On the Characteristics of Native and Non-native Speakers' Interactions in English Tutoring on the Telephone

Sujin Cho
(Seoul National University)

Cho, Sujin. 2007. On the Characteristics of Native and Non-native Speakers' Interactions in English Tutoring on the Telephone. *SNU Working Papers in English Linguistics and Language 6*, 101-121. The current study is an investigation of telephone tutoring within the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA). In this paper, I demonstrate that the beginnings of native speaker-nonnative speaker telephone conversations display distinct characteristics in relation to the interactional context of English tutoring. One major finding of the current study concerns the NNS characteristics that are not found in NS telephone conversation: the non-reciprocality of 'how are you' exchange, the formulaic use and a lack of variety in response to 'how are you' inquiry, and the use of passing turn 'yeah'. The current data also show that the NNSs have a tendency to bypass introduction of the first topic, which is echoed in their overall passiveness in initiating a new sequence and dependence on the initiative of the NS tutor. The importance of this paper is to provide new data on English tutoring on the telephone and a description of the actual conduct of the NNS tutees in telephone conversation. The current findings on the NNS characteristics have several important pedagogical implications such as ESL textbook development for more natural telephone conversations (Wong 2002) and test design for interactional competence (Young and He 1998).

Keywords: openings, telephone conversation, nonnative speaker, tutoring, interaction

1. Introduction

There have been a number of studies investigating telephone conversation (Schegloff 1968, 1970, 1979, 1986, 2002, Schegloff and Sacks 1973, Sacks 1992) within the research tradition called Conversation Analysis (CA) (cf., Hutchby and Woffitt 1998). One central issue of interest under CA is to investigate the interactional and sequential property of everyday conversations (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974),

one of which is to examine how the 'first topic', i.e., 'the reason for the call' is collaboratively brought up by its interlocutors (Schegloff 1968, 1986).

In recent years, there has been a growing number of CA-based studies in nonnative speaker (NNS) discourse, adding new data to the study of the uses of interactional mechanisms in various social interactions (c.f., Wong and Olsher 2000). Yet, there has been little research regarding the openings that occur in native speaker (NS)-nonnative speaker tutoring on the telephone.

The present study investigates the openings of telephone conversation based on the data fragments that are extracted from English tutoring on the telephone. The central goal of this paper is first to provide new data on NNS discourse and then to offer an analytic account of the NNS interactions. Specifically, I show that the canonical sequences that traditional CA literature has mentioned are still observed but there are something else going on regarding the technological development, i.e., Caller ID. In addition, I demonstrate that these NS-NNS conversations on the telephone display distinct characteristics in relation to the interactional context of English tutoring.

2. Previous studies

2.1 The openings in telephone conversation

The systematic study of telephone conversation has been first conducted by Schegloff and Sacks (cf. Sacks 1992). By demonstrating that ordinary conversations such as telephone calls can also provide raw material for scholar scrutiny, they have developed a method of analyzing telephone conversation, which has been later applied to cover the full range of speech communication from ordinary to institutional talk.

Schegloff (1986) identifies four 'routine' tasks that are canonically found in the openings: summons/answer, identification/recognition, greetings, 'how are you' inquiry exchange. He observes that when there is nothing special going on, these sequential action take place in an orderly, 'ritual' fashion. Since the caller and the call recipient lack visual information, these interactional opening sequences occupy the talk itself in the beginning before 'the reason for the call' is brought up.

Each sequence has at least one organizational attribution for the conversation. Summons/answer indicates the openness of communication channel. This indicates that the first contribution to telephone conversation is not the most common response form, 'hello', but the ringing itself as the summons (Schegloff 1968). Identification/recognition sequence establishes the relevance of the following interaction from the outset since the individual or categorial identity of the interlocutor is critical for the type of interaction to take place (Schegloff 1979). The job of greetings is often intricately connected to identification/recognition by signalling mutual recognition and participation of the interlocutors. Finally, 'how are you' sequence is reciprocally inquired and responded on some current state of being (Schegloff 1986). At the end of this sequence exchange, 'the anchor position' is established for the interlocutors to bring up the first topic, i.e., the reason for the call. In addition, Schegloff observes that the first topic can be brought earlier than the anchor position by omitting some opening sequences with a preemptive move. As a consequence of such actions, the openings can be shortened and allow the interlocutors to deal with prioritized or urgent topics.

