Studies in Applied Linguistics & TESOL at Teachers College, Columbia University, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. i–v
The Forum

Documenting Change from a Conversation Analytic Perspective: Introduction to the Spring Forum

Carol Hoi Yee Lo & Kelly Katherine Frantz
Teachers College, Columbia University

Since its inception, Conversation Analysis (CA), which aims to describe the fine-grained machinery of talk (Sidnell, 2010), has uncovered an impressive range of "member's methods"—how members of society accomplish social actions. The "lived work" of participants is, in fact, dynamic and complex: Facing new situations and unforeseen contingencies could inform how participants respond to similar situations in the future. And beyond tracing the emergence of new knowledge and practices, our understanding of member's knowledge can also be extended by charting how novices of a community of practice develop competence and expand their repertoires. After all, novices do not become experts overnight; documenting the trajectories and evolutions of practices can provide important insights into the very process of becoming a competent member.

This dual perspective of *change* in members' practices—the focus of this forum, was inspired by a LANSI virtual workshop on "Longitudinal Conversation Analysis" facilitated by Simona Pekarek-Doehler (2022). Simona's cogent and thorough explanations of the premises and challenges of longitudinal CA prompted us to carefully consider how *time* shapes interactional practices. We thus proposed the theme "documenting change" in hopes of illuminating the multifaceted ways that participants—be it novices or experts—recalibrate and adapt their practices in order to accomplish specific social actions. For the purpose of this forum, however, we choose to highlight microscopic patterns of change over longitudinality; therefore, in addition to comparisons across a considerable time period, we direct the analytic spotlight on microgenetic and ontogenetic change as well. But despite the differences in timescales, all papers in this forum strive to adhere to the "same-but-different" principle (Koschmann, 2013, p. 1039, as cited in Deppermann & Pekarek-Doehler, 2021); that is, to make change analytically tractable and comparable, all papers focus on instances that evidence how a specific interactional mechanism evolves.

Over the last two decades, longitudinal CA research has yielded important insights into how a wide range of competencies develop. One line of empirical work has been concerned with children. Beginning with Wootton's (1997) seminal study on request formats, studies have traced children's development of, for example, self-repair (Forrester, 2008), recipient design (Filippi, 2009, 2015), and more recently, awareness of language and cultural norms (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2021). Another considerable body of research focuses on second language learners, documenting increasing participation and growing complexity in story openings (Lee & Hellermann, 2014; Pekarek-Doehler & Berger, 2018), story recipiency (Ishida, 2011; Kim, 2016), turn-taking (Cekaite, 2007), repair initiation (Hellermann, 2011), managing routine inquiries (Waring, 2013), and saying grace (Greer, 2018). The third strand of work tracks how novices' conduct changes in professional settings. Findings describe, for instance, how a Ph.D. student manages criticism from their supervisor (Li & Seale, 2007), how a pharmacy intern develops increasingly recipient-

designed advice (Nguyen, 2011), and how a hotel employee becomes skilled in assessments and topic management (Nguyen, 2020).

In addition to traditional longitudinal designs, a smaller body of CA work has examined change across single interactional episodes. Occasionally labeled "microgenetic" (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1985; Wertcsh & Stone, 1978), this research typically focuses on participants' learning processes as they repeatedly engage with a learning item. Studies describe, for example, how a student and teacher engage with a grammatical item during an oral proficiency interview (van Compernolle, 2010), how peers work toward lexical and phonological accuracy during role play tasks (Mori, 2004), and how children construct topical knowledge while reading together (Melander & Sahlstrom, 2009). Overall, whether the time frame is several minutes or several months, all CA studies that document change use historical time as the organizing principle for analysis. The papers in this forum do the same, focusing on the temporal aspect of interaction across a range of settings and time frames.

