Conversation Analytic Approaches to Language and Education
Hansun Zhang Waring

Gathered by Pedram Razeqi

What is the aims of this chapter??

This chapter documents the impact of conversation analysis (CA) as a research method on language education.

Sketch how conversation analytic findings have enriched our understandings of the nature of interactional competence, the complexity of pedagogical practices.

Highlight the field of language education and its major contributions to our understandings of the nature of interactional competence, the nature of language learning, and the nature of language teaching.

Major contributions of CA

CA and Interactional Competence

CA and Language Teaching

CA and Language Learning

CA and Interactional Competence

A useful summary of major CA findings on L1 interactional practices can be found in Wong and Waring (2010), who also show how understanding such practices as turn-taking, sequencing, overall structuring, and repair are relevant, and can be applied, to ESL/EFL teaching.

Barraja-Rohan (2011) relates CA specifically to the teaching of interactional competence to lower to intermediate levels adult ESL students, showing how a CA-informed pedagogical approach can effectively raise students' awareness of the norms of spoken interaction and help them become analysts of, and eventually better participants in, conversations.

In sum, aside from constituting the foundational repertoire of L1 interactional practices, CA findings have also provided crucial insights that have led to a reconceptualization of L2 interactional practices – a reconceptualization that would not have been arrived at without CA's deeply emic research stance that prioritizes participant orientations.

CA and Language Teaching

CA contributes to our understanding of language teaching by portraying in great detail the "amazingly complex and demanding interactional and pedagogical work in the classroom" (Seedhouse 2004, p. 265) as teachers manage "the reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction" (p. 263) from one moment to the next.

CA studies in the language classroom have yielded useful descriptions of how participation is promoted (Richards 2006), instructions are given (Seedhouse 2008), and explanations are offered (Mortensen 2011).

A noticeable focus of CA research on language teaching falls under what may be called the contingent management of learner contributions.

In sum, what such findings have offered overall is a richer and more nuanced depiction of what the professional work of language teaching entails.

CA and Language Learning

We should consider two bodies of CA work: **1.Learning opportunities 2. Learning over time**.

1.Learning opportunities

Describes the local interactional process by which learning as a process is negotiated.

CA scholars have repeatedly drawn our attention to learner practices of repair and various types of searches in contexts ranging from the casual to the institutional (Brouwer 2003; Reichert and Liebscher 2012).

The discussion of learning opportunity is often bound up with identity negotiations in learning encounters.

Aside from identity, task seems to be another locus for investigating learning opportunities.

Learning opportunities have also been explored in learner behavior such as learner initiatives

CA and Language Learning

2.Learning overtime

Documents learning as a product in the short term (Markee 2008) or over a longer period of time (Hellermann 2008).

Some scholars have focused on how learning a particular vocabulary item or grammatical structure is achieved within local interactional contexts in the short term.

CA has recalibrated our investigative gaze into language learning in at least two ways. **1.** It has forced us to recognize and appreciate how participants themselves do learning through managing repairs, navigating tasks, and negotiating identities. **2.**It has also, importantly, reminded us that language learning is, to a great extent, learning to become competent in mobilizing a wide range of interactional practices.

Future Directions of CA

Continuing advancement of the CA and language learning program will entail producing stronger evidence and argument for the in situ nature of learning as it is experienced by the participants.

On a more practical front, to further the impact of conversation analysis on language education, great benefits may be gained from richer dialogs and more fruitful collaborations between CA scholars and language teaching professionals.

Finally, serious theory building around the interactional competence for teaching (ICT) will require disciplined empirical work on a wider range of teacher practices with greater specificity.