The importance of the description of the opening sequences is in offering an empirically grounded account of what is transpired in those telephone calls as well as of what fails to occur there. For instance, non-routine openings are marked with deviations such as pauses, deletions and contractions of some of the opening sequences, which affect the course of actions in interactions. Such a systematic approach allows researchers to see how interlocutors themselves understand what is going on in the interaction.

2.2 NNS discourse

Traditionally, the study of NNS discourse has been mainly investigated in the domains of second language acquisition (SLA) research (cf., Ellis 1994, e.g., Long 1981, Gass and Varonis 1985) and in a few sub-fields and related areas of sociolinguistics (e.g., Bayley and Schecter 2003, Cameron and Williams 1997). In recent years, the CA framework has been adopted in interdisciplinary study of various types of NNS discourse. It has particularly drawn the attention from SLA by providing

the actual conduct of the NNSs in NS-NNS interaction (e.g., Carroll 2000, 2004, 2005, Firth 1996, Hosoda 2000, Kasper and Ross 2001, Kurhila 2001, 2004, 2005, Schegloff 2000, Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, and Olsher 2002, Wagner 1996, Wong 1984, 1994, 2000a, 2000b, Wong and Olsher 2000). The findings have focused on demonstrating that the NNSs or learners can actually maneuver talk to learn in naturally occurring talk, using local interactional resources that are also found in NS conversations. Such studies have contributed to establish NNS discourse as a genre of discourse analysis (Markee 2000).

3. Data and methodology

The data for the study consist of 24 telephonic tutorial sessions. This type of tutoring is normally timed for 10-minute sessions. The interaction involves a single NS tutor who is the caller and 15 NNS (7 male and 8 female) tutees who are the call recipients.

The level of speaking proficiency varies from beginner, intermediate, and advanced. The speaking proficiency level of the students was classified according to the NS instructor's own evaluation. It should be mentioned that the present study does not focus on social categories such as gender, social, class, and proficiency level. Instead, it mainly addresses details of talk using the fundamental techniques of CA.

The NS is an American female who has worked as an English instructor in Korea. The NNS participants are Koreans including elementary school, middle school, high school students, office workers, business people, and a retired school principal.

The tutoring sessions are conducted under different topics of conversation, e.g., everyday conversational topics and issues, reading the weekly magazine Time for Kids, and discussion topic for job interview.

These calls were audio-taped and transcribed according to CA transcription conventions (See Appendix).

4. Analysis

4.1 Summons/answer and identification/recognition sequences

It seems relevant to begin with how the new technological development called Caller ID has changed the ways people answer the telephone. Ever since Caller ID came into service, the identification of callers has become possible even before picking up the telephone so that the answerers have symmetrical information on who the caller is (Schegloff 1979). In the current study, there are a few noticeable findings regarding Caller ID. First, I have found most telephone calls are responded to with 'hello' (19 telephone call out of the total 24 calls) or 'hi' (4 telephone calls) in English. One involves the Korean conventional answer of 'hello', yepwuseyyo, in which case the NNS call recipient did not use Caller ID. These utterances are produced in English by the NNS answerers who have been informed of the caller's identity by Caller ID.

Before the invention and popularization of Caller ID, a caller had an idea of who the target of the calling was meant to be while the answerer usually did not have such information (Schegloff 1968). Instead, 'hello' functioned as a voice sample for recognition for the caller. The current data, however, show that the Caller ID-aided openings hardly dismiss the 'hello' sequence. The evidence of Caller ID appears to be in the NNSs' response to the summons, not with 'hello' in Korean (i.e., yepwuseyyo) but with "Hello" in English, indicating that they are aware of the caller's identity.

The following excerpt illustrates an instance of NS-NNS conversational opening where the first turn of the conversation is 'hello'. C is a 35-year-old adult who works for the Korean government water agency.

(1) PT3-2
S=NS; C=NNS
((ring))
1   C :   Hello
2   S :   Hello
3   C :   Hi::
4   S :   Hi, how are you.
5   C :   I'm um: good
6   S :   Good good good good .hh[h ((long sigh))
7   C :   [Uh yesterday ah::=
8   S :   =Mhm

In line 1, C answers the telephone with Hello. Subsequently, S

recognizes C from this first voice sample and produces another Hello as a passing turn. The upward intonation indicates that this *Hello* from line 1 is not a variant of greetings. At this, C initiates the first part of greeting exchange sequence *Hi::*, which is reciprocated by S's turn *Hi*, interlocked with *how are you*. After C's response, S produces acknowledgement tokens as an assessment of the prior utterance in line 6.

