



The Impact of Conversational Analysis (CA) into Education and Teaching and Learning Process

Dr. Manal O. Mousa

Dr. Dunia T. Hameed

Mrs. Samara M. Ahmed

Introduction

Conversation analysts initiate the study from the describable smallest units of conversation, examining the organization of the conversation. Here, conversation is not restricted to casual and informal talk, but it also includes “all forms of talk in interaction” (Schegloff, et al, 2002: 3), such as talks in educational environment, in workplace or in classroom. It concerns about the macro-level features of discourse, including “power, value systems, prestige and status” (Riggenbach,1999:23); and the micro-level features of discourse, including falling or rising intonation, stressed or unstressed syllabus, grammatical structures (ibid:23).

Conversational Analysis

Crystal (1997:75) defines Conversational Analysis is a term used in linguistics and associated discipline to refer to a





method of studying the sequential and coherence of conversation usually employs the techniques of ethnomethodology.

Conversation is a general term that refers to a state of talk which generally processed so that one person talks at a time and all members in the particular group are attending 'the same conversation' (Schegloff,1999:375-6).

In the social psychological sense, conversation refers to the study of interaction between language and social behaviour. Social psychologists concentrate on three main issues: the segmentation of speech into appropriate units, the classification of these units, and the formation of rules which generate the orderly behaviour sequences which can do and can occur. Such an approach can concentrate only on analyzing how conversation is constructed in terms of speech acts (Robinson,1995:123)

The basis of a conversation is normally interactional. Conversation can be used to: exchange information; create or maintain social relationship; decide on something; carry out a joint task.

There are certain rules or norms which are generally abided by on a sub-conscious level during a conversation. These rules, however, shape the structure of most conversations that take



place. They govern who speaks, for how long and when they speak.

The rules are:

Opening and closing a conversation.

Changing the subject.

Interrupting.

Holding the floor and turn-taking

Repairing conversation. (ibid:2)

Conversational sequence can be described by the formula ababab, where 'a' and 'b' are the parties to the conversation. The abab formula is a specifications for two party conversations of the basic rule conversation; one party at a time (Schegloff,1999:107).

1.1.1 Structures of Conversational Analysis

The organization of conversation involves many aspects such as “turn taking”, “turn organization”, “action formation”, “sequencing”, “repair”, “word/usage selection”, “recipient design” and “overall organization of the occasion of interaction” (Schegolff, et al, 2002: 4-5). Therefore, CA is of much importance in fostering learners’ sociolinguistic competence, linguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence.



The structures in CA has grown to a large corpus over the decades since the late sixties. An attempt at summarizing the main structures must therefore remain partial. In this section, there is a sketch of some important structures in the fields of adjacency pairs, turn-taking, sequence organization, repair, turn design, and prosody.

1.1.1.1 Turn – Taking

Turn-taking observes “when and how people take turns in conversation.” (Burns et al,1996:18). It is concerned with the way in which participants in interaction hold turns, pass turns, get in and get out of a talk. The point at which people alter turns is called Transition Relevance Place (TRP) (Yule 2000:72). Usually, there are certain linguistic or paralinguistic devices that people can adopt to take turns. These devices include: overlaps, pauses, eye-contact or body gestures. Sometimes, people who do not want to take turns, may use backchannel responses, such as, mm, yeah, right, really, to indicate that they have no desire to take turns (McCarthy, 2002, p. 27). Turn-taking may also vary in terms of socio-cultural factors.

There are many instances of short pauses and short overlaps, but rather a normative or 'observably oriented to' feature of conversation. It is a rule used by conversationalists



themselves. If more than or less than one party is talking it is 'noticeable' and participants set out to 'remedy' the situation and return to a state of one and only one speaker. If the problem is more than one speaker one of the participants usually quickly yields the floor. While if the problem is silence other speakers begin speaking, or indicate their intention to speak by noises like 'er' or 'mm'. In other words turns to speak typically occur successively without overlaps or gaps between them. Overlapping is dealt with by one speaker ending his turn quickly, gaps between turns by another speaker beginning his turn or simply indicating that his turn has begun and incorporating the silence into it (Couthard,1985:53-54).