The three papers in this forum work within the conversation analytic framework and draw on naturally-occurring data from three different institutional settings. Frantz tracks how a second-year graduate student formulates her criticism of a scientific construct in virtual writing consultations across seven months. Over time, the focal student gradually formulates sophisticated academic critique that features more appropriate lexical choices and domain-specific argumentation. Yu examines a town hall meeting on high-capacity weapons regulation, tracing how an anti-gun citizen presses for a response from a pro-gun member of congress. The citizen and the congress member, as they pursue and evade a response respectively, reframe the term *rights* to their own agenda. Finally, Hughes traces a first-grade teacher's change in her formulation of directives as a student remains uncooperative. By progressively upgrading the corrective force of the directive, the paper provides a snapshot of the teacher's micro-level change in disciplinary strategy crucial for socialization of appropriate behavior.

These papers contribute to CA literature on change by demonstrating the variety of time frames, settings, and topics available for study. The interactions analyzed in this forum, spanning a few minutes to several months, underscore how a focus on temporality in interaction can lead to rich analytical insights. Moving beyond the common themes of learning processes and development, contributors to this forum use CA to describe members' shifting methods for accomplishing a variety of actions. Both Yu's analysis of a town hall discussion and Hughes' study of teacher directives reveal how speakers reshape their talk in response to resistance. And Frantz, taking a more traditional longitudinal approach, offers a welcome interactional perspective on an understudied academic skill. The variety of work presented in this forum shows the diverse analytic possibilities for future CA research documenting change.

REFERENCES

Cekaite, A. (2007). A child's development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00509.x

Deppermann, A., & Pekarek-Doehler, S. (2021). Longitudinal conversation analysis - Introduction to the special issue. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *54*(2), 127–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2021.1899707

Filipi, A. (2009). *Parent and toddler interaction: The development of interactional competence through pointing, gaze and vocalisations*. John Benjamins.

Filipi, A. (2015). The development of recipient-design in bilingual parent-child interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *48*(1), 100–119. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2015.993858

Forrester, M. A. (2008). The emergence of self-repair: A case study of one child during the early preschool years. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *41*(1), 99–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810701691206

Greer, T. (2018). Learning to say grace. *Social Interaction: Video-based studies of human sociality*, *1*(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.7146/si.v1i1.105499

Hellermann, J. (2011). Members' methods, members competencies: Looking for evidence of language learning in longitudinal investigation of other-initiated repair. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek Doehler (Eds.), *L2 interactional competence and development* (pp. 147–172). Multilingual Matters.

Ishida, M. (2011). Engaging in another person's telling as a recipient in L2 Japanese: Development of interactional competence during one-year study abroad. In G. Pallotti & J. Wagner (Eds.), *L2 learning as social practice: Conversation-analytic perspectives* (pp. 45-85). University of Hawai'i.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). John Benjamins.

Kim, Y-H. (2016). Development of L2 Interactional Competence: Being a Story Recipient in L2 English Conversation. *Discourse and Cognition*, *23*(1), 1–29. doi:10.15718/discog.2016.23.1.1

Lee, Y-A., & Hellermann, J. (2014). Tracing developmental changes through conversation analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, *48*(4), 763–788. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.149

Li, S. & Seale, C. (2007). Managing criticism in Ph.D. supervision: a qualitative case study. *Studies in Higher Education*, *32*(4), 511–526.

Melander, H. & Sahlstrom, F. (2009). In tow of the blue whale: Learning as interactional changes in topical orientation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*(8), 1519–1537. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.05.013

Mondada, L. (2019). Conventions for multimodal transcription. https://www.lorenzamondada.net/_files/ugd/ba0dbb_986ddd4993a04a57acf20ea06e2b9a34.pdf

Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 536–550. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-17-.x

Nguyen, H. T. (2011). Achieving recipient-design longitudinally: Evidence from a pharmacy intern in patient consultations. In J. K. Hall, J. Hellermann, & S. Pekarek (Eds.) *L2 Interactional competence and development* (pp. 173–205). Multilingual Matters.