Here, C's 'hello' does not only work for the summons/answer sequence in "confirming the openness of, a channel of communication, and the availability of an attentive ear and mouth ready to speak (Schegloff 1986: 117)."

These sequences resemble the NS interactional openings of telephone conversation where there is no overt identification and recognition work (cf., Schegloff 1986) as in the following example.

```
(2) Schegloff (1986: 114)
((ring))
1     Nancy :   H'llo?
2   →Hyla  :   Hi:,
3   →Nancy :   Hi::.
4     Hyla  :   Hwaryuhh=
5     Nancy :   =Fi:ne how'r you,
6     Hyla  :   Okay: [y,
7     Nancy :          [Goo:d,
8     (0.4)
9     Hyla  :   mkhhh[hh
10    Nancy :          [What's doin,
```

The speakers, Nancy and Hyla both recognize each other without overtly identifying themselves. As soon as Nancy answers the telephone in line 1, Hyla greets her with *Hi::* which is reciprocated by Nancy's *Hi::* as mutual recognition. The difference between Segment (1) and (2) is that 'hello' from (1) is selectively spoken in English by the NNSs who are being informed by Caller ID. Another difference is the turn type of the caller's first turn (T2, hereafter) in line 2 in both segments. Segment (2) contains greetings initiated in T2, which is returned by the recipient in the next turn, while Segment (1) involves a passing turn (*Hello*), indicating the NS's reservation for launching new sequences. Such bypass

can induce the NNS to initiate next relevant actions, for example, initiating greeting sequences.

The next segment presents an instance where anticipated Caller ID does not succeed and result in a disruptive opening development. N is a 65-year-old retired elementary school principal. At the time of this call, he was on the way to a golf club from the airport of Busan, a coastal city in Korea, with his wife and friends. The NS and the NNS have known each other over the telephone for three years.

```
(3) PT5-2
S=NS; N=NNS
((ring))
1    →N :   yepwuseyyo.
2     (.)
3    →S :   Um hello?
4    →N :   Hello HI! HI!
5     (.)
6     S :   Oh hi::=
7     N :   =Do[nna
8     S :       [sound ver-
9     N :       [yeah.
10    S :       [t s-
11    (.)
12    S :   You sound [very different.
13    N :              [(Hi/I)
14    N :   Yeah:: I went to::::: Busan (.) uh::: Air:::pos.
```

Here, N answers in Korean 'hello' (*yepwuseyyo*). The micropause in line 2 indicates non-recognition. It is because S was anticipating N to expect her call and have her identity recognized by Caller ID. Instead, she is taken off guard by his answering in Korean and seems initially unsure of whether or not she had reached the right person. This is displayed in her first turn in the opening (line 3) withheld at first and containing a hesitation ('um') plus hello? 'hello' in English. The NS's 'hello' in line 3 is used rather as to invite the NNS to recognize who is calling (Schegloff 1968). At this turn, N recognizes and confirms S that she did reach the right number by immediately switching from Korean to English. In line 6, after a micropause (line 5), S produces a

change-of-state token 'oh' (Heritage 1984b) plus greeting return. This 'oh' marks success of identification and marks 'just now', that is, the point at which recognition is achieved (Schegloff 1979). Then, her remark notes on the difference in N's voice quality (*You sound very different*).

Ironically, the symmetry of information assumed by Caller ID can be disruptive on the part of caller as observed in this segment. If a caller calls a number or a place where familiars are expected to answer, and is actually answered by someone else, or in different fashion from the usual, then the caller may 'hear' that the wrong number has been reached, and hang up the phone right away. Alternatively, the caller may repeat 'hello' as a passing turn to prompt the answer to give another opportunity to speak and to be recognized by the answerer as in Segment (3). In other words, identification and recognition work is inextricably linked with summons/answer work and is an issue to be solved before speakers establish a conversation. In the next section, I will examine instances whose answer to the summons is other than 'hello'.