The principle of turn-taking has been established as one of the central interests of CA, as it is the basic component of all conversation. The turn form, the turn content, and the turn length are all of interest when examining turn-taking in conversation. Turn form, turn content, and turn length are affected by the formality or informality of a situation. Turns between teachers and students, clients and lawyers, have more boundaries defined by the formal context, whereas telephone conversations among friends are freely variable and determined by elements within the interaction. Turns have two components: a turn construction component and a turn



distribution component. Turn constructions have turn construction units that often correspond to linguistic elements such as sentences, phrases, or single words (e.g., “Yo!” or “What?”). Turn construction units have two prominent properties. One is called projectability. It is possible for a speaker to project, as the turn construction unit proceeds, what kind of a unit it is and when it is likely to end. This leads to the second property, transition-relevant places. These occur at the boundaries of the turn construction unit and make it possible for transition between speakers .

1.1.1.1 Turn-Taking Rules

Turn distribution has some “simple rules” as articulated by Sacks et al. (1974:55-57) that occur at the initial transition-relevant place in a turn.

Rule 1: (a) If the current speaker designates the next speaker, that speaker should take the turn at that place. (b) If no such selection occurs, then any speaker can self-select, with the first volunteer having the right to speak first. (c) If no speaker is selected, the first speaker may (or may not) continue speaking with another turn construction unit, unless or until another speaker self-selects, at which point that speaker has the floor.

Rule 2: However the participants work out the turn distribution. Schegloff (1992:113) notes that speakers project



to possible not actual transition points because in natural spoken conversation the optimum condition is for as little time as possible to occur between turns. This is practical, as waiting for any speaker to finish completely would result in gaps that would erode the natural flow and meaning as well as lessen the opportunity for any speaker to enter the conversation because either someone else does or the current speaker continues. According the Sacks et al. (1974:59) such rules of turn distribution are intended as descriptors of practices that speakers exhibit in the actual occasion of turn-taking in conversation.

1.1.1.2 Adjacency Pairs and Sequence Organization

A second level of orderliness in the organization of talk is that of the sequencing of actions in talk. At one level this deals with the obvious: a question tends to be followed by an answer, a greeting by a greeting, an offer by an acceptance or a rejection. This basic pairing of actions in conversation has led to the notion of adjacency pairs. The basic rules for the production of adjacency pairs were formulated early in the history of CA, Given the recognizable production of a first pair part, at its first possible completion its speaker should stop, a next speaker should start, and should produce a second pair



part of the same pair type. Thus adjacency pairs are composed of two turns by different speakers, and speakers orient to them being placed adjacently. Typical first pair parts include questions, requests, offers, invitations, advice, and informings (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973:289).

Typical second pair parts include answers, acceptances, rejections, declines, agreements, and disagreements. There are constraints on these pairings, thus questions take answers, greetings take return greetings, and requests take grants or rejects. A way of expressing these constraints is to say that a first pair part is sequentially implicative of a second pair part. If, upon the utterance of a first pair part, the second pair part is missing, its absence is noticeable, and regularly remarked on by speakers. As Schegloff (1990:213) put it, the second pair part becomes officially absent.

Adjacency pairs refer to “the pairs of utterances in talk, which are often mutually dependent” (McCarthy, 2002:119), for example, greeting-greeting, congratulation-thanks. Usually, there are two types of responses: a preferred response and a dispreferred response (Cook, 1989:53-54). A dispreferred response is often indicated by “a slight pause, or by a preface like ‘Well’ or ‘you see’, or by an explanation and justification of the response.” (Cook, 1989:54) Moreover, the structures of



adjacency pairs vary from culture to culture, and are affected by social settings, such as role relationships, situation, etc (McCarthy, 2002:121).

