1. Introduction

One persistent problem for language teaching is to provide students with sufficient opportunities to interact in the target language with their peers. To offset the limitations of teacher-fronted classroom interaction, teachers organize various kinds of in-class peer activities in pairs or small groups—task-structured activities, discussions based on a teacher-selected topic, text, or video, role plays and simulations, and the like. There is a large literature that investigates the organization and effectiveness of different types and formats of classroom peer interaction from a range of theoretical perspectives (e.g., Branden, Bygate and Norris 2009; Robinson 2011).

In addition to in-class lessons, some language programs also offer second or foreign language speakers opportunities for using the target language, typically in talk with L1 speakers, outside the classroom. Variously called conversations-for-learning, conversation tables, conversation clubs, conversation lounges, or conversation rooms, these activities are arranged to provide foreign language students with an environment for target language use that may be difficult to come by with other means, as in the case of Chinese (Hwang 2009, Estonian (Kivik 2012), or German (Kasper 2004; Kasper and Kim 2007) in the North American context or English in Japan (Carroll 2000, 2004, 2005; Nao 2011, 2013; Otsu and Krug 2013). Language programs in contexts where the L2 is a language of wider communication may offer conversation tables in order to give students access to L2 use that is typically different from the classroom and that students may not be exposed to or seek out by themselves. Multiparty conversations in particular afford the L2 participants opportunities for using the L2 in interaction not only with an L1 speaker or L1 speakers but with other L2 speakers whose first language they may not share. To date, published reports of such arrangements are limited to ESL settings in the US (Hauser 2005a, b, c, 2008, 2010; Jung 2004). Conversations-for-learning are also arranged on the initiatives of L2 speakers, students, or parents independently of language programs, for instance to practice English as a second language (Hauser 2013a, b; Kim 2012, submitted;
Koshik and Seo 2012; Markee and Seo 2009; Seo 2011; Seo and Koshik 2010) or Japanese as
a foreign language (Mori 2003; Mori and Hayashi 2006) in the US. In a prototypical
conversation table arrangement, L2 speakers get together with one or more L1 speaker(s) in
order to talk, without a set agenda, about a wide range of topics relating to their lives, expe-
riences and interests, and culture-specific practices. The expected pedagogical benefit is
that in the course of such topical talk, opportunities for learning language and culture will
contingently arise. As the research literature shows, conversation tables indeed meet this
expectation.

The chapter will be organized as follows. We will begin by describing conversations-
for-learning, or conversation tables, as forms of institutional talk. Then we will examine
some of the practices through which the participants achieve the local order of conversation
table interaction. This section will include considerations of participant identities, their
relation to participation frameworks, and of language choice. We will also illustrate some of
the prevalent interactional practices through which the participants orient to the institutional
character of the activity. Next, we will show how opportunities for L2 learning are
contingently generated, how the participants engage in L2 learning as a social activity, and
how conversation table interaction over an extended period allows us to observe the
development of language resources and interactional practices. In closing, we will outline
some directions for future research on conversations-for-learning.

2. Conversation-for-Learning as Institutional Talk

As activities arranged for language practice, learning, and development, conversations-for-
learning are a form of institutional talk (Heritage and Clayman 2010), a general characteristic
they share with language classrooms and language tutorials. Compared to the extensive lit-
erature on in-class peer activities, conversations-for-learning outside of classrooms are a
fairly recent research interest, and the literature is small. Detailed descriptions of the activity
type center on the particular format under study (Hauser 2008; Kasper 2004) and can mostly
be found in dissertations (e.g., Hauser 2003; Hwang 2009; Kim 2009; Kivik 2012; Seo 2008).
Formats among the described arrangements vary, and there is also considerable diversity
between and within sessions of the same arrangement. There are no agreed-upon category
names for the activity. Seo (2008) adopts the participants’ emic category, ‘ESL tutorial’. Further,
although they occupy a social space outside of the classroom, conversations-for-
learning share some of their interactional organization with in-class peer activities. In the
absence of systematic comparisons of different conversation table settings, and of collection-
based studies that examine a specific interactional phenomenon in a range of different
conversation tables, generic claims about the organization of conversations-for-learning
have to be taken with a grain of salt.

With these cautions in mind, we note that most documented conversations-for-learning
have the following characteristics.

1. They are held on multiple occasions over an extended period of time.
2. The purpose is to talk in the target language, with the expectation that the talk will be
beneficial for L2 learning and that repeated participation will result in L2 development.
3. There is no other agenda than to ‘just talk’.
4. The L2 participants’ performance is not assessed. The talk has no institutional
consequences.
5. Turn-taking is locally managed by the participants. When asymmetrical participation
frameworks emerge, they do so contingently.
Settings differ in their participant composition. Most arrangements include novice L2 speakers and expert L1 speakers of the target language, while in some others, all participants are novice L2 speakers (Carroll 2000, 2004, 2005; Otsu and Krug 2013).

Settings are also diverse regarding the L1 conversation partners’ institutional status, for instance whether the L1 partner is also the L2 participants’ teacher, or another teacher in the language program that arranges the conversation table, or whether they are hired by the language program or the L2 participants. None of these participants’ relations is necessarily consequential for the interaction, but the participants do orient to them with more or less regularity, as we will show below. Lastly, regardless of participants’ language and institutional identities, whether the activity is multiparty or dyadic is consequential for the distribution of speaking turns.

