori 2003), and how a language is used as a *lingua franca* (Brouwer and Wagner 2004; Firth 1996; Wagner 1996). The classroom context for language learning has also become a context that CA researchers have begun to explore (Markee 2000, 2005; Mori 2002 and collections by Gardner and Wagner 2004; Markee and Kasper 2004). A major contribution of all this research

to the field of applied linguistics is its focus on participants' own orientations to particular actions and the way those actions are accomplished through turns at talk.

Within this body of research, studies using CA (and working primarily with data of language learners) have even more recently begun to address the issue of to what degree CA methods can be used to uncover evidence of additional language learning (He 2004; Hellermann 2007, 2008; Markee 2008; Mondada and Pekarek-Doehler 2004; Mori 2004). Given that the primary disciplinary roots of additional language learning (commonly referred to as 'second language acquisition', or SLA) were psychology and linguistics, CA's socio-interactive research is offering new theoretical insights to the field (Kramsch and Whiteside 2007, but see Gass 1998 for another view).

2. Seeing competence and learning using CA methods

The use of CA methods for the analysis of language learning brings an action and process-oriented perspective to language and language learning that treats learners or so-called 'nonnative speakers' not as defective communicators by definition (Firth and Wagner 1997) but rather, as participants in talk-in-interaction. From this perspective on the interaction of learners, language learning is seen as developing interactional rather than grammatical competence (Hall 1995; Young 1999, 2000).

CA methods provide strong tools for the analysis of language as it occurs in interaction and its theoretical roots provide the opportunity for an important epistemological refocusing for the study of language learning. Given its ethnomethodological roots (see the overviews in Clayman and Maynard 1995; Garfinkel and Sacks 1970; Goodwin and Heritage 1990), CA research on language learning offers an alternative to structural linguistics' determinacy fallacy (Harris 1981): that language (for learners or non learners) is a discrete, unitary entity or product that people have and that learners acquire. The data for CA research, talk-in-interaction, is not the linguist's code. That data, talk-in-interaction, is the co-constructed work of members' methods¹ for accomplishing intersubjectivity. CA research can uncover the aspects of language that participants (language learners in this case) produce to accomplish their social interactions (inside or outside a classroom) and offer indigenous or participant-defined phenomenon for language researchers to study (Eskildsen 2008). An-

1. Whether the data for research are from those who do not consider themselves language learners or those who do consider themselves language learners, the data can be considered in their own right without a priori assumptions about competencies with the language as Schegloff has noted (Wong and Olsher 2000; Heeschen and Schegloff 2003).

alyzing the talk-in-interaction of language learners entails uncovering the processes that the learners engage in to reify the object of their learning: language itself (Seedhouse 2007).

Although CA methods provide this particular strength to language learning research, the ability of CA research to produce findings about psychological concepts like 'cognition', 'learning' or 'acquisition' that have been prevalent in language learning research has been an issue of debate (He 2004; Koschmann et al. 2005) and researchers in the field have called on CA researchers using data from language learners to address the issue of 'acquisition' more explicitly (Kasper 1997; Larsen-Freeman 2004). One way to address that debate and that call is to focus (as do some papers in this special issue) on how a psychological concept (cognition) seen in and through interaction (socially distributed cognition) might lead us to see learning in the moment. This is a perspective associated with cultural and discursive psychologists (Edwards 1997; Hutchins 1995; Resnik, Levine, and Teasley 1991; te Molder and Potter 2005) and earlier CA research on language learning (Markee 2000).

Another way that CA researchers can approach the issue of language acquisition is to focus on the learner as simultaneously an individual and group member. The socio-interactional focus of CA has led various researchers to conceptualize competence in active senses such as 'participation' (Brouwer and Wagner 2004), as 'understanding' (Zemel and Koschmann, forthcoming), or as 'resources' for interaction (Kasper 2006; Mori and Hayashi 2006). My own research and that reported on in this paper has looked for evidence of language learning in the process of increasing participation within communities of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998), the communities in this case being both the classroom and one that might be glossed as 'English language users' (Hellermann 2008). Taking this perspective, an assumption is made that participants in a community of practice are mutually engaged in a joint enterprise and develop and use a shared repertoire (Wenger 1998) of language practices to accomplish the social actions and shared meanings of the community of practice. For research drawing on community of practice theory, language learning is investigated as changing practices for social interaction rather than individual or shared cognitive phenomenon.

Such a perspective aligns with the ethnomethodological foundations of CA that look for the methods in talk-in-interaction that members use to order their mundane interactions. Ethnomethodology assumes a moral order for cooperative work toward intersubjectivity in social interactions, an order that members hold one another accountable to (Garfinkel 1967; Jayussi 1984). CA has shown how this accountability is visible in talk-in-interaction. Language learners who, simultaneously, do the work of the 'language learning classroom' community of practice as well as the 'English language user' community of practice are doing the work of co-constructing accountability for intersubjectivity and the

methods or language practices that they use to accomplish this work are traceable as changing degrees of participation within various intersecting communities of practice (Hellermann 2008).

With the goal of adding to the growth and development of CA studies of additional language learning, in this paper,² I investigate a particular action as it is co-constructed by one learner and her peers over the course of 50 weeks of her participation at the data collection site: negative dispreferred responses to previous turns and courses of action. This action is accomplished, for the most part, with the use of the English token *no*³ in various sequential trajectories. The analysis of the learner's formatting of this action shows the negotiation of participation in the 'classroom' and 'English language user' communities of practice through talk-in-interaction.

Although we cannot always attribute particular actions that are accomplished in talk-in-interaction to particular grammatical or lexical forms (Schegloff 1997), a great deal of CA research has shown that members do rely on linguistic formats as shortcuts in their orientations actions that are implicated in talk (Ford 1993; Jefferson 1984, 2002; Koshik 2002, and papers in Selting and Couper-Kuhlen 2001, among others). The English lexical item *no* is one such form that has been noted both for the different ways it is used as a response to the actions that implicate it (Ford 2001, 2002; Ford, Fox, and Hellermann 2004; Jefferson 2002).

3. Data and methods

The data come from a four-year classroom video recording project⁴ focusing on beginning adult learners of English. Almost 4,000 hours of classroom interaction was recorded for the project focusing on learner-learner interaction. I focused on the talk-in-interaction that occurred around one student, 'Inez'⁵, who participated in classes for five 10-week terms from September,

2. I would like to thank Numa Markee, Junko Mori, Randy Musillami, and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback on ideas presented in this paper.

3. Although the focus of the analysis turns out to be a particular language form, it was the action of the focal speaker establishing a negative stance as a response to some action in a variety of sequential contexts that suggested this focus (see Hakulinen 1995 and Seedhouse 2004, 2007, for discussions cautioning linguists to not lose sight of the roots of CA methods).

4. The National Labsite for Adult ESOL was supported, in part, by grant R309B6002 from the Institute for Education Science, U.S. Dept. of Education, to the National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy (Reder et al. 2003). The Labsite was a partnership between Portland State University and Portland Community College. The school and research facilities were housed at the university while the registration, curriculum, and teachers of the ESL students were from the community college.

5. All names used in this study are pseudonyms.

2002 through June, 2004. Approximately 6 hours of Inez's interactions with students (and sometimes teachers) over that time was transcribed using CA methods.

In a first attempt at an investigation of changes in practices for repair by participants in language learning classrooms (Hellermann 2009), the use of the lexical item *no* became notable both for its frequency of occurrence and the actions it performed in repair and other sequences of talk-in-interaction. Given that this lexical item is used (in most cases) to express a dispreferred response to previous talk, the use of *no* and the action of performing dispreferred response more generally show a participants strong orientation or attention to and treatment of previous talk-in-interaction. Such negative responses may also have important consequences for face and interpersonal relations that are co-constructed through talk. From that study of repair, I investigated negative responses that Inez made in various sequences of talk throughout her 18 months as a student at the data collection site to better understand the organization of Inez's talk-in-interaction around this action, especially around the use of *no*. To begin the investigation, I found instances of Inez's negative responses to prior talk in the transcripts and did sequential analyses of these turns and surrounding sequences.

