Introduction
The objectives of the seminar were to:
- explore the nature of the relationship between Conversation Analysis and Applied Linguistics;
- identify and exemplify applications of CA methodology within the broad area of Applied Linguistics.

A number of themes emerged during the papers, groupings and titles of which are presented below. The main themes were:
- application of CA methodology to the analysis of L1 child language development and L2 acquisition;
- application of CA methodology to the analysis of L2 classroom interaction;
- application of CA methodology to the analysis of disordered speech;
- application of CA methodology to the analysis of professional discourse;
- compatibility of CA and Applied Linguistics;
- use of quantification in CA and in Applied Linguistics;
- relevance of CA to developments in qualitative research in Applied Linguistics.

Papers
The following papers were presented. Paul Drew (University of York) gave the first plenary session entitled Some themes for considering the relationship between CA and applied linguistics. In the paper, he identified a number of themes or dimensions in terms of which we can consider the interconnections, namely:
- Shared practices (including patterns and devices) for talking and reasoning in interaction are not setting-specific;
- Normativity of these practices, and speakers’ orientations to them;
- Talk as action, and sequential organisation of actions
- Intervention and designed output;
- Lesson to be drawn from the interactional construction of conduct;
- Large corpora and quantification: frequency and collocation;
- Procedural relevance of identities in talk.

Sub-theme: Therapy
The first three papers were in the area of application of CA methodology to speech therapy and disordered speech.
- John Rae, Penny Stribling and Paul Dickerson (University of Surrey) gave a paper entitled: Autistic children’s co-ordination of gaze and talk: re-examining the ‘asocial’ autist.
- Steven Bloch (University College London) presented a paper entitled: The use of Conversation Analysis in adult disordered speech: spelling aloud for meaning.
- Hilary Gardner’s (University College London) presentation was entitled: Doing ‘being the therapist’: a comparison of mothers and speech/language therapists working with children on target sounds and words.

Sub-theme: Professional Discourse
The next set of papers were in the area of institutional settings and covered three rather different areas of work.
- Ian Hutchby (Brunel University) presented on ‘Active listening’ and the construction of concerns about family relationships in child counselling.
- Joseph Gafaranga (King’s College London) gave a paper entitled Talking an institution into being: the opening sequence in general practice consultations.
- Maria-Carme Torras (University of Lancaster) examined Language choice, social identity and the order of service talk-in-interaction: a study of trilingual service encounters in Barcelona.
Sub-theme: Nativespeaker-nonnative speaker interaction
The next two presenters tackled an area which has received a good deal of attention recently in CA, namely interaction between native and nonnative speakers.
- Jean Wong (The College of New Jersey, USA) presented on Sidestepping grammar.
- Maria Egbert (Carl von Ossietzky Universitaet Oldenburg, Germany) looked at Discrimination due to nonnative speech production.

Sub-theme: First and Second Language Acquisition
Speakers in the final sub-theme considered a variety of themes both inside and outside the classroom in relation to language acquisition.
- Numa Markee (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA) presented A conversation analytic perspective on off-task classroom talk: implications for Second Language Acquisition studies.
- Denise Chappell (Anglia Polytechnic University) looked at the interface between Conversation Analysis and Second Language Acquisition: perspectives on formulations and recasts.
- Reuben Woolley (Zaragoza and Aston Universities) gave a presentation on Second Language Classroom ‘Conversation’ and Membership Categorisations.
- Andrew Packett (Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal) gave a paper on Teaching institutional talk in English Specific Purposes: the case of journalistic broadcast interviewing.
- Caiwen Wang (Loughborough University) examined English parents’ corrective speech in their English-acquiring children: an insight from a CA approach.

Leo Van Lier (Monterey Institute of International Studies, USA) gave the final plenary session via videoconferencing in the early morning from California and the late afternoon in Newcastle. Strangely enough it was very sunny in Newcastle and overcast in California! Fortunately the technology worked perfectly all the way through and we were able to have a 2-way discussion. The paper was entitled Conversation Analysis, ecology and language learning. It reviewed some of the key events in the history of research into interaction in language classrooms and then considered the possibility of integrating CA into an ecological framework.

Presenters put drafts of their papers onto a website some weeks before the seminar, which meant that participants were able to become familiar with the data and analyses prior to the presentations. This in turn meant that many discussions at the seminar were detailed and in-depth. We recorded the presentations and discussions in order to facilitate the editing process.

