5ED-O10: การวิเคราะห์รูปแบบการสนทนาในห้องเรียนเป็นแนวทางในการสอน เพื่อพัฒนาทักษะการพูดภาษาอังกฤษของนักเรียนไทย

Analyzing Classroom Conversational patterns as Pedagogical Guidelines to Develop English Speaking Skills of Thai Students

สุรนุช ตุลพันธ์[1*]　กัญญาณัฐ หวังสง่า[1]　พาตีเมาะ ยูโซะ[1] และ จตุพร โพธิ์วิจิตร[1]

Suranut Tunlaphan[1*], Kanyanat Wangsanga[1], Patimoh Yoso[1] and Jatupon Powijit[1]

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อวิเคราะห์รูปแบบการสนทนาภาษาอังกฤษและวิธีการที่ครูเจ้าของภาษาสนับสนุนให้นักเรียนพัฒนาทักษะการพูดภาษาอังกฤษผ่านการสนทนาระหว่างคุณครูต่างชาติกับนักเรียนไทย สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ คณะครุศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏภูเก็ต กลุ่มตัวอย่างที่ใช้ในการวิจัย คือ นักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏภูเก็ต จำนวน 23 คน เครื่องมือในการวิจัยประกอบด้วยการบันทึกเสียงและการสังเกตการณ์ในชั้นเรียนเป็นสิ่งแรก หลังจากนั้นได้ทำการสัมภาษณ์ครูและนักเรียนเพื่อให้คำอธิบายเพิ่มเติมและความกระจ่างของการบันทึกเสียงและข้อมูลการสังเกต สถิติที่ใช้ในการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูล คือ ค่าความถี่ และค่าร้อยละ ผลการวิจัยพบว่า adjacency pairs(รูปแบบการผลัดกันพูดที่เกิดคู่กัน), preference organization (รูปแบบโครงสร้างการตอบรับตามคาด), และ repair sequences(รูปแบบผลัดแก้) เป็นรูปแบบการสนทนาสามประเภทแรกที่ถูกนำใช้ระหว่างครูเจ้าของภาษาและนักเรียนไทย และที่น่าสนใจก็คือ ผลลัพธ์ที่ได้สามารถนำไปเป็นแนวทางการจัดการเรียนการสอนในการพัฒนาทักษะการสนทนาภาษาอังกฤษของนักเรียนผ่านการพูดคุยในชั้นเรียนได้

คำสำคัญ: การวิเคราะห์การสนทนา (CA)　ทักษะการพูดภาษาอังกฤษ　นักเรียนไทย　แนวทางการสอน　ครูเจ้าของภาษา

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to analyze the patterns of the English-speaking conversations and the ways in which a native -speaker teacher encouraged students to develop English speaking skills through conversation between foreign teacher and Thai students in English major, Faculty of Education, Phuket Rajabhat University. The research sample is the 23 first-year students at Phuket Rajabhat University. The research instruments are firstly comprised of audio recording and classroom observation. After that, interviewing teacher and students were conducted to provide explanation and clarification of the audio recordings and observation data. The data obtained was analyzed by the frequency and percentage. The findings showed that adjacency pairs, preference organization, and repair sequences are found as the top three types of conversational patterns conducted between the native-speaker teacher and Thai students. Interestingly, the results can raise some pedagogical implications to how English conversation skills of the students can be enhanced through the classroom talk.

Keywords: Conversation analysis (CA), English speaking skills, Thai students, Pedagogical Guidelines, Native-speaker teacher.

---

[1] มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏภูเก็ต

[1] Phuket Rajabhat University

* Corresponding Email: suranut.fon@gmail.com

Introduction

In modern times, language is considered an integral part of human life which is used for exchanging communication and creating the human understanding together, especially in the era of globalization. English is a common language, and it is also a universal language used to communicate among countries. Therefore, it becomes more and more relevant to our lives, which is important to the highest level of education.

