A STUDY OF CLASSROOM INTERACTIONAL COMPETENCE AT A THAI
UNIVERSITY LEVEL

PANADDA PRATOOMRAT

I.D. No. 5729409

A Dissertation Submitted in Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in English Language Teaching

Graduate School of Human Sciences

ASSUMPTION UNIVERSITY OF THAILAND

2018

A STUDY OF CLASSROOM INTERACTIONAL COMPETENCE AT A THAI UNIVERSITY LEVEL

PANADDA PRATOOMRAT

I.D. No. 5729409

A Dissertation Submitted in Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in English Language Teaching

Graduate School of Human Sciences

ASSUMPTION UNIVERSITY OF THAILAND

2018

Copyright by

ASSUMPTION UNIVERSITY OF THAILAND

2018

Dissertation Title: A STUDY OF CLASSROOM INTERACTIONAL COMPETENCE AT

A THAI UNIVERSITY LEVEL

By: PANADDA PTATOOMRAT

Field of Study: DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

Dissertation Advisor: ASST. PROF. DR. KULAPORN HIRUNBURANA

Accepted by the Graduate School of Human Sciences, Assumption University in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy in English Language Teaching

………………………………………

(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Suwattana Eamoraphan)

Dean of the Graduate School of Human Sciences

Dissertation Examination Committee

………………………………………….. **Chair/External Expert**

(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Supong Tangkiengsirisin)

………………………………………….**Advisor**

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Kulaporn Hirunburana)

……………………………………. **Faculty Member**

(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Suwattana Eamoraphan)

……………………………………. **Faculty Member**

(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Joseph Foley)

……………………………………. **Faculty Member**

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Ngamthip Wimolkasem)

ABSTRACT

I.D. No.: 5729409

Key Words: CLASSROOM INTERACTIONAL COMPETENCE, CONVERSATION

ANALYSIS, INTERACTIONAL STRATEGIES, TEACHER-STUDENT

INTERACTION, STUDENT-STUDENT INTERACTION

UNIVERSITY LEVEL

Name: PANADDA PRATOOMRAT

Dissertation Title: A STUDY OF CLASSROOM INTERACTIONAL COMPETENCE AT

A THAI UNIVERSITY LEVEL

Dissertation Advisor: ASST. PROF. DR. KULAPORN HIRUNBURANA

This study aimed to 1) analyze classroom interactional competence (CIC) of a small

group of Thai university students through four interactional resources; turn-taking, overlap

and interruption, repair, and topic management in spoken English, and 2) examine the oral

interactional strategies used by both teacher-student to enhance their interaction and

opportunities for learning English in a Thai university. The participants were a Thai teacher

and fifty five students interaction as whole class discussion and a small group of five student

discussion. The instruments used in this study were 1) questionnaire 2) semi-structure

interview, 3) oral interaction observation, and 4) audio and VDO recording. The data were

transcribed and analyzed using conversational analysis (CA). The findings revealed that

the student-student interaction in English course at a Thai university level in classroom

interactional competence. The most frequency strategies used by the students were turn-

taking, overlap and interruption, topic management, and repair respectively. In terms of turn-

taking, students most frequent uses pass turn to encourage other students to get the

opportunity to speak out of their minds. Regarding overlap and interruption, a good listener and a good speaker keep the students develop in interactional competence in listening and speaking to group discussion interaction. With respect to topic management, the students improve interactional competence through making the contribution of greater topics introduce when interaction with friends. In repair, the students develop in interactional competence more language production to deliver the message or getting and checking information, their peers in the group. The findings also discovered that the most frequency strategies used by the teacher and students were turn-taking, topic management, overlap and interruption, and repair respectively. In terms of turn-taking, teacher-student frequent use self-selection the most. With respect to topic management, the teacher-student use topic introduces the most to introduce a new idea and supporting the point. Regarding overlap and interruption, the teacher and the students use speakership to engage in the classroom talk as the more people talk the more ideas are develop. In repair, teacher self-repair is the teacher make self-initiated correct their own speech while the students use peer repair in the whole classroom discussion to repeat the utterance because he/she could not hear or understand the meaning of the earlier conversation. It can be suggested that the present study raise awareness of CIC for English teachers use appropriate interactional strategies to encourage students' involvement, to design interactive activities on the students' classroom interaction. Since CIC is considered as a tool to mediate teaching and learning. Therefore, paying attention to both the teacher and the students' conversations, especially, speaking and listening courses which need more interactional competence to develop the interaction competence and to an open the space for classroom teaching and learning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend thanks to the many people who so generously contributed to the work presented in this dissertation. There are many people that have earned my gratitude in graduate school. More specifically, I would like to thank six groups of people, without whom this dissertation would not have been possible.

Firstly, I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness, special appreciation, and sincerely thanks to my enthusiastic advisors Asst. Prof. Dr. Kulaporn Hirunburana, who has a kind heart of a teacher and for her dedication, her valuable guidance, constructive comments, motivation, understanding, and most importantly her patience in having me as her advisee. Moreover, I would like to give my sincere thanks to my former advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Joseph Foley and also Asst. Prof. Dr. Ngamthip Wimolkasem to gave the opportunity for me to further my Ph.D. to start and watch me grow during my graduate studies at Assumption University, you all have been a fabulous adviser for me. I would like to thank you for encouraging my research and for allowing me to grow and made this dissertation possible. Last but not least, thank you for the dean, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Suwattana Eamoraphan for her active and supportive in everything.

Secondly, I would also like to express my gratefully and sincerely thank the members of my Ph.D. committee, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Supong Tangkiengsirisin (External Expert), Assoc. Prof. Dr. Suwattana Eamoraphan, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Joseph Foley, and lastly Asst. Prof. Dr. Ngamthip Wimolkasem (Faculty Member) for your brilliant comments and suggestions that shaped my final dissertation. Besides my Ph.D. committee, I would like to thank the rest of my external dissertation reviewers in evaluating the research instrument: Dr. Wilaichitra Nilsawaddi (Head of Phranakhon Language and ASEAN Center; PLACE, Phranakhon Rajabhat University), Dr. Marilyn Fernandez (English Language Teaching,

Assumption University) and Dr. Arthur McMeill (English Language Teaching, Assumption University) for their insightful comments and encouragement, the difficult question which give me to analyze widen my research from various perspectives.