One of the most encouraging outcomes of the conference was the extent to which researchers from different disciplines within applied linguistics were able to exchange ideas and insights. This aspect is one that we hope to highlight in any subsequent publication.

As well as presenters we had 8 attendees and participants came from the USA, China, Spain, Portugal, Germany as well as the UK. We had an excellent Chinese conference dinner in Newcastle’s Chinatown.

Future Plans
We intend to submit a proposal for a book of collected edited papers provisionally entitled ‘Applying Conversation Analysis’ to the Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics’ series at Cambridge University Press.

Many participants suggested that we have a follow-up seminar, perhaps in Spain or Portugal! Many thanks to BAAL and CUP for funding the seminar and to the University of Newcastle for providing infrastructure and technical support.

Paul Seedhouse and Keith Richards
Introduction
This seminar was organised to promote SLA research with reference to French, by bringing together European researchers conducting empirical research into all aspects of the learning of French as a second/foreign language. Our specific aims were:

- To document linguistic progression in learners of French.
  Empirical papers were invited which could further our understanding of developmental stages in French, by documenting and analysing the development in French interlanguage of form-meaning relationships, morphosyntactic structures, pragmatic functions and sociolinguistic variables.
- To inform current theoretical debates on SLA.
  The seminar also aimed to inform current theoretical debates about linguistic development in second language learners, in terms of the different learning mechanisms available to classroom learners of French, and in terms of the impact of classroom instruction on development (comparison with naturalistic learners; role of formulaic language).
- To define a research agenda
  A final objective was to discuss a research agenda for the future study of French SLA.

Two invited speakers gave hour-long overview lectures, and 14 papers were also presented and discussed. Full details of the seminar programme, including abstracts of all papers, can be found at http://www.lang.soton.ac.uk/lingdev2002/.

Overviews of the field
The two invited speakers gave authoritative overviews of current major strands in SLA theorising, with rich exemplification from empirical work on French. Roger Hawkins (University of Essex) discussed the phenomenon of optionality/variability in interlanguage, from a generative perspective. Recent research in this tradition has argued for two different possible explanations of optionality, whether temporary, or resulting in permanent interlanguage ‘divergence’ from native speaker grammars. The first explanation is that learners can re-set syntactic parameters and develop a full underlying syntax for L2, but have ongoing difficulties in ‘mapping’ vocabulary items onto the terminal nodes of the grammar, e.g. choosing between (more specific) finite and (more general) non-finite verb forms where the syntax expects finite forms. (For example, learners of French are known to alternate between tout le monde reste/ *rester au salon.) The second explanation is that older learners cannot re-set parameters, and so where the target grammar involves parametrised syntactic features not present in the speaker’s L1, the underlying feature specification of terminal nodes in the interlanguage will be incomplete. (For example, Hawkins’ own research suggests that adult learner difficulties with French gender concord arise because terminal D nodes lack the features which agree with the gender of the N, and so the learner cannot ‘match up’ underlying syntax and lexical morphology as native speakers do.)

Hawkins argued for a structured research agenda which would help choose between these two generativist accounts of optionality, and explain where the real learning burden lies for L2 learners (with potential spin-offs for e.g. language education). Future research should be larger scale, and better quantified; learners from a greater range of L1 backgrounds should be researched; and in particular, research should not look only at the distributions of forms, but a methodology is needed to explore the meanings for L2 speakers of the forms they use.

Daniel Véronique (DELCA-SYLED, Université de Paris III) gave an overview of the development of temporality and subordination in the acquisition of French as a second language, from a functionalist perspective. His richly illustrated talk reviewed recent research using the well known ESF database of French interlanguage gathered from adult informal learners (L1 speakers of Spanish and of Moroccan Arabic), as well as other corpora such as INTERFRA gathered from instructed learners (L1 Swedish and L1 Japanese). He showed that temporality in the French interlanguage of informal learners is mainly not carried by verb morphology, but by other distributed means, including discourse context and lexical aspect. For these learners, inflectional morphology is a later acquired means of expressing temporality; it is often hard to assess the temporal value actually carried by ‘short’ forms (or V forms, e.g. regarde) and ‘long’ forms (or V + e forms, e.g. regarder/é) in untutored learners, though these forms seem to be acquired at much the same time. When alternation between
these forms develops, this may be due to lexical aspect, but other local reasons such as the presence of negation also seem to affect alternation. Thus the best indicators of the appearance of tense in French interlanguage is the development of auxiliary and modal forms, not the development of the ‘past participle’.