4. Negation and the use of *no*

As the second part of the foundational pair of turns in talk-in-interaction, responses are important sites for displaying both an understanding of a previous turn and stance toward that turn. In their responses to a prior turn, participants can align⁶ with the action projected by that turn by producing positively or negatively marked turns (Schegloff 2007). A participant responding to a first turn that expressed a positive assessment or stance will affiliate with that assessment by producing a turn with positive polarity. Likewise, a participant responding to a first turn that expressed a negative assessment will affiliate with that assessment by producing a turn with a negative polarity. Markers of negative affiliation in English include the token *no*⁷, and other negative lexical items (*never*, *not*, and its contracted form *n't*) and non-lexical tokens (what might be written as *nn nn* or *uhn uhn*). While negative responses are not un-

6. Although few researchers make a distinction between the terms 'alignment' and 'affiliation' (Steensig and Drew 2008), Stivers (2008) has suggested a distinction something like this: a negative alignment is negative with respect to an action performed by previous talk; a negative affiliation is negative with respect to the stance taken by previous talk. For brevity, since both responses are dispreferred, I will use that term and 'disaffiliative' as the generic terms and make the distinction when necessary in analysis.

7. See Jefferson (2002) for research on *no* in other senses.

common in talk-in-interaction, the cooperative nature (Jayussi 1984) of talk-in-interaction suggests that participants cooperate toward a shared understanding of their talk. This is reflected in the foundational finding in CA research that has shown how participants in interaction treat the default for responses as affiliation (Pomerantz 1984; Sacks 1987). When speakers produce a next turn in a sequence that does not affiliate with the previous turn, it is reflected in certain aspects of the design of the turn: the semantic content of the lack of affiliation may be preceded by pause, non-lexical (*um, er, uh* etc.) or lexical (*well*) markers of hesitation. These findings point to the sensitivity around the use of *no* in response to a prior turn.

This sensitivity or pragmatic strength around the use of *no* can be seen in its use in a particular sequential slot as a repair initiator (Schegloff 1992): the third position repair initiator. Such a sequential context occurs when a primary speaker (A) says something which a recipient (B) displays in a next turn either a mishearing or different interpretation from (A). In the third position of the sequence, (A) then initiates a correction using *no* or to prevent (B)'s interpretation from being carried forward. An example is seen in (1).

- (1) Dan: Well that's a little different from last week.
 Louise: he heh heh Yeah. We were in hysterics last week.
 Dan: ⇒ No, I mean Al.
 Louise: Oh. He ...
 (from Schegloff 1992 : 1303)

Its use in the third position of a sequence shows how *no* is used to remedy a possible misunderstanding in what Schegloff called (in the title of the paper) "the last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity" (1992). It is at this point in the sequence that the misunderstanding needs to be cleared up to prevent a longer explanation and sequence of turns.

The dispreferred nature of *no* to indicate negative affiliation in a response in mundane talk-in-interaction is seen when, in some sequential environments, accounts following *no* are treated as relevant (Ford 2001, 2002). In classroom talk, the orientation to the dispreferred nature of the use of a *no* response is seen when teachers use *no* in particular sequential formats where its evaluative force toward students is lessened (Seedhouse 1997; Hellermann 2005). The research from CA suggests that the use of negation and displaying negative affiliation in response to prior talk, especially when using the token *no*, is a highly sensitive action done in talk-in-interaction in English and one that may have interactional and interpersonal consequences for learners of the language.

Structurally-oriented research on second language acquisition has investigated *no* and negation in general as part of the development of language learners' linguistic systems (Eskildsen and Cadierno 2007; Irvine 2005; Ravem

1968; Schumann 1979). This research has focused on the degree to which learners of English learn the various syntactic outlays for negation in a particular developmental order and the degree to which multi-word expressions serve as the basis or catalyst for the development of a system for negation (Eskildsen 2008; Eskildsen and Cadierno 2007). Language learning research, however, has not explored how negation and *no* tokens particularly implement particular actions through the sequential organization of talk-in-interaction among learners and interlocutors and how such sequences might help understand language learning.

5. Inez's use of unmitigated *no* in second position for other-correction and humor

In the context of classroom language learning, it is not unusual to expect repair in the form of correction related to a language learning task. Correction can be done in less overt ways, embedded (Jefferson 1987) so that the corrected item is not dwelt upon. Such embedded corrections did not appear often in the data. In some instances of correction, however, Inez used *no* to mark negative responses in interactions for language learning tasks that were overt corrections to peer candidate language. Such *no* tokens in this sequential environment first caught my ear as something notable because of their lack of mitigation and their direct way of correcting a peer.

In (2), from Inez's third term of study, she is helping her peer, Jorge, with a writing task in which students are responding to questions in writing. After modeling questions (lines 2–3) and an answer (lines 6 and 12) for Jorge and telling him to write out his answer (line 8), Jorge writes (lines 9, 11) and after Inez looks at his writing (line 12), Jorge shifts his gaze to Inez and utters what sounds like a first turn question or request with rising pitch (line 13). After a short gap in which Inez continues looking at what J had written and J holds his gaze on Inez, Inez responds to Jorge's turn with a stretched *no* token and then a repetition of the question and answer in slower speech (line 15).

- (2) [term 3, 5–13–03, 206, task, 34:33–34:58⁸]
((◊ indicates whispering in this excerpt))
02 I: ◊() are you cook at the restaurant
03 (do you like your classes)
04 (.5)
05 J jye[s]

8. Some of the excerpts can be viewed via the following link: <http://www.labschool.pdx.edu/Viewer/viewer.php?IRAL>. Viewers must be using a pc, Windows XP, and Windows Internet Explorer.

- 06 I: [ye:s I do◦
 07 (1)
 08 I: [yeah pero◦ you need you need t- write.
 [((gesturing writing))
 09 (.) ((J writes))
 10 you need answer.
 11 (1.2) ((J writes))
 12 I: yes [(.) ◦I [do◦
 [((I looks at J's writing))
 13 J: [◦(okay?)◦
 [((J shifts gaze to I))
 14 (.5)
 15 I: ◦ no:::◦ ⟨do jyou like you job, ↑yes. I ↑do.⟩

In (2), Inez uses a second position *no* response to format a correction to Jorge's first turn request in a language learning task marking that answer bid as notably wrong. Inez produces the token stretching the vowel and then follows it with an overt correction repeating both the question and the candidate correct response at a slow pace.

Excerpt (3) shows a similar action (a correction) performed using a *no* token but in a very different interactional context than (2). In an interaction from Inez's second term of study, students are milling around the classroom during a regularly occurring mid-class break. The teacher is out of the room. Inez has taken it upon herself to record names of present students on an attendance sheet when Jin asks Inez about her name and country of origin. This question turns into a negotiation of the pronunciation of Inez's name (lines 13–27).

(3) [term 2, 1–7–03, 204, conv, 1:41:26–1:42:10]

- 06 I: Abby,
 07 A: yeah?
 08 I: Abby ((writing))
 09 A: eh:: thank you
 10 (4)
 11 J: your your name
 12 I: Jo:::h[n?
 13 J: [Ineezy.
 14 I: I- nez=
 15 J: =Inez.
 16 I: Ine[z.
 17 J: [Inez. Inez.
 18 I: only? is (.5) I say Inez::.
 19 J: Ine:z

- 20 I: ⇒ no
 21 J: Ine[z.
 22 I: [uh huh no ask e- ee zee? ((saying letters 'e'
 23 'z')) no.
 24 J: ah
 25 I: ((points to a word)) Inez
 26 J: Inez. Inez.=
 27 I: =uh huh. reading, Inez[:
 28 J: [are you come from?
 29 I: in my from is Mexico;
 30 J: from Mexi[co oh:: oh oh
 31 I: [Mexico city
 32 J: Inez: he heh heh

After Jin produces Inez's name (line 13), Inez hears it as mispronounced and offers an alternative pronunciation with a careful, syllable-by-syllable saying of her name in line 14. After Jin tries the name three more times (lines 15 and 17), Inez tries to instruct Jin in the saying of her name (line 18) and after Jin says it one more time (line 19), Inez uses the *no* token as a more overt correction, an upgrade to the ongoing correction. This overt correction is followed by an instructive account: her isolating particular letters that should not be pronounced (lines 22–23) as the reason for her correction.