Thirdly, my special thanks go to the Head of Language and Academic Services who assisted me with his suggested direction to this research project. My sincerest thanks are also extended to who gave me an opportunity to collect data for my Ph.D. dissertation. I very much appreciate the cooperation of all the students from the Faculty of Humanities, Srinakharinwirot University participating in this dissertation and their useful information and recommendations to carry out this study.

Fourthly, I deeply wish to express my deepest and wholehearted thanks to my beloved parents, brothers, cousins, and relatives for their love, understanding, moral support, and encouragement, which inspired me from the beginning through this undertaking. They will always have my deepest gratitude.

Fifthly, I would also like to thanks all of my colleagues and friends – Language and Academic Services, Srinakharinwirot University – Bangkok and Nakorn nayok, Phranakhon Rajabhat University - Bangkok, Wat Prasrimahadhat Secondary Demonstration School – Bangkok, Chandrakaserm Rajabhat University-Bangkok, and Assumption University – Bangkok, friends who supported me in writing and proofreading to strive towards my goal.

Finally, thanks to International College for Sustainability and Language and Academic Services, and Srinakharinwirot University for their financial support that I otherwise would not have been able to finish my study.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CA   =   Conversational analysis

CIC   =   Classroom interaction competence

CLT   =   Communicative language teaching

EFL   =   English as a foreign language

EIL   =   English as an international language

ELF   =   English as a lingua franca

ELT   =   English language teaching

GE   =   General English

IC   =   Interactional competence

IRF   =   Initiation, Response, Feedback

L1   =   First language

L2   =   Second language

SLA   =   Second language acquisition

SWU   =   Srinakharinwirot University

SWU121   =   English for Effective Communication I

SWU122   =   English for Effective Communication II

ZPD   =   Zone of proximal development

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

The interactional sociolinguistic transcription convention adapted in this study based on

Gumperz, J and Berenz, N (1993) 'Transcribing Conversation Exchanges in J. Edwards and

M. Lampert (eds).

Notes on Transcription

Transcription convention	Symbol	Explanation
Square brackets	[…]	Square brackets indicate the points where overlapping talk starts (left bracket) and ends (right bracket). Overlap and interruption between the speakers.
Parenthesis	(number)	Numbers in brackets indicate wait time in tenths of a second.
Triangle brackets	<…>	Translation from Thai to English and from Japanese to English

Additional symbols

T: teacher

S: student

S1, S2, etc: identified student

SS: several or all students simultaneously

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The introduction provides a brief overview of the background of the study. It includes the roles of the English language in the context of globalization, the role of English in Thai educational context, the difficulties confronted by Thai students with spoken English communication in classroom interaction, the issue involved the importance of interactional competence in the classroom. It is followed by the research objectives, research questions, the significance of the study, the terms and definitions and the abbreviations used. The last section addresses the organization of the thesis.

Background of the Study

The Roles of English Language in the Context of Globalization

In the context of globalization, English is the most widely used language in the world. The 21st century, witnesses a large demand for communication and language and skills, particularly English. English is spoken all over the world by both native and non-native speakers (Graddol, 1997). English has also evolved into different varieties, such as World Englishes (WEs) (McArthur, 2004; and Bolton, 2004), English as an International Language (EIL) (Kachru, 1985; & Crystal, 1997) and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Jenkins, 2006; and Kirkpatrick, 2007). Crystal (2003) claimed that English is "the world's first truly global language" and plays an important role in the globalization process. The English language plays a crucial role in the national and international settings as a medium or a tool for communication between people from different countries and different cultures. As a result, English has spread worldwide as a *lingua franca* (Graddol, 1997; and Crystal, 1999). For

these reasons, individuals have to deal with communication situations in a variety of contexts. Graddol (1997: p.3) claimed that "people around the world communicate in English, at a basic level at least. Since English is widely used for communication purposes, it is sometimes identified as the world's *lingua franca*."

In the context of English as a global language, English is also utilized as a *lingua franca* among people who come from different L1 and lingua-cultural backgrounds. In addition, in order to communicate effectively, individuals must develop both conversational and interactional skills. Without effective communication skills, individuals tend to be less successful in terms of the development of their expertise. Therefore, in the 21st century, English is developing as ELF communication skills as a way to interact with people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds and as a key component of the social and cultural capital needed to negotiate trans-local networks (Appadurai, 1996; Blommaert, 2010; Kirkpatrick, 2007). In particular, the improvement of the communicative competence among the learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) has become the focus of linguistic and pedagogical interest on a global level (Jeong, 2018).

The Role of English in Thai Education Context

The role of English in Thailand serves as a basic tool for communication for different purposes, such as further education, knowledge-seeking, and the opportunity to get a better job. English language communication skills are vital because Thailand is one of the ASEAN members. ASEAN Secretariat, 2009b has clearly stated the intentions of making English the working language of the community (Deerajviset, 2015). It has also underscored the importance of developing the communication abilities of English language learners in Thailand in order to communicate more efficiently with neighboring ASEAN countries as well as speakers of other languages. In Asian countries, there is an increasing need for people

to develop communicative competence in the English language (Nunn, 2005). As a result of

the significance of English as a world language and the existence of revolutionary new

technologies, Thai learners should be trained in the classroom and apply to use interaction

strategy outside the classroom. In this way, English helps to break down language barriers,

create and promote a unified world community.