Institutional settings can be distinguished according to the extent to which they prestructure the organization of the talk, a dimension that Atkinson (1982) refers to as formality. Against ordinary conversation as the benchmark of nonformal talk, the teacher-fronted IRF structured classroom is a prototypical exponent of a formal setting, while conversation tables are located at the nonformal end of the spectrum. Following Hauser (2008), conversations-for-learning can be described as a type of nonformal institutional interaction. On the one hand, the flexible format enables participants to conduct their talk in a manner similar to ordinary conversation while also allowing them to contingently generate moments for teaching and learning language and culture. Shifts between different activity frames are therefore common. On the other hand, conversation table participants use interactional practices that specifically orient to their asymmetries in language competence and cultural knowledge, and to the particular institutional arrangement of the activity. For these reasons, we see considerable diversity in the endogenous organization of conversation table talk. Just how members at a conversation table achieve the local order of their activity, and what they get done through it beyond ‘just talking’, requires sustained analytical attention.

3. Achieving the Local Order of Conversations-for-Learning

3.1 Identities, participation framework, and language choice

Across the different formats of conversation tables that have been reported in the literature, one stable characteristic is that participants’ identities as relative experts or relative novices in the target language and culture are omnirelevant in the setting. ‘Omnirelevant’ means that the participants can invoke their membership in these categories at any time (Sacks 1992). It does not mean that language status and cultural identities are constantly or even predominantly relevant in the talk. In fact, another robust finding is that participants invoke a host of other identities in their talk that are unrelated to their language status, such as being a sister, swimmer, expert in high-end cars, resident of a particular city, and so forth. Much like in ordinary conversation, such category incumbencies serve as a source for generating topical talk and for establishing and maintaining social affiliation (Kasper 2004; Kim 2009).

But especially in initial meetings, participants often draw on their membership in different cultural groups to supply conversational topics. Mori (2003) investigated how Japanese and American students initiate topical talk as they get acquainted with each other during the first meeting at a ‘conversation table’, a student-arranged activity for practicing Japanese. The participants categorize each other as ‘Japanese’ and ‘American’ by asking questions about Japanese and American cultural objects. These category questions generate a particular participation framework. For instance, in response to a Japanese student’s question whether the American students have seen any Japanese movies, the American students respond as a
team and thereby categorize the participants into ‘culturally same’ and ‘culturally different’. Each party also aligns as a team to repair problems in hearing or understanding in the question–answer sequences. Other methods by which the participants achieve the construction of in-group and across-group relations are speech style and language choice. The Japanese students use addressee-honorifics when talking to the American students while using plain forms to their Japanese peers, and all participants choose the language associated with their team for within-group talk and the language of the other team for talking across groups. In an ESL conversation club setting, Hauser (2005c) observes that an L2 speaker treats the L2 speakers together as a team by making requests on their behalf. The participants also accomplish team formation through the use of personal pronouns, such as when the conversation partner addresses the L2 speakers as ‘you guys’, while an L2 speaker acts as a spokesperson for the ESL participants by using ‘we’.

The categorization practices observed by Mori and Hauser do not appear specific to conversation tables but can be readily observed in ordinary conversation and other institutional settings. In contrast, Nao (2011) reports a case where a language program’s ‘English Only’ policy shapes participants’ claims to language identity in a way that does not transfer beyond the boundaries of the program’s ‘conversation lounge’. Discussing the topic of overseas experience, the participating teacher (‘Marie’), an L1 speaker of English who is fluent in Japanese, tells the L2 English speaking Japanese students that she has lived in Japan for ‘almost ten years’. The exchange in Excerpt 1 ensues.

Excerpt 1  Monolingual policy (Nao 2011, p. 3773)

27. Sayaka: do you speak Japanese?
28. Marie: uh: NO -! not in the [[conversation lounge]].
29. ((laughter))

Sayaka’s question is set off by Marie’s revelation of her long-term residency in Japan. The grammatical format of the question indexes it as a question about Marie’s ability, not about whether she speaks Japanese in particular circumstances. Yet Marie first emphatically denies speaking Japanese, then restricts the domain of her claim to the conversation lounge. Responding to a student’s expression of surprise, Marie humorously adds ‘yeah (..) I forget everything in this room’ (p. 3774). Marie thus constructs the pretense identity of a monolingual English speaker within the socio-physical confines of the conversation lounge. In this way she programmatically disables the possibility that her knowledge of Japanese be used as a resource and implements the English Only policy. Yet some moments later, she abandons her pretense identity, showing her expertise in Japanese culture and language in an effort to maintain the ongoing topic. Nao’s study shows two ways in which a monolingual policy becomes consequential for a conversation-for-learning activity. When participants seek to adhere to the policy, such orientation leads to very non-conversational interaction and thereby defeats the rationale of the conversation table. When the policy gets in the way of maintaining a productive line of talk, the participants disregard it. These observations call the usefulness of a monolingual language policy into question.

Even in the absence of a monolingual policy, participants orient to the institutional purpose of the conversation table as a setting for practicing the target language. When conversation partners are competent speakers of the L2 participants’ first language (or other shared languages), they do not normally use that language productively (Hauser 2013b; Kasper 2004). L2 speakers, on the other hand, do use their first languages as an interactional resource, especially when their L2 repertoires are still quite limited. However, this does not
mean that they abandon the normative orientation to target language use. As in any setting, code-switching at the conversation table can accomplish many things. Kivik (2012) finds a range of codeswitching practices in multi-party Estonian coffee hours that show the participants’ variable orientations to the dual framing of the activity as conversation and language pedagogy. We will illustrate two contrasting practices from German conversations-for-learning with novice L2 speakers who are L1 speakers of English and a German L1 speaker who is fluent in English. In one practice, the codeswitching serves as a device to elicit an L2 formulation of an action that the L2 speaker has difficulties producing, as in Excerpt 2.