Unlike the correction in (2), in (3), Inez's use of *no* as a correction is followed by an account for her negating her peer's attempts. As part of the upgraded correction that starts with *no* (line 20), in line 22, Inez highlights two letters which she takes to be the trouble source in Jin's pronunciation ('e' and 'z') and indicates that he should not pronounce those in the way he did (Inez uses the word 'ask' rather than 'say' or 'pronounce'). Her use of print as a resource (she points to her printed name) shows her orientation to this as a correction of pronunciation sequence and after her pointing to the print resource Jin produces an accepted saying of the name (line 26).

Excerpt (3) also differs from (2) with respect to the issue of preference. In (3), the use of *no* for correction occurs after other repair initiations were used suggesting that, for Inez, in this non task-directed, more conversational type of interaction there is an orientation to the preference for self repair noted in research on mundane conversation (Pomerantz 1984) as Inez uses a *no* token only near the end of a longer repair sequence.

The pragmatic strength of a *no* response is also evidenced in its use in (3) as an upgraded correction. We see more evidence of this in excerpt (4), also from Inez's second term of study. Here the implication of a *no* response for negative affiliation is shown in Inez's ironic use of the token as she jokingly refutes the

characterization of a peer made by the teacher.⁹ Excerpt (4) occurs at the end of a teacher-assigned task in which students were to ask one another whether they shared personal characteristics and personality traits using the syntactic question form “are you ____”. The teacher had given students possible traits (*shy, friendly, intelligent, etc.*) to use with this question format. At the end of the task, (lines 4–12), Inez, Fernando, and Yan laugh about Yan’s negative response to Fernando’s question “are you intelligent”. The teacher observes the students laughing and comes over to their desk. When she arrives, Inez repeats the question that had been asked to Yan (in line 15) and that had elicited the laughter as a way to respond to the teacher’s query about what had taken place (line 14). Although possibly addressed to Yan, the teacher offers a response to Inez’s question and when she expands her response (line 18), Inez overlaps with a *no* token and an account for her disaffiliation (line 19): the information her peer and she herself (line 4) had elicited from Yan. Inez knows Yan well having attended classes with her the previous term and is clearly joking (indicated by the laughter in lines 6–13 and smile voice in line 15) by reiterating this question about intelligence for the teacher. Inez utters a louder and stretched *no* token making a faux serious face and follows this with laughter (line 20), laughter which was initiated by Yan (line 22).

- (4) [term 2, 1-21-03, 204, conv, 1:35:42-1:36:05]
 04 I: I’m sorry. are you intelligent.
 05 Y: (sorry). no. I’m not.
 06 I: ↑no? ah hah hah he [he
 07 Y: [yeah
 08 I: .hh (\$qu(h)e ma(h)l [)
 09 Y: [ah heh heh
 10 (.5)
 11 .hhh AHH hah hah hah
 12 Y: hah heh heh heh heh heh heh .hh \$↑I’m not.\$
 13 I: [((laughs))
 14 Te: [⟨I ne:z,⟩ whatcha doin.((T comes to I’s desk))
 15 I: .hhh eh wha- \$are you intelligent?\$((points at Y))
 16 Te: yes [she is.
 17 I: [((points to self then to Y))
 18 Te: she’[s very intelli[gent.
 19 I: ⇒ [no::: []Fernando say no⟨ ((points to Y))
 20 ⇒ she [NO::[: heh heh heh heh hah
 21 Te: [(yes she is)



9. Excerpt (4) is also a good example of the fluid nature between explicitly task-directed and more conversational interaction.

- 22 Y: [ah heh heh
 23 A: ssssh
 24 (1)
 25 I: Fernando[o
 26 Te: [everybody is very intelligent in this
 27 classroom
 28 Y: \$yes I [am\$
 29 I: [intelligent hxhhhhh
 30 I: [(gestures an expanding brain))

Here, Inez orients to information attained as part of the language learning task as 'truthful' in disagreeing with the teacher's characterization with two *no* tokens and the account reporting the answer she and Fernando had elicited to justify her refutation of the teacher. After the teacher's supportive comment in lines 26–27, Yan re-answers the question with a smile (line 28) and Inez gestures an expanding brain (line 30) completing a kind of send up of different, potentially humiliating responses to the question about intelligence. The use of *no* as a 'negative' affiliation to a teacher's stance about a peer's intelligence shows Inez's orientation to the token as marker of negative affiliation as well as her competence to use this type of response to express irony (an ironic 'refutation' of the teacher's claim) for the sake of humor.

6. *no* in repair initiations

The previous three excerpts showed how Inez used *no* tokens to indicate a negative affiliation to prior talk both in a serious and humorous way. The following excerpts show two ways she used the *no* token as a repair initiation. The first, (5), from Inez's first term of study is in response to a peer's own repair of Inez's response to the teacher. Excerpt (5) comes from talk-in-interaction that does not have an explicit task orientation and occurs as students are coming into the classroom before what looks like the start of the language teaching part of class. The teacher is looking around the room to see which students are present. For purposes of her own records, for the students to learn one another's names, and for language practice, she is asking which students were absent in the previous lesson. Her question in line 11 does not reflect the elicitation she is seeking (her intentions, which she had made clear just previously, were to ask 'who was not here') and Inez responds giving the name of a student who had been absent the previous class (line 12) which the teacher ratifies by expanding the response (line 13). When Inez offers that Eduardo was absent in the previous lesson (line 16), another student (Abby) orients to Inez's response as incorrect and initiates repair (line 18).

- (5) [term 1, 10/28/02, conv, 20:27-20:49]
- 11 Te: who was here?
 12 I: Felicia
 13 T: Felicia was not he[re?
 14 I: [n::o,
 15 T: okay, so Felicia was not here, who else was not here.
 16 I: Eduardo,
 17 (.5)
 18 A: Eduardo? ((turns head toward Eduardo)) no?
 19 I: ⇒ * no:[:: ** last?
 20 A: [no.
 21 I: last (.) [class no. (.) Eduardo. (moongli)
 22 E: [last.
 23 (1)
 24 Te: moongli?

* An indexical gesture, pointing to Eduardo in his current position

** A metaphorical gesture, pointing to the past time behind her

Abby hears Inez's response to the teacher in line 16 to be indicating that Eduardo is not currently present. After Abby says the name Eduardo in line 18, both Abby and Inez turn to look in Eduardo's direction (he had come into the room a minute before) she then uses a *no* token with rising pitch to question Inez's response to the teacher from line 16. Inez responds to Abby's misinterpretation of her turn first with a *no* token and gestures (in line 19) first indicating Eduardo's current seated position and then to the metaphorical past space – behind her.¹⁰ The coordination of gesture and talk is better highlighted in Figure 1.

Inez uses a phrase ('last class') to indicate the teacher is asking about the previous class. Rather than an upgrade in a longer repair that we saw in (3), (5) shows *no* used as the start of a repair initiation by Inez of Abby's repair and misinterpretation of the teacher and Inez's actions (the misinterpretation being that the teacher was asking about and that Inez was indicating Eduardo's attendance in the current class).