The Ministry of Education has the policy to reform the educational system to develop the potential of learners especially, English language skills so that students can use English as a tool for seeking knowledge for self-development in the teaching and learning of English according to the basic education curriculum. Therefore, Most Thai students know how important the English language is, especially Thai students in English major, but they cannot use English to communicate with foreigners in real situations due to lack of motivation to use English, both speaking and communication in daily life Especially in listening and speaking skills which are an important skill for conversation (Sri Ngeon Paesu. 1998), which Wilga. 1978 research shows that humans use listening and speaking skills together 75% of the time spent in all communication causing English skills to develop slowly such as environmental factors, including social conditions and current teaching. These two skills are the foundation of later reading and writing development. Therefore, the lack of development of listening and speaking skills leads to the main problem of the English language development of Thai students. In addition, the conversational teaching method covers with the development of four skills of learners such as listening, speaking, reading and writing. Therefore, the conversational teaching method allows learners to interact in the classroom and contribute to the improvement of Thai students' English better. The Faculty of Education Department of English Phuket Rajabhat University English language instruction is provided in a conversational style in the English language courses. The purpose of the research aimed to develop the speaking and listening skills mainly in English. In addition, there are the characteristic of teaching and learning activities to achieve in English course.

For these reasons, the organizers were aware of the use of English in communication, especially speaking skill, which is a part of important skills in learning English. Thus, researchers have conducted research in this course for analysis of dialogue patterns that occurred in classroom talk and the ways in which a native-speaker teacher encouraged students to develop English speaking skills through conversation in the classroom. The result of this research was very helpful in the classroom management. The teachers can select these approaches for encouragement the learners to speak and be able to develop English conversations in the classroom very well.

Literature review

Classroom conversation

A key strength in classroom is the ability to employ instructional strategies that engage students in classroom activities. That is the using conversational pattern that supports the students' development of academic skills. In order to assess what students are thinking, we have to get them for talking and communicating in the class. Learning kick-off with a question that provokes the learner before begin the class and lesson closure or finishing step, end with an open-ended question. This strategy is instrumental in the development of academic vocabulary for all students, especially English learners.

Conversation analysis (CA)

Conversation analysis is an approach which can help in studying the interaction between teacher and students as well as uncovering a deeper meaning. Moreover, the conversation is both consistent and non-objective. As previous research that Scholars suggest the concept of conversation analysis is Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974), which has an important hypothesis that although people generally have conversations, there is often no advance preparation and conversations seem to proceed without a system. Thus, we analyze the conversation in the classroom between foreign teachers and students for developing the students' conceptual and linguistic skills in the conversation by analyzing three main points such as adjacency pair, preference and repair. More over, the using conversation in the classroom helps students to apply knowledge from using English conversation to develop further in the future. Adjacency pairs consist of two turns by different speakers which are adjacent to each other and ordered as a first pair part and a second pair part (Liddicoat, 2011; Gardner, 2008). With 'adjacency pairs' it is important for the first speaker to select the next speaker in order to complete the conversation, which also enables the next speaker to avoid both gap and overlap (Coulthard, 1979). For example: question-answer, informing-response, reprimanding-acceptance, greeting-greeting, call-response, and leave taking-leave taking.

Example of question-answer:

Teacher: How many groups?

Student: 4 groups.

Example of question-response:

Teacher: How are you today?

 Student 1: I am fine.

Example reprimanding-acceptance

Teacher: Good job! And you guys have English acting. Umm good work!

Students: Uhhhh! (Students crap your hand)

Example of call-response

Student 4: Teacher

Teacher: Yes (rising sound)

Preference deals with the possible ways in which some conversational action may be accomplished. It does not refer to the personal desires of the speakers, but rather to recurrent patterns of talk in which actions are carried out (Liddicoat, 2007). Moreover, the basic distinction made in preference organization is that in a particular context, certain actions may be avoided or delayed, while other actions are performed directly and with little delay. Actions which are performed immediately and related to the topic are called 'preferred', while actions which would not be performed in this way are called 'dispreferred'.

Example of preferred answer:

Teacher: What do you feel after your action completed video?

Student1: Great! Funny.

Example of dispreferred answer:

Teacher: What do you feel after your action completed video?

Students: Students are silent.

Repair Success in ordinary talk is often seen as contingent on the overall degree of mutual understanding. However, understanding is not always a given. One of the regular features of talk-in-interaction identified by conversation analysts is the notion of repair, a mechanism that allows speakers to identify problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding in talk, and potentially to resolve them (Schegloff et al. 1977). Repair can be analyzed in light of where it occurs relative to a trouble source, who initiates and who resolves the repair effort, and the outcome, i.e., success or failure of repair efforts. For language classrooms, the interactional organization of repair is of interest because mutual understanding among teachers and students is contingent on more than one language, and students master one of these languages only in parts. Repair may occur in various interactional contexts, such as in teacher–whole class interaction, in individual teacher–student interaction, and in student–student interaction during partner or group work, thus serving potentially different purposes. CA classroom studies have found a range of regular classroom phenomena to benefit from being analyzed in light of repair (Brouwer 1999; Hall 2007; Hellermann 2009; Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2003; Seedhouse 2001, 2007, 2010).