Adjacency pairs constitute a basic sequencing occasion in talk, in which chains of adjacency pairs can often be located. Basic adjacency pairs can, though, also be expanded at any point: before the first pair part, between the two parts, or after the second pair part. These expansions can become very elaborate, with sometimes several minutes of talk hung on a single adjacency pair. Expansions are usually adjacency pairs in their own right. In pre-expansions an adjacency pair may pave the way for the main adjacency pair. The description of preference organization is based not through appeal to some notion such as politeness, or what a speaker would “prefer” to do, but on the observation that preferred responses to a first pair part are done differently to dispreferred ones. Thus acceptances of invitations, for example, are, overwhelmingly, straightforward, immediate, and brief. Declines of invitations, on the other hand, are frequently delayed, both temporally through a longer than normal silence before the response, and also sequentially, in that they may be preceded by some other action, such as a turn-initial “well” or “uhn,” or an account for



why the invitation is going to be rejected, or a thanks for the invitation (ibid:122-123).

Adjacency pairs can also be expanded between the first and second pair parts, or after the second pair part. Insertion sequences often occur as repairs to an actual or potential misunderstanding of the first pair part, to clear up a mishearing or ambiguity or non-comprehension, before doing the second pair part. They may also seek more information, such as finding out the reason for an invitation or a request before accepting or granting it. Post expansions may also be repairs, to clarify a potential or actual misunderstanding of a second pair part. They may also do things such as acknowledge a second pair part, or express thanks for it, or expand on it in some way (Schegloff and Sacks,1973:290).

Any adjacency pair can be expanded. One finds, for instance, insertion sequences within pre-sequences, or post-sequences to insertion sequences, so that some sequences of talk can become extremely complex. However, even the most complex of sequences are still organized around adjacency pairs.

1.1.1.3 Repair



Participants in interaction can make corrections through repair either on their own initiative (self-repair) or be required by the other participants (other-repair) (Cook, 1989:55).

Repairs can occur as adjacency pairs. They then constitute a very particular kind of pair, one that is used to deal with troubles of hearing, production, or understanding in talk. One astonishing feature of talk is how unusual breakdown is. This is not to say, of course, that total understanding is the norm in conversation, nor that it is not, but it is to claim that generally the organization, structures, and coherence of talk are maintained, and that when that orderliness is threatened with breakdown, overwhelmingly that threat is dealt with very quickly, and orderliness is restored (ibid:291).

Most repairs do not in fact occur as sequences, but are achieved by a speaker dealing with a problem him- or herself during the production of a turn. These self-repairs in the same turn take the form of a replacement or insertion or deletion of a piece of talk, or of a reordering of the elements of a turn. Other repairs are achieved more collaboratively. The recipient of some talk may indicate difficulty with it. This can take the form of a “Pardon?” or a “Who?” or “Did you say X?” In such cases initiation of repair takes place in the turn subsequent to the turn in which the source of the trouble occurs. More rarely,



a speaker may not realize there is trouble until a response has been heard, and thus initiate repair in the third turn. Even rarer is initiation in the fourth turn (Jefferson al, 1987:158).

Beyond that turn, no repair initiation has been described. There is also a preference for the speaker of the trouble turn to do the repair. That is, whilst another speaker regularly initiates repair, which is then typically done in the third turn by the trouble source speaker, it is comparatively rare for another speaker to actually carry out the repair. Thus problems of understanding are overwhelmingly dealt with efficiently, mostly by the speaker of the trouble source, and mostly very close to the source of the trouble (ibid:160).

1.1.1.4 Turn Design

A more recent strong focus in CA has been turn design, in particular the aspects of grammar or the way in which a turn at talk, or a turn constructional unit, is put together. This is an area of inquiry in which linguists have obvious credentials to make a contribution. Rather than approach the grammar of a sentence as a psychological phenomenon, it can be considered as something that is constructed in response to the contingencies of the local meaning and social requirements of the emerging talk. This is, more or less, the old question



about the relationship between form and function: the morphosyntax and lexis of an utterance, and the action it is designed to achieve.

Early CA was somewhat naive in its understanding of grammar, which is perhaps not surprising, given that the practitioners were sociologists. The unit of talk (the turn constructional unit, or TCU) was considered to be a word, a phrase, a clause, or a sentence (Sacks, et al, 1974:115), but the importance of prosody was at least recognized.

Their approach has been to look at how people construct utterances in real time, and in particular the way in which they use regular, patterned, grammatical schemas under the constraints of having to talk in interaction. Their view is that syntactic constructional schemas need to be flexible enough to be subordinated to local interactional contingencies. Ono and Thompson suggest that syntactic schemas are abstract prototypes, which speakers and listeners orient to in a rough and ready and tolerant way (ibid:187).

It also raises questions about what constitutes a unit of talk. A turn can be from a single morpheme (or even a phoneme or a non-verbal/non-vocal element), to a complex of several clauses. Turns are packaged as intonational units, and are further chunked into units of meaning, or pragmatic units.



So there is broad agreement that a unit of talk is phonological (units of intonation), grammatical (clauses, clause complexes, or sub-clausal units) and pragmatic (action or meaning units). But many questions remain unanswered (Schegloff, 1996:132). What elements make up a TCU? How do you deal with repetitions or revisions, or with mid-turn silences? Where do turns start? Where do they end? What is the relationship between a TCU and the previous TCU, and the following one? Ford & Thompson (1996) have proposed an answer to a few of these questions. They found, for example, that speaker change occurs most regularly where there is a coincidence of pragmatic, intonational, and syntactic completion, but that syntactic completion regularly occurs without the other two, and is not, in itself, a good predictor of speaker change. Their conclusion is that these three systems work together to determine where a unit of talk begins and ends (ibid:190-191).

Much remains to be done to work out the complex relationship between the form of a turn, and the action it is designed to do. There is reason to believe that a study of grammar in talk can help to understand in a principled way the relationship between the grammatical resources available in a language, for example the many possible ways to ask a question, and the sequential position of an action, for example



whether this is an only question, or the first in a series, or a later one in a series (Schegloff,1996:131) .

1.1.1.5 Prosody in Talk

Another area in which linguists have contributed to the broader CA project is prosody, in particular a group of German linguists engaged in what they call “interactional linguistics” (e.g., Auer & di Luzio, 1992; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 1996; Selting & Couper-Kuhlen, 2001). Whilst their interest is not restricted to prosody, and they are not the only scholars looking at prosody in conversation, they have made a particularly strong contribution to the area, one which has traditionally been a weak point in CA studies. Their studies have included descriptions of intonational and other prosodic forms and practices in relation to grammatical phenomena in interactional settings such as indirect speech, questions, clause subordination, the beginnings of stories, emphatic speech, focusing on features such as pitch level, the level of onset at the beginning of a unit of talk, terminal pitch direction, and rhythm in conversational talk. They have opened up systematic studies in this highly complex area (Schegloff,1996:133) .



1.1.2 Sequential Organization and Intersubjectivity.

In Conversational Analysis CA, participants' understandings are displayed in interaction and displayed for the conversationalists chiefly through the sequential organization of turn-taking. The fact that talk-in- interaction is organized by turns leads to an important distinction for CA. Turns occur one after the other, in a serial order. However, the relationship between turns is not serial but sequential. This distinction is crucial because the talk does not just occur in a series of responses; rather the talk is organized in sequences of two or more in which conversants show their understanding of the kind of turn the prior turn was intended to be (their understanding of the turn construction). This concept is known as the adjacency pair sequence. Clear case examples are invitations that make acceptance or deferral relevant as the next move or questions that make an answer relevant as the next move. The insight here is not just that answers follow questions but that responses are conditionally relevant to utterances in prior turns. The second pair part is conditional on the first—it is normative. The normative constraints on adjacency pairs are important to CA because the researcher can draw inferences in the cases where typical responses do not occur. For example, a



lack of an answer to a question may imply evasion. Moreover, the resolution of the meaning of the break in normative constraint is confirmed in subsequent turns through what in CA is called the next-turn proof procedure (Schegloff,1992:123-124).

1.1.3 Strategies and Goals of Conversational Analysis

Despite strong ties to pragmatics and social psychology, CA takes an opposing view of the nature and relevance of goals and strategies in common everyday conversation. CA uses the many nuances and details of talk-in-interaction to observe through the empirical evidence of the exchanges in the transcript the subtleties of how communication and shared understanding is achieved. The communication was accomplished through interactive negotiation of the information through conversational turn-taking. Of course, conversants have goals and strategies and the CA perspective does not deny that they play a key part in communication. However, the interest of CA in goals and strategies is how conversants show their understandings and orientations to each other using their talk as evidence (Sacks1974:61).



Conversational Analysis and Discourse Analysis

While most sentence linguists are concerned with the formal forms of language, Zelling Harris (Harris, 1952, cited in McCarthy, 2002, p.5; Cook, 1989, p. 13) wrote an article titled 'Discourse Analysis', in which he initiated to explore the 'grammatical rules' that account for the relations between the text and the social settings. Hence many researchers began to voice in this field. It involves many disciplines: "semiotics and French structuralist approach to the study of narrative" (McCarthy, 2002, p.5) from the perspective of sociology; the speech act theory, conversational maxims (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969, Grice, 1975, cited in McCarthy, 2002:5) and pragmatics (Levinson, 1983, Leech, 1983, cited in McCarthy, 2002:6) from the perspective of psychology.

Though discourse analysis appeals to many disciplines, it achieves at an agreement on the description of language in use.

1.2.1 Discourse Analysis

Cook's (1989) definition of discourse analysis has been employed: "Discourse analysis examines how stretches of language, considered in their full textual, social and



psychological context, become meaningful and unified for their users.” In other words, discourse analysis describes the interrelationships between language and its context (McCarthy, 2002:5). It differs from traditional approaches to teaching. Traditional teaching mainly concerns on the study of words, pronunciation and grammar, thinking language is independent from outside context. However, discourse analysis is concerned with the relationships between language and its context. Moreover, “discourse analysts consider context to be of primary importance”. (Schiffrin, 1994; cited in Riggensbach, 1999:2) Nevertheless, discourse analysis cannot be separate from traditional teaching. As is said by Cook (1989, viii), discourse analysis takes traditional teaching of vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar as the basis of foreign language knowledge, and attends on how to apply the knowledge into practice and succeed in social communication. Thus discourse analysis relates language forms to function that a piece of discourse fulfills.

American discourse analysts primarily take a point of view of conversation analysis influenced by ethnomethodological tradition (McCarthy, 2002, p. 6). Conversation analysts initiate the study from the



describable smallest units of conversation, examining the organization of the conversation. Here, conversation is not restricted to casual and informal talk, but it also includes “all forms of talk in interaction” (Schegloff et al 2002:3), such as talks in educational environment, in workplace or in classroom.

It concerns

about the macro-level features of discourse, including “power, value systems, prestige and status” (Riggenbach, 1999: 23); and the micro-level features of discourse, including falling or rising intonation, stressed or unstressed syllabus, grammatical structures (ibid:23).

The organization of conversation involves many aspects such as “turn taking”, “turn organization”, “action formation”, “sequencing”, “repair”, “word/usage selection”, “recipient design” and “overall organization of the occasion of interaction” (Schegloff et al 4-5). Therefore, CA is of much importance in fostering learners’ sociolinguistic competence, linguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence.

Discourse Unit and Discourse Function



Discourse does not consist simply of a succession of turns, a string of grammatically well-formed utterances. The following example from Labov (1970 cited in McCarthy, 2002:34-36) is grammatically unexceptional yet noticeable odd:

I feel hot today

No.

In this example B's contribution obviously breaks rules for the of production of coherent discourse, and one of the major aims of conversational analysis is to discover these rules and to describe the conversational structures they generate.

Harris (1952) observed that traditionally grammatical description has taken the sentence as its upper limit and it is instructive to discuss the reasons for this. A grammatical description provides the structure(s) of a given unit in terms of allowable description is the specification not only of what structures can occur but also of those structures which cannot occur (Coulthard,1985:62).

The speaker's choice of one of the grammatical options depends on cohesive and stylistic considerations. There is no way of describing paragraph structure in terms of allowable combinations of the units next below, sentences, any collection of sentence types in any sequence can constitute a paragraph



and 'rules' about paragraph writing take the form of advice about 'topic sentences' and the alternation of long and short sentences (ibid:63).

Any attempt to characterize discourse structure in terms of functional units must confront the problem of grammatical realization, how do the four major clause types, declarative, interrogative, imperative and moodless realize a multiplicity of different functions, and how can a hearer correctly interpret which function is intended (ibid:66)

Grice (1975: cited in McCarthy, 2002:54) argues that there is an underlying constraint on all conversationalists to 'be relevant' for this reason that there is a preposition known to both which connects response to this question.

This rule makes clear the crucial importance of shared knowledge in conversation; not simply shared rule for interpretation of linguistic items, but shared knowledge of the word, to which a speaker can allude or appeal (ibid:65).

The first rule is concerned with explaining how utterances following questions come to be heard and interpreted as answers. Labov (1972 cited in McCarthy, 2002:66) also discusses how some utterances, declarative in form, come to be heard as questions.



Labov (1972 cited in McCarthy, 2002:68) recognizes, that 'there may be such a thing as premature formalization' which the ethnomethodologists are anxious to avoid, and that a linguist may be led to set up 'paradigms of discrete features where only open sets are found in reality'.

Conversational Structure

It is important to decide on the size of the basic unit. Sinclair and Couthard (1975:89) observe that they also began with utterance as the basic unit but, in dealing with examples like the following, came to feel the need for a smaller unit, which they called more. More can be co-extensive with utterances, but some utterances, like A's second contain two mores.

A: Can you tell me why do you eat all that food.

B: To keep you strong.

A: To keep you strong, yes, to keep you strong. Why do you want

to be strong? (ibid).

Sacks (1992:70) observes that a conversation is a string of at least two turns. Some turns are more closely related than others and he isolated a class of sequences of turns called adjacency pairs which have the following features: they are two utterances long; the utterances are produced successively by



different speakers; the utterances are ordered, the first must belong to the class of first pair parts. The second to the class of second pair parts; the first part often selects next speaker and always selects next action. It sets up a transition relevance and expectation which the next speaker fulfills, in other words the first part of a pair predicts the occurrence of the second.

1.4 Principles of Conversational Analysis

Conversational Analysis (CA) pays unique attention to human actions accomplished via talk. CA analysts attempt to determine how participants analyze and interpret one another's talk in interaction and generate a shared understanding of the interaction (Seedhouse, 2004:123). The aim is to “discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus being on how sequences of actions are generated” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998:14). CA thus focuses on three major types of data: 1) naturally occurring data taken from the actual occurrences of talk not from manipulation, 2) transcribed data using a fine-grained transcription system and 3) analyzed data from an emic perspective which accounts for interlocutors' language in social interaction (Wong & Waring, 2010:205).



Although CA is subsumed within ethnomethodology, CA does have its own subset of principles. Markee (2000:40) defines four aims of CA , which manifest similar features to the four principles delineated by Seedhouse (2004:13-16).

- There is order at all points in interactions; Conversation has structure.
- Contributions to interaction are context-shaped and context-renewing; Conversation is its own autonomous context.
- No order of detail can be dismissed a priori as disorderly, accidental, or irrelevant; The study of conversation requires naturally occurring data .
- The analysis is bottom-up and data driven; There is no a priori justification.

Particularly, the fourth principle and aim also uncovers what attitude analysts should have to CA. It will be the emic perspective in which the viewpoint results from studying behaviour as from inside the system instead of the etic perspective in which the viewpoint studies behaviour as from outside of a particular system (ibid:37).