Excerpt (6) also shows *no* used as a repair initiator, this time as a third-position repair during a side-sequence in a task-oriented interaction (line 22). In the interaction from which this excerpt is taken, students have been engaged in a language learning task in which they need to supply verbs with the appropriate tense given the context of a picture in their workbooks. In an insertion sequence, a definition sequence (Markee 1994) that occurs during their task

10. Reviewing the recording of the previous class it is clear that Inez is not referring to Eduardo's seat in the previous class with this gesture as he was not in the classroom that day.



Inez and peer (Abby) oriented toward front of room



16 I: Eduardo,
((Inez and Abby looking toward Eduardo))



19 I: ⇒ no : [: : . .
((I points toward E))



last?
((I points behind her))

Figure 1. Inez' and Abby's gaze and gestures in excerpt (5)

talk, Inez and her peer Sambath are working out the meaning of the word 'applying'. The sequence started after Inez speculated about what type of verb this word is and then asked Sambath if she knows what it means (lines 4–8).

- (6) [term 4, 11–18–03, 204, task, 2:16:09–2:17:00]¹¹
- 04 I: I think
 05 (4)
 06 I: this is regular verb.
 07 (.)
 08 I: I think. .hh ^h what does that mean.
 09 (.5)
 10 I: do you know? Sambath?
 11 S: hm?
 12 (.5)
 13 I: applying. ((the target word is ‘applying’))
 14 S: airplane?
 15 (.4)
 16 I: uh huh_i=
 17 S: =airplane.
 18 (.)
 19 S: yes I know airplane.
 20 I: what is it
 21 S: THIS. ((gestures airplane))
 22 (2)
 23 I: ⇒ no
 24 S: no?
 25 (4) ((I. looking in her book/ S. looks into her book))
 26 S: pahcking! or what
 27 (1.5)
 28 S: pahcking? pahcking
 29 I: ^happlyng
 30 (1)
 31 I: applyng is the: (2) ((looks around, looks back to S.))
 32 ^happlyng is when you:: ((gestures writing)) write? in
 33 the form? for the:: eye dee? ((‘ID’))

After Sambath offers a candidate hearing in line 14 (‘airplane’) which is (wrongly) confirmed by Inez, Inez asks again for the meaning of the word (line 20) which Inez understands as ‘applying’. Sambath then uses a deictic pro-form with a non-verbal as a definition for the word she hears Inez saying

11. All ^h indications are for Inez’s indexical gesture pointing at the focal word in the textbook.

Mundane talk (excerpt (1) from Schegloff (1992))

- 1 Dan: Well that's a little different from last week.
- 2 Louise: Were in hysterics last week.
- 3 Dan: ⇒ No, I mean AI.

Classroom (excerpt (6))

- 1 I: what is it
- 2 S: THIS. ((gestures airplane))
- 3 (2)
- 4 I: ⇒ no

Figure 2. *Comparing sequences*

(line 21) and after a short pause, Inez replies with a bare *no* token. Inez may not know the definition of 'applying' but she knows the word does not refer to an airplane.

The sequence from lines 20–23 is organized in much the same way as the third position repair initiation from mundane conversation presented in (1). A first turn of a sequence by Inez (line 20) contains the potentially ambiguous pro form 'it'. Sambath makes a response to that question (line 21) which Inez hears and sees as a misunderstanding of the referent in her question and uses a *no* token to indicate that she and Sambath are not sharing the referent for 'it'. Sambath also orients to this *no* as not correcting her understanding of 'airplane' but for a reference issue as she offers a new referent for 'it', 'pahcking' (line 26).

The use of bald *no* tokens at the start of Inez's repair initiation in (6) looks similar to third position other-initiated other repair using *no* tokens that have been found to occur in talk-in-interaction outside classrooms by non-learners (discussed earlier and illustrated in excerpt (1) from Schegloff, 1992). Figure 2 is presented to compare the configuration of the use of *no* as a third-position repair initiator from mundane talk with that of Inez in both the conversational and more explicitly task-oriented interaction. In Figure 2, a current speaker's talk (line 1) is responded to (line 2) in a way that suggests to the first speaker that her talk was misinterpreted or misheard and due to that hearing, a repair is made in the next slot (line 3) starting with the token *no*.

The comparison above highlights how talk-in-interaction in a language classroom between language learners is a site where practices for mundane talk-in-interaction are available and, perhaps, necessary in order to organize the social interaction of the classroom.

pain	pen	main
men	pan	man
pine	pin	mine

Figure 3. *Pronunciation 'tic tac toe'*

7. Negative alignment formulated as a dispreferred response

We have seen examples of Inez using *no* tokens in sequences of talk for explicit correction, as part of a humorous exchange, and for third position repair initiation. In several of these sequences, her use of *no* is followed by talk to account for the dispreferred response. Previous research on preference has suggested that more than simply accounting for a dispreferred response, participants in talk-in-interaction project that a negative affiliation to prior talk is dispreferred by marking that talk in other ways (Pomerantz 1984). We see one such example by Inez in (7).

In (7), during a language learning task from Inez's fifth term of study, she, Valerio, and Daniel are engaged in 'pronunciation tic tac toe', an activity in which one student reads a minimal pair from a grid pattern worksheet and another student is to either place an 'o' or 'x' on the word they hear in order to try to complete a row of three consecutive marks (see Figure 3).

After Valerio initiates a move in the game (saying a word on the game board, line 4) and after some negotiation over the saying of the word, Inez points to a different word (line 10) and Valerio says the focal word more loudly (line 11). Inez hears line 11 as a repair initiation and after a short pause responds with a meek sounding "no understand" (line 13).¹² After a more explicit correction (line 14), Inez points to the correct word ('pen' in the upper row, middle column, see Figure 3) which is confirmed by Daniel (line 18). When Valerio asks Inez to account for her inability with this part of the task in lines 21 and 23 (asking whether she was absent during the last class and "what happened"), Inez responds with a marker of a dispreferred response ('well' in line 24) and some hesitation. Valerio responds to this with a mocking tone in his repeat of Inez's first part of the turn (line 25) which is followed by Inez's account for her lack of understanding (line 27): Valerio's inferior pronunciation.

- (7) [term 5 3-09-04, 204, task, 1:00:47-1:01:12]
 04 V: pen.
 05 I: peay:[n

12. This usage of 'no' (line 13) was not taken up in the analysis as it does not used to perform the work of doing a disaffiliative response.

06 V: [pen=
07 D: =mmmmmmmm
08 V: pen not pai[n.
09 D: [hhheh hhheh hhheh hheh
10 I: ((points to a word))
11 V: PE::N.
12 (2.5)
13 I: no unders[tand
14 V: [no pa:n. Roberto he say pa[n.
15 D: [pen.
16 (.8)
17 I: pen ((pointing to word))
18 D: yes
19 V: pen.
20 I: ((circles a word))
21 V: oh you 'wis the last class no?
22 I: \$of course\$.
23 V: what happened
24 I:⇒ well I don't– don't und↑erstan[d.
25 V: [(↓I do[n't understand)
26 I: [don't
27 your pronunciation is (.) ba(h)dt[hah
28 D: [eh hih [heh
29 V: [heh oh
30 ye(h)ah
31 I: eh hah hah hah hah

This entire task interaction between Inez, Valerio, and Daniel is playful. The shared laughter by all three participants (lines 27–31) which follows Inez's account shows Inez (and peers) treating her formulation of the dispreferred response expressing a negative affiliation in lines 24 and 27 as (like excerpt (4)) humorous. Although excerpt (4) showed her ability to use and orient to *no* tokens for negative affiliation for the sake of humor fourteen months earlier, in (7), we see the incorporation of a turn formatting for doing a dispreferred response that is rare in the data from classroom language learning. The use of the discourse marker *well* is frequently occurring marker of a dispreferred turn (Pomerantz 1984) but it is rare in the talk of language learners from beginning through upper intermediate levels of proficiency (Hellermann and Vergun 2007). Only one other instance¹³ of this marker was found in Inez's transcripts.