Example of question-answer:

Student: Good morning oh! Sorry, good afternoon teacher?

Teacher: Good afternoon students (laugh)

The related research

There are numbers of studies regarding conversation analysis in educational contexts. For example, Barraja-Rohan (2011) investigated using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. The result found that conversation analysis proved to be successful for the groups of learners of English who participated in the study since they became more effective conversationalists in acquiring aspects of L2 interactional competence related to the conversation.

In addition, Rukanuddin (2013) studied about conversation analysis: a way to identify the components of conversations resulting in better teaching and better learning. The result finding makes the researcher think that if teachers are capable of analyzing conversations, they will the ability to understand the nooks and crannies of the learners' interactive talks and thus the understanding and relationships among teachers and students which will lead to better teaching and better learning. Finally, Fajardo (2008) studied about conversation analysis (CA) in primary school classrooms. The result found that Colombian primary school classrooms showed in terms of the interaction promoted is a very limited picture. The basic components of the machinery identified in the mundane talk in terms of adjacency pairs, sequence, turn-taking or preference, for example, are far from being reached in the context of this study. Interaction has to be urgently promoted and pre-service teachers have to be trained in its principles and methodology.

<div align="center">

Methodology

</div>

1. Participants of the study

The population in this study was the 23 first-year Thai students in English major, Faculty of Education at Phuket Rajabhat University who enrolled in a course entitled 'English Listening and Speaking' in the first semester of the academic year 2019 by using the purposive sampling.

2. Type of Data

The data collected in this research used only a quantitative type. The details are as follows:

➢ Independent Variables: Classroom Conversational patterns

➢ Dependent Variables: Students' English-speaking skill

3. Duration of the Study

The classroom research took place in November 2019, totaling three weeks of classroom sessions. Each week is three hours with a total of nine hours.

4. Research instruments:

The data of this study was derived from three types of research instruments.

4.1) Audio-record of the classroom conversation

The teacher-student talk in English for General Communication class was audio-recorded.

 4.2) Classroom observation

Classroom interaction was observed and notes of significant interactional points were taken such as analyzing the conversational patterns used in the classroom and reaction between the teacher and students in classroom conversation.

4.3) Interview

The interview was conducted for teacher and students in order to gain further detail and meaning. Interview questions were inquired based on the interesting information gained from classroom observation and audio-recording. The questions were derived from the interesting points raised in the classroom observation. For example, the students were asked why they had given an irrelevant answer to the teacher's question. The questions for the teacher and the four students are as below.

Table 1 Questions from interviews with the teacher and student

Questions for Teacher	Question for Students
1. How do you feel when the teacher speaks with the student sometimes, they don't understand the language to communicate?	1. Do you feel that when using English conversation throughout the study?
2. What do you think about the barriers that make your communication errors?	2. Why do you sometimes become quiet and do not answer teacher questions like other friends?
3. What do you think when the student shy to communicate with others in English?	3. What are the main reasons for answering the disputed questions?
4. How can they develop for using English Language to communication correctly?	4. Who does the mistake of speaking in the class come from, and how can you solve it?

5. Data collection

The data for this study consists of conversation collected from audio-recording, notes collected from classroom observation, and interview. In data analysis, the conversation was analyzed based on the three main categories (adjacency pairs, preference organization, and repair sequences) provided in CA framework in order to find its patterns. After that, notes and interview were used to provide more accuracy to the interactional meaning found in the conversational practice.

6. Data analysis

This research employs Conversation Analysis (CA) to analyze talk in interaction in an English language classroom. First of all, we analyzed and summarized the results of the analysis to be the percentages. Subsequently, there was a content analysis from the interview to reach more an in-depth attitude of the participants.

6.1) An analysis of classroom talk

6.1.1) The classroom talks which was audio-recorded was transcribed.

6.2) An analysis of classroom observation classroom: For example, the teacher admired the students in conversation showed that the reason for admired can help that the students were admired make they have motivated in question to answer.

6.3) Interview analysis: the interviews were analyzed in support of the discussion and results in the previous stage. For example, some students in the classroom used dispreferred answers including silence and do not correspond to the question, so it is important to use the interview to help explain the reason.