Regarding clause combining/ subordination, Véronique showed that this is not absent from untutored learners, but that they tend to prefer means such as parataxis; the development of means to express temporality supports the development of clause combining.

Trends in individual papers
The 14 shorter papers presented and discussed were mainly on aspects of French morphosyntax. However topics also included the development of a range of sociolinguistic and pragmatic features among instructed learners, and problems in French pedagogic grammar. Data from learners of all ages were presented, from a pre-school French-English bilingual child, to school age and undergraduate instructed learners with varied L1 backgrounds, plus untutored adult learners. The papers were generally strongly grounded in rich interlanguage corpora, and one positive outcome of the seminar was greater knowledge of these corpora and their locations (Lund, Stockholm, Graz, and Dublin, as well as a variety of UK and French universities). Another striking trend was the increasing level of interest and expertise in computer-aided analysis; three papers drew on CHILDES procedures and software to support their analyses, and one paper reported use of Goldvarb 2001. It is clear that the availability within CHILDES of a French language parser, recently devised by Christophe Parisse, will in the future be a major stimulus to computer-aided analysis of French interlanguage data.

Future directions for French SLA research
A concluding round table canvassed future directions for French interlanguage research. Hawkins suggested some key issues which he had identified from the two days’ discussion:

- the need to find a methodology which could address relationships between the interlanguage forms used by learners, and the meaning of those forms for the learner (too many studies still assume that interlanguage forms carry native speaker meanings/ functions, which is not necessarily the case);
- the need to establish independent measures of general proficiency levels among learners, so that close studies of the development of individual forms can be related to overall development;
- the need to study input and the learning context more systematically, e.g. to explain oddities in interlanguage pragmatics, which may be caused by biases in input;
- the need to study larger corpora, and for stronger quantification of results.

Veronique noted the focus of papers presented at the seminar on instructed learners as positive, and complementary e.g. to current work in France on uninstructed learners. However he also noted the lack of discussion of NNS interaction at the seminar, and the absence of work on written L2 French, which must also be studied if we are to understand tutored learning properly. He was keen to see more systematic work on L1 influence and transfer. Regarding methodology, he argued the continuing case for small scale studies and qualitative analysis of sharply focussed corpora, complementing Hawkins’ call for larger scale work.

In addition to these varied suggestions for further research, the round table discussed the need for training events e.g. in use of CHILDES or Goldvarb, and more regular local communication in general, if ambitious research agendas are to develop effectively. The current shift in language teaching agendas back towards a more cognitive approach, including the reinstatement of more explicit grammar pedagogy, was also noted, and SLA researchers urged to make sure that this movement takes due account of current understandings of second language learning. Time, perhaps, for a BAAL Special Interest Group on second language acquisition?

There were 27 registered participants at the seminar, from 7 different countries (Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Ireland, Sweden, and the UK), and the group included 7 research students, several of whom gave papers. The seminar took place in the very pleasant 18th century surroundings of South Stoneham House and its gardens (one of Southampton University’s best secrets!), which contributed to an informal yet productive atmosphere. The organisers are grateful for the support received for this successful seminar from the Association for French Language Studies and the French Embassy, as well as from BAAL/ CUP.

Rosamond Mitchell
Researching the Indic Languages Diaspora in Britain
19-20 October 2002, University of York
Organisers: Mahendra Verma (University of York) and Mike Reynolds

Introduction
The aim of the seminar was to bring together researchers into the Indic languages in Britain, in order to examine three themes: language change in the Indic languages, literacies and literacy practices among Indic language speakers, and educational and resources issues.

The papers
13 papers were given.

Mahendra Verma (University of York) surveyed research over the past 30 years, and the status of Indic languages in the British education system. He highlighted the shift in emphasis from questionnaire-based data to ethnographic approaches, the emergence of ‘critical sociolinguistics’, new perspectives on literacy and new technologies. Although the 5 major Indic languages – Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Panjabi and Urdu – are in the national curriculum, Tamil is not and Hindi is no longer available at GCSE. There is a clear shift to English among the 3rd and 4th generations, even in the home domain.