13. This occurred in Inez's fourth term of study and seemed to do the work of displaying a reluctant agreement.

Inez's use of *well* with the hesitation in her response to Valerio's questioning of her diligence and ability as a student in excerpt (7) shows her orientation to the idea of preference in turn-taking and the production of a turn format to project that orientation. Even more interesting, it shows her ability to flout that orientation for the sake of humor in a language learning task.

8. Multiple sayings of *no* in the language learning classroom

In the preceding excerpts, examples of Inez's responses expressing a lack of affiliation were presented, in all but one case, using a *no* token. Her use of *no* was seen for other correction, third position repair, and as part of doing humor. An orientation to the preference for affiliation to prior talk in her turn construction was also seen in (7). In a number of other instances in the collection of Inez's uses of *no* tokens, *no* was repeated several times consecutively leading me to look at what it was about the sequence of talk-in-interaction that implicated Inez repeating *no* in this way.

By repeated sayings of the same word by the same speaker, I refer to a phenomenon in which the same speaker says the same word or phrase more than once consecutively and as a prosodic whole (Stivers 2004). Over the course of 5 terms of study, in the transcribed interactions of Inez, I collected 15 multiple sayings, 11 of which are multiple *no* tokens. These multiple *no* tokens occurred in talk that was task-oriented as well as during interactions that were less task-oriented and in all five terms of Inez's study at the data collection site. However, they occurred most frequently in her final three terms. As the analysis will show, the multiple sayings seem function in several ways, first, as an upgraded repair initiation and second, as Stivers noted, orienting and doing work to move the currently developing line of talk in another direction.

The first example of a multiple *no* saying comes from a sequence of talk that is not focused on a language learning task. In excerpt (8), we see Inez and Eduardo from Inez's first term of study in an interaction that occurred after the students had finished a teacher-assigned task and before the class moved a teacher-cohort participation structure (in line 8, the teacher is calling for students' attention). In line 5, Inez asks Eduardo (sitting several desks away) about the date of his birthday (line 5). Eduardo's response (line 6) is repeated by a nearby student (Carla, line 7) and after the teacher's exhortation and a short pause, by Inez (line 10), with exaggerated stress on the word 'eight'.

- (8) [term 1, 11-14-02, 204, conv, 1:14:33-1:14:55]
 05 I: Eduardo? when (.) did your birthday.
 06 E: em (1) eight seventeen,
 07 C: eight seventeen
 08 Te: excuse me,

- 09 (.5)
 10 I: eight seventeen,
 11 (.)
 12 I: ⇒ eight? ↑no: no.=your birthday.
 13 E: si
 14 I: birthday.
 15 E: ((writing)) birthday.

It seems that, due to the pauses and Inez's exaggerated stress on 'eight' (line 10) that she hears Eduardo's response as problematic and after another slight pause Inez more clearly initiates repair repeating the first part of Eduardo's answer with rising pitch (line 12). This repeat is followed by a pitch shift on two *no* tokens under one intonation unit and a repeat of the predicate of Inez's original question: "your birthday". Eduardo then acknowledges in Spanish (line 13) and in writing (line 15) that he understands Inez's question and had given her the appropriate response to her question. The multiple tokens of *no* in (8) occur late in a repair sequence, late in the sense that they occur after a third party's repeat of Eduardo's response, a slight pause, Inez's stressed repeat (line 10) of the trouble source, another pause, and Inez's repeat of the trouble source with rising pitch. The double *no* token is an upgrade of the repair initiation made previously by Inez and a more explicit attempt to get Eduardo to understand her elicitation. It can also be seen as a display of negative alignment to Eduardo's line of action.

In Inez's last three terms of study, multiple *no* sayings of more than two tokens appeared. Excerpts (9)–(10) are examples of these cases and along with their action as an upgraded repair initiation, the multiple sayings of *no* also appear to be displaying a negative alignment to the just-started course of action. These two excerpts come from interactions more explicitly oriented to language learning tasks and occur in her third and fifth term of study (that is, after her 30th week of participation in the classroom).¹⁴ In each case, the multiple saying occurs as part of Inez's work to reorient her peers away from the currently building line of understanding.

In (9), Inez, Jin, and Carla are engaged in a task in which they need to find out about the weather in their home countries. In lines 2–3, Jin topicalizes a type of weather (rainy, stormy weather) and asks a question referring to that weather (line 5), to paraphrase: 'which months are rainy, stormy months in your country'. Both Inez and Carla seem to be unfamiliar with the word 'which' as the turns in lines 9–22 suggest. In lines 24 and 26, Jin does recipient design work and changes the wording of the question to which Carla shows a change of epis-

14. A third such multiple saying occurred in term 5 and performed much the same type of action but for the sake of space is not presented in this paper.

temic stance towards (line 27) now understanding the gist of Jin's question. In lines 30 and 33, Inez makes a display of her new understanding (Sacks, 1992) of Jin's question by listing candidate months as possible answers to 'which months' and 'how many' months.

After a side sequence between Jin and Carla (lines 37–43) about the pronunciation of 'eight' and Jin stating "the storm", Inez utters a stretched *no* token in line 46 with raised pitch. The teacher enters this discussion in overlap with Inez's negation with a candidate topic summary (line 47). Carla and Jin (lines 48 and 49) agree with the teacher's topic summary, that what students have been discussing is rain which is confirmed by Carla and Jin and here Inez responds with the multiple saying of *no* (line 50).

- (9) [term 3, 4–4–03, 206 task 1:11:34–1:13:15]
- 01 J: the storm uh:: uh:: the storm uh:: the thunder and
 02 lightening,
 05 (2)
 04 J: which month, which month ee is the: weather. ((writing
 05 as he says this))
 06 (3)
 07 I: yeah. this is the
 08 J: which month,
 09 I: which month
 10 J: it. it is ()
 11 C: () which?
 12 J: [which
 13 I: [which
 14 C: which [()
 15 J: [which month
 16 I: which () no es (.) como.
 17 C: oh[:
 18 I: [no.
 19 C: no [how
 20 J: [which [month.
 21 I: [how monsh. how
 22 J: =how=
 23 I: =how month,
 24 J: }how -ow how many.<
 25 I: yea[h
 26 J: [how many months ah ohow many mo[nths○
 27 C: [ah::[::: o k a y
 28 I: [eh: the
 29 J: which month.

- 30 I: the Sep[t e m b e r, (.) October,
 31 C: [OH (beda beda beda beda)
 32 J: uh September,
 33 I: September, Oc[t o b e r
 34 J: [Octob[er
 35 C: [(oh no)
 36 I: No[vember.
 37 C: [eich, eich eich mon[ths,
 38 I: [in in in
 39 C: ei[ch months
 40 J: [eich eight months [oh::
 41 C: [eight months
 42 I: ho:w [mo-
 43 C: [eight months ((holding up eight fingers))
 44 I: [(eight months)
 45 J: [the storm,
 46 I: ⇒ ↑no[::
 47 Te: [what rain?
 48 C: yeah ((points to J))
 49 J: rain. ((points to C))
 50 I: ⇒ no:: no no no [no no no no.
 51 C: [you oh
 52 J: Mexico.
 53 I: [()
 54 J: [Mexico
 55 (1)
 56 I: eh: ih he ask (1.5) ((gesturing between self and C))
 57 we? (.) [eh::
 58 Te: [okay hello[: ((to class))
 59 I: [how [months, (.)
 60 J: [.hh heh huh
 61 I: rain in your country.
 62 (2)
 63 I: how (much)
 64 C: I'm sorry=
 65 I: =September Oct[ober November
 66 C: [I no understand.
 67 Te: which which months.=
 68 J: Octob[er
 69 Te: [which months.
 70 C: whi
 71 J: November De[cember;

- 72 Te: [months August? (.) September? (.) maybe
 73 April or M[ay.
 74 I: [September: is terrible [in Chiapas.
 75 C: [eich months
 76 Te: uh huh
 77 J: eight [months
 78 I: [yeah
 79 C: eiche month[s
 80 J: [okay.