<div align="center">Result</div>

This research aims to investigate in depth the ways that a native speaker teacher encouraged students to develop English speaking skills through her conversation with the students in the class. The results were divided into three main parts, which are adjacency pairs, preference organization, and repair sequences.

Adjacency pairs

 For adjacency pairs, as shown in Table 2, question-answer was the most frequency used adjacency pair (43 times /53.75%), followed by question-response (20 times/25.00%), reprimanding-acceptance (8 times/10.00 %), call-response (6 times/7.50%), greeting-greeting (2times/2.50%) and the least frequent leave taking-leave taking (1 time/1.25 %).

Table 2 Use of adjacency pairs in the English Listening and Speaking subject

Rank	Adjacency pairs	Total
1.	Question-answer	43 (53.75%)
2.	Question-response	20 (25.00%)
3.	admiring-acceptance	8 (10.00%)
4.	Call-response	6 (7.50%)
5.	Greeting-greeting	2 (2.50%)
6.	Leave taking-leave taking	1(1.25%)
	Total	100 %

Example of question-answer:

Teacher: How are you today?

Student 1: I am fine.

Example of question-response:

Teacher: How many groups?

Student: 4 groups.

Example of admiring-acceptance:

Teacher: Good job! And guys have English acting. Umm good work!

Students: Uhh! (Students crap your hand)

Example of greeting-greeting

Teacher: Hi! Good afternoon, students.

Students: Good afternoon, teacher.

Example of call-response

Student 4: Teacher

Teacher: Yes!! (rising tone)

Example of leave taking-leave taking:

Students: Thank you teacher, see you next time.

Teacher: See you again, good bye.

Firstly, the question-answer pair was found 43 times (53.08%). The question part had three main types:1) Wh- question (22 times/51.16 %), 2) yes/no question (14 times/ 32.56%), and 3) blank question (21 times/ 48.84%). The results showed that all the questions that encourage the students to answers the questions take part in the class. Most of them answered by analyzing from the teacher's questions at the beginning with Wh – questions patterns, yes/ no questions and blank questions, sequence.

An example of wh- questions is as below:

Teacher: How are you today?

Student1: I am fine.

An example of yes/ no questions is as below:

Teacher: Hi guys the last week we have the task based for presentation, right?

Student1: Yes, teacher.

An example of blank questions is as follows:

Teacher: Now this time for present the…………….

Student1: Video project.

Secondly, the question-response pair was found 21 times (25.93%). It revealed that the teacher tended to initiate the conversation (20times/ 95.24%), whereas the students initiated the conversation by informing the teacher first only 5 times (23.81%).

[inform] Teacher: How many groups?

[response] Student: 4 groups.

Thirdly, the results showed eight pairs of admiring-acceptance (8.97%). the teacher admired the students when they will be successful. This way is the best thing for motivation them to will be happy in the class.

[admiring] Teacher: Good job! and you guys have English acting. Umm good work!

[acceptance] Students: Uhh! (Students crap your hand)

Fourthly, the call-response pair was found 6 times (7.41%) in this classroom conversation. The call part was initiated by one student who confuses with something in the lessons, so the student called

the teacher ("teacher") The teacher took part in the second pair part (response) and answered back to the student ("yes"). An example is as follows:

[call]   Student 4: Teacher?

[response]   Teacher: Yes! (rising sound)

Moreover, the greeting-greeting pair was found 2 times (2.47%) at the beginning of the teacher-students conversation. For the greeting part that was started by the teacher, it happened at the beginning of the class when the teacher entered the room and greeted the students. Then, the students also greeted the teacher. The way is good for making the relationship between the teacher and the students for beginning the classroom well.

[greeting] Teacher: Hi! Good afternoon, students.

[greeting] Students: Good afternoon, teacher.

Lastly, for the end of the conversation, the leave taking-leave taking pair was also found only 1 time (1.23%). This pair happened when the teacher talked about next week's lesson and told them that it was the end of the class. Then, the students started to say goodbye to the teacher as shown in the example below.

[leave taking] Students: Thank you teacher, see you again next time.

[leave taking] Teacher: See you again, good bye.

Preference organization

For preference organization, as shown in Table 3, during the conversation in the classroom, most of the second parts of preference organization were preferred answers (68 times/89.47%), and there were much fewer dispreferred answers (8 times/10.53%).

Table 3 The use of preference organizations in the English Listening and Speaking subject.

Rank	Preference organization	Total
1.	preferred answer	68(89.47%)
2.	dispreferred answer	8(10.53%)
	Total	100%

The preferred answer in this study is defined as the way the participants answer or reply back, and the answer is related to the previous statement under the same topic. Both teacher and students used preferred answers in the classroom and the teacher used preferred answers 68 times (89.47%). For example, the student presents a video project to the teacher. Then the teacher asks them what do you feel after your action completed from the video? and they say great and funny.

Example of preferred answer:

[inform] Teacher: What do you feel after your action completed video?

[preferred teacher] Student 1: Great! Funny

For dispreferred answers, the answer is not related to the previous statement from the teacher. It occurred only with the students for 8 times (10.53%).

Example of dispreferred answer:

[inform] Teacher: What do you feel after your action completed video?

[answer] Students: Students are silent.

Repair sequences

The use of repair sequences was also shown in this conversation of the English Listening and Speaking subject; as shown in Table 4, most repair sequences were repair type2: other-initiated self-repair (5times/50%), type3: other-initiated self-repair (3times/30%) and there was the rare occurrence of repair type4: other-initiated other-repair (2 times/20%).

Table 4 The use repair in the English Listening and Speaking subject.

Rank	Repair	Total
1.	repair type2 other-initiated self-repair	5(50%)
2.	repair type 3 other-initiated self-repair	3(30%)
3.	repair type 4 other-initiated other-repair	2(20%)
	Total	100%

The teacher used repair sequence type 2 five times. The teacher initiated the repair and the students corrected their mistake by themselves. This is because the teacher could not hear the word clearly, so the teacher had to initiate repair as shown in the example below.

[question]   Teacher: Cushion, everybody says cushion.

[answer]   Student 4: Cussion

[repair]   Teacher: Not Cussion, just Cushion.

The teacher used repair sequence type 3 three times know the correct answer, the students will correct the answer when they say mistake to the teacher and they teacher, as shown in the example below

[question]   Student: Good morning oh! Sorry, good afternoon teacher.

[answer]   Teacher: Good afternoon students (laugh).

The teacher used repair sequence type 4 two times. To explain, the teacher initiated the repair and gave the corrections to the students. This is because he wanted the students to know the correct answer, and he realized that the students did not know the correct answer, as shown in the example below

[question]   Teacher: Everybody stands the one line there?

[answer]   Students: (Stand here)

[repair]   Teacher: Not standing here, so everybody stand one line there.

Discussion

The results have shed the light of pedagogical practice in an English-speaking class between the English major students and the foreign teacher. Firstly, we found adjacency pairs in question-answer and question - response formats are the top two most frequently used form of conversation in the classroom in line with Xie, 2008; Rajab, 2015; Sundai, Rafli, & Ridwan, 2017), which were conducted and focused on teacher talk in the classroom. From the findings, for the question-answer as well as inform respond adjacency pairs for motivating students to be enthusiastic about learning and developing their academic skills.

Example of question-answer:

Teacher: How many groups?

Students: 4 groups.

Example of question:

Teacher: How are you today?

Student 1: I am fine.

In addition, from the Pichanee's research (2017) shows that there is reprimanding-acceptance case for Stopping inappropriate behavior of the students and keeping the students in discipline and they opt reprimanding the students the rights way in which they get bring them back on the track so as to perform as the teacher wishes.

For example, reprimanding-acceptance

Student1: Shuuuuu!!!

Students: (Students stopped talking)

However, this study reveals that there is another situation which is different from previous research. That is Example of admiring-acceptance case. Teachers approach students with admiration for motivation and making the Students feel safe without the pressure and happy to learn in the classroom effectively. Observation from the student's interjection show that they feel excited in the positive way, and they enjoy in the class. The teacher can choose this part of the adjacency pairs for encouraging the students to speak.

For example, reprimanding-acceptance

Teacher: Good job! And you guys have English acting. Umm good work!

Students: Uhhhh! (Students crap your hand)

The one more the Adjacency pair's pattern is call-response situation that makes learning fun and motivates students to push themselves to be assertive for calling the teacher when they had a problem.

In the same way the teacher responses them with the rising sound. That means she focuses and interested from their calling.