However, English has been considered as a foreign language in Thailand since it

is neither an official language nor a medium of instruction. Thai students study English as a

foreign language in the classroom but have few opportunities to put it into practice outside

the classroom environment, particularly for English for everyday use of the four skills such as

speaking, listening, reading and writing. Consequently, the average English proficiency level

of Thais is low in relation with other nations in Asia such as Malaysia, the Philippines, and

Singapore. Though it has been claimed that the university-leavers' English level is B2 or

intermediate level on the CEFR, only 10 % of the Thai populations speak English fluently

(Manager Online, 2014). According to the Education First statistics in 2018, the English

proficiency of Thai people is very low, which is ranking in the position of 16 out of 21 in

Asian. Moreover, Thailand is ranked at number 64 out of 88 countries listed countries and

territories in the EF English Proficiency Index 2018. In the latest results, Thailand has a score

of 48.54, which is classified as low proficiency.

In higher education, universities are obliged to follow government policies and

strategies. The National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education in Thailand (NQF-

HEd) (2006, p. 13) expects "qualifications of graduates at different levels—entry level,

advanced diploma, bachelor's, graduate, diploma, master's, and doctoral degrees. These

outcome-based qualifications are elaborated into five different domains: ethical and moral

development, knowledge, cognitive skills, interpersonal skills and responsibility, and

analytical and communication skills" (as cited in Buppanhasamai, 2012). Foley (2005) states

that the Thai government recommends that knowledge of English be essential for Thai university level.

The Difficulties of Spoken English Communication in Thailand

      The Thai government has greatly promoted English language teaching and learning, since the beginning of 2012 as "English-Speaking Year"; a path towards enhancing English abilities among Thais and pushing them on the same level with the neighboring nations by 2015 (Hodal, 2012 cited in Buppanhasamai, 2012). According to the former Education Minister Phongthep Thepkanjana, "the Thai education system is unsatisfactory and behind other countries in the ASEAN region. To tackle the problem, the ministry has drawn up measures to restructure the system." The Minister further revealed that "students desperately need to improve their English language skills, especially their communication skills, in which Thai students are far behind students in other ASEAN countries. The ministry will, therefore, bring in more English-speaking teachers to teach Thai learners." (Smith, 2013). This means that educators, planners, teachers and people who teach the English language in Thailand need to be aware of the importance of teaching English in Thailand, particularly with regard to interactional competence and communication ability in globalization.

      A number of studies (Chuanchaisit and Prapphal, 2009; Domalewska, 2015; Jeharsae 2012; and Khamwan, 2007) on spoken English communication have also indicated that the causes of the difficulties faced by students are as follows: (1) a lack of involvement in the classroom, (2) artificial interacting in the classroom, (3) use native language while interacting in a group or in the classroom, (4) a lack of social contact between L2 learners or speakers of other languages, (5) a lack of students' motivation, (6) the fact that teachers use a variety of different techniques to create interaction in the classrooms which fail or succeed to

a greater or a lesser extent, (7) a lack of opportunities for students to use English outside the classroom which results in an inability to speak English fluently or spontaneously and (8) a lack of exposure to different kinds of materials as some universities fail to provide effective teaching materials, with the result that students lack confidence in their ability to speak English. In addition, it can be caused by a failure to the comprehension of the complex classroom situation, non-fluency in classroom interaction, and a lack of awareness of social and the cultural background of the students (Forey and Lockwood, 2007, as cited in Jeharsae, 2012). Of all the problems previously mentioned, the problems about spoken English in Thai classroom that have been mentioned above, the interactional competence in the classroom is also needed to be discussed in the following part.

Statement of the Problem

Issues Involved the Importance of Interactional Competence in the Classroom

Interaction in the classroom is vital for learning and teaching in the language classroom. According to Wu (1998), classroom interaction is crucially significant for both learning and teaching language because it directs to language acquisition and learning. Vygotsky (1978) puts forward that individuals could build on their knowledge of the language all the way through interaction and co-operation with peers or more capable individuals. Hatch (1978) maintains the notion that classroom interaction contributes to the learning development on condition that the students have chances to practice the target language. Similarly, Allwright (1984) proposes that the importance of classroom interaction was to provide authentic communication opportunities in the classroom. Moreover, Walsh (2011) also refers to the ability of the "teachers and learners to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning." (p: 158).

Previous studies on second language interactional competence by Barraja-Rohan (2013) have revealed that interactional competence is essential for international students in Australia, especially non-native speakers, in terms of improving their English abilities to successfully study in a Native English Speaking (NES) country. Galaczi (2014) investigates interaction co-constructed in a paired speaking test by learners at different proficiency levels which can help learners interactional competence across their proficiency. Research in Europe (Sert, 2011), shows that students with insufficient knowledge have low interactional competence. Due to the fact that social interaction is necessary for the development of spoken language, it is crucial to investigate the problems that the students typically experience at Thai universities, as well as their perceived learning needs. Therefore, this study is concerned with how classroom interactional competence helps in developing speaking ability in English of Thai university students. Few studies pay attention to spoken interaction students engage in with their teachers and other students in Thai higher education.

As can be observed, the problems experienced by Thai university students in terms of their spoken English abilities originate from two major sources: the students and the teachers. In terms of the students, they tend to interact less in English due to the fact that some students fail to pay attention which may cause less interaction. With regard to teachers, they fail in employing using the types of interactive activities which provide students with the best opportunities to speak English or to practice their English communication skills. As a result, students have fewer opportunities to speak English and to interact with other students in the target language. Moreover, the low English competency of Thai students may be a serious obstacle in terms of the development of the nation due to the high competition in both the domestic and the international market / global workforce market. The result of such a shortcoming could be the inability of Thailand as a country and Thai people as individuals to effectively compete in the global workplace.

In Thailand, English is taught at every level starting from the primary to tertiary level. Thai university students take English as a compulsory subject due to the fact that they are expected to use English in authentic situations in the workplace, with a particular emphasis on conversation. On the other hand, many Thai university students who have the ability to communicate fail to engage completely in interaction (Buranapatana, 2006) or lack the confidence to use their skills to interact with other people in a natural talk (Ngowananchai, 2013). Moreover, some students do not like learning English or have had some bad experiences in the past which contribute to their negative attitudes (Thongwichit, 2013). Students should be provided with opportunities to construct a discourse in order to interact with the interlocutor (Domalewska, 2015). From this perspective, the instructor should focus on classroom interactional competence (CIC) context and the messages which are being communicated during the interaction and paying more attention to the area that the interaction competence appears. Through an understanding of classroom discourse interaction, language teachers may improve the quality of their professional practice and thereby improve the learning of their students.