4.2 'Hello' and 'Hi'

In some instances, Caller ID seems to attribute to NNSs' omitting the answering part of the summons/answer sequence and immediately initiates greetings. In this part, I will examine two types of answering: 'hello' and 'hi'. Schegloff (1986) notes 'hi' is used in 'I'll call you right back' circumstances, where the two parties close a conversation with an agreement that one of them will do some task and then call back. The next example contains 'hi' of such use.

(4) Friedman (1979: 56, cited from Schegloff 1986: 121)
1   Mom :   Terrific, listen, I'll call you back.
2   Ed   :   O.K.
3   Mom :   All right, in about one minute.
((ring))
4   →Ed   :   Hi.
5   Mom :   Hello there. I just got some more coffee.
6   We um went to see the Rhineholts last night.

So, the answerer of the later call may exhibit 'superconfidence'in the

identity of the caller by saying Hi. Participants can immediately constitute and display 'resumed' conversation by saying 'hi' and they can omit other parts of the opening including any further identification work.

In the current data, the answerer's 'superconfidence' about the identity of the caller is not restricted to the interactional contexts above. The following segment displays a case of NS-NNS encounter on the telephone which looks similar to the NS 'resumed' conversation from Segment (4). P is a 16-year-old female high school student. Here, S is late for her tutoring session with P and tries to explain the reason for her tardiness. Her apologetic explanation is given by the way of topic preemption.

(5) PT6-5
S=NS; P=NNS
((ring))
1   →P :   Hi::
2   →S :   Hi::: I'm little [late=
3   P :   [(uh)
4   S :   =I:::- every night (I to::-) .hhh actually I- I dialed
5   y' minute or two ago and I realized like I got like
6   a message dial again? .hhh

In line 1, P answers the call with *Hi::*, displaying confidence on the caller's identity. In line 2, S, the NS, responds with a second greeting and immediately initiates the first topic. 'Hi' from this instance indicates the confidence of speakers; however, its interactional context is not necessarily one of 'I'll call you right back' circumstances.

Concerning 'hi', Schegloff's (1979) study notes that such initial greeting in second turn (as in Segment (4)) has two aspects that are intertwined. First, it is the first part of the adjacency pair of greetings therefore, it has a restricted set of second parts (e.g., 'hi' or 'hello'). Second, it is a "claim that to have recognized the answerer and a claim to have the answerer recognize the caller (ibid.: 35)." While the first greeting exhibits recognition, so does the second greeting. From this stance, Segment (5) is a similar instance of (4) only with the omission of the second part of the summons/answer sequence. Instead of the caller initiating the first part of the greetings in second turn, the answerer initiates it, making a second greeting relevantly occupy the next turn in the second turn.

This description implies that the impact of Caller ID is not in creating

an entirely different sequential organization in the openings. It rather confirms the conventional structural organization of the openings of telephone conversation as Schegloff has observed a few decades ago. Yet, there are delimitations to be accounted since there has been little or no research on NS-based interactional data with reference to Caller ID which shapes conversational openings on the telephone. Future analysis in this matter should be conducted to solidify further observations.

In the next segment, the NNSs' tendency of bypassing the initiation of some routine sequences is observed. T is a 10-year-old elementary school student who has been reading *Time for Kids in his* tutoring sessions.

```
(6) PT 7-1 Child 4
S=NS; T=NNS
((ring))
1    →T :  Hi ((sleepy voice))
2    →S :  Hi:::
3    →T :  Yeah. ((sleepy voice))
4     S :  How are you?
5     T:   .hhhh Fine. ((sigh))
6     S :  Ah::: tired. Hhallight::: Okay. Well, how was
7           yesterday at school. Anything interesting?
8     T:   mNo
9     S :  What about today. Do you have any plans?
10    T:   No
11   (1.3)
12    S :   It's Thursday. So let's see. Yeah. Nothing special?
13    T:   Yeah.
14   (1.0)
15    S :   Good. Okay. Alright. Well. Uh::: Let's see.
16           Last ti:me wewere doing::: thee::: Times Kids.
17           Right.
18    T:   Yeah.
```

In this segment, T's answer *Hi* is responded to with S's return greeting. The structural relevance for initiation of greetings and 'how are you' inquiries ordinarily establishes the first opportunity to the caller. In this instance, however, T, the NNS is allocated with a turn to initiate a 'how

are you' inquiry, but he bypasses his current turn with the acknowledgement token 'yeah' as a passing turn in line 3, displaying his reluctance to initiate a sequential action on his terms.

