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Question

- How has learning and change been addressed within CA, and what are some of the constraints and possibilities of this work?

- Would it be a) of interest, and b) possible to argue learning/change as an activity it as a “CA doing”, and what are some of the challenges and possibilities in doing so?
Learning and change

- Jean Lave: (1993:5-6) there is no such thing as “learning” sui generis, but only changing participation in the culturally designed settings of everyday life. Or, to put it the other way around, participation in everyday life may be thought of as a process of changing understanding in practice, that is, as learning.
- Enfield & Levinson: (2006, p. 1): At the heart of the uniquely human way of life is our peculiarly intense, mentally mediated and highly structured way of interacting with one another. [...] This mode of cooperative, mentally mediated interaction enables the accumulation of cultural capital and historical mergence of cultures.
- Sfard: (1998, p. 6) To put it differently, learning a subject is now conceived of as a process of becoming a member of a certain community. This entails, above all, the ability to communicate in the language of this community and act according to its particular norms.
Several strands of contemporary theorizing (most notably those associated with the names of Bourdieu and Habermas) have sought to put language, communication, and “practice” in a position of comparable theoretical “gravity”; still, none has yet provided a clear depiction and exemplar of how the prima facie, observable embodiment of sociality – action, activity, and conduct in interaction – as effectuated through the deployment of language and the body can be put at the center of theorizing about the social and can be grounded and elaborated in detailed, empirical analysis of that conduct. Schegloff (1996: 162)
Learning and the education of attention

The process of learning by guided rediscovery is most aptly conveyed by the notion of showing. To show something to someone is to cause it to be made present for that person, so that he or she can apprehend it directly, whether by looking, listening, or feeling. Here, the role of the tutor is to set up situations in which the novice is afforded the possibility of such unmediated experience. Placed within a situation of this kind, the novice is instructed to attend particularly to this or that aspect of what can be seen, touched, or heard, so as to get the ‘feel’ of it for him- or herself. Learning, in this sense, is tantamount to an ‘education of attention’. (Ingold, 2001: 141-142)

Relying on ostensive-referential demonstrations of the relevant aspects of the opaque skills, communicative knowledge transfer could alleviate the learnability problem by having the knowledgeable conspecific actively guide the novice through selectively manifesting ‘for’ the learner the relevant information to be acquired and generalized. Thus, we propose that the mechanism of natural pedagogy is ostensive communication, which incorporates evolved interpretive biases that allow and foster the transmission of generic and culturally shared knowledge to others (Csibra & Gergely, 2006, 2009).
Describing prior work on CA and learning

- Understanding interaction as basis for understanding learning but not focused on learning as such (e.g., Mehan 1979; Kääntä 2010)

- Studying longitudinal change in a certain CA feature - often repair - in one participant’s interaction over time (e.g., Hellermann, 2008), or longitudinal change in a certain CA feature within a certain content domain in one participant’s interaction over time (e.g., Martin, 2004)

- Studying learning as content-integrated doing, constituted by certain oriented-to aspects (longitudinality, epistemic stance, epistemic asymmetries) (e.g., Sahlström, 2011)
1. Understanding interaction as basis for arguing in relation to learning

- Traditional CA in educational settings
- Learning (or other possible aspect of interest) usually discussed in section on theory and in discussion, but not in the actual analysis
- Includes both older and recent work (Mehan 1979; Sahlström; 1999; Kääntä 2010)
2. Longitudinal change

- Studying longitudinal change in a certain CA feature - often repair - in one participant’s interaction, commonly in one setting (eg. Hellermann, 2008; Wootton, 1997)

- Studying longitudinal change in a certain content domain in one participant’s interaction over time, in one setting (eg. Martin, 2004; Martin & Sahlström, accepted; Slotte-Lütтge, Pörn & Sahlström, accepted)

- In many cases relying on repair for establishing change
An example: participation changes as learning, in terms of repair changes

(Martin, 2004; Martin & Sahlström, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medal No</th>
<th>Repair organisation</th>
<th>Date &amp; tape number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 1</td>
<td>OI + OR</td>
<td>011023 - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 2</td>
<td>OI + OR</td>
<td>011024 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 3</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>011204 - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 4</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 5</td>
<td>OI + OR</td>
<td>011204 - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 6</td>
<td>OI + OR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 7</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>020117 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 8</td>
<td>OI + OR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 9</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 10</td>
<td>OI + OR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 11</td>
<td>OI + OR/SR</td>
<td>020122 - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 12</td>
<td>OI + OR/SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 13</td>
<td>OI + OR/SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 14</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>020122 - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 15</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 16</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 17</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>020206 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 18</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 19</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 20</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>020212 – 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 21</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 22</td>
<td>OI + OR/SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 23</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>020319 - 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 24</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 25</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>020204 - 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 26</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 27</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 28</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 29</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 30</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 31</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 32</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>020507 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 33</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 34</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 35</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 36</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 37</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 38</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>020530 – 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 39</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 40</td>
<td>SI + SR</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal 41</td>
<td>OI + SR</td>
<td>020820 - 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language acquisition research

- Following on and building on changed understandings of second language use

- Work focusing longitudinal changes in uses of interactional practices

- Successful and rapidly growing (Hellermann, Cekaite, Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, Slotte-Lütte - and many others)
3. Learning as social action

- Argument for approach based in regular, basic CA notions of emic perspective and focus on action.

- An argument from other research on human sociality: Humans have evolved complex and specialized cognitive resources - that we call “pedagogy” - that form a dedicated communicative system in which the participants are inclined to teach and learn new and relevant cultural information to (and from) conspecifics” (Gergely & Csibra, 2006).
Emic learning trajectories
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA studying classroom interaction</th>
<th>CA studying longitudinal change</th>
<th>CA studying learning as action in itself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-social</strong></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Individual (social)</td>
<td>Social (individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form-content</strong></td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Merged (SLA), selection criterion (&quot;the medal, &quot;tähti&quot;)</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product-process</strong></td>
<td>Process (possible relationship generally not topicalized)</td>
<td>Product (analytically), process (participants)</td>
<td>Process (product, for participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
<td>Not addressed, not always clear</td>
<td>In focus, addressed, topicalized</td>
<td>As doing, understanding in development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicability beyond CA</strong></td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Etic-emic Contribution to CA</strong></td>
<td>Emic</td>
<td>Etic (emic)</td>
<td>Emic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empirical anchor</strong></td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Participant/Content</td>
<td>Participant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Setting-centered work

- Situated interaction within site (classroom, family) in focus
- Individual actors not foregrounded
- Longitudinal change not foregrounded
- Radically social “lamination” view of learning possible (but not generally taken up)
Content and/or practice-centered work

- Content and/or practice(s) foregrounded (Ekström, Lymer)
- Situated interaction in relation to focused content/practice within multiple sites in focus
- Longitudinal change in individual content and/or practice possible to foreground (but mostly not done)
Participant-centered work

- Individual participant(s) foregrounded
- Situated interaction of participant within multiple sites (classroom, family) in focus
- Longitudinal change in individual and content and/or practice foregrounded
- Emic orientation proposed as suggestion for finding learning
- The role of the anchoring individual not properly understood
1. Trajectories of epistemic topicalization

2. Differences in epistemic topicalization
Epistemic topicalization: inside the classroom
Emelie: tur-ke-y (1.5) hu säger man de
tur-ke-y how do you say that
Mamma: turkey
Emelie: tu:rr-key
Mamma: turkey
Emelie: tu:rrk-key
Mamma: no ei. mut ajattel(ka) aika hassuu että se on
PRT no. but think it is quite funny that it is
suomeks Turkki. no toisaalta (.)
in Finnish Turkey. but on the other hand (.)
turkey (.) tarkoittaa myöski kalkkuna (1.0) aika
turkey (.) also means turkey quite
hullua
strange
Pappa: kalkon.
turkey.
Emelie: hu ser en kalkon ut
what does a turkey look like
Pappa: ganska fula fåglar tycker ja
quite ugly birds I think
Emelie: [mamma tycker att-]
mom thinks that-]
Pappa: [hu e amerikanska ]fåglar då
[what are american] birds like then
Emelie: mamma tycker att dom e vackra
mom thinks they are beautiful
Mamma: nne on aika haus- aikain vitsikkään näköisiä
they are at least quite funny looking
Emelie: man får inte säga att dom int e [s-]
you can’t say they are not [s-
Pappa: [nå nej]
[well no]
Mamma: kaikki eläimet on sen näköisiä kun niitteen
all animals look the way
tavallaan kuulukin olla
should look
Emelie: e kalkonen en fåg(h)el
is the turkey a bird
Pappa: jo
yes
Emelie: ai
oh

Epistemic
topicalization in the home
Pojke 1: tänkt ja så då dom hade bättre geografiska sen då (.)
I thought like they had better geographic then (.)

Pojke 1: lokation |(.) eller vänt nu lokationer (.)| (ohb)lokationer
location |(.) or wait now locations (.)| (inau)locations

Daniela: |((skratt))
|((laughter))

Daniela: hö(h)d(h)u va e lokation
listen what is location

Pojkel: de ett ord (.). eller e de
it is a word (.). or is it

Daniela: ja men va betyder he (.).
yes but what does it mean

Daniela: lokation
location

Pojke 1: lokation plats
location place

Pojke 1: e de e de |e de ett ord
is it is |it a word

Daniela: lokation nå no kan no: hända men de låter
location well it can be but it sounds
konstit| i mitt huvve de
strange|in my head it

Pojke 1: |geografisk lokation
|geographic location

Daniela: näää lo- lo-
noo lo- lo-

Pojke 2: ja e övertygad om att de e de där senare (ohb)
I am convinced it is the latter

Pojke 1: han sa han sa att de funka
he said he said that it works

Daniela: lokation
Pojke 1: lokets tåg
the locomotive's train's

Daniela: nä för att si: då man börjar lääsa (.)
no because look when one begins to read

Daniela: leta så kommer de så dår öh lokation på svenska va e de på svenska
search then there is uh location in Swedish what it is in Swedish
så där (. ) location men de no: de säger man ju att de lokaliserats
like that (. ) location but it is one can say it has been localised
men int tydlig lokation
but obviously not location
Epistemic topicalization trajectories in interaction on content problems

- Initiated by talk (so far in our analysis) on epistemic stance to content

- Followed up in different ways:
  - Not knowing $\rightarrow$ knowing right answer (student-student interaction)
  - Not knowing $\rightarrow$ knowing how to find answer (teacher-student interaction)
  - Not knowing $\rightarrow$ being told in general terms how to find the answer (teacher-student)
  - Not knowing $\rightarrow$ not knowing in specified way (teacher-student)
  - Not knowing $\rightarrow$ student complaint, no intention of wanting to knowing (student-student, teacher-student)
Extended trajectories of epistemic topicalization
Transcript 1. Re-introducing the English paper.

1. Hanna: ja ha:r den hä engelskalappen. I have here this English note
2. (1.2)
3. Hanna: ja kommer int ihÅ:g va va tie å åtta. I don't remember what was ten and eight
4. Sara: tie å åtta. ten and eight
5. (1.0) ((they unfold the paper))
6. Sara: tie å åtta e eight och (.) de e ten. ten and eight is eight and (.) that is ten
7. Hanna: va e de dÅ_då. (.) nie. what is that then (.) nine.
8. Sara: va hhçi whatçi
Transkript 5. *Counting in the woods.*

1 Sara: har du blyertspenna me.
2 Hanna: (nå)
3 Sara: har du din engelskapapper.
4 Hanna: ja.
5 (2.4)
6 Sara: du kan räkna nu.
7 (0.5)
8 Sara: du kan nu räkn- försöka nu räkna utan de.
9 (0.2)
10 Sara: du kan läsa.
11 Hanna: nej du får läsa. fö ja säger efter okej
12 (.) sådär som (0.7) som (.). Marina sa. (0.2)
13 (.) the way as (0.7) as (.). Marina said. (0.2)
14 Sara: [alltså de där ga- när ga:tan gick sönder.
15 Hanna: ((brings out the paper)) ja så kan du nu gör de
16 Sara: *(okah)* ok
17 (2.8)
For discussion

- The analysis of epistemic topicalization and other interactional resources deployed in the analyzed materials

  - Provides evidence for
    - cross-situational relevance at empirical level
    - coherence and change as emic accomplishments
    - instructional practices as co-constructed social phenomena

- Questions
  - static conceptions of epistemic authority in instruction
  - conceptions of classroom as primary space for learning and instruction

- Asks for
  - further work on how practices of learning and instruction are constructed and recognized as such by participants
  - further theorizing of longitudinal anchors within CA-based learning research
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