Classroom interaction in the Thai context, most of Thai teachers adopted the traditional approach of teaching in English classroom from grammar translation to communicative language teaching (CLT) (Seangboon, 2002.) Teachers teach speaking using repetition, giving the language pattern in order to teach speaking English rather than adopting the holistic approach. The teacher starts with questions and students answer could be the pattern of typical teaching. The Thai students are used to depending only on the teacher to get new information where the teacher already knows the answers and he or she expects the student to give the right answer. Moreover, Thai teachers spend most of their time lecturing in front of the class with hardly any interaction with students. Therefore, the students are not given enough chance to practice speaking on their own and the interaction among the

students in the classroom rarely exists (Gosh 2010). Nowadays, a teacher-center methodology is no longer acceptable in language teaching classrooms and the education system has changed with time and so as the teaching methods. At present, interaction strategy at the Thai university level demands more interactional competence amongst the students and between teachers and students rather than just let the student listen to the teacher. For the reason previously mentioned interactional competence is very essential in today's educational settings.

Srinakharinwirot University (SWU), one of the Thai universities located in central Bangkok also has experienced similar and differences in English teaching and learning. SWU has 14 faculties including the Faculty of Education, Humanities, Fine Arts, Social Science, Physical Education, Science, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Dentistry, Health Science, Engineering, Agricultural Product Innovation and Technology, and Environmental Culture and Ecotourism. The students from the fourteen faculties are required to take four integrated skills English courses, some of which are general English courses (English for General Purposes or EGP), while others are more specialized or specific (English for Specific Purposes or ESP) courses two of which are taught and conducted by Thai instructors of English. To improve student interaction and teacher-students classroom interaction in the English language is not easy in Thailand because English is a foreign language and is not used in everyday conversation in the public.

To gain a deeper understanding of interactional competence, it is necessary to be examined on the interaction strategies between student-student and teacher-student in Thai university classrooms. Numerous researchers have studied classroom interactional competence. Walsh (2012) suggests the conceptual framework of classroom interactional competence with four resources: turn-taking, repair, overlap and interruption, and topic management are available to both teachers and learners to enhance CIC and to produce

classrooms which are more dialogic, more engaged and more focused on participation. The benefits of the interactional resources employed can lead to the overall flow and coherence of the discussion.

Accordingly, the researcher works as a lecturer at the Language and Academic Services Center, International College for Sustainability Studies at SWU which is responsible for teaching two general English courses (English for General Purposes or EGP); 1) English for Effective Communication I (SWU121) and 2) English for Effective Communication II (SWU122). The students learn four skills in preparation for future study or future employment. Therefore, it is useful to explore the interactional competence of the students studying in these two English courses.

Finally, this study aims to expand the knowledge closely associated with learner participation, and engagement where language acts as a mediating tool. Also, it intends to obtain more discussion of socio-cultural theory with aspects of interactional competence in the classroom through four interactional resources on four components; turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management that might collaborate in developing spoken English by using conversational analysis and it has not been investigated much in the Thai university.

This study incorporates CIC with some CA. The purpose of this research is to analyze classroom interactional competence (CIC) of a small group of Thai university students through four interactional resources and examine the oral interactional strategies used by both teacher-student to enhance their interaction. This study is conducted with a small group of students in conversations in English and a whole class discussion between a teacher and students through a questionnaire, semi-structured interview, oral interaction observation, and audio and VDO recording during the course of the first and second semester. The data are transcribed using CA convention and analyzed.

Research Questions

1. What components of classroom interactional competence (CIC) are used by a small group of Thai university students in spoken English?

2. What oral interactional strategies are used by both teacher and students in order to engage in interaction in a Thai university?

Research Objectives

1. To analyze classroom interactional competence (CIC) of a small group of Thai university students through four interactional resources; turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management in spoken English.

2. To examine the oral interactional strategies used by both teacher-student to enhance their interaction and opportunities for learning English in a Thai university.

Scope of the Study

This research concentrates on classroom interactional competence in a context of the EFL/ESL settings based on Walsh's (2012) framework for the analysis of interactional strategies and on collected data from participants' spoken interaction from a small group of student-student and teacher-student at the university level in Thailand. The population in this study includes non-English major students from the Faculty of Humanities at Srinakharinwirot University and a Thai teacher. The data were collected using the following research instruments and methods: 1) questionnaire 2) semi-structured interview, 3) oral interaction observation, 4) audio and VDO recording.

Walsh (2006, 2011) identifies interactional strategies which can promote or hinder students' use of the target language. This framework is suitable for the present research study at different levels.

Conceptual Framework

This study analyzed the classroom interactional competence (CIC) of a small group of Thai university students through four interactional resources: turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management in spoken English. Moreover, it examined the oral interactional strategies used by both the teacher and students to enhance their interaction and opportunities for learning English in a Thai university. The data gathered through the questionnaire, semi-structured interview, oral interaction observation, and audio and VDO recording. The data were analyzed based on the conceptual framework of CIC (see Figure 1.1.) In this study, the use of interactional strategies is believed to provide the students with the opportunity for learning through the strategic use of interactional competence. This study's conceptual framework of classroom interactional competence is based on taxonomies of Walsh (2012). Stenstrom theory (1994:68), Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977), Cekaite (2007), and Barraja-Rohan (2013).

Conceptual Framework of Thai University Classroom Interactional Competence

Figure 1.1 Conceptual Framework of Thai University Classroom Interactional Competence

Source: This framework is based on classroom interactional competence by Walsh (2012).

Stenstrom (1994:68), Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977), Cekaite (2007), and Barraja-

Rohan (2013).

Definitions of Terms

Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) is defined as the 'Teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning' Walsh (2011) p: 158).