Excerpt 2  Weekend (Kasper 2004)

Dagmar: conversation partner, L1 German speaker; Cindy: L2 German speaker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C: um war- um woch- wochenende um</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>was weekend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>°how was your weekend°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>→ D: wie war dein wochenende=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>how was your °weekend°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>C: =wie war dein °wochenende°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>how was your °weekend°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>D: [ich war auch] im kino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>“I was also at the cinema”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>“I was at the cinema too”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previously Dagmar had asked Cindy about her weekend and Cindy now attempts to reciprocate the question. After several unsuccessful tries, Cindy aborts the incomplete turn component and produces the question in English. By delivering the question in a low voice, Cindy could be heard to treat the switch to English as nonnormative. Dagmar does not respond with an answer (as she does later, in line 23), and neither does she request confirmation of her hearing (Wie war mein wochenende? [How was my weekend?]). Instead, she produces a German version of Cindy’s question that retains the pronoun dein [your], that is, without making the deictic shift to mein [my] that comes with speaker change. In this way, Dagmar animates the utterance from Cindy’s perspective as author of the question. Cindy repeats the reformulated question in next turn, rehearsing it as in language classroom practice (line 22). Dagmar now answers the question as sequentially projected (line 23) and so returns to the topical talk. The codeswitching to English in this excerpt not only puts the ongoing sequence on hold but shifts the focus of the talk to language learning (see section 3.1).

A contrasting use of codeswitching occurs just a few moments later (Excerpt 3). Cindy and Dagmar have just found out that they saw the same film.

Excerpt 3  Funny film (Kasper 2004)

Dagmar: conversation partner, L1 German speaker; Cindy: L2 German speaker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D: der war sehr lustig=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>it was very funny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>C: =yeah=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>D: =[ja:]↑ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>C: [it] was funny um (. ) yeah=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>D: =ja:m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cindy affiliates herself with Dagmar’s positive assessment of the film, first with an agreement token (line 28) and then with an assessment and another agreement (line 30). Both actions are delivered in English. The codeswitched turns do not put the ongoing sequence on hold but are treated by the participants as unremarkable actions in the assessment sequence. Outside of the conversation table setting, language alternation that advances the progression of the talk is a normal practice among multilingual speakers, but the practice seems to be in conflict with the institutional purpose of the conversation-for-learning. In addition, elsewhere in her talk Cindy shows that she has enough German to produce simple turns such as the ones that she here delivers in English. Why then the codeswitching? When a speaker agrees with a previous speaker’s assessment, they do so by upgrading the first assessment (Pomerantz 1984). Dagmar’s assessment is already upgraded with the intensifying adverb sehr [very], which is also given prosodic emphasis. In order to make an affiliative second assessment in German, Cindy would have to choose a stronger formulation than sehr lustig [very funny], for instance an extreme case formulation like zum Schießen/zum Totlachen [what a scream], or wahnsinnig [insane]. Such expressions, however, are not yet part of Cindy’s German repertoire. By repeating, with some modification, Dagmar’s assessment with the resources of the language that they both use in their daily lives, Cindy conveys authenticity and positive affect and so accomplishes an upgraded second assessment. In this way, Cindy shows her interactional competence—specifically, her sequential competence—in the normative organization of assessment sequences.

Excerpts 2 and 3 illustrate how with their codeswitching practices, participants orient to the constitutive tension of conversation tables as a setting for conversational talk and as a pedagogical activity.

3.2 Embodied action and writing as interactional resources

When participants are co-present and share visual access, they make use of a wider range of semiotic resources than the languages they have in common. To date only a few studies specifically examine how participants in conversations-for-learning employ their bodies to achieve mutual understanding. Mori and Hayashi (2006) investigated the practice of ‘embodied completion’ in conversation table talk among L1 and L2 speakers of Japanese. In this interactional practice, a Japanese L1 speaker completes a partial turn with a gesture. An L2 speaker demonstrates their understanding by verbalizing the meaning of the gestural part in Japanese, and the Japanese L1 speaker reformulates the L2 speaker’s turn with a more sophisticated linguistic expression. In this way, the practice affords the L2 speakers with an opportunity for learning Japanese grammar or lexis. In a series of studies, Seo and colleagues examine the use of multimodal resources in dyadic ESL conversational tutoring sessions. Markee and Seo (2009) demonstrate that embodied action is critically implicated when tutor and tutee manage problematic activity shifts between conversational and pedagogical talk. Seo and Koshik (2010) find that both tutor and tutee use the same types of gesture to other-initiate repair in a way similar to vocal open class repair initiators such as ‘huh?’. The gestures are made and understood without concurrent vocal productions, and they are sustained until the problem is resolved in the following talk. The nonvocal action provides the repair speaker with a resource to monitor the repair initiator’s understanding of the ongoing repair turn. Seo (2011) further shows how the participants coordinate multimodal resources including bodily conduct and material objects to achieve mutual understanding and collaboratively construct new lexical knowledge.

Embodied conduct is a universal means to accomplish interaction and learning (Streeck, Goodwin and LeBaron 2011). Other types of semiotic systems require specific competencies
to be usable in conversations-for-learning. In her study of a Chinese conversation table, Hwang (2009) examined a practice used in interactions of speakers of East-Asian languages who do not share each other’s language but who are literate in a writing system based on Chinese characters. In order to express a word for which they do not have the phonological form, or to see what word may be associated with an ambiguous phonological form in its present turn location, participants may write the Chinese character. This practice is sometimes referred to as brush talk, bitan (Chinese) or hitsutan (Japanese). There were many occasions in Hwang’s study where the L1 Japanese and L1 Chinese participants resorted to brush talk, for instance to repair problems in production or understanding, identify names of persons and places, or produce the second pair part of an adjacency pair. For the most part, brush talk proved an effective resource for the participants to achieve mutual understanding. Although on occasion the brush talk became a trouble source in its own right, it provided opportunities for learning vocabulary and pronunciation.