Such reluctance or tendency involves an interactional outcome of tutoring sessions where the NNSs often display heavy dependence on the NS tutor in terms of the initiation of this type of routine sequences. There is also the matter of, though unclear, whether it is ordinarily the tutor who has control over the topics or 'talkables' in tutoring sessions. In a typical telephone conversation, the caller has the right to introduce the reason for the call. However, it is not easily determined who has the priority in selecting and launching topic introduction in tutoring. Yet, as it is noticed in Segment (6), the NNSs often show even more reluctance in expanding or topicalizing opening sequences against the NS's multiple attempts to get them to talk. This tendency is often marked by the use of the passing turn 'yeah' and the likes. The following section addresses the issue of how these NNS and NS participants manage the 'how are you' exchange sequences and their expansion, if topicalized.

4.3 'How are you' sequences

In ordinary NS telephone conversations, the 'how are you' sequence is reciprocated. In other words, 'how are you' sequence is reciprocally inquired by the recipient of the first 'how are you' (Schegloff 1986). Unless these sequences are omitted by a preemptive move from either recipient or caller, they are likely to be fully developed before the first topic of conversation. However, no instance of the 'how are you' sequence displays reciprocality in the current data. In the following, I will examine two instances of the 'how are you' sequence. In the first instance, it exemplifies how NNSs do not reciprocate the 'how are you' exchange sequences.

In the next example, B is a 10-year-old female elementary student. S is calling B second time this week (Tuesday).

(7) PT3-1
S=NS; B=NNS
((ring))
1   B :   Hello?

```
2    →S :    Hi::: How'[re you
3     B :              [Hi::
4     (.)
5    →B :    Fine
6    →S :    Goo:::::::d .hh
7    →B :    Yeah.
8     S :    Awight. Today's only Tuesday::
9             Th[e week is so slow:::
10    B :     [I know.
```

This segment contains an interlocking turn of S's 'how are you' preceded by a greeting (line 2). B produces the second part of the first 'how are you' in line 5. However, there is no second 'how are you' inquiry on the part of the first 'how are you' recipient, B, as do the NS conversational openings ordinarily. S closes the 'how are you' sequence with a closing assessment token *Goo:::::::d*. Then, B , the NNS again bypasses the turn position for topic initiation with another token, Yeah, in line 7. B's turn in line 7 confirms the closing of the 'how are you' sequence (line 2-6) in that there will be no more pursuit of that topic. At this, S also produces an accepting token in agreement and introduces her first topic of conversation.

The findings on the NNS responses to the NS's 'how are you' involve two noticeable features. First is the lack of variety in the responses. Out of the 15 instances that have the 'how are you' sequence, The rest of 9 instances are preemption either by the caller or the recipient. A striking number of NNS responses to 'how are you' is largely formulaic "Fine/I'm fine" (10 instances), which also include 3 instances of its variant, "Good/I'm good", adding up to 13 out of 15. By 'formulaic', it signifies that some NNS participants produce them in an automatic fashion and do not consider them real inquiries for their current state of well-being. This seems to be the case because after the 'how are you' sequence is closed, immediately following questions which similarly ask about news on its recipients (e.g., "How was your day?") seem to be able to topicalize their current state. Such sequences often result in previous responses cancelled or reversed. Discussion on how this sequence is introduced in ESL textbooks is offered in Wong's (1984, 2002) studies.

The other interesting feature is the topicalization of NNS 'how are you'. While the most of the second pair part of 'how are you' is formulaic

'fine', there are only 2 instances of "I'm tired", both of which are topicalized in sequence expansion. As Schegloff (1986) notes, non-neutral responses (negative or positive) engender a whole sequence unlike neutral responses (e.g., 'O.K.,' 'Fine').