Interactional strategies mean a variety or availability of strategies that teachers and learners can choose from in order to interact in the classroom.

Interactional resources refer to resources used for oral interaction: turn-taking, repair, overlap and interruption, and topic management.

Turn-taking is the process in which the teacher and students decide who will speak next in their conversation. It shows the changing roles of a speaker and as a listener in a conversation.

Take-turn refers to teachers and students taking the floor to contribute to their talk or to their conversation.

Hold turn refers to teachers and students waiting for other speakers' utterance to finish and giving his/her turn to respond.

Pass turn refers to teachers and students passing their turn to other speakers.

Self-select refers to teacher and student selecting him/herself to talk without others ask him/her to speak.

Repair means a way of dealing with problems in speaking, understanding, and hearing in terms of meaning or message.

Self-repair refers to teachers and students saying something to correct him/herself after he/she notices/realizes problems in his/her previous communication.

Peer repair refers to students saying something wrong in meaning and other students correcting it.

Teacher repair refers to teacher asking for repeating the wrong meaning or wrong words after he/she notices/realizes problems in his/her previous communication initiated by student.

Overlap and Interruption as good listenership and speakership that the interactant shows a speaker that (he/she) has been understood that signal the communication is going well.

Listenership refers to the process in which teachers and students make a sound while the other person is speaking so as to show that he/she is understood.

Speakership refers to the process in which teachers and students speak up while the other person has not finished speaking yet and want to convey the message before (they) forget.

Topic Management means paying attention to the coherence of a topic or piece of spoken interaction.

Topic introduce refers to the way in which a teacher and student want to introduce a new topic to the discussion.

Topic development refers to the way in which a teacher and student support points to stay on the same topic and succeeds in maintaining the topic for a while.

Topic shift refers to how a teacher and student deal with changes in a topic or bring the discussion back to talk about the same topic discussed earlier.

Student-Student Interaction (S-S) means the interaction among students when they are (discussing) in a group. This type of interaction is labeled as student-student interaction at Srinakharinwirot University in Ongkaluk campus.

Teacher-Student Interaction (T-S) means one teacher and students' initiate interaction within typical teaching classroom at Srinakharinwirot University in Ongkaluk campus.

Translanguaging means a Thai teacher teaching English, using his/her first language (Thai) as a process for general instruction along with English; and it also refers to

Thai students including students answering or asking questions about the subject to fulfill

understanding to discuss the topic in one (first (Thai) or second) language, and then to

produce language or make a presentation about it in another language, means the topic has to

be processed in learning.

Significance of the Study

This study will benefit second and foreign language teachers and students using

CIC in the following ways:

Firstly, hopefully, it will contribute to the education of Thai university

instructors in terms of their professional development by promoting EFL pedagogy via

classroom interactional competence or CIC, focusing on the need of students to know how

and when to interact and also consider the teachers' role in facilitating this process.

Secondly, it will not only enhance the English language skills of the students

but also improve relations between teachers and students to use English over correctness with

fluency and confidence. Through this process CA analysis, awareness of language use and

context is raised.

Thirdly, the findings of the study might contribute useful information to

English language teachers, so they may be able to adapt and apply their knowledge of CA

research to design training course or teaching model to enhance CIC instructional strategies

and instructional conversation toward language and pre-service students training.

Moreover, the results of this study may also be used as a set of guidelines for

improving the classroom activities in language classrooms and can also be used as a method

for solving the interaction problems experienced by English teachers in terms of English

language learning.

Limitations of the Study

The limitation of this study would be, the researcher just looks at her own teaching, therefore the result of the study does not reveal some other classrooms taught by other teachers at SWU University or other universities in Thailand. Moreover, the population for a small group discussion is the only male which may not be a good representation for other group discussions. Lastly, the choice of the group of the student as an intact group just likes purposive sampling. This would also be the limitation because it does not mean that this section of the student represents all sections at the university. Therefore, the reader needs to be careful in using the strategies.

Chapter Summary

This dissertation contains five chapters as follows:

Chapter 1 presents the background of the study and introduces the history of English Language Teaching (ELT), the roles of the English language in the context of globalization and in the Thai context. It also addresses the difficulties concerning spoken English communication and the importance of interactional competence in the classroom in the English language in Thailand. It includes the research questions, the research objectives, the scope of the study, the definitions of terms, the significance of the study, the limitations of the study, and the abbreviations used in this study.

Chapter 2 reviews the relevant literature, with an emphasis on the most effective ways in which the level of classroom interaction competence can/could be increased among the students. The overview of the chapter which introduces the English learning and teaching in Thailand consist of using L1 in the English language classroom as a resource, translanguaging, promoting L2 to use in the EFL classroom, pedagogical implications using L1 and L2 in Thai context. Next, the review focuses on interactional competence in second

language acquisition including socio-cultural theory. Moreover, conversational analysis and spoken language interaction in the conversational analysis are discussed. More explanation is on classroom interactional competence between teacher-student and student-student. Lastly, previous studies in classroom interactional competence are reviewed.

Chapter 3 provides an overview of the research methodology employed in this research. It includes the research design, research instruments, processes of participant selection and data collection and data analysis. It also gives the rationale for conducting a pilot study and the design of the pilot study and the main study which includes data collection procedures and data analysis.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of data analysis to answer research question one which related to the classroom interactional competence in spoken English of Thai university level. Both quantitative and qualitative data are presented. This chapter also reports on the findings of data analysis that answer research question two which is interactional strategies available to both teacher and students.

Chapter 5 provides a discussion and a conclusion of key findings and implications of the research findings based on the two research questions. Moreover, pedagogical implications, contribution to knowledge and recommendations for developing EFL pedagogy for tertiary language teachers and students towards CIC for further studies are also provided.