Nguyen, H. T. (2020). Turn-design as longitudinal achievement: Learning on the shop floor. In J. Hellermann, S. W. Eskildsen, & S. Pekarek-Doehler (Eds.), *Conversation analytic research on learning-in-action: The complex ecology of second language interaction 'in the wild'*. Springer.

Nguyen, H. T., & Nguyen, M. T. T. (2021). 'But I want to say "I means love you"': A child's development of stancetaking in parent-initiated language-focused sequences. *Research on Children and Social Interaction*, *5*(2), 211–238. https://doi.org/10.1558/rcsi.17523

Pekarek-Doehler, S. (2022, January 14). *Longitudinal conversation analysis*. LANSI Virtual Workshop Series.

Pekarek-Doehler, S., & Berger, E. (2018). L2 interactional competence as increased ability for context-sensitive conduct: A longitudinal study of story-openings. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(4), 555–578. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw021

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.

van Compernolle, R.A. (2010). Incidental microgenetic development in second-language teacher-learner talk-in-interaction. *Classroom Discoursde, 1*(1), 68–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463011003750608

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Waring, H. Z. (2013). "How was your weekend?": Developing the interactional competence in managing routine inquiries. *Language Awareness*, *22*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.644797

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of the mind*. Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J. V., & Stone, C. A. (1978). Microgenesis as a tool for developmental analysis. *Quarterly Newsletter for Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition*, *1*(1), 7–10.

Wootton, A. J. (1997). *Interaction and the development of mind*. Cambridge University Press.

Carol Lo received her doctorate in Applied Linguistics at Teachers College, Columbia University. Her research applies conversation analysis to study pedagogical interaction and, more recently, video-mediated family interaction. Her work has appeared in peer-reviewed journals (*Classroom Discourse*, *WORD*) and edited volumes (*Communicating with the Public: Conversation Analytic Studies* and *Storytelling in Multilingual Interaction: A Conversation Analytic Perspective*). Correspondence should be sent to hyl2110@tc.columbia.edu.

Kelly Frantz is a doctoral student in Applied Linguistics at Teachers College, Columbia University. In her research, she uses conversation analysis to study writing tutoring, language learning, and technology-mediated interaction. Correspondence should be sent to kkf2109@tc.columbia.edu.

APPENDIX A

Jefferson (2014) and Mondada (2019) transcription notation

(.)	Just noticeable pause
(.3), (2.6)	Examples of timed pauses
↑ word, ↓ word	Onset of noticeable pitch rise or fall (can be difficult to use reliably)
A: word [word B: [word	Square brackets aligned across adjacent lines denote the start of overlapping talk. Some transcribers also use "]" brackets to show where the overlap stops
.hh, hh	in-breath (note the preceding full stop) and out-breath respectively.
wo(h)rd	(h) is a try at showing that the word has "laughter" bubbling within it
wor-	A dash shows a sharp cut-off
wo:rd	Colons show that the speaker has stretched the preceding sound.
(words)	A guess at what might have been said if unclear
( )	Unclear talk.
A: word= B: =word	The equals sign shows that there is no discernible pause between two speakers' turns or, if put between two sounds within a single speaker's turn, shows that they run together
word, WORD	Underlined sounds are louder, capitals louder still
°word°	material between "degree signs" is quiet
>word word< <word word>	Inwards arrows show faster speech, outward slower
→	Analyst's signal of a significant line
((sniff))	Transcriber's effort at representing something hard, or impossible, to write phonetically
* * + + Δ Δ	Descriptions of embodied actions are delimited between two identical symbols (one symbol per participant and per type of action) that are synchronized with correspondent stretches of talk or time indications.
---> ---->	The action described continues across subsequent lines until the same symbol is reached.
fig	The exact moment at which a screen shot has been taken # is indicated with a sign (#) showing its position within the turn/a time measure.