Conversational Analysis and Education

Conversation analysis (CA) has been concerned with education from an interest in how educational practices are accomplished by participants as situated activities. First and foremost this has meant an interest in interaction in classrooms as the primordial site of formal education. Conversation analysts aim to analyze how teachers and pupils establish “order” in the classroom; not order as the pedagogical teacher problem of how to keep pupils from disruptive behavior, but order in the sense of bringing about classroom interaction in such an “orderly” manner as to become recognizable and interpretable as classroom interaction, both for teachers and pupils as participants, and for us as observers and analysts (Mehan, 1979:78).

Conversational Analysis and Communicative Language Teaching

The current paper argues that the aforementioned problems can be addressed using CA. According to Seedhouse (2004:180), scholars in social science recognize the importance of a classroom as the social context in which most students learn L2 and L2 classroom talk offers a crucial context for language learning because “Learning is situated; learning is



social; and knowledge is located in communities of practice and that learning not only takes place in the social world, it also constitutes that world” (Brouwer & Wagner,p:33 as cited in Seedhouse, 2007).

Seedhouse (2004:183-184). posits that CA contributions to SLA primarily lie in its ability to specify how classroom activities are interactionally achieved and what opportunities for L2 learning these interactional environments afford. Therefore, in English language teaching, the most important thing to pay attention to “is to identify the core institutional goal, which is that the teacher will teach the learners L2. This core goal remains the same wherever the L2 lesson takes place and whatever pedagogical framework the teacher is working in”. Seedhouse (2004:188) argues that the goal offers three universal properties in all second language classroom interaction:

- 1) Language is both the medium and object of instruction.
- 2) There is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction in the classroom. The organization of the interaction will vary depending on the pedagogical focus.



3) What the students say and respond in the L2 classroom provide teachers with critical linguistic forms and patterns of interaction for feedback and evaluation (ibid:188-190).

To effectively engage in intercultural interaction, participants have to understand the inherent norms of interaction or sociocultural norms, the ways in which norms of interaction change based on situational factors and the ways in which speakers from other language backgrounds might have different expectations of language usage and behavior. Moreover, Brouwer and Wagner (as cited in Seedhouse, 2007:11) suggest that L2 teaching shift from the “conception of language in terms of individual cognition and an input-output approach to acquisition of discrete linguistic (typically syntactic or lexical) items” to “the development of interactional skills and resources and conceptualizing language learning as a social process” . As Barraja-Rohan (1997:34) argues, focusing on written-grammar accuracy overlooks the fact that interactants look for meaning rather than just grammatical accuracy. CA discloses that native speakers also make a lot of linguistic mistakes in speaking but they manage to keep conversation going; if there are any problems with their understanding, they use repair mechanisms to solve the problems to avoid communication breakdowns.



CA will make teachers become aware of interactional practices (IP), which are the systematic verbal and nonverbal methods interactants employ to participate in social interaction and key components of IC (Wong & Waring, 2010:56). Barraja-Rohan (1997:39) maintains that to operate effectively in society a thorough understanding of the norms of interaction is essential since these cultural specific norms operate at every moment in an interaction.

The Value of Conversational Analysis in Teaching Oral Skills

By investigating the transcriptions of native or non-native speakers' spoken data, learners can learn how to organize a conversation appropriately with regards to the socio-cultural factors, hence foster the sociolinguistic competence. By investigating the sequences of a conversation, learners can learn how to co-construct a coherent discourse that functions hence foster their discourse competence. By examining the aspects of organizing a conversation, learners can learn how to make choices from target language resources to speak accurately, hence foster their linguistic (or grammatical) competence. By examining the way people take turns, hold



turns, respond, open and close a conversation, learners are able to communicate effectively, hence develop their strategic competence (ibid:90-91).