The main purpose of this chapter is to review the literature that is related to the research project focusing on knowledge improvement to increase students' classroom interaction competence through conversational analysis. It introduces the historical background of the development of spread English language, then information about English learning and teaching in Thailand including using L1 in the English language classroom as a resource, translanguaging, promoting L2 to use in the EFL classroom, pedagogical implications using L1 and L2 in Thai context. Next, it focuses on interactional competence in second language acquisition this include socio-cultural theory; ZPD, scaffolding, and collaborative learning. Moreover, conversational analysis and spoken language interaction in conversational analysis are discussed. Related researches in CIC are touched upon. More explanation is on classroom interactional competence between teacher-student and student-student and lastly, the conclusion of the chapter is provided.

English Learning and Teaching in Thailand

The official policy of the Thai government is reflected in the Basic Education Core Curriculum of B.E. 2551 (A.D. 2008). It is comprised of four main areas of foreign language learning. The first is the use of foreign languages for communication including the four skills, reading, writing, listening and speaking. The second area is concerned with the ability to work in harmony with the speakers with different cultures. The third area is linking foreign languages with other learning areas. The final area is the use of English outside the classroom setting; language learners are expected to be able to use English outside the

classroom context and in a globalized society. After graduation from university, Thai students should have adequate communicative competencies as well as the ability to use English in real-life communication.

However, target language fluency is dependent on the ability of individuals to develop an adequate command of the language for communicative purposes and this may result in a gap between the official government policy and what actually takes place in the English language classroom. Nunan (2003) studied the effect of English as a global language on both educational policy and practice in the Asia-Pacific region. The study focused was on Malaysia and Vietnam (p.589). Nunan identified the existing gap between policy and actual practice in terms of language. This was due to ineffective language instruction and inadequately trained or unskilled teachers. The results of this study indicated that there could be a similar situation in Thailand in terms of English language education. Other researchers have claimed that a large number of Thai English teachers used Thai rather than English in their teaching (Karnnawakul, 2004, p.80; & Kimsuvan, 2004, p.78). The Thai English teachers had high proficiency in reading but low proficiency levels in listening and speaking. This may have a negative influence on the spoken proficiency of students, and as a result, many Thai students may not be able to communicate effectively in English. Even competent Thai English speakers may be hesitant to speak because they are anxious or lack confidence regarding their English skills.

The fact that the Thai national policy in education can be incongruent with reality in term of English language practices in teaching and learning has defied a series of studies. The current findings of Fitzpatrick (2011) examined how a group of Thai English teachers conceptualized Thai English language policy in an investigation of practices and beliefs (p.3). The divergence between the goals of government policy and the reality of what actually takes place in the classroom were identified in this study. Fitzpatrick (2011) discussed the ways

that many Thai English teachers found the communicative approach difficult to implement in

the classroom and how the communicative approach has been used in Thailand (p.127).

However, this may be a result of the pressure caused by national exams; this factor may lead

Thai students to feel that the purpose of English language learning is to pass the national

exams, rather than communication (Karnnawakul, 2004, p.81; & Kimsuvan, 2004, p.79) or in

order to facilitate real-world communication. The grammatical approach is preferred by many

Thai students as this aspect of English is actually part of national examinations. These

findings indicated that national examinations play a key role in learning and teaching English

in Thailand. The Thai national examinations, also known as the entrance exam for admittance

to university, do not assess listening and speaking skills. The disparity between official

language policy and real-world applications have resulted in many Thai students lacking an

adequate command of the English skills necessary for communication in the real world.

English classes in Thailand are generally focused on grammatical competence.

ELT in Thailand has emphasized traditional teaching methodologies (Saengboon, 2006).

More recently, government policy on ELT has changed and teachers are encouraged to use

the communicative approach. The majority of scholars agree with the idea that

communicative language teaching (CLT) is a more appropriate approach in teaching Thai

EFL learners because it focuses more on language in use. On the other hand, other

practitioners claim that CLT is not appropriate for EFL/Thai learners at the present time

(Prapaisit de Segovia, Hardison, 2008; & Seangboon, 2002). This might be due to the fact

that in teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) in the Thai context, many teachers use

commercial textbooks from a western country that may not be relevant or suitable for Thai

students. Similarly, Nonkukhetkhong, Baldauf, and Moni (2006) examined that the

development of Thai students' communicative competence, and have found that Thai EFL

educators' instructional practices were still conventional. That is, they normally teach the

entire class focusing on sentence structure and vocabulary clarification, and drills. The take-up of the communicative curriculum proposes the need to address Thai EFL instructors' conceptualizations of CLT methodologies. According to Hymes (1972), CLT is not only a development of the form of language but also the ability to use language in a variety of contexts. In this perspective, interaction practices are necessary to initiate second language or foreign language conversation inside the classroom in order to develop the negotiation of meaning and the distribution of classroom discourse between teachers and learners. For this purpose, the use of L1 has some play in the scene English language classroom and this includes some further English Education.

Using L1 in the English Language Classroom as a Resource

The use of L1 in the English classroom has advantages and disadvantages for both students and teachers. The teachers may use L1 to make it easier to communicate in class. Moreover, L1 is also used in the translation method of teaching. This is the most common use of the L1 and is also employed to check for meaning and understanding. Al – Nofaie (2010), studied the attitudes of students and teachers concerning the use of the L1 in the EFL classroom (p.77). The findings discovered that using an L1 to teach English were found to be boring, but the lessons were found to be more interesting when the teacher used English a teaching resource. In other words, these students were more motivated and enthusiastic about learning English.

A similar study by Al-Nofaie (2010) claimed that the L1 was effectively used by many teachers in order to explain grammar and new vocabulary. The results established that learners with high levels of English ability demonstrated greater progress when the L1 was used (p.69). The professional experience of teachers and the level of the learners and may influence the degree to which teachers resort to using the L1 (Jadallah & Hasan, 2016).

Moreover, Choomthong (2011) researched that the effect of encouraging students to think in the L1. She found that high-ability students used the L1 by translating English sentences and then adding the Thai passive marker in order to see if there was English passive voice construction or meaning required. These findings revealed that the high-ability students did not apply the language to other English passive voice contexts. In other words, they were thinking in the L1 and in other language contexts and usages, but unable to transfer linguistic knowledge or development in terms of the target language (p.80).