Inez's use of the multiple *no* in line 50 seems to be an attempt to deflect what Inez sees as the teacher's and her peers' potential misunderstanding of the issue that the students had been discussing. Inez does not see that the primary issue for the students' discussion had been the topic of 'rain' but rather, a problem of understanding question words, particularly 'which', and the meaning of Jin's question from lines 1–2, 4. Carla hears that question as requiring a number of months as a response; Inez, as requiring the specification or names of the months. In (9), Inez's use of multiple *no* tokens not just as a response to the previous turn but as a way to display a negative alignment to the course and action and move the discussion to what she sees as problematic – the meaning of Jin's question. After the multiple *no* tokens, Inez is able co-construct, with the teacher, what she sees the problem in the interaction to be (lines 56–57; 59, 61, 63, 67) and seems to resolve the issue by telling the months in which bad weather occurs in her country (lines 65, 74). Carla is from Brazil and seems to want to indicate that in her country, storms and rain occur for eight months (lines 75, 79).¹⁵

Inez's use of a multiple saying of *no* does similar clarification and reorientation work in the next excerpt (10). Here, Inez and Chi started a language learning task in which they were to role play a situation in which one student was to play a customer requesting something at a shop and the other student was to be an employee at the shop to whom the request is addressed. Inez quickly became frustrated with Chi's behavior due to his failure to understand the nature of the task as explained by the teacher and to stay 'in character'. Inez complained to the teacher that she wanted to work with someone else and the teacher notes, as a way to assure Inez that she is working with a competent member of the class, that Chi has "lived here twenty years" (line 59). After

15. A reviewer asked whether Carla might have been using the number 'eight' to refer to one month, the eight month, August. That may be the case but earlier in this interaction Carla suggested that her home area had a lot of rain which I take as evidence that she is referring to more than one month of rain. Also the non verbal behavior of Carla and Jin (lines 43, 48–49) suggest that there is agreement between the two of them regarding number of months.

hearing Inez's frustration and request for a new peer partner for the task, Chi gives his account for what happened during their task (lines 58, 61, 62, 66, 68).

- (10) [term 5, 2-3-04, 204, task, 1:27:01—1:28:00]
- 49 I: teacher, eh heh can I change this #eh# chair? eh heh
 50 heh heh [heh huh huh .hhhh
 51 Te: [change partners?
 52 (2)
 53 I: n- n: eh:: she is ↑cra::zy.
 54 Te: no he's not
 55 I: ↑ye:s. I [I I ask
 56 Te: [he has a lot of experience
 57 I: I ask eh n(h)o she heh cra(h)zy
 58 C: she she she [ask me.
 59 T: [he's lived here ↑twenty years
 60 I: \$.hhh jye(h)as jyeh I(h) [know.\$
 61 C: [where (ah) where she go to
 62 buy milk.
 63 (.5)
 64 T: okay=
 65 I: =nah:
 66 C: I [say a li-
 67 I: [eh- I:
 68 C: a little (store).
 69 T: where?
 70 C: little store.
 71 (1)
 72 I: lil' stor[e.
 73 C: [little store.
 74 T: at the ↑little store
 75 I: ((gestures)) (candita)
 76 T: [seven eleven?
 77 C: [(little store) seven e↑leven.
 78 T: no: it's too expensive.=
 79 C: =o:r Safeway.
 80 T: Safeway is bet[ter.
 81 C: [o::r Fred Meyer.
 82 T: yes.
 83 I: ⇒ .hh no no n[o no no.
 84 C: [it's too far away wi'd you Fred Meyer you
 85 go [to
 86 I: [no. #eh I- I- I:: tell. talk.

- 87 ↑thi::nk= ((gestures thinking hard))
 88 T: =you are in the store.=
 89 I: =in the s- [grocery store
 90 T: [and you need information.
 91 C: mm hm
 92 I: yeah
 93 C: mm [hm
 94 I: [and ((gestures to C)) jyou are the em- emple-
 93 T: you' [re the employee
 94 I: [employee yeah? [okay.
 95 C: [ahhh.

When the teacher repeats “little store” (line 74) as a confirmation of hearing and offers a candidate franchise name as a type of the category ‘little store’ (line 76), Chi confirms the teacher’s understanding. The teacher then assesses a quality of this type of little store (line 78). At this point, Chi is no longer in the position of defending the behavior which Inez found troubling. Rather, he is engaged with the teacher in an assessment sequence of local stores ‘Seven Eleven’, ‘Safeway’, and ‘Fred Meyer’ (lines 76–84). Inez’s multiple *no* at line 83 occurs just after this assessment sequence by Chi and the teacher. Chi does not immediately orient to this multiple *no* turn by Inez but interrupts it to add another turn to the assessment sequence (line 84). Inez continues her turn in line 86 and with the teacher’s help, moves the talk back to the topic of the proper methods for doing their particular language learning task.

Given what took place during their task interaction and the sequence of talk which starts this excerpt (lines 49–57), we see that Chi and the teacher became engaged in a course of action that Inez did not anticipate. As long as that course of action continued, it preempted her reason for delaying the language learning task and involving the teacher: that is, her complaint that Chi was not doing the task in a way that Inez could follow. After her turn using the multiple saying of *no*, Inez is able to shift the topic of the interaction and get Chi to agree that what the task entails is a role play: Chi should be acting in the role of a store employee who is ready to give information about that store to the ‘customer’ Inez.

Excerpts (9) and (10) are interesting for Inez’s turn constructions involving multiple sayings of *no* and for how the action implicated in this turn construction may show evidence for the use of a language practice for a particular action in one learner’s later terms of study. Stivers (2004: 264) writes that the practice of multiple sayings has been noted in a number of other languages, including Spanish (Inez’s home language). It may be that doing multiple sayings is a cross-cultural practice for social interaction that adult language learners have been socialized to do in a home language. If that is the case with Inez,

learning might be visible in the way that Inez develops a way to do multiple sayings through repeated experience with talk-in-interaction in the language being learned (English in this case).¹⁶

9. Conclusions

The data for this paper were presented here in support of the insights that CA methods give to research on language learning. The argument in support of this research is built around a conceptualization of language and language learning that is quite different from most research programs in SLA's past. The conceptualization toward language and, particularly, language learning that I take is that each is situated, co-constructed, and a contingent social phenomenon and best studied as such. In this paper, I have shown how *no* responses were used by one language learner in her talk-in-interaction in a classroom for several sequence and action types similar to those uncovered in previous CA research using data from non-learners.

First, we saw how unmitigated *no* was used as part of doing overt correction in a language learning task and also near the end of longer repair sequences. I suggested that Inez's use of a bare *no* at the end of a repair sequence may show her orientation to the preference for mitigating turns which do not express affiliation. Her orientation to preference structure was also seen in (7) from her last term of study when a humorous disaffiliative response was packaged to project her dispreferred response. Finally, *no* was used by Inez in multiple sayings to display her disalignment to the ongoing talk as developing a line of action that she considered not timely (excerpts (9) and (10)).

In the excerpts showing talk that was more explicitly task-focused (2, 6, 7, 9, and 10), the sequences around disaffiliative *no* responses show Inez's orientation to repairing and correcting action explicitly related to language learning tasks. These sequences show Inez's strong orientation toward performing tasks in a felicitous manner to help her learn English. The excerpts that presented talk less focused on language learning tasks (3, 4, 5, and 8) show Inez's ability to hear, understand, and respond, giving her stance toward her interlocutor's talk. Although not directed explicitly to language learning, those excerpts show Inez's investment in interpersonal relationships with her peers and in the classroom community of practice. In all the excerpts, whether in talk explicitly oriented to language learning tasks or not, the fact that Inez uses, for the most

16. I see multiple sayings as being, possibly, a pan-cultural practice that is performed through different language systems, or, at least, different lexical items in different languages. In the case of 'no', it is not absolutely transparent that Inez is speaking English except that there is no orientation by others that she has switched to Spanish at that point.

part, such a direct formatting for disaffiliation is not oriented to as remarkable by her peers or the teacher. This suggests that Inez and her peers are doing practices for talk-in-interaction that are not deviant or peripheral to this classroom community of practice.