The following excerpt illustrates an instance of canonical opening occasioned with negative response to the 'how are you' sequence. C is a 35-year-old businessman. He talks about his tiredness from watching the Korean national soccer team play in an international tournament until late.

```
(8) PT 6-3
S=NNS; C=NS
((ring))
1     C :   Hello?
2     S :   Hello
3     C :   Hi::
4   →S :    Hi, how are you
5   →(0.5)
6   →C :    I'm: (.) um::: tired (.) a little.
7     S :   Yeah you sound a little tired?
8     C :   Mhm yes. Uh:: (0.2) because I:: (0.5)
9            uh watched TV hhh hhh
10    S :   Ah::::
11    C :   Last night. Hhh hhh .hhh I- I- I watched soccer
12           game hhhm
13    C :   .Hhhh
14    C :   [(mm)- national team on T(hh)V hhh=
15    S :   [Ohhh:::::
16    S :   =I- I heard that you guys a- you guys played
17           Iraq last night.
18    C :   Yeah yeah right.
```

In line 4, S initiates the 'how are you' sequence as usual. However, her turn is followed by a pause in line 5. After this pause, C produces his response turn in line 6 with a negative response, to which he precisely relates his current state. Then S acknowledges his response and produces an assessment of his voice to align it in line 7 (it hears "now that you mention it"), which allows him to continue elaborating on the cause of

his tiredness (lines 8-12). Such a negative response engenders a whole sequence expansion.

Until now, I have examined several instances whose opening sequences include summons/answer, identification/recognition, greetings, and 'how are you' sequences found in NS-NNS interactional contexts. The analysis of the openings in telephone conversation demonstrates that Caller ID-aided openings involve sequences in which identification and recognition have already been solved. Moreover, in the course of the openings, the NNSs are observed to have a tendency of bypassing initiation of some sequences, yielding it to the NS tutor with a passing turn (e.g., 'yeah'). Also, the analysis comprises instances where the NNSs do not reciprocate the 'how are you' sequences and respond with a restricted set of formulaic neutral answers (e.g., 'fine').

4.4 Preemption

Schegloff (1986) introduces various ways that the reason for the call can be brought up earlier than the anchor position, resulting the opening shortened. One of them is by preemption. By 'preemption' or a 'preemptive move', it refers to the early start of a first topic or some initial action before the opening has worked out in full, i.e., anchor position (Schegloff 1986, Luke 2002).

The following extract contains a radical case of recipient preemption. In this segment, the NNS preempts what would have been the place for the response to the 'how are you' with topic initiation. D is a 11-year-old female child. She tries to initiate a first topic by topicalizing how S's greetings have upbeat note signaling that S is in good mood that day.

(9) PT3-3
S=NS; D=NNS
((ring))
1   D :   Hello?
2   S :   Hello.
3   D :   Hello.
4   S :   How are you
5   →D: Teacher I think today you feel really good.

```
6      (.)
7      S :   Ah::::::
8      D :   Today your hello was great.
9      (.)
10     S :   T- Today my:: hello was good? Hhh [hhh hhh hhh
11     D :                                    [Yeah
```

In line 5, D makes a preemptive move to first topic by omitting her relevant response to S's inquiry of 'how are you'. At this, S initially produces micropause followed by a turn that signals a weak acknowledgement in line 7. The micropause delays her delivery of response to D's turn (line 5). As D elaborates on her topic in line 8, S issues a repair for D's utterance by repeating D's prior turn jokingly. It is also prefaced by a micropause (line 9).

Schegloff (1986) observes that the call recipient preempts the current turn position when there is a prioritized urgency. The following excerpt illustrates the point. Here, the answerer of the call, R, was not the expected recipient of the call. R is a 10-year-old female child who is also sister of S's other student, G, on whose behalf she answered the telephone. Thus, R tries to tell S that G is not available at this number and also asks S to call G on her cell phone.

```
(10) PT3-5
S=NS; R=NNS
((ring))
1       R :   'ello
2       S :   Hello
3      →R:    Hello my sister is going to study.
4       S :   Ah hah. So should I call her cellphone or
5       R :   Yeah. Maybe cellpho[ne
6       S :                       [O::kay I'll give her try.
7       R :   ·eah. ·
8       S :   Okay well, thank you
9       R :   Yeah:::
10      S :   Alright. Have a good ni::ght.
11      R :   Good night.
12      S :   Alright. Bye.
13      R :   By::e
```

Having the knowledge on the caller's identity, R answers the summons with 'ello in English and after NS' greeting, she immediately preempts first topic. Before the openings are fully developed, this is prioritized because the identification work is not achieved in the answerer's first turn in line 1. R's answering 'ello is non-recognitive for S. Not until line 3 does S recognize F by her covertly self-identifying utterance. If G were around in that place, this would have been a switchboard instance, i.e., asking for someone else than the answerer (cf., Schelgoff 1979). By interlocking two utterances in one turn, F shortens the potential length of openings.