Promoting L2 to Use in the EFL Classroom

A number of studies on attitudes and perceptions of students with regard to the ways the English language has been taught in the EFL classroom have been made, but only a few of these studies have been discussed. Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz (2011) examined the attitudes of high-ability and low-ability students with regard to the use of the L2 in English classes in Iran at the pre-university level. The results of the observations and interviews revealed that high and low ability students both have similar attitudes; they support the idea that one minute spent using the L1 means that they experience one minute less exposure to the L2. For example, students in Iran learn English by focusing on the L2, with little use of the L1 (p.139). These results are similar to the findings of Mahmoudi & Amirkhiz (2011) which indicated that the L1 should be avoided in interaction in the English language classroom. On the other hand, an investigation of the attitudes towards first language use in English classes among Japanese students, conducted by Saito and Ebsworth (2004, as cited in Sharaeai, 2012) established that using the L1 was advantageous for EFL students. As a result, Japanese students in EFL classes preferred Japanese teachers who spoke and understood their first language and were able to provide explanations of both ideas and the vocabulary in Japanese.

Translanguaging

Translanguaging originally originated in Wales, where the term was penned by Williams (1994) to describe a well-known process in bilingual education whereby students gain in one language (English) and produce in another language (Welsh). This engages students by providing them with information in one language and questioning them to provide a chunk of written or oral in another language. Scholars took to the idea and now promote this concept as a useful element to be included as part of the bilingual education system for teaching children in the 21st century. This educational system particularly encourages language learning through meaning and comprehension.

A number of scholars have been developed translanguaging. Baker (2003, 2006) was the primary who translated the Welsh term as translanguaging and then García (2009) extended Williams' original definition. García (2009) investigated translanguaging in bilingual children context, mostly L1 speakers from Spanish-speaking homes who live in the United States. García argued in favor of moving away from the model of two separate languages and recommended a new model for bilingual students, the idea that they have one, larger linguistic repertoire at their disposal. As a consequence, students should be flexible in order to draw from their multi-language repertoire to meet complex communicative needs. Translanguaging can also be effective in terms of achieving proficiency in both their native language and English.

Cummins (2008) provided the following definition of bilingual education: "the use of two (or more) languages of instruction at some point in a student's school career" (p. xii). García, Skutnabb-Kangas, and Torres-Guzman (2006) defined a multilingual school as one that "exerts educational effort that takes into account and builds further on the diversity of languages and literacy practices that children and youth bring to school" (p. 14). In other

words, this approach requires going on the far side of the acceptance or tolerance of languages toward the 'cultivation' of languages for the purposes of teaching and learning.

Using Translanguaging as a Resource

Bilingual education plays a central role in English language learning and teaching in Thailand. While Thai is still the language of instruction in the majority of educational institutions in Thailand, the Thai Minister of Education has encouraged students to study English through the promotion of 'bilingual education.' Furthermore, it is widely believed that bilingual education programs may be used to help students with limited English language proficiency to keep up with their required academic competencies, including history, math, and science, while learning English through ESL instruction. Based on research by Collier and Thomas (n.d), bilingual programs provide the best results. Collier and Thomas found that students in two-way bilingual programs (for example, bilingual students and native-English speakers learning in two languages within the same classroom) out-performed their mainstream peers. Furthermore, they also indicated that bilingual teaching programs transitioned their students into beginning to think in another language into the thought within three years.

Cummins (2005) defined the clarification system for the separation of language instruction as being related to the occurrence of monolingual educational approaches in schools, institutions, and universities. He illustrated the assumptions made by these approaches, as follows:

"Instruction should be carried out exclusively in the target language without recourse to the students' L1 [first language]".

"Translation between L1 and L2 [second language] has no place in the teaching

of language or literacy. The encouragement of translation in L2 teaching is

viewed as a reversion to the discredited grammar/translation method ... or

concurrent translation method".

Taken from Hélot, Ó Laoire, 2011, & Poza, 2014 as

cited from Velasco, P. & García, O. 2014.

"Within L2 immersion and bilingual/dual language programs, the two languages

should be kept rigidly separate: They constitute "two solitudes" (p. 588).

Translanguaging is often confused with code-switching. Code-switching can be

defined as a strategy adopted by bilingual speakers that requires the use of two languages,

both intrasentential and intersentential (Cook, 2001). Although translanguaging may include

some aspects of code-switching, it goes beyond it by drawing from a different linguistic

system that does not clearly fit into one of the traditional languages of nations and textbooks.

Translanguaging is concerned with an exceedingly versatile approach to using a linguistic

repertoire for the purpose of gaining new information, developing new skills, and enhancing

language practice. Translanguaging is significant in terms of teaching potential bilingual

speakers as it allows them to choose the aspects that best work for them at the time and

allows them to participate in situations they would usually be somewhat excluded from.

Thus, translanguaging increases such speakers' levels of confidence as well as their language

skills. It conjointly capitalizes on their strengths, such as the abilities they're getting, instead

of focusing on their weaknesses, thereby minimizing potential feelings of alienation.

García (2007) preferred the term 'translanguaging' (p. xii) to code-switching to

explain the normal and usual practice of "bilingualism without diglossic functional

separation" in classrooms in New York (p. xiii). Lemke (2002) claimed: "It is not at all

obvious that if they were not politically prevented from doing so, 'languages' would not mix and dissolve into one another, but we understand almost nothing of such processes." Further adding, "Could it be that all our current pedagogical methods, in fact, make multilingual development more difficult than it need be, simply because we bow to dominant political and ideological pressures to keep 'languages' pure and separate?" (p. 85).

Translanguaging is able to provide a "voice to those who do not speak" (García 2014a, p. 115). However, Kano (2013), in her Ph.D. thesis, stated that translanguaging involves simultaneous shifts in modes, in other words, a shift between understanding and creation; for example, among the four language skills of reading and writing, listening and speaking. Therefore, the ability of teachers to be able to manage movements between student–students to follow the discourse for achieving the learning objectives and for social purposes toward involving the whole class in the teacher–student interaction is essential for second language classroom interactional competence experience.