1

Conclusion

In the age of globalization involving a growing number and diversity of ESL/bilingual classroom learners, TESOL/bilingual education has become a challenge for both teachers and learners. It is a challenge for teachers to take advantage of every opportunity to create a facilitating learning environment in which diverse learners are encouraged to become empowered and more independent. However, it can be an opportunity for ESL/bilingual teachers to take advantage of English conversation analysis in the curriculum. Conversation analysis cannot just be a matter of understanding how to accomplish a restricted set of actions, but it can be a fundamental significance for one of the most basic issues in TESOL/bilingual education: the question of how ESL/bilingual learners understand the role of English conversation in obtaining and accomplishing mutual understanding with native speakers as well as with other speakers of English as a second language. ESL/bilingual learners can be educated, for example,



about how to reflect on and think critically about the mutual relations of utterances in different types of English conversation produced by native speakers or other speakers of English as a second language in different situations and contexts. This pedagogical practice would help learners to trouble common sense concepts and knowledge, improve their cognitive and meta-cognitive skills, enhance their critical thinking, and raise their social and cultural awareness.

3. References

Burns, A., Joyce, H., & Gollin, S. (1996). "I see what you mean: Using spoken discourse in the classroom".

Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquaire University.

- Barraja-Rohan, A.-M. (1997). 'Teaching language, Teaching Culture. Teaching conversation and sociocultural norms using conversation analysis and aspects of pragmatics'. Australian review of applied linguistics. Retrieved July 26, 2014, from

<http://www.academia.edu/1055516/1997>



- Cook, G. (1989). Discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coulthard, M. (1985). Introduction to discourse analysis. (2nd ed.) Harlow: Longman.
- Crystal, David (1997) Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. Cambridge :Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). Conversation Analysis. Cambridge. Polity Press.
- Jefferson, G., Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Notes on laughter in pursuit of intimacy. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), Talks and social organization (pp. 152–205). Cleveland: Multilingual Matters
- Markee, N. (2000) Conversation analysis. Mahwah, N. J.: Erlbaum Associates
- Mehan, H. (1979). “What time is it, denise?” Asking known questions in classroom practice. Theory into Practice, 18(4), 285–294 Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia.
- McCarthy, M. (2002). Discourse analysis for language teachers. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.



- Riggenbach, H. (1999). Discourse analysis in the language classroom. Volume 1. The spoken language. AnnArbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Robinson, P. (1995). "Review article: Attention, memory and the 'noticing' hypothesis". Language Learning, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00441.x>
- Sacks H (1974). 'An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation.' In Bauman R & Sherzer J (eds.) Exploration in the ethnography of speaking. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 337–353.
- Sacks, H (1992). " Lectures on conversation". Jefferson G (ed.), Introduction by Schegloff E. Oxford/Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language.
- Salomon, G. (1993). No distribution without



individuals' cognitions: A dynamic interactional view. In G. Saloman (Ed.), *Distributed cognitions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). "Opening up closings. *Semiotica*". Scolari Company. (2002). *ATLAS.ti Qualitative Analysis Software*.

www.scolari.co.uk/atlasti/atlasti.html. Scott, J. (1991). *Social network analysis. A handbook*. London: Sage

Schegloff, E. (1990) On the Organization of Sequences as a Source of "Coherence" in Talk-in-Interaction. In B. Dorval (ed.), *Conversational Organization and its Development*. Norwood: Ablex.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). "Repair After Next Turn: The Last Structurally Provided Defense of Intersubjectivity in Conversation". *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1295–1345

- Schegloff, E. (1996) "Turn Organization: One Intersection of Grammar and Interaction". In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (eds.),



Interaction and Grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Schegloff, E. A., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S., & Olsher, D. (2002). "Conversation analysis and applied linguistics". Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22 .
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000016>
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). The Interactional Architecture of Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective. University of Michigan. Blackwell.
- Sinclair, J., and Coulthard, M., (1975). Towards an analysis of discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). Conversation Analysis and second language pedagogy. New York. Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group. New York and London.
- Yule. (2000). Pragmatics. Shanghai: Shangshi Foreign Language Education Press.