Tony McEnery (University of Lancaster) introduced us to the EMILLE Project (Enabling Minority Language Engineering), jointly run at Lancaster and Sheffield Universities, in collaboration with the Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore. The goal is to collect a corpus of 86 million words in 14 Indic languages, and to develop standardised fonts using UNICODE. Andrew Hardie (University of Lancaster) described his work on a part-of-speech tagset devised for Urdu using a modified version of the EAGLES standards for Western European languages.

Arvind Bhatt and Nirmala Bhojani (University of Leicester) outlined the ESRC-funded research they are beginning in Leicester into the contribution that the voluntary complementary schools make to the political, social and economic life of the city, as well as their role in sustaining community languages and literacies that influence the changing identities of young people.

Mahendra Verma and Arvind Bhatt presented their findings from a survey of community language teachers across the UK. The teachers were well qualified and trained and with long experience, but with low status and limited career opportunities. The main obstacles to their work were perceived to be a lack of resources, lack of support from the community and from other professionals. Quangos such as the Commission for Racial Equality and Equal Opportunities Commission have largely ignored linguistic issues that impinge upon equality and the life chances of community language teachers.

Mehroo Northover (Belfast) described her work on ethnicity and identification among Gujarati/English bilinguals, making use of Weinreich’s psychologically-oriented Identity Structure Analysis. She found that though language had a modifying influence on identification with the group, just as important were ‘empathetic identification’ (positive) and ‘contra-identification’ (negative).

Raymonde Sneddon (University of East London) presented ‘The Raja’s Big Ears: a study of language maintenance and shift’, carried out with Kanta Patel, among children in the Gujarati Muslim community of North East London. Children with a dense social network and access to a Gujarati community playscheme used Gujarati significantly with their siblings. She also found a very strong positive relationship between the children’s storytelling skills in English and Gujarati. Codeswitching was common in the Gujarati storytelling, but not in the English versions.

Jane Stuart-Smith (University of Glasgow) spoke on ‘Phonological variation and change in British Panjabi.’ The variety of English spoken affects the realisation of Panjabi phonology. She has found a reduction in Panjabi pitch movement, and convergence on a single dialect realisation of low tone.

Tim van der Avoird (Tilburg University) presented his findings on the language use of British Hindus, compared with the language vitality of Hindus in the Netherlands. Vitality was highest among adults, but low among adolescents, though it rose again among younger children.

Shahela Hamid (University of York) outlined her research among the Sylheti community in Leeds, and raised a lively discussion of whether Sylheti is a language or a dialect of Bengali. The outcome was indecisive!
Urmii Chana (Maidenhead EMAG team) asked for a proper grounding in language and cultural issues to form part of initial teacher training. The expertise of community members on EMAG teams was sometimes overlooked, leading to a sense of marginalisation, and she declared a need for more researchers who share the background of the researched community.

Mike Reynolds (MultiLingual City Forum, Sheffield) raised the phenomenon of ‘mixed code’ speech in the Indic language diaspora, using a set of data examples from Panjabi-Urdu speakers in Sheffield. This concept is controversial in some quarters but readily accepted in the context of Indic language-English contact.

Euan Reid (Institute of Education, London) introduced the LANMOB project (‘Mobilization of Minority Communities in Europe around Language’), a cross-disciplinary study in 5 European countries deriving from the European Charter of Regional and Minority Languages, Art. 1 (1992). Euan raised a number of methodological and conceptual issues that still need resolving: e.g. should ‘community’ or ‘language’ be the real focus of investigation? Should autochthonous or allochthonous languages be the focus?

Round-up
This concentrated on gaps in research coverage and on the way forward. Gaps included:
- improved linguistic descriptions and corpora for Indic languages. This includes the need for phonological analyses for corpora and for speech therapy;
- pedagogically-oriented descriptions of the acquisition of Indic languages in the diaspora;
- contacts between the diaspora, in Britain and elsewhere, and the sub-continent;
- the use of English in the communities;
- the impact of new technologies and the media on Indic languages in diaspora.
- the need to train Indic language speakers to undertake research, and to link teachers, activists and researchers. Training would need to be short and intensive

There were 21 participants, including 3 research students, and one participant from The Netherlands. Participants appreciated this opportunity to come together on common issues concerning Indic languages in the UK diaspora. This was the first such gathering since the days of the Linguistic Minorities Project in the 1980s. So, in that respect the seminar very successfully met its aims. We are grateful to BAAL/CUP for providing this opportunity. It was an enjoyable seminar, and that definitely includes the Indian meal in an excellent out-of-town restaurant. In order to develop the network initiated an annual meeting was suggested, and Tony McEnery’s offer to host one in 2003 at Lancaster, in association with the National Literacy Centre, was warmly accepted. A likely theme would be Indic languages corpora and how to access and use them.