Pedagogical Implications Using L1 and L2 in the Thai Context

In the Thai context, L1 is used as a medium of instruction in the EFL classroom in order to teach grammar rules and for practicing reading comprehension. However, this may not be fully effective for encouraging Thai students' ability to communicate in English. On the contrary, many Thai students are well-equipped with understanding the grammar rules and reading skills, but they lack sufficient opportunity to interact in English with only a limited time in class provided for doing so. For that reason, students need more opportunities to interact in English conversation for the negotiation of meaning in English. In this way, both teachers and students will use L1 to ask and answer unclear questions, for instance, regarding the grammar rules and translation in reading comprehension. In order to use L2, both teachers and students would use English when giving instructions and presentations.

Interactional Competence in Second Language Acquisition

The fundamental issues in second language acquisition include learning and acquiring (Krashen and Terrell, 1983; Schmidt, 1990, Ellis, 1994). They also concern the process of language learning, which encompasses numerous approaches and methods in language teaching (Foley, 2012). The effect of instruction is another factor affecting L2 learning (Vygotsky, 1978, cited in Lantolf, 2002). The relevant second language acquisition concepts cover three aspects, namely the zone of proximal development, collaborative learning, and scaffolding.

Second language acquisition (SLA) means a language learners learned as an additional language after picking up their first language (L1) and includes both naturalistic and tutored acquisition. SLA also refers to all aspects of the language that L2 learners acquire (syntax, morphology, phonology, pragmatic knowledge). It is typically set in the environment of the language needed to be learned. Children absorb a language through the process of learning with formal structured situations or conscious settings. SLA also implies language acquisition and language learning. Acquisition refers to studying a second language through exposure to linguistic communication use, once learners have learned how to focus on meaning rather than form and so the process is more subconscious. Meanwhile, learning is the conscious study of a second language. Therefore, second language acquisition is defined as "the subconscious and conscious processes by which a language other than the mother tongue is learned in a natural or a tutored setting." For instance, Thai children whose family uses bilingual language (e.g., Thai and English at home) would acquire Thai as their first language, while they would pick up English as an additional language. SLA has some benefits in that children or learners will ultimately gain more than one language. Furthermore, the sequence of developing language is best in the silent period where a child acquires language in a natural environment without explicit teaching. This means, in the

silent period is a natural way for a child to pick up SAL through hearing and exposure. On the other hand, SLA might be interfered with by the first language. To sum up, it is clear that age can be a major factor in the acquisition of second language acquisition.

In the language learning process, interaction plays a crucial role in language acquisition. To acquire language, the essential steps in the learning process are: input, process (interaction), and output. According to Long (1983) and Swain (1982), SLA can be developed through classroom interaction. Long (1983b) stated that interaction is very important, not only because it provides non-native speakers with a chance to receive input, but also an opportunity to create intelligible communication through negotiation and to switch their speech to another language when interacting with another speaker to try and make their output more understood in order that to ensure their output can be more understood. Regarding this point, Pica, Holliday, Lewis, and Morgenthaler (1989) identified other ways to discuss interaction, which is with an interlocutor, who could assist the learner to understand unacquainted L2 input. They supposed that through the discussion learners would have increased opportunities to provide new statements. Learners would be able to negotiate meaning in the new language to form input that would be a lot more understandably if students had more opportunities to use the target language, such as through partaking in greater interactions. This suggests that changing speech to accomplish comprehensible input and output can support greater levels of language acquisition. Gass and Varonis (1994) outlined how a number of studies have supported the connection between interaction and acquisition, showing that comprehensible input and output modification leads to greater interaction. Moreover, Vygotsky (1978) also believed that knowledge occurs through the interaction process, which he saw as primarily a social process. In the same way, Hellermann (2007) indicated that interactional competence could be reviewed as the relationship between

language use and context. The discussion now turns to consider how interactional

competence is used in a socio-cultural theory.

Socio-cultural Theory

In the classroom, Vygotsky's socio-cultural theories are used in various

instructional strategies. Vygotsky's three principles of the zone of proximal development

(ZPD), scaffolding, and collaborative learning can be considered and applied in any

language-learning activity.

Zone of proximal development

Vygotsky (1978), a cognitive psychologist, proposed a theory of learning

development known as the zone of proximal development (ZPD). Vygotsky (1978) developed

the notion of the ZPD in order to show how the role of more skillful individuals, either

teachers or peers, is indispensable to language learners. In his definition of ZPD, he stated:

"The distance between the actual developmental level as determined by

independent problem solving and the level of potential development as

determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration

with peers." (p. 86)

He explains the learning development occurring under three aspects, as shown in Figure 2.1,

which presents three circles addressing the different aspects of children's learning progress.

The inner circle represents the aspects that the learners or a child can do by themselves. It is a

zone where the learners or a child have the potential to perform a task alone. The outer circle

emphasizes the boundaries of the possible ability of the learners or a child to accomplish a

task with help or through interaction with an adult/teacher/or other more experienced persons.

This aspect is where the ZPD is located. The outward circle focuses on how the learners or a

child have less ability to achieve the task alone. This zone signals the difficult things that

learners still cannot overcome by themselves or even with others' assistance. This is the idea

for the learning process in the social aspect, the professionals and specialists interact in order

to solve issues.

Figure 2.1 Zone of proximal development, Source adapted from Vygotsky's (1978) model

In the zone of proximal development, Vygotsky (1978) stated that learner's

learning takes place inside the ZPD. It concerns the difference between what a learner can do

by themself without any guidance and what a learner can do with help; specifically learner's

level-up autonomous problem-solving ability may be quite different from what he or she

could learn or achieve with the guidance and assistance of teachers, peers, fathers, mothers,

or parents (Birch, 1997, pp. 80–82). This means that a teacher can employ the ZPD to

encourage and build a gap between learners who have the ability to do a thing alone and

learners who cannot perform the same task, even with assistