

# Using Conversation Analysis (CA)-Informed Intervention to Enhancing the Turn-taking Skills of EFL Students

**Lemma Kassaye Sileshi\***

*Bahir Dar University, P.O.Box: 79, Ethiopia*

*\*Corresponding author: email: [lemma.kassaye261@gmail.com](mailto:lemma.kassaye261@gmail.com), Telephone: +251911390470*

## **Abstract**

*The present study explores the contribution of Conversation Analysis (CA)-informed intervention in developing students' turn taking skills, the essential mechanism in conversations. In order to address the issue CA approach and procedures were used. Data were gathered through audio/video devices while the participants of the study were holding conversations. Oral productions of the participants recorded and oral task analysis was made to see if qualitative changes were observed. And the findings show that the intervention has enabled them to hold conversations through the production of turn constructional units in a better way than they used to and this has an implication to the acquisition of second language.*

## **Keywords:**

Conversation analysis, Turn-taking, Turn constructional units, TCU

## **Introduction**

The primary focus of research in conversation analysis (CA) is talk rather than language (Gordon, 2004), and talk is understood to be an occasion when people act out their sociality (Schegloff, 1986). A turn-at-talk refers to a participant's spoken contribution to a conversation (Wong and Waring, 2010). Turn-taking is one of the key structural units of conversation and having knowledge of it and its constituent element is of vital importance for successful oral interaction (Dornyei and Thurrell, 1994). The idea of 'turn-taking' as an organized activity is one of the core ideas of the CA enterprise (Ten Have, 2007). Turn-taking is one of the essential mechanisms in conversation (Bakeman and Gnischi, 2005).

A contemporary well-built focus in CA has been turn design; especially the aspects of grammar or a turn constructional unit, is put together (Gordon, 2004). The unit of talk (the turn constructional unit, or TCU) was considered to be a word, a phrase, a clause, or a sentence (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Turn constructional unit (TCU) is a building component of a turn in a conversation. It is a unit of conversation that completes a communicative act (Markee, 2000).

Having knowledge and skills of these allows us to better control the conversation and ensure the other person is better able to respond (Gorjian and Habibi, 2015, Goodwin, 1981). Hence, the CA-informed turn taking instruction could enhance learners' interaction in the classroom and beyond. Having this in mind, the present study is sought investigate whether CA-based intervention promotes the turn taking skills of learners in interaction.

## **The Rationale**

The ability to communicate orally enables a person to verbalize thoughts and ideas (Donato, 2000). And for communicating effectively, one needs to understand the rules and practices that structure conversational turn-taking: who can speak when, how long they can speak for and what they can say (Schegloff, 2007). In addition to understanding and putting the turn taking skills, one has to develop

language skills required for this purpose. However, students in the current research context seem to lack interactional skills in English though several attempts are being made due to the fact that turn taking rules and constituents of turn taking issues are less focused in spoken English classes (Dornyei & Thurrell, 1994) and the language classroom does not offer too many opportunities for students to develop their awareness of turn-taking rules or to practise turn-taking skills. Such being the case, the current study tried to explore whether turn taking based intervention enhances students' interactional skills.

### **Research questions**

Being drawn from the problem statement of the study, the following research questions were formulated.

1. Does the CA-informed intervention help to develop the turn taking skills of the study participants?
2. How does the CA-informed intervention enable students to produce turn constructional units to be interactionally competent?

## **Methods**

Conversation analysis (CA) methodology, which emerged from ethnomethodology, was employed for the collection and analysis of the data of the study. As many authors such as Barrajan-Rohan (2011) argue, CA takes a highly empirical approach to analysis and a conversation analyst would shun intuitive interpretations of data. It helps to discover how participants themselves understand and interpret what they are doing, allowing unmotivated looking in the collection of data (Gardner, 2004). It is also emphasized that the use of conversation analysis method helps to uncover the gaps in conversational features of the study participants and take an intervention accordingly (Hoskins & Noel, 2011). CA is a rather specific analytic endeavor in that it is an explication of the ways in which conversationalists maintain an interactional social order (Ten Have, 2007). Hence, using the CA methodology has important contributions in promoting second language acquisition (Markee, 2000).