Mike Reynolds and Mahendra Verma
2001 Series

Linguistic ethnography in the UK
28-29 March
Venue: University of Leicester
Organiser: Ben Rampton (ben.rampton@kcl.ac.uk) and Janet Maybin (j.maybin@open.ac.uk)

Young language learners - Towards a research agenda
15 June
Venue: University of Manchester
Organiser: Linda Thompson (Linda.Thompson@manchester.ac.uk)

Integrational linguistics and systemic-functional linguistics: prospects of dialogue?
21st May
Venue: University of Birmingham
Organiser: Michael Toolan (m.toolan@bham.ac.uk)

2000 Series

Learning to Write in New Times: Constructing an Agenda for Research
15-16 May
Venue: University of Southampton
Organiser: Gemma Moss (gem@soton.ac.uk)

Research and Practice in Teacher Cognition
26-27 October
Venue: University of Leeds
Organiser: Simon Borg (s.borg@education.leeds.ac.uk)

Complexity Theory and English Language Acquisition
November
Venue: London
Organiser: Paul Meara (P.M.Meara@swansea.ac.uk)

1999 Series

Postgraduate Research in Applied Linguistics: the Insider Perspective
20-21 March
Venue: University of Lancaster
Organisers: Kristina Bennaert, Sian Etherington, Karin Trusting (k.tusting@lancaster.ac.uk)

Investigating Discourse Practices Through Corpus Research: Methods, Findings and Applications
5 June
Venue: University of Reading
Organiser: Paul Thompson (p.a.thompson@reading.ac.uk)

Researching Talk: Methodological Issues
18-19 October
Venue: Open University, Milton Keynes
Organisers: Joan Swann, Margie Wetherell, Janet Maybin (J.Maybin@open.ac.uk)
1998 Series

Symptom/Symbol/Handicap: Winter Workshop on Language and Cultural Difference in Germany
9-10 January
Venue: Brunei Gallery, University of London
Organiser: Alissa Shethar (AShethar@compuserve.com)

The Grammar of Spoken English and Applications to EAP Teaching
29-30 June
Venue: University of Sunderland
Organiser: Elisabeth A Knox, University of Sunderland (elisabeth.knox@sunderland.ac.uk)

Language, Masculinities and Gender Relations
8-9 September
Venue: University of Lancaster
Organisers: Sally Johnson and Jane Sunderland (s.johnson@lancaster.ac.uk)

1997 Series

Urban Culture, Discourse and Ethnography
24-25 March
Venue: Thames Valley University
Organisers: Ben Rampton and Celia Roberts

Second Aston Corpus Seminar: Register and Corpus Dynamics 11 April
Venue: Aston University
Organiser: Chris Gledhill

Rethinking Language Education
18-19 September
Venue: Royal Holloway, University of London
Organisers: Constant Leung (Thames Valley University) and Arturo Tosi (Royal Holloway College, University of London)

1996 Series

Neurolinguistics in a Multilingual World
4-5 January
Venue: Birkbeck College, University of London
Organiser: Marjorie Perlman Lorch

Researching and Applying Metaphor
11-13 January
Venue: University of York
Organisers: Lynne Cameron (University of Leeds) and Graham Low (University of York)

Second Language Acquisition and Writing; a Multi-disciplinary Approach
11-12 July
Venue: University of Southampton
Organiser: Alasdair Archibald

Multilingual Literacies
14-16 November
Venue: University of Lancaster
Organisers: Marilyn Martin-Jones and Kathryn Jones
1995 Series

Advances in the Study of Oral Second Language Development
12-13 May
Venue: Institute for Applied Linguistics, University of Edinburgh
Organisers: Tony Lynch (University of Edinburgh) and Martin Bygate (University of Leeds)

Genre Analysis: Perspectives and Contributions
7-9 July
Venue: University of Sheffield
Organisers: Mike Reynolds and Chris Aldridge (University of Sheffield) and Nicki Hedge (Division of Education)

The Ethics and Practice of Evaluations and Reviews in English Language Education
10-11 July
Venue: University of Warwick
Organisers: Pauline Rea-Dickins and Thelma Henderson