### 3.3 Managing conversation table interaction

Regardless of specific language and literacy competencies, a common observation is that an L1 conversation partner takes on the charge of interaction manager. That capacity includes officially opening and closing the conversation table interaction (Kasper 2004) and keeping the talk afloat by acting as an interactional pivot (Hauser 2008). Although in the research literature, it is always an L1 speaker who manages the talk, this discourse identity is not directly tied to L1 speaker status but rather to a participant’s institutional identity of conversation partner. Hauser (2008) describes two managerial practices in multi-party talk at an ESL conversation club, serial questioning and pivoting. Through serial questioning, the conversation partner aims to introduce and develop a topic that the L2 participants can talk about (Excerpt 4).

**Excerpt 4  Serial questioning (Hauser 2008, p. 281)**

M, K: conversation partners; E: student

```plaintext
1   M: it's interesting [though yeah?=
2   K: [yeah
3   M: = (I think it's) fun
4   (1.5)
5   M: .n yeah good
6   (0.6)
7 → M: .h so do you have any children?
8   (0.5)
9   E: no: [haha
10  M: [no children
11  E: ha ha ha
12  M: °hm::°
13   (0.7)
14 → M: will you have in the future? or.
15   (1.3)
16  E: mm::: be- (0.4) before: (0.4) uh:
17   (0.7) I don't want to: have
18  children, [ha ha (. ) ha ha ha=
19  M: [uhn
20  E: =(but) now a little bit.
```
In line 1, M is producing an assessment regarding a prior sequence. M’s first assessment gets an agreement from K. M produces two further assessments, each followed by a gap of silence (lines 4 and 6). At each of the gaps, the participants had the opportunity to either develop the prior topic or introduce a new topic. However, the opportunity is not taken up until M introduces a new topic by asking a question about student E’s family status (line 7). The questions in line 7 and 14 are linked through ellipsis and in this way marked as parts of a series. When the first question does not generate substantive talk on the proposed topic, M produces a second, linked question in an effort to develop the topic. The second question successfully generates a substantive response from the student. Although the L2 participants do ask questions in the conversation club interactions, Hauser reports that they do not practice serial questioning.

In the nonformal institutional settings of conversation-for-learning, turn-taking is participant administered. It is therefore possible that some participants contribute more to the talk than others. Pivoting is a practice through which a conversation partner initiates a shift in the current participation framework and a more symmetrical distribution of turns (Hauser 2008). Excerpt 5 is an example.

Excerpt 5  Pivoting (Hauser 2008, p. 288)

T: conversation partner; F, B: students

1 T: yeah (0.6) especially like in
2 Hawaii it’s really easy to do that.
3 T: [cuz there’s a lot of Japanese=
4 F: [right
5 T: =[[people.
6 F: [[°(yeah)°
(1.0)
7 → T: how ’bout you (. ) Boram (0.7) you
8 speak Korean and stuff? outside?
9 (1.0)
10 B: (yep) (2.0) uh (0.7) but (0.9)
11 (at scone) my classmate. (0.4)
12 (is). (.) Japanese (0.3) so I have
13 to (0.4) I have to speak English.

In the beginning of the excerpt, the conversation partner T is aligning himself to what student F has said about the importance of speaking English rather than Japanese in order to learn English. Up until line 06, T has directed his talk to F as the addressed recipient while B is listening silently. When no other participant takes a turn, T selects B as his addressee and directs a topically related question to her. The question also selects B because the topic, speaking Korean outside of the English program, is only relevant to her, the sole Korean speaker in the group. The nomination and question operate as pivoting devices that shift the participation framework to T and B as addressing and addressed participants.

Serial questioning and pivoting are two practices by which conversation partners allocate turns and generate topical talk. By distributing speaking opportunities more equally among the participants, these practices advance the institutional goal of the conversation-for-learning as a site for language practice. At the same time, by moderating the talk, the conversation partners remove the need for the L2 participants to self-select for taking turns and to initiate topics. In this way, the interaction manager transforms the organization of the conversation table away from ordinary conversation.
In the conversation lounge described by Nao (2011, 2013), the language program attempts to offset participation asymmetries between students and teacher by requiring that the students pre-select a topic and direct a sequence-initiating turn to the teacher. As Nao (2013) reports, the students variably transform the instruction into such openings as ‘so what do you want to talk about’ (p. 257), ‘what shall we talk about’ (p. 261) and ‘today we we are going to talk about so sports’ (p. 263). With the first and second formulation, the student solicits rather than nominates a topic, reminiscent of topic solicitations that advisers or counselors may address to clients in the opening of a consultation. The third utterance unilaterally announces the student’s topic selection in the manner of teacher’s classroom talk. All three formats initiate talk about a topic in a non-conversational manner. Instead of generating more conversation-like talk, the pre-allocation of topic nomination to the students further institutionalizes the interaction. Nao’s study documents well the paradoxical consequences that the engineering of de-institutionalizing conversations-for-learning may engender.

4. Learning and Development

4.1 Orientations to L2 learning

One feature that conversations-for-learning have in common despite their diversity in many other regards is that they do not pre-organize objects and contexts for L2 learning. If learning opportunities do come up, they arise contingently from the participants’ main activity, which is to conduct and advance mutually intelligible topical talk. The participants’ concern with staying engaged in topical talk can be evident in the ways in which the conversation partner treats an L2 speaker’s misaligned responses to the previous turn. Kasper and Kim (2007) found that rather than addressing such interactional problems through overt third position repair (such as saying ‘no that’s not what I meant, I meant such-and-such’), the L1 speaker used three methods that did not make the misunderstanding the main business of the interaction—repairing the problem en passant, initiating other-repair in next turn instead, or passing up the repair entirely. Through these practices, the topical talk was sustained without disruption and the L2 speakers’ identity as a competent co-conversationalist remained unchallenged. At the same time, any learning opportunities that might have arisen from addressing the trouble were also prevented. Another, very common practice is for the recipient of a problematic turn to correct the problem, and neither the speaker of the correcting turn or the recipient orient to the correction but continue their line of topical talk (Hauser 2005a; Kim 2012; Kivik 2012). An example is Excerpt 6, from conversations-for-learning among novice L2 speakers of German and a German L1 speaker.