Two sequences around a disaffiliative response ((3) and (7)) were highlighted as showing, perhaps, Inez's orientation to the preference for self-repair and mitigation of upcoming dispreferred response. Such instances are evidence of Inez's and her peers' interactional competence and changing or emerging practices for participation in a community of practice we might gloss as 'English language users'. An orientation through the use of non-lexical items (*um*, *er*, etc) or discourse markers such as *well* to mark upcoming responses as dispreferred are rare in the data, however. This may be the result of Inez having had little direct instruction in pragmatics, particularly, in doing disagreement or disaffiliation. A survey of teacher talk suggests that teachers do not frequently model or even use discourse markers like *well* as markers of upcoming dispreferred responses (Hellermann and Vergun 2007). The incorporation of such material into practices for doing disaffiliative responses in the talk-in-interaction of language learners may indicate a change to more full participation in the community of practice of English language users. Other longitudinal research may be able to detail that in the future.

This highlighted how learners' engaging in a language learning task or in talk outside of such tasks have affordances for learning simply through the need to co-construct turns of talk in sequence to accomplish social actions. The program of CA research on language learning is showing researchers and teachers what those practices, sequences, and actions look like in the talk among novice language users. The research reported on here investigated the sequences of talk-in-interaction involving one participant in a language learning classroom doing a, potentially, interpersonally delicate social action as she responded to prior talk with negative affiliation. These sequences of talk show ways that members of the language learning classroom engage in a particular social action that is representative of two overlapping communities of practice: the classroom and that of 'English language users'.

Continued use of longitudinal data may allow CA studies to find evidence of language development in tracing practices for talk-in-interaction over time (Kasper 2006). But as this study and many other CA studies interested in language learning¹⁷ have shown (see the current and previous work by the contributors to this volume along with Brouwer 2004; Brouwer and Wagner 2004; Carroll 2005; He 2004; Huth 2006; Seedhouse 2005; Taleghani-Nikazm 2006,

17. See also CA research interested in learning in general (Koschmann et al. 2005; Macbeth 1992, 2000, 2007; Nishizaka 2006; Zemel and Koschmann, forthcoming).

among others), interaction in a turn by turn fashion using talk may be 'learn-ING' in the active sense of the word. CA may best be able to explain language learning (Maxwell 2004) by showing its microgenesis, how participants work out or co-construct talk-in-interaction through reference to socially relevant and necessary mechanisms for talk-in-interaction already found in CA research including, but not limited to turn construction, repair, displays of understanding, and recipient design work.

Portland State University
<jkh@pdx.edu>

Appendix: Transcription conventions

[A left bracket indicates a point of overlap onset.
=	When two lines by different speakers are connected by equal signs, it indicates a latching. When two lines by the same speaker are connected by equal signs, then it indicates a single continuous utterance with no break or pause.
☞	This sign is used to indicate speaker pointing.
(0.5)	Numbers in parentheses indicate silence, represented in tenths of a second.
(.)	A dot in parenthesis indicates a micro-pause; less than 0.2 second.
.	The period indicates a falling or final intonation contour.
?	A question mark indicates rising intonation.
,	A comma indicates continuing intonation.
¿	An inverted question mark indicates a rise stronger than a comma but weaker than a question mark.
!	An exclamation mark indicates strong emphasis with falling intonation.
↑	Arrows indicate shifts into especially high pitch.
<u>word</u>	Underlining indicates stressed syllables
::	Colons indicate the prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them.
°°	The degree signs indicate the talk between them is soft or quiet.
-	A hyphen after a word or part of a word indicates a cut-off.
><	The combination of more than and less than symbols indicates a rushed talk.
<>	The combination of less than and more than symbols indicates a slowed down talk.
# #	The pound signs indicate the talk between them is produced with creaky voice.

\$ \$	The dollar signs indicate the talk between them is produced with smile voice.
hhh	This sign is used for hearable aspiration (e.g., breathing, laughter).
.hh	This sign is used for inhalation.
(())	Double parentheses are used to indicate transcriber's descriptions.
()	Single parentheses indicate uncertainty on the transcriber's part.