Example of call-response

Student 4: Teacher

Teacher: Yes (rising sound)

The second is preference. This this situation shows a conversation that corresponds to a question related to the conversation. In a conversation, students respond to this question for their purpose, showing that they understand the dialogue, which helps students to answer the objectives and helps students to answer a variety of questions.

Example of preference

Teacher: What do you feel after your action completed video?

Student1: Great! Funny.

The third is dispreferred answers. This is an inconsistent conversation style from the analysis in the class found that this form occurs during conversation.

Example of dispreference

Teacher: What do you feel after your action completed video?

Students: Students are silent.

From this example, the students don't answer and have shown the silent reaction. From interview students, one of them found that students they did not understand the conversation or they understood the question but did not know how to give an answer in English and some students still don't pay attention to listen. Therefore, students can't answer this question. As Jalilifar and Dinarvand (2013) pointed out, students find it very difficult to say "no" or tell the teacher directly that they cannot understand; the teacher, therefore, needs to pay attention to the students' dispreferred answers, as they can show that the students do not understand the conversation.

The last one is repair. There are many patterns of the repair. However, this is a main point in the classroom that the teacher manages a class to be effective.

Example of repair:

Student: Good morning oh! Sorry, good afternoon teacher?

Teacher: Good afternoon students (laugh)

Teacher doesn't focus on mistakes students and the teacher is ready to give the opportunity to say again with her smile face and the laugh until students corrected their mistake by themselves in line with the researcher (Skuse, 2012) reveal that repair sequences help improve students' speaking skills in the classroom and encourage the students to repair the sentences by themselves.

Conclusion

This study aims to analyze the patterns of the English-speaking conversations and the ways in which a native-speaker teacher encouraged students to develop English speaking skills through conversation with the freshmen students in English major, Faculty of Education, Phuket Rajabhat University. From using the conversation analysis pattern (CA). That is an approach which can help in studying the interaction between teacher and students in classroom. The findings reveal that the students' English-Speaking skills were potentially developed through the teacher's frequent use of questions for motivation which are three basic concepts of CA (adjacency pairs, preference organization, and repair sequences). In addition, the most common form adjacency pairs of conversation patterns in the class are the question-answer format which encourages students to answer questions and use their thoughts. Moreover, we got a new pattern that nobody studies or finding in classroom. That is an admiring-acceptance format which is a pattern that using compliments reinforces students' motivation to learn. The teacher can choose this part for encouraging the students to speak and be able to develop English conversations in the classroom very well.

Hopefully, this research can help provide classroom interactional guideline as useful pedagogical resources to develop conversational and speaking skills.

References

Barraja, R, (2011), "Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence" *Learning Teaching Research*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 479-507.

Brouwer (1999); Hall (2007); Hellermann (2009); Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2003; Seedhouse 2001, 2007, 2010). "Conversation Analysis and Language Classroom Discourse", *Thorsten Huth First published*, Vol.5, No.5, pp. 297-309.

Coulthard, M., 1979, "An introduction to discourse analysis", *Longman Publishing Group*, London. Fajardo, A., (2008), "Conversation Analysis (CA) in primary school classrooms", *Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia –UPTC*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 11-27.

Gardner, R., (2008), "Conversation analysis", In The handbook of applied linguistics, Davies, A., & Elder, C. Editor (Ed.), Blackwell publishing, United Kingdom, pp.1-808.

Hall, J, (2007), "The Modern Language Journal banner", *Redressing the Roles of Correction and Repair in Research on Second and Foreign Language Learning JOAN KELLY HALL First published*, Vol. 91, No.1, pp 511-526.

Jalilifar, A. R., & Dinarvand, R., (2013), "An analysis of Iranian EFL learners" dispreferred responses in international discourse", *The Journal of Teaching Skills (JTLS)*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 19-44.

Pichanee's research, (2017), "A conversation analysis of teacher-student talk: The organization of talk for developing English speaking skills", *King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi*.

Schegloff, E. A., (1997), "Whose text? Whose context?", *Discourse and Society*, No. 8, pp. 165-187.

Schegkoff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H., (1977), "The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation", *Language*, Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 361-362.

Schegloff, E. A., (2000), "Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation", *Language in Society*, No. 29, pp. 1-63.

Skuse, G. E., (2012), "English as a Foreign language (EFL) class information gap-task, Master's thesis", *College of Arts and Law, University of Bermingham*.

Xie, X., (2008), "Interactions during teacher-fronted class time of English classes in a Chinese university", Master's thesis, Applied Linguistics, Victoria University of Wellington.