Excerpt 6  Ex-girlfriend
Dagmar: conversation partner, L1 German speaker; Bill: L2 German speaker

1  D: ah::: hast du nicht eine eine: uh- kannst
   have you not a a had
   du nicht eine freundin in Japan? (° °)
   you not a girlfriend in Japan
   “don’t you have- didn’t you have a girlfriend in Japan?”

2 → B: einen moment, nein.=
   a moment no

3 → D: =nein ° im moment.°
   no at the moment
Before the start of the excerpt, Bill brought up his upcoming travel to Japan and Korea. Dagmar asks whether he did not have a girlfriend in Japan, something that she ostensibly remembers from an earlier meeting. Bill gives a relevant but grammatically incorrect answer (line 2). Dagmar acknowledges Bill’s response by repeating the negation marker ‘nein [no]’ and then, in a low voice, confirms her understanding with a corrected version of Bill’s utterance, ‘im moment [at the moment]’ (line 3). In his next turn, Bill confirms Dagmar’s understanding, and Dagmar asks another question about Bill’s travel plans. The interactional focus remains on the ongoing topic throughout the excerpt. Whether L2 participants notice embedded corrections (Jefferson 1987) such as the one in Excerpt 6 at all is an open question. There are very few documented cases of L2 speakers’ correct production of an embeddedly corrected item later in the talk (but see Kim 2012, for some exceptions).

On many other occasions, the participants do put the topical talk on hold in order to address a problem in speaking, hearing, or understanding. The primary goal that they pursue with different forms of repair is to maintain or restore mutual understanding. But we also see with some regularity that they temporarily shift the interactional focus to a language item itself. At those moments, the participants transform the conversational talk into a language learning activity (see Excerpt 2 above). Such shifts frequently happen when a speaker makes reference to some object or event and the language resources used for making the reference are treated as problematic by either the speaker themselves or by a co-participant (Kim 2012; Koshik and Seo 2012). Our examples of such shifts in orientation (Excerpts 7–9) come from conversations among two Korean adolescents, Chungho and Jinho, and their conversation partner Tom, an American L1 speaker of English. The participants met in various settings, including an ice cream shop, an auto show, and someone’s home. Although arranged for the purpose of language learning, the talk evolved like ordinary conversation around topics of shared interest and experience (Kim 2009, 2012). Excerpt 7 illustrates a type of sequence where an L2 participant formulates a target referent and that formulation is subsequently corrected by the conversation partner. Chungho describes something that recently caught his attention.

Excerpt 7  Triplets (Kim 2012)
C: Chungho; T: Tom

609  (8.3)
610  C: I saw (0.4) three same chilºdº (0.4) children (0.5) last
611  week [(   )
612  }  T: [triplets.
613  
614  C: yeah triple (0.3) [do you call it triplets?
615  T: [how old were they?
616  T: um
617  C: I didn't a:sk um I just (1.6) [passed
618  T: [um were they children
619  or (0.6) older?
620  (2.0)
621  C: <very, little children> I guess they're just two
622  years [old,
623  T: [oh: 'kay
In response to Chungho’s multi-word description ‘three same chil’d°, (0.4) children’, Tom reformulates the description with a lexicalized item, *triplets* (line 612). With the reformulation, Tom shows that he recognizes the target referent and at the same time corrects Chungho’s use of language form (Hauser 2005a; Kurhila 2006). In his response (line 613), Chungho first acknowledges and confirms the correction, though not with the same pronunciation (‘triple’) (see Kim 2012, for discussion of the yeah + X/X + yeah formats). Then, with the question ‘do you call it triplets?’, Chungho treats the word as a lexical item that he did not know before. (Note that he did not say ‘did you say triplets?’, which would request confirmation of an uncertain hearing.) By focusing on the word form, Chungho shifts orientation from topical talk to L2 learning. With the question, he orients to the epistemic imbalance between Tom as an L2 expert and himself as an L2 novice. Tom, however, refocuses the talk on topical matters. In overlap with Chungho’s vocabulary question, he asks a question that advances Chungho’s telling (‘how old were they?’) (line 614). By answering Tom’s question, Chungho follows Tom’s return to the topical talk.

Earlier in this chapter, we noted that conversation table participants use their membership in different language and cultural communities as a resource for generating topics. Such topics often come with descriptions of culture-specific practices and with culture-specific lexical repertoires. A participant talking about what they assume to be a culture-specific concept or practice may be unsure about whether the co-participants with different cultural backgrounds understand references to such objects. In order to achieve understanding, the speaker uses generic referential practices which address epistemic imbalances between the participants. At these moments, learning opportunities become available. Two such practices are illustrated below. An implicit method is to produce the target referent with rising intonation (Excerpt 8). An explicit method is to issue a knowledge check question (Excerpt 9).

In Excerpt 8, Tom describes how he was helping at a school festival when he was a high-school student.

**Excerpt 8  Moon bounce (Kim 2009, p. 101)**

C: Chungho; T: Tom

744 C: ah so- m did you go to private school?
745 (0.4)
746 T: um-um (0.4) ’at was, it was, (0.5) for public
747 schools, but it was j’st for the s- for the city,
748 (0.8)
749 T: so the city got some money together, and put it.
750 n they had uh, a moon bounce¿
751 (1.8)
752 T: which was is like u:h, they fill up (0.7)
753 something softer th’n air, you jump on it,
754 (2.4) ((knuckling sound))
755 T: but no rides, not like this place, (0.7) did
756 you go on any of the rides?