The caller can also preempt opening sequences as in the following extract. There is, however, a difference in the degree of abruptness in the NS and NNS preemption. S was late for the appointed time with P so she tries to apologize by not overtly designing it as apology. She also gives an excuse for having called earlier only to find out that she had dialed the wrong number, thus not reaching P on time.

(11) PT6-5 (also appeared as (5) previously)
S=NS; P=NNS
((ring))
1   →P :   Hi::
2   →S :   Hi::: I'm little [late=
3   P :   [(uh)
4   S :   =I:::- every night (I to::-) .hhh actually I- I dialed
5   y' minute or two ago and I realized like I got like
6   a message dial again? .hhh

After issuing identification work in line 2, S launches her preemptive move in the same turn by interlocking them in one turn. This kind of preemption is less abrupt than the previous instances of the NNSs.

So far, I have examined the structural organization of NS-NNS telephone conversation whose context is the institutional settings of language tutoring, with focus on the special status of the opening. The openings of telephone calls have been analyzed in relation to the studies of previous NS conversational openings in order to identify features related to the NNSs. It is observed that these conversations are vulnerable not only to social orderliness (e.g., turn-taking system, repair organization, adjacency pairs, etc.) but also to linguistic or grammatical

orderliness (Wong 2005). This observation is resonant with Wong's (2000b) remark on NNSs' having dual roles as "both talkers and learners of the language (p. 40)." In this sense, the CA approach used in the current study shows that it offers a method of analyzing NNS discourse as an independent genre of discourse as well as investigating NNS interactions in terms of second language acquisition research.

5. Conclusion

The findings can be grouped roughly in two strands. The first set of findings is concerned with the issue of identification and recognition. The data indicated that the consequences of technological developments, Caller ID in particular, are not likely to create new sequences in the opening. It was observed that the Caller ID-aided openings manifest themselves in the same forms as in the NS telephone conversational openings where the problem of identification and recognition are already solved before the contact was fully established between the caller and the call recipient. These results confirm the findings from the previous studies in regards to the canonical opening sequences. While they occupy the talk itself due to the lack of visual information (e.g., the call recipient doe not know who the caller is), the consequences mark the talk in the openings (e.g., the call recipient omits the identification/recognition sequence) when related problems are solved (e.g., Caller ID identifies the caller).

The other set of findings are related to NNS-like features found in the NS-NNS interaction. A notable NNS characteristic is the non-reciprocality of the 'how are you' inquiry exchange sequence in the openings. The NNSs seem to have difficulties in performing the social practice of exchanging reciprocal greeting inquiries (e.g., 'hi' and 'how are you'). Also, most of the NNS answers to the 'how are you' inquiry are typically limited to 'Fine/I'm fine'. They are largely used in formulaic fashion, often engendering notably different answers when the NNSs are further inquired. Overall, the NNSs display passiveness in responding and reluctance in initiating new sequences in the openings. When allocated with a turn to initiate a sequence, they tend to bypass them with a passing turn, i.e., 'yeah'. In the data, this characteristic appears to be largely related to the proficiency level. The NNSs in lower

level tend to depend on the initiative by the NS. Another finding shows that the younger NNSs show more abruptness in preempting turns than the adult NNSs. Although preemption is not uncommon in the NS telephone openings, the NS preemption exhibits more naturalness in initiating a new sequence as a thing of moment in terms of urgency, relationship, etc..

The findings of the present study offer some pedagogical implications. Lately, the NNSs are tested for communicative competence not only in linguistic aspects but also in pragmatic aspects. Among them, the importance of interactional competence is ever increasing. The NNSs are required to know how to initiate and manage conversation and negotiate meaning with other participants. That also includes knowing and using interactional rules in various communication situations (Maynard 1987). As Luke and Pavlidou (2002) describes, making a successful call is seen "something of a test for a person's mastery of another language and culture (p. 7)." However, as Wong (2002) points out, very few ESL textbooks reflect the actual conduct of the interlocutors. Furthermore, the findings from the study, e.g., the non-reciprocality of 'how are you' and the tendency of bypassing in initiating new sequences, implicate important insights for ESL textbook and curriculum design.

Additionally, a recently growing interest in English proficiency exams on speaking (e.g., internet-based TOEFL) contains semi-direct speaking test that does not involve turn-taking interactions. However, designing test for interactional competence is still in its incipient stage. Deeper understanding of the NNS interactional competence will provide materials for both test designers and test takers. Lastly, the observations can be taken into account in devising training protocols for telephone English tutoring so that the tutors become aware of the NNS characteristics in telephone interaction and help them practice appropriate interactional skills on the telephone.

For further research, an examination based on the NS-NNS telephonic interaction in which the NNSs are the callers will be helpful to describe how the NNSs deal with opening sequences in order to introduce the reason for the call.

References

Bayley, R. and S. Schecter. 2003. *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

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

Carroll, D. 2004. Restarts in novice turn-beginnings: Disfluencies or interactional achievements? In R. Gardner and J. Wagner (eds.), *Second language talk*: 318 - 345. London: Continuum.

Carroll, D. 2005. Vowel-marking as an interactional resource in Japanese novice ESL conversation. In K. Richards and P. Seedhouse (eds.), *Applying Conversation Analysis*: 214-234. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cameron, R. and J. Williams. 1997. Sentence to ten cents: A case study of relevance and communicative success in non-native - native speaker interactions in a medical setting. *Applied Linguistics* 18: 415-445.

Ellis, R. 1994. *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Firth, A. 1996. The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 237-259.

Gass, S. and E. Varonis. 1985. Variation in native speaker speech modification to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 7: 37-57.

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

Hutchby, I. and R. Wooffitt. 1998. *Conversation Analysis.* Cambridge: Polity.

Kasper, G. and S. Ross. 2001. 'Is drinking a hobby, I wonder': Other-initiated repair in oral proficiency interviews. Paper delivered at *the annual convention of the American Association for Applied Linguistics.*

Long, M. 1981. Input, interaction and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (ed.), Native language and foreign acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 379: 259-278.

Luke, K. 2002. The initiation and introduction of first topics in Hong Kong telephone calls. In K. Luke & T. Pavlidou (eds.). *Telephone calls: unity and diversity in the structure of telephone conversations across languages and cultures:* 171-200. John Benjamins.

Luke, K. and T. Pavlidou. 2002. *Telephone calls: unity and diversity in conversational structure across languages and cultures.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. 1968. Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70: 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E. 1970. Opening Sequencing. Unpublished manuscript; published in J. E. Katz and M. Aakhus (eds.), *Perpetual contact: mobile communication, private talk, public performance*: 284-300. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. 1979. Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings. In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: studies in ethnomethodology*: 23-78. New

York: Irvington.

Schegloff, E. 1986. The routine as achievement. *Human Studies* 9: 111-151.

Schegloff, E. 2002. Beginning in the telephone. In J. Katz and M. Aakhus (eds.), *Perpetual contact: mobile communication, private talk, public performance*: 284-300. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wagner, J. 1996. Foreign language acquisition through interaction – A critical review of research on conversational adjustments. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 215-236.

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

Wong, J. 1994. *A conversation analytic approach to the study of repair in native-nonnative speaker English conversation: The element 'yeah' in the same turn repair and delayed next turn repair initiation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Wong, J. 2000a. Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/nonnative speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics* 21: 244-267.

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

Wong, J. 2000c. Repetition in conversation: A look at 'first and second sayings'. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33: 407-424.

Wong, J. 2002. 'Applying' conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating English as a second language textbook dialogue. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 40: 37-60.

Wong, J. and D. Olsher. 2000. Reflections on conversation analysis and nonnative speaker talk: An interview with Emanuel A. Schegloff. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 11: 111-128.

Sujin Cho
sujinn@yahoo.com

Appendix: Transcription Conventions

[overlapping or simultaneous talk
=   a latch sign is used when the second speaker follows the first
with no discernible silence between them
(.5)   length of pause
(.)   micropause
?   a rising intonation, not necessarily a question
,   a continuing intonation
-      a cut-off or self-interruption
hhh   hearable aspiration: It may represent breathing, laughter, etc.
(())   transcriber's descriptions of events
( )   uncertainty on the transcriber's part