### **Data collection tools**

The researcher analysed the recorded and transcribed oral productions of students (before and after the intervention) to examine the quality changes (if any) between the oral communication task performance during the pretest and the posttest. A description of each task performance together with the actual verbal outputs has been presented in the analysis part of the study. Based on the CA turn taking model, an analysis and interpretation of the oral communication performance of each pair and group was made as can be viewed below.

### **Data collection and analysis procedures**

Procedures adopted from Barraja-Rohan (2011) were used to meet the objective of the study. Hence, the first step was examining in detail how students interact without the teacher's intervention. In the pre-intervention phase of the study, students were provided with different scenarios in which they performed tasks without the intervention of the researcher. The oral practice students performed was believed to enable the researcher to get opportunities to record, analyze, and take field notes. The second was finding an interactional framework to treat the problems identified. The researcher chose the CA framework to conduct the intervention. The third step was identifying what interactional features needed to be taught. The fourth step the researcher followed was finding suitable teaching materials based on the gaps identified. Having analyzed the oral productions of the study participants and identified the gaps, the researcher intervened using the framework proposed by Dornie and Thurrell (1994) and Hoskins and Noel (2011) for teaching conversational features. In addition to using written teaching materials, the students were exposed to sample audio/video tools to supplement the written materials. The intervention took four months. In the fifth step, the researcher refined the CA-based pedagogical approach in the way it could help the promotion of students' turn taking skills. The last step was to check students' progress and their responses to the CA approach. This was achieved by recording students having a conversation with their peers before, during and after the intervention (conducted both in pairs and triads).

The data collected through audio/video devices were analysed based on Dornyei and Thurrell's (1994) CA-framework as well as Wong and Warings' (2010) CA framework to see the students' enhanced use of semiotic systems (Markee, 2008), one of which is turn taking. Thus, CA framework has been used for it helps to uncover the gaps in conversational turn taking (Ten Have, 2007, Sidnell, 2000, Seedhouse, 2005,) and to conduct an intervention accordingly (Hoskins and Noel, 2011). To begin with, the analysis bases on the following audio/video extracts.

## Results

The data collected before and after the intervention have been presented and analysed from the perspective of CA as presented below.

### The pre-intervention conversation analysis

The first step taken was to have a baseline study to ensure the real existence of the gaps in students' conversational skills especially the turn taking skills and related aspects of language productions. In doing so, activities or tasks that could enable them to elicit conversations were given to them. The tasks were scenarios of different types, and varied in their genre. The students were paired up, and were told to read the scenarios first and then to perform the activities. However, the type of scenario they performed was based on their choice. As presented and analyzed below, the gaps were identified and the materials which were considered to be appropriate for the intervention were prepared and taught to them to enhance their conversational skills.

Sample excerpts are used here to show the oral productions of the study participants in the pre-intervention phase of the study. The presentation of some of the conversation excerpts is believed to increase the credibility and reliability of the data. Another reason is that it helps to compare the conversational practices of the study participants before and after the intervention.

#### Excerpt I: Telephoning

*((Ringing))*  
Ywb: Hello::  
Fs: Hello Bz  
Ywb: Good morning  
Fs: Good morning Bz::what the new:?  
Ywb: Fs I would like invite you my birthday party. Would you able to come?  
Fs: At what o'clock?  
Ywb: *((What second line)) ((not audible)) at two o'clock*  
Fs: Local time local time?  
Ywb: *(( )) time*  
Fs: *((Gazing at each other)) (11s) Ok-I will have*  
Ywb: Thank you Fs  
Fs: Good [bye *((with overlap))*  
Ywb: [Thank you.  
Fs: Goodbye.

In the opening of the conversation both conversants took turns and produced similar turn constructional units (TCU): 'Hello-Hello' with an extension of the greeting by producing other utterances: 'Good morning-Good morning'. In turns they took to greet each other, they produced complete sentences. The second adjacency pair part of the conversation was stretched until Fs thought what she had to say in her attempt to produce more than one TCU. Fs developed the topic of the conversation by asking a question using the expression 'what the new?' she meant 'what is new?'. Ywb's utterance (line 7, and 9) was difficult to hear, almost not audible except the phrase at two o'clock. That is why double brackets are used to indicate the inaudible part of her utterance. The surprising thing is that Fs took 11 seconds and they gazed each other for Fs failed to say something in response to the preceding turn constructional unit. After 11 seconds of pause, Fs could say 'Ok-I will have'. Here it is very difficult to judge whether the utterance 'Ok-I will have' goes with the preceding turn constructional unit. What can be understood from their conversation is that the conversants especially Fs lacked linguistic resources to produce an utterance or turn constructional unit which is building block of conversational skills.

These conversants also have gaps in their knowledge of the use of turn constructional expressions for pre-closing and closing in English though they took turns. As can be seen in the extract (line 12), the expression 'thank you Fs' immediately followed by 'goodbye' overlapping with 'Thank you' where this expression inserted by between the adjacency pairs of 'goodbyes'. Here, two things happened. One is the closing is an abrupt because no bridging expression or turn constructional resource was used. The second is that the expression 'thank you' was inserted between the terminal closing adjacency pairs: *goodbye-goodbye*.

### Excerpt II: Telephoning

((*Ringing*))

Um: *Listening*

TgA: *How are you? This is TgA.*

Um: (12s) ((*bending her face with a sign of shyness and signalling her partner to restart the call*)). *Hello TgA. This is Um.*

TgA: *How are you this is TgA.*

Um: *How are you:*

TgA: *I'm fine:*

Um: *A'm-I-I forget you-I forget you I-forget you-I forget you:r-you-you: homework:: tell me to page.*

TgA: *Yes: it is page on ((lege)) ((general))*

Um: *Thank you:*

TgA: *No matter. Good bye.*

Um: *Goodbye ((quieter than the surrounding))*

This conversation was opened by a telephone ringing (summons) followed by the response given by Um using the turn constructional unit 'listening' which is unusual in English. Then came the 'How are you' greeting and the self-identification: 'I'm TgA' turn constructional unit. Pausing for 12 seconds and bending her face as a sign of shyness, Um signaled her partner to restart the conversation and said 'Hello TgA this is Um'. At the identification and recognition stage, TgA greeted Um with 'How are you' this is TgA' repeating what she said before they restarted the conversation (line 2). As part of the opening the 'How are you- I'm fine' expressions continued.

In her attempt to provide a reason to ask a question, Um used repeated turn constructional units (linguistic units) in an awkward manner as indicated in (line 7) of the conversation. Though the adjacency pair seems to be appropriate to the question asked, it lacks clarity for it was not stated bringing into play clear language and appropriate language use which is an indication of the use of appropriate turn constructional units. Even the page number she was referring to was not indicated.

Lastly, 'thank-no matter' adjacency pair parts were used as a pre-closing expressions followed by terminal closing adjacency pair parts (TCUs) of 'Goodbye-Goodbye'.

### Excerpt III: Shopping

Kf: *How are you ((shaking hands))*

Jm: *I'm fine.*

Kf: *I want to buy something firom you eh (( ))*

Jm: *eh have you travel have you care of travels?*

Kf: *Yes I have: (( ))*

Jm: *Please estimati the white one the black one?*

Kf: *Yes (( ))*

Jm: *Oh: it is big extenses ((to mean expensive)) do you think it counts price?*

Kf: *It's ss four hundredi brr it is four hundredi n brr*

Jm: *Sorry could I bar you: four hundred brr:*

Kf: *Yes: take iti.*

Jm: *ek: thank you very much::.*

Kf: *No matter*

Jm: *Goodbye.*

*Kf: Goodbye.*

Jm and Kf opened their greeting with 'How are you-I'm fine' adjacency pairs or sequence of turn constructional units (TCU) indicating their familiarity to each other accompanied by hand shaking. The kind of conversation involved was transactional. It was shopping for clothing. Kf developed the conversation by telling the shop keeper (Jm) that he wanted to buy something from Jm. In doing so he used an expression which has both inaudible portion and a pronunciation influenced by his mother tongue: a one syllable word 'from' pronounced by Jm as a two syllable word "firom" (line 3) which of course was followed by unclear utterance or turn constructional unit (line 4). Kf has also produced inaudible utterances in (lines 5 and 7) which are marked by double parentheses.

Both Jm and Kf were influenced by their mother tongues, for example, words like take and hundred were pronounced as 'taki' and 'hundredi'. Some of the words in their turns were pronounced in an odd manner. For instance words like 'expensive' were pronounced as 'extenses' (line 8).

The closing was made by using *thank you-no matter* adjacency pair parts (or sequences of turn constructional units) as pre-closing and the 'Goodbye-Goodbye' turn constructional units as terminal closing. Jm's utterance in the pre-closing sequence was accompanied by a falling intonation. Jm used it to indicate the closing of the conversation, to initiate the closing of the conversation and to allocate the turn to his conversational partner, Kf. As discussed above falling intonation marks the turn completion point.

Based on the analyses of the above excerpts, problems were identified that would show the areas to be focused and intervened accordingly to promote the conversational skills of the study participants as the contribution of turn taking in CA here is to shed light on SLA (Lee and Hellermann, 2013).

### Post Intervention Analysis

The post-intervention conversation was used to show the qualitative changes if there are any achieved as a result of the intervention. The results of the post intervention analysis are presented below.

#### Excerpt I

*Ywb: Good morning*

*TgA: Good morning-((overlapping))*

*Um: Good morning-((overlapping))*

*Ywb: Imm: How are you.*

*TgA: I'm fine thank you.*

*Um: I'm fine thank you.*

*Ywb: Today: we share celebration of our holidays eh: we come from different eh town or regions. Let-let me see let me how do celebrate a holiday? which holiday: you greatly celebrate?*

*TgA: Oh:e: celebrate holiday greatly eh: Merry Christmas, eh: eh:Merry Christmas I: celebrate: eh at church anda eh: at the room eh: at church: you celebrate eh preaching the word of God eh you sek some anda eh::many other program eh: at the home:eh: you prpare many kinds of food: like imm: doru wot eh: eh soft drink anda another many goods then you collect eh: many my friends or the native live around that you can together then enjoy it you you celebrate holiday at-((quieter as a sign of turn allocation))*

*Ywb: Ok: how about you Um*

*Um: Eh: ihih ((clearing throat)) I celebrate holidays celebrate is I will many celebrate I like I like Remodan eh I-I eating porridge I eating porridge and a I going to mosquito imm I coming to: collect family imm: I drink coffee I eating food imm I drink mil: soft I drink soft: drinking I drinking soft and so on.*

*Ywb: Ok:*

*TgA: How do you celebrate holiday?*

*Ywb: Ehh: I celebrate many: holidays. Eh:.let see the one: Merry Christmas or app-Easter example. I celebrate at the church and at the home. At the church by every-many programs after that: at home we prepare many kind of food; for example we bake a bread soft drin we make soft drinks and other foods at there then we whole or come together our relative and neighboring and with my friends and come together and enjoy with us. Come together and we celebrate at this kind. Thank you.*

Ywb, TgA and Um opened their conversation by greeting adjacency pair parts of 'Good morning-Good morning- Good morning' the second and the third turn constructional units being overlapped. The overlap happened because Ywb started the greeting and TgA and Um responded concurrently. Ywb again extended the greeting and the two responded using similar expression 'I'm fine thank you'. Since they were familiar with the topic and made a lot of practice on other topics before, it allowed them to talk for a longer time with a better progress. After the greeting adjacency pair parts (line 5), Ywb took turn and gave a brief introduction and explanation about what they would talk about or share by mentioning a reason that they came from different towns or regions. Having introduced the topic, she asked two questions of how they celebrate and which holiday they significantly celebrate. In asking them, Ywb used repeated phrases in framing her question, omitting the pronoun 'you' in the first question, for she was in hurry, and she stretched the word 'holiday:' in the second to think about what she would say next in her turn. Her utterance in the first clause has also the stretched word 'today:'.

In her turn TgA, started her utterance with stretched fillers 'Oh:' and 'e.' as a sign of welcoming the question. She used a lot of 'eh' which helped her to fill the gaps in her turn and have time to think to organize the ideas she was talking. In addition, mother tongue influence in pronunciation such as 'anda' to mean 'and' was greatly observed. Some grammatical or syntactic errors were also observed in her turn when she was contributing to the conversation. However, as compared to the previous conversations she held, this one is better in terms of time she took and her contribution to the conversation. Finally, she left her turn or utterance incomplete with a quieter voice as a sign of turn allocation to Ywb.

Having heard TgA's contribution, Ywb used the stretched 'Ok:' as a sign of admiration of the way TgA celebrates holidays in her locality. Then Ywb allocated the next turn to Um mentioning her name by using the turn of phrase 'what about you Um'. Having realized that the next turn was hers, Um started her turn by such fillers: 'Eh: ihiihi and threat clearing for thinking and organizing what she would contribute to the talk. In her utterance, there are many repetitions, fillers and serious grammatical or accuracy problems as can be seen from her utterance in her turn. Though Um produced a longer utterance than the ones she produced before, her grammar needed to be improved and her fluency was also affected as a result of taking longer time in her turn to organize her thought and language. Significant and notable pronunciation problem was also observed for example 'mosquito' to mean 'mosque'. Empty (meaningless) forms were also felt such as 'a' as gap fillers. Regardless of all these her contribution was understood by the conversation participants or her conversation partners. Following Um, Ywb took the turn and expressed their acceptance of Um's explanation about holiday celebration in her area using the long 'OK: thereby allowing the floor to other turn-takers.

Being nominated and taking-turn to speak next, TgA asked Ywb to tell them how she did celebrate a holiday in her vicinity. In her turn, Ywb started both clauses in her utterance using the stretched filler 'Eh:' to organize her thought. Her utterance has long words and some accuracy problems in addition to some repetitions. Her contribution was also significant and longer. Though she has some problems in her utterance, her language in the talk was better than others. Finally, she closed the conversation by thanking the conversation participants. However, they should have made the closing using the procedures taken to close conversations in English.

## Excerpt II

Jm: Are you::

Kf: Fine

Jm: Are you fine.

Fs: I'm fine.

Jm: Ok Kefyalew, how many holidays you celebrate in a year?

Kf: Oh:::an average I may cerebrate more than three several holidays.

Jm: What are they? Do you mention them?

Kf: Yea: eh-eh-eh the first one is Fiche, other one is Genna and Fasika.

Jm: How do you celebrate the Fiche (( ))?

Kf: Averi Fiche celebrate eh=

Jm: Wha..t? Is it cultural or religious holiday?

Fs: =It is cultural. [Now is

Jm: [How do you celebrate it?-(overlapping))

Kf: We celebrate eh eh Fiche we collecti eh one natural placi. people collecting in their house they are eating pro: there is cultural food. that ev. cultural food is for some. (3s) eh-what about you?

*Jm: Ok..good..I celebrate around three holidays in a year, three holidays in a year.*  
*Kf: Ok: what are they?*  
*Jm: Yes, yea eh-s there are around the great three religious holiday: Eid-al Feter Arefa, and another is a cultural holiday: Irrecha.*  
*Kf: Ho how are you cerebrate Irrecha?*  
*Jm: Good it is. A cultural holiday which is celebrat-ed by big peoples. Also (( )) on it is people are collecting around place and gow to the river banks by wearing the casteral ehhhh clothes eh: they piv the grasses into the river and they prayed God for countries and peoples to be developed anda so many consequences are take place on this day.*  
*Kf: Ok so: could you tell me what are you at that time (( )) cultural:.*  
*Jm: Eh: there are so many cultural foods we eat if we come back from there: like: Shumo when we say Shumo it is Mulo, eh nda they are so many-it's:*  
*Kf: Ok:*  
*Jm: Ok: what about you Fs:?*  
*Fs: (( )) holiday:*  
*Jm: Three holidays:?*  
*Fs: Imm:*  
*Jm: What are they?*  
*Fs: Eh: Gennaa, Fasika and Meskel eh:*  
*Jm: How do celebrate Meskel holiday?*  
*Fs: Meskel holidy is: Hadya celebration eh: Hadya celebration my Meskel (( )) eh: by (( )) My parent eh: My parent is by eh: eating food meat(mt) and Atekana. Atekana is perpr by my mother: by father is prepare by eh: b eh-my f-eh: dinner is prepare by eh: house cleaner environment area by Meskel ceremony:*  
*Jm: Ok thank you. Good thank you. Bye.*  
*Fs: ((Non verbal signal as a sign of bye))*  
*Kf: ((Non verbal signal as a sign of bye))*

In the opening of this conversation, Jm started greeting with incomplete and long utterance followed by a second pair part of Kf's utterance 'Fine'. Jm also turned his face and greeted Fs in which she responded with 'I'm fine'. Jm asked the conversation partners to tell about how each of them celebrates a holiday. Thus, he first allocated the turn to Kf. He used a spoken grammar in his utterance. In response, Kf used an expression which has a spoken grammar structure with less accuracy. Jm sought an explanation about the holidays thereby extending the conversation. As Jm continued his question, Kf responded accordingly. And responding, he used an utterance which has long 'yea:' and repeated fillers: 'eh-eh-eh' as a conversation strategy to compensate for gaps till he thought and organized what he would say next (line 8). In addition he used code-mixing: Genna and Fasika which are Amharic words for Christmas and Easter respectively (line 8). He used code-mixing as conversational strategy to replace names of the holidays in English words by the Amharic ones, for he could not either know or remember their English versions.

Jm's next question was focused on one of the holidays: Fiche. However, the last part of his utterance was not audible. As soon as Kf started to respond using an utterance, Jm's interruption for another question of clarification (line 11) after which Kf continued the interrupted utterance of his. But this time the second clause in his utterance (line 12) was overlapped by Jm's utterance of (line 13) which still sought for another question aimed at clarification. Having heard Jm's question, Kf responded using a structure which has a mother tongue influence in pronunciation, fillers which somehow affect fluency, syntactic problems and unnecessary forms (line 14). After three seconds silence, he asked Jm to take turn and tell them about how Jm celebrates his own holiday. The language contains features of spoken grammar (line 15).

Jm agreed to take the turn and contributed to the conversation and for his contribution of the conversation, he used a good grammar with long 'ok:' and 'good'. His utterance has a repetition of phrases for the sake of emphasis. Kf asked an explanation question with an utterance preceded by 'Ok:' and an appropriate expression. Jm in his turn responded explaining about the types of holidays he celebrates. His language is good regardless of certain problems such as syntactic order in (line 19). Kf was interested in the third holiday: Irrecha and asked him about the celebration of it but he used an utterance which is ungrammatical, but intelligible. Having understood Kf's question, Jm used a longer utterance which has certain errors. Such errors include syntactic, mispronunciation and unnecessary

forms. In addition, a part of the utterance is inaudible. But still his language is good though it is highly influenced by his mother tongue (lines 22-25).

In his attempt to extend the conversation (line 26), Kf asked additional question using a language which has a good start but with some missing language elements, inaudible part and long word. Jm's response to the question was made with appropriate language use but with slight accuracy problems and to some extent with fluency difficulty. When he stretched words his fluency was affected. However, it still helped him as a conversational strategy to fill gaps and think what he would say next. Kf used long 'ok:' as a sign of understanding and allowing urn to the next speaker.

Jm took the turn and forwarded his question to Fs using long 'ok:' at the start for the purpose of attention followed by '*what about you Fs*' using a spoken grammar. Having realized that she was nominated to take turn, she attempted to contribute to the conversation though the beginning of her utterance was not audible followed by a stretched word '*holiday:*' Jm made other initiated other repair to shape or frame her utterance thereby seeking clarification and produced the utterance '*Three holidays?*' which she responded with the long '*imm:*' as a sign of expressing agreement. Jm continued to ask another question to extend the conversation further. His structure for asking the question was appropriate and compatible to spoken grammar. Fs code-mixed and mentioned three different holidays in Amharic (Genna, Fiska and Meskel for Christmas, Easter and The founding of the True Cross respectively) with the beginning and the end of her utterance having the long filler '*eh:*'. The final filler is an indicator of turn allocation. And having understood the turn allocation, Jm asked her for clarification about how she celebrates the 'Meskel' holiday. In his question he omitted the pronoun '*you*' which should come after the auxiliary '*do*' in the utterance '*How do celebrate Meskel holiday?*'. In giving the response to the preceding question, Fs used a longer utterance with a number of serious language problems as can be observed in the extract (lines 37-40).

By taking the turn from Fs, Jm used '*Ok thank you. Good thank you.*' two times before he came to use the terminal closure expression: '*bye*' as a pre-closing turn. After Jm uttered the terminal closure '*bye*', the remaining two conversation partners used nonverbal signs to close the conversation. Though Jm attempted to use pre-conversational expressions, they should have used reasons to go apart before they closed their talk as mentioned in different cases above.

## Conclusion

Based on the findings of the present study, it can be concluded that CA-informed intervention can promote students turn taking skills and their interactional skills. CA-based intervention has enabled the participants of the study to know and use features of conversation required for oral communication. It has also enabled them to know the spoken grammar of English language. Since turn taking involves the employment of turn constructional units at: lexical, phrasal, clausal and sentential levels as wells as prosody, in their attempts to interact, the study participants practiced, assisted through the intervention and could develop their conversational skills through employing these turn constructional units. Further, the study participants could produce longer turn constructional units and took longer time to hold conversation in triads as compared to the pre-intervention conversation analysis. Thus, the CA-informed intervention has a significant implication for the enhancement of conversational skills of foreign language English students.

## References

- Auer, P. (1996). On the prosody and syntax of turn-continuations. In E. Couper-Kuhlen and M. Selting (eds.), *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies* (pp. 57-100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakeman, R., & Gnisci, A. (2005). Sequential observational methods. In M. Eid & E. Diener (Eds.). *Handbook of multi method measurement in psychology* (pp. 127-140). Washington: APA.
- Bakeman, R., & Gottman, J.M. (1986). *Observing interaction: An introduction to sequential analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.



- Barraja-Rohan, M. A. (2011). *Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence*. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(4):479-507.
- Bortfeld, H., Leon, S.D., Bloom, J.E., Schober, M.F., & Brennan, S.E. (2001). Disfluency rates in conversation: Effects of age, relationship, topic, role, and gender. *Language and Speech*, 44(2), 123-147.
- Donato, R. (2000). Socio cultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In J. P. Lantolf, (Ed), *Socio cultural theory and second language learning*. (pp. 27-52). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dornyei, Z and Thurrell, S (1994). Teaching Conversational Skills Intensively: Course content and rationale. *ELT Journal*. 48(1), 40-49.
- Elbers, E, K. & Prenger, J. (2006). Instructional dialogues: Participation in dyadic interactions in multicultural classrooms. In Deen, J. M. Hajer & T. Koole (Eds), *Interaction in two multicultural mathematics classrooms*. (pp. 139-170). Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Gardner, R. (2004). *Conversation analysis in Davies, A and Elder, C. (ed). The handbook of applied linguistics*. New Jersey: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Gordon, C. (2011). *Conversation and interaction in Mesthrie R. (Ed). The Cambridge handbook of sociolinguistics*. (pp. 105-121). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Gorjian, B. and Habibi, P. (2015). The Effect of Conversation Strategies on the Classroom Interaction: The Case of Turn Taking: *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Learning* 1(1): 14-23.
- Hellermann, J and Lee, Y. A. (2014). *Tracing developmental changes through conversation analysis: Cross-sectional and longitudinal /analysis*. *TESOL quarterly*. 48(4): 763-788.
- Hoskins, B. and Noel, K. (2011). *Conversations frameworks: A program for adolescents and young adults*. The Cognitive Press.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis: Second language acquisition research*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Markee, N. (2008). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*. 29 (3): 404-427.
- Sacks, H. Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974) A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.
- Shegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seedhouse, (2005). *Conversation Analysis as Research Methodology in Richards, K. and Seedhouse, P (Eds). (pp. 251-265). Applying conversation analysis*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis: An introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Waring H. Z. and Wong, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for language teachers*. London, Routledge.