When Tom’s telling gets to a practice at the school festival called ‘moon bounce’ (line 750), he delivers the reference term with rising intonation (‘a moon bounce¿’). The prosodic format displays uncertainty that the L2 participants know the expression and projects some response from them that shows whether or not they understand it. When no response is forthcoming (line 751), Tom takes the silence for a negative response and self-selects for a turn in which he describes what a moon bounce is.

In Excerpt 9, Tom is describing his older brothers.
Tom is about to name the games that he played with his brothers (line 1333). When the name of the target game is due after like uh, Tom puts the turn-in-progress on hold and issues a question with the format do you guys know X, where X is the target referent. (lines 1333–1334). With the knowledge-check question, Tom orients to the possibility that the game hide and seek might not be known to his interlocutors. However, both boys claim that they do know the game, and Tom continues with his story.

In the interactional environments that we have considered thus far, at least one of the participants orients to L2 learning while they are engaged in repairing a (potential) problem in speaking or understanding. On occasion, we can observe that repair, a method to maintain or restore mutual understanding, and other-correction of language form, a practice aimed at language learning, are sequentially displaced.

Hauser (2010) describes such cases, in which the correction follows a completed repair sequence. When the correction is sequentially displaced from the correctible item, the participants have to do extra interactional work to recover the error. Since the error correction becomes the sole interactional business, correction sequences that are both exposed and displaced make language learning into the focal social activity.

This section has shown a range of practices by which participants in conversations-for-learning handle problems in their talk and the opportunities for language learning that these practices engender. Two of these methods, passing up repair and post-completion corrections, occupy opposite ends on a continuum of orientations to language learning in conversation table interactions.

4.2 Development over time

Compared to showing how the participants in conversation table talk accomplish language learning as a social activity, demonstrating how participants’ interactional competencies develop over time is a more difficult analytical project. As in any developmental research, an indispensable requirement is longitudinal data, that is, the focal participant(s) have to engage in successive meetings over an extended period of time (see also Pekarek Doehler and Fasel Lauzon, this volume). But even when these conditions are met, a conversation-analytic approach demands that researchers first gain some understanding of how conversation tables are organized through recurrent interactional methods and how participants generate moments for language learning in the course of their talk. Furthermore, tracing the development of an interactional object requires that the object can be observed in comparable sequential contexts, a requirement that can pose considerable methodological challenges (Markee 2008). For these reasons, the body of research on the development of interactional competencies in conversations-for-learning is still very small, and it is limited to talk conducted in English. Two studies examine the development of linguistic resources; lexical items (Jung 2004) and a grammatical feature, negation (Hauser 2013b). Two other studies report on the development of interactional practices; marking direct reported speech (Hauser

Excerpt 9  Hide and seek (Kim 2009, p. 109)
T: Tom; C: Chungho; J: Jinho

1332  T: [they’re all so funny. (0.5) but they also
1333  (.) played games with us, (1.0) like uh, (.)
1334  → do you guys know what hide and seek is?
1335  C: yeah (under coughing)
1336  J: heh heh
1337  T: they had played that game with us all the time, (1.1)
1338  ((smacks lips)) (.) and tag, (1.1) tag, (0.6) you
2013a) and taking up recipiency in storytelling (Kim forthcoming paper ‘Being a story recipient in L2 English conversation’). We will refer to the studies by Jung (2004) and Kim (forthcoming paper ‘Being a story recipient in L2 English conversation’) for illustration.

4.3 Development of linguistic resources

Excerpts 10a–c are from Jung’s (2004) study of vocabulary learning and development at a conversation table arranged by an ESL program. The focal participant, Ok-son, is talking with different co-participants. In the first two conversations, recorded one month apart, Ok-son was unable to produce the target lexical item on her own. In the third conversation, held five months after the second, she produced the item without assistance and quite fluently. All three sequences were initiated by a co-participant’s question about Ok-son’s family.

Excerpt 10a  Sisters 1 (Jung 2004, p. 54)
M: Mary, conversation partner; O: Ok-son; I: Isao

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M: How big is your family.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>O: hhhhehe .hh I have hehe many::: hehe .hhh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>I have many:: (1.3) hh .hh sister. hehe I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>have [four sister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>I: [ma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Oh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>M: Wow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>O: and one hh .hh (.3) ah fo:ur el- , elder sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>and one- (.3) ah, four older sister and one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>elder sister. (.8) Only sister. hehe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M: Oh, so four older sisters and one younger?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>O: one younger a:nd uh [fo:ur older.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M: [Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Older. Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I: A:::h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M: Oh wow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>O: Yeah.=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Ok-son elaborates her answer by attempting to subcategorize her sisters (lines 09–11), she has difficulty finding the pertinent kinship terms. Starting with ‘one’, she self-repairs to ‘fo:ur el-, elder sister and one- ’, at which point she cuts off the ongoing turn again and, after some more searching, settles for ‘four older sister and one elder sister’ (10/11). With a summary (‘only sister’) and a laughter token, she shows that her turn is complete. In line 13, Mary claims a change of her understanding with the epistemic token oh and asks Ok-son to confirm Mary’s new understanding of the number and subcategories of Ok-son’s sisters by saying ‘so four older sisters and one younger?’ with rising intonation. Ok-son confirms Mary’s candidate understanding in her next turn (line 14) by repeating the critical items from Mary’s turn, ‘one younger a:nd uh [fo:ur older.’ By placing the repaired item ‘one younger’ turn-initially, Ok-son confirms Mary’s other-correction of ‘elder sister’ as the correct resolution of Ok-son’s word search. In this sequence, Ok-son starts with the contrast pair ‘older sister’ and ‘elder sister’. After Mary’s correction, she correctly uses the contrast pair ‘older (sister)’ and ‘younger (sister)’.
One month later, Ok-son again struggles with the reference terms for her siblings (Excerpt 10b).