References

- Antaki, Charles and Sue Widdicombe (eds.) (1998). *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage.
- Brouwer, Catherine E. (2003). Word searches in NNS-NS interaction: Opportunities for language learning? *The Modern Language Journal* 87 (4): 534–545.
- Brouwer, Catherine E. (2004). Doing pronunciation: A specific type of repair sequence. In *Second Language Conversations*, Rod Gardner and Johannes Wagner (eds.), 93–113. London: Continuum.
- Brouwer, Catherine E. and Johannes Wagner (2004). Developmental issues in second language conversation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1 (1): 29–47.
- Carroll, Donald (2005). Vowel marking as an interactional resource in Japanese novice ESL conversation. In *Applying Conversation Analysis*, Keith Richards and Paul Seedhouse (eds.), 214–234. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Clayman, Stephen and Douglas Maynard (1995). Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. In *Situated Order: Studies in the Social Organization of Talk and Embodied Activities*, Paul ten Have and George Psathas (eds.), 1–30. Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis and University Press of America.
- Edwards, Derek (1997). *Discursive and Cognition*. London: Sage.
- Egbert, Maria (2005). Discrimination due to nonnative speech production? In *Applying Conversation Analysis*, Keith Richards and Paul Seedhouse (eds.), 174–194. London: Palgrave.
- Eskildsen, Søren (2008). Constructing a second language inventory: The accumulation of linguistic resources in L2 English. PhD Dissertation, Southern Denmark University.
- Eskildsen, Søren and Teresa Cadierno (2007). Are recurring multi-word expressions really syntactic freezes? Second language acquisition from the perspective of usage-based linguistics. In *Studies in Languages: Proceedings from the First Nordic Conference on Syntactic Freezes*, Jussi Niemi (ed.), 1–14. Joensuu, Finland: University of Joensuu.
- Firth, Alan (1996). On the discursive accomplishment of “normality:” On lingua franca English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26 (2): 237–259.
- Firth, Alan and Johannes Wagner (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA Research. *Modern Language Journal* 81 (3): 285–300.
- Ford, Cecilia E. (1993). *Grammar in Interaction: Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, Cecilia E. (2001). At the intersection of turn and sequence: Negation and what comes next. In *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*, Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Seltin (eds.), 51–79. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ford, Cecilia E. (2002). Denial and the construction of conversational turns. In *Complex Sentences in Grammar and Discourse: Essays in Honor of Sandra A. Thompson*, Joan Bybee and Michael Noonan (eds.), 61–78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox and John Hellermann (2004). Getting past "no": Sequence, action and sound production in the projection of no-initiated turns. In *Sound Production in Interaction*, Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Cecilia E. Ford (eds.), 233–269. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gardner, Rod and Johannes Wagner (eds.) (2004). *Second Language Conversations*. London: Continuum.
- Garfinkel, Harold (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Garfinkel, Harold and Harvey Sacks (1970). On formal structures of practical actions. In *Theoretical Sociology: Perspectives and Developments*, Jack C. McKinney and Edward A. Tiryakin (eds.), 338–366. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.
- Gass, Susan (1998). Apples and oranges: Or, why apples are not oranges and don't need to be. A response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal* 82 (1): 83–90.
- Goodwin, Charles and John Heritage (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 283–307.
- Hakulinen, Auli (1995). Review of the book *Grammar in Interaction: Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversations*. *Language in Society* 24 (1): 129–131.
- Hall, Joan K. (1995). "Aw man, where you goin'?": Classroom interaction and the development of L2 interactional competence. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 6 (2): 37–62.
- Harris, Roy (1981). *The Language Myth*. London: Duckworth.
- He, Agnes W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4): 568–582.
- Heeschen, Claus and Emanuel A. Schegloff (2003). Aphasic agrammatism as interactional artifact and achievement. In *Conversation and Brain Damage*, Charles Goodwin (ed.), 231–282. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hellermann, John (2005). The sequential and prosodic co-construction of a 'quiz game' activity in classroom talk. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37 (6): 919–944.
- Hellermann, John (2007). The development of practices for action in classroom dyadic interaction: Focus on task openings. *The Modern Language Journal* 91 (1): 83–96.
- Hellermann, John (2008). *Social Actions for Classroom Language Learning*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hellermann, John (2009). Language learning seen in practices for repair. *Scandinavian Journal of Research in Education* 53 (6).
- Hellermann, John and Andrea Vergun (2007). Language which is not taught: The discourse marker use of beginning adult learners of English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (1): 157–179.
- Higgins, Christina (2007). Constructing membership in the in-group: Affiliation and resistance among urban Tanzanians. *Pragmatics* 17 (1): 49–70.
- Hosoda, Yuri (2000). Other repair in Japanese conversations between nonnative and native Speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 11 (1): 39–63.
- Hosoda, Yuri (2001). Conditions for other-repair in NS/NNS conversation. *The Language Teacher* 25 (11): 29–31.
- Hutchins, Edwin (1995). *Cognition in the Wild*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Huth, Thorsten (2006). Negotiating structure and culture: L2 learners' realization of L2 compliment-response sequences in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (12): 2025–2050.
- Irvine, Martha (2005). Developmental states in one learner's interlanguage. Unpublished MA Thesis, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.
- Jayyusi, Lena (1984). *Categorization and the Moral Order*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Jefferson, Gail (1984). Notes on a systematic deployment of the acknowledgement tokens 'yeah' and 'mm hm'. *Papers in Linguistics* 17: 197–216.
- Jefferson, Gail (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In *Talk and Social Organisation*, Graham Button and John Lee (eds.), 86–100. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Jefferson, Gail (2002). "No" an acknowledgment token? Comparing American and British uses of (+)/(-) tokens. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (10–11): 1345–1383.
- Kasper, Gabrielle (1997). 'A' stand for acquisition: A response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal* 81(3), 307–312.
- Kasper, Gabrielle (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILA Review* 19: 83–99.
- Koshik, Irene (2002). A conversation analytic study of yes/no questions which convey reversed polarity assertions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (2): 1851–1877.
- Koschmann, Timothy, Alan Zemel, Melinda Conlee-Stevens, Nata P. Young, Julie E. Robbs and Amber Barnhart (2005). How do people learn: Members' methods and communicative mediation. In *Barriers and Biases in Computer-mediated Knowledge Communication and How they May be Overcome*, Rainer Bromme, Freiderich W. Hesse and Hans Spada (eds.), 265–294. New York: Springer.
- Kramsch, Claire and Anne Whiteside (2007). Three fundamental concepts in second language acquisition and their relevance in multilingual contexts. *The Modern Language Journal* 91: 907–922.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane (2004). CA for SLA? It all depends. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4): 603–607.
- Lave, Jean and Etienne Wenger (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macbeth, Douglas (1992). Classroom "floors": Material organizations as a course of affairs. *Qualitative Sociology* 15 (2): 123–151.
- Macbeth, Douglas (2000). Classrooms as installations: Direct instruction in the early grades. In *Local Educational Order: Ethnomethodological Studies of Knowledge in Action*, Stephen Hester and David Francis (eds.), 21–71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Macbeth, Douglas (2007). Understanding understanding as an instructional matter. Paper presented at the European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction (EARLI), Budapest.
- Markee, Numa (1994). Toward an ethnomethodological respecification of second-language acquisition studies. In *Research Methodology in Second-Language Acquisition*, Elaine Tarone, Susan Gass and Andrew Cohen (eds.), 89–116. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Markee, Numa (2000). *Conversation Analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Markee, Numa (2005). The organization of off-task talk in second language classrooms. In *Applying Conversation Analysis*, Keith Richards and Paul Seedhouse (eds.), 197–213. London: Palgrave.
- Markee, Numa (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics* 29 (3): 404–427.
- Markee, Numa and Gabrielle Kasper (2004). Classroom Talks. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4): 491–500.
- Maxwell, Joseph A. (2004). Causal explanation, qualitative research, and scientific inquiry in education. *Educational Researcher* 33 (2): 3–11.
- Mondada, Lorenza and Simona Pekarek Doehler (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4): 501–518.
- Mori, Junko (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 (2): 323–347.
- Mori, Junko (2003). The culture of interculturality: A study of initial encounters between Japanese and American students. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36 (2): 143–184.
- Mori, Junko (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (4): 536–550.
- Mori, Junko and Makoto Hayashi (2006). The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: A study of interactions between first and second language speakers. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (2): 195–219.

- Nishizaka, Aug (2006). What to learn: The embodied structure of the environment. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 39 (2): 119–154.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage (eds.), 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ravem, Roar (1968). Language acquisition in a second language environment. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 6 (2): 175–185.
- Reder, Stephen, Kathryn A. Harris, and Kristen Setzler (2003). A Multimedia Adult Learner Corpus. *TESOL Quarterly* 37 (3): 409–425.
- Resnick, Lauren B., John M. Levine, and Stephanie D. Teasley (eds.) (1991). *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Sacks, Harvey (1987). On the Preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In *Talk in Social Organisation*, Graham Button and John R. E. Lee (eds.), 54–69. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, Harvey (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (5): 1295–1345.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1997). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes* 23 (3): 499–545.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schumann, John H. (1979). The acquisition of English negation by speakers of Spanish: A review of the literature. In *The Acquisition and Use of Spanish and English as First and Second Languages*, Roger W. Andersen (ed.), 3–32. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Seedhouse, Paul (1997). The case of the missing “no”: The relationship between pedagogy and interaction. *Language Learning* 47 (3): 547–583.
- Seedhouse, Paul (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Seedhouse, Paul (2005). “Task” as research construct. *Language Learning* 55 (3): 533–570.
- Seedhouse, Paul (2007). On ethnomethodological CA and “linguistic CA”: A reply to Hall. *The Modern Language Journal* 91 (4): 527–533.
- Selting, Margret and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen (eds.) (2001). *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stensig, Jakob and Paul Drew (2008). Introduction: Questioning and affiliation/disaffiliation in interaction. *Discourse Studies* 10 (1): 5–15.
- Stivers, Tanya (2004). “No no no” and other types of multiple sayings in social interaction. *Human Communication Research* 30 (2): 260–293.
- Stivers, Tanya (2008). Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41 (1): 31–57.
- Taleghani-Nikazm, Carmen (2006). *Request Sequences: The Intersection of Grammar, Interaction and Social Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- te Molder, Hedwig and Jonathan Potter (eds.) (2005). *Conversation and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wagner, Johannes (1996). Foreign language acquisition through interaction. A critical review of research on conversational adjustments. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26 (2): 215–235.
- Wenger, Etienne (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, Jean (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics* 21 (2): 244–267.

- Wong, Jean and David Olsher (2000). Reflections on conversation analysis and nonnative speaker talk: An interview with Emanuel A. Schegloff. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 11 (1): 111–128.
- Young, Richard F. (1999). Sociolinguistic approaches to SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 19: 105–132.
- Young, Richard F. (2000). Interactional competence: Challenges for validity. Paper presented at the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Vancouver, BC.
- Zemel, Alan and Timothy Koschmann (forthcoming) Understanding-as-participation: A single case analysis of a program-based learning meeting. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

Copyright of IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching is the property of Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.