**Excerpt 10b  Sisters 2 (Jung, 2004, p. 40)**
J: Jamey, conversation partner; C: Chieko; O: Ok-son; K: Katsu

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>C: Mm, you have t- o:ne sister?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>O: .hh sss, (1.4) siste:rs, elder siste:rs o:ne,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>(1.0) ah, (.8) hhhh yeah sisters, (1.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>[three siste:rs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>K: [How old is that sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>O: ahaha three: older sister a:nd o:ne,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>(.7) hhhow can I say, “ah-”=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>K: =[Younger [sister.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>J: =[Younger [sister.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>O:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>J: [O::h you have five-girls.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>C: [O::h three sisters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Eh?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>O: yeah, but (.5) a::hm, nowadays we li:ve,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>just(e:::) my younger sister and I: and my parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>C: O::h.=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ok-son’s answer to Chieko’s question starts with perturbations that show her difficulties in finding the right kinship terms. Using a category → subcategory format, she produces ‘sisters,’ followed by ‘elder sisters one’ (line 2). After more perturbations that suggest an ongoing word search, she affirms the result of her search, ‘yeah sisters,’ and then expands this turn component to ‘three sisters’ (line 4). At this point, Ok-son appears to have said that she has three sisters, one of whom is an elder sister. The last component of Ok-son’s turn is said in overlap with Katsu’s question in line 5 (‘How old is that sister’). In her next turn, Ok-son does not respond to Katsu’s question, suggesting she did not hear it. Instead, Ok-son produces a token indexing the outcome of a search, ‘ahaha’, and expands ‘three sisters’ to ‘three: older sister’. As the sound stretches in the next turn component ‘and o:ne,’ indicate, she is running into a lexical search problem again. This time she explicitly marks the re-entry into a word search by saying ‘hhhow can I say’. In response, both Katsu and Jamie supply the candidate solution, ‘younger sister’. Ok-son takes up the proposal with the confirmation + agreement format X + yeah, ‘Young, younger sister, ye:ah.’(line 11; Kim 2012), marking the successful outcome of the collaborative word search.

The preceding two excerpts show that Ok-son had problems producing the lexical unit ‘younger sister’, although she recognized the phrase when offered by the co-participants. Five months later, Ok-son uses the target referent without assistance (Excerpt 10c).

**Excerpt 10c  Sisters 3 (Jung 2004, p. 56)**
K: Kyungmi, former interchanger; O: Ok-son

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>K: Okay. How many family members are there in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>your family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Who are they.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gabriele Kasper and Younhee Kim

In response to Kyungmi’s questions about the size and composition of her family, Ok-son starts her answer in the order of seniority, beginning with her parents. Then she moves on to collect her siblings in the category ‘sisters’, with some display of uncertainty about the number of members in the category (line 6). After a search at the beginning of her next turn component, Ok-son breaks down the number of members in the superordinate category ‘sisters’ into ‘four older sisters, and one younger sister’ (lines 7–8). Here then Ok-son produces the two subcategories of sisters correctly and quite fluently. In addition, the sequence shows that with the required lexical units available for production, Ok-son is able to design a more organized and comprehensive answer that clearly represents the categorial relationships of her family.

4.4 Development of interactional practices

As activities in which participants talk about their practices and experiences, conversations-for-learning are prime environments for story-telling. Participants bring their interactional competencies as story tellers and story recipients to the conversation table. However, when story tellings are done in a less familiar language, L2 participants may contribute less than they otherwise would (Hellermann 2008). This raises the question whether L2 speakers’ practices of telling and listening to stories at the conversation table change over time. Hauser (2013a) showed that an L2 speaker’s use of devices for marking direct reported speech in his story tellings developed over multiple stages over a five month period, from representing the talk as enactment by prosodic shifts to framing the voiced utterance with a Japanese quotative and finally by introducing the represented talk with person reference and a verb of saying in English. Focusing on an L2 participant’s alignment as a story recipient, Kim (forthcoming) observed a number of changes over a period of five months. Stories were absent in the initial sessions, which were conducted in an interview-type format with the conversation partner taking the lead. As the participants met more often, the interactional organization of the talk became more conversation-like, story tellings gradually increased, and with them environments for story recipiency. In the last two sessions, there was a substantial number of sequential contexts for story recipiency. The focal story recipient’s practices did not develop in a linear fashion, but they showed some notable changes. On the first occasions, Chungho displayed his understanding of the stories with an affect-marked recipient token and laughter, and with an empathy formulation (‘I can imagine it’) and a summary assessment. While he produced the nonlinguistic response tokens in a well-timed manner just after the teller delivered the punch line, the linguistically formulated turns were sequentially delayed. The next practices that emerged were ancillary questions, followed by a second story after the teller’s response. In Excerpt 11, Tom reaches the end of a story about how one of his high school classmates used a watch with a remote control to turn the TV on in the middle of a lesson.
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With his question (line 18), Chungho shows his understanding of the story and interest in its consequences, leading to further elaboration of the story beyond its possible completion with the teller’s assessment (line 15). After Tom’s answer, Chungho acknowledges the elaboration and launches a second story (line 26).

Finally, Chungho solicits a story from Tom and thereby aligns himself as a story recipient from the first position of the adjacency pair (Excerpt 12).

Excerpt 11  Did the teacher find out (Kim forthcoming)
T: Tom; C: Chungho; J: Jinho

14    T: =during classes push zho Independence heh heh heh
15    it was awesome
16    J: hehe .hh
17    (.)
18 → C: so um did teacher fa- found
19    T: there’s no way she could know (0.4) cuz it’s just such
20    (. ) uh y’know such a small a thing you can just (0.9)
21    oh I don’t know what’s go(h)ing on [xxx heh heh change it,=
22    C: [hah hah hah
23    J: [heh heh hehh
24    T: =change the channel, turn it off
25    (0.8)
26 → C: yeah um (1.0) one of my friend had a cell phone (0.7)
27    the remote controlling cell phone

With his question (line 18), Chungho shows his understanding of the story and interest in its consequences, leading to further elaboration of the story beyond its possible completion with the teller’s assessment (line 15). After Tom’s answer, Chungho acknowledges the elaboration and launches a second story (line 26).

Finally, Chungho solicits a story from Tom and thereby aligns himself as a story recipient from the first position of the adjacency pair (Excerpt 12).

Excerpt 12  Motorcycle lesson (Kim forthcoming)
C: Chungho; T: Tom

448    C: um- (0.6) how’s your (. ) motorcycle?
449    T: finished. (0.3) I’d, yesterday was my last day ! class.
450    a: nd I got uh ninety five percent (0.3) on like, on the
451    driving part, [story continues]

As this section has shown, when L2 participants engage in repeated conversations-for-learning over a longer period of time, they can be seen to expand their repertoire of L2 resources and use available resources more assuredly over the course of the meetings. They also produce a wider range of interactional practices, and they use practices that they engage from early on with a tighter sequential fit in later conversations. An important but different question is whether or not the observable changes in interactional competencies can be attributed to participants’ orientations to these resources and practices as learning objects in prior conversation table talk (Excerpts 2 and 7–10b. While it can be difficult to make such claims with certainty, Markee’s (2008) proposal of learning object tracking offers one method that could be applied to document the development of interactional competencies in longitudinal conversation table data.

5. Some Directions for Future Research

Since the body of research on conversations-for-learning is small, studies are needed that expand the data base not only quantitatively but also qualitatively. As Kivik (2012) showed in her study of the Estonian coffee hour, the rich morphology of Estonian becomes an object of shared attention and learning in ways we do not see in morphologically less complex
languages such as English. Just how novice L2 speakers manage to design turns with the resources of different L2 grammars is an underresearched direction in conversation-analytic studies of L2 talk and learning in any setting. As L2 speakers typically participate in conversations-for-learning over many sessions, the activity is a natural provider of longitudinal data for investigating the development of L2 grammar in interaction.

One of many differences in conversation table setup is whether or not an L1 conversation partner participates. When this is the case, we saw that the conversation partner regularly assumes the discourse identity of interaction manager or pivot (Hauser 2008; Kasper 2004; Kivik 2012). In settings with no L1 speaker present, novice L2 speakers who spoke the same first language organized their turn-taking in the manner of ordinary conversation (Carroll 2004; Otsu and Krug 2013). No research has been reported yet on arrangements in which the target language is a lingua franca and the participants talk among themselves without an L1 conversation partner. The conversation table talk might gain more family resemblance with talk that is not arranged for language practice because the choice of the target language is normal for participants with different first languages even without participating L1 speakers as conversation partners.

All reported studies examine how the participants organize their talk, but so far only studies of conversation tables with an L1 conversation partner present investigate moments of L2 learning and development over time. The literature on in-class peer activities conducted under a variety of analytical perspectives documents that students generate learning opportunities for each other while pursuing the activity at hand (e.g., Cheng 2013; Kunitz 2013). These findings are directly consequential for educational practice since they assure program developers and teachers that communicative peer activities are beneficial for L2 learning. One direction for future conversations-for-learning without L1 conversation partners is therefore to examine how the participants generate and treat opportunities for L2 learning and what progress they make in their use of resources and interactional practices over time.

Because of the small number of available studies, the range of interactional practices that have come under scrutiny is limited as well. The most systematic attention has been given to turn taking, repair, question sequences, word searches, initial reference, and some story telling practices. Therefore, continued research guided by the conversation-analytic method of unmotivated looking is critical to gain a more detailed understanding of how participants organize diverse forms of conversations-for-learning. But we also need to get a more differentiated view of practices that are shared among differently arranged conversations-for-learning, and of how such practices might be calibrated to the contextual particulars of different conversation table settings. To that end, the comparative strategy demonstrated by Drew (2003) could be adopted. Drew examined formulations–actions that explicitly state a speaker’s understanding of what another speaker said—in four institutional settings, psychotherapeutic consultations, call-in radio programs, news interviews, and industrial negotiations. The generic action of formulation was designed with different linguistic forms that were responsive to the specific institutional goals of each setting. In a similar manner, researchers of conversations-for-learning could select an interactional resource or practice in differently arranged settings and compare its formats and interactional consequences in equivalent sequential contexts.

REFERENCES


Hauser, E. (2005b) Face-work with limited linguistic resources: Showing concern for face during language learning conversations, in *Pragmatics in Language Learning, Theory and Practice*, (ed. D. Tatsuki), Japan Association for Language Teaching Pragmatics Special Interest Group, pp. 25–42.

Hauser, E. (2005c) Footing and identity in interaction at a conversation club, in *Consequences of Mobility*, (eds B. Preisler, A. Fabricius, H. Haberland, S. Kjaerbeck, and K. Risager), University of Roskilde, Denmark, Department of Language and Culture, pp. 28–44.


Kivist, P-K. (2012) *Conversation-for-learning in Estonian coffee hour: An interactional*
Seo, M-S. (2011) Talk, body, and material objects as coordinated interactional resources in repair activities in one-on-one ESL tutoring, in L2 Learning as Social Practice: Conversation-analytic Perspectives (eds G. Pallotti and J. Wagner), University of Hawai‘i, National Foreign Language Resource Center, Honolulu, pp. 107–134.

CROSS REFERENCES

See Chapter 9: The Sequential Analysis of Instruction.
See Chapter 22: L2 Classroom Interaction as a Complex Adaptive System.
See Chapter 25: CA-For-SLA Studies of Classroom Interaction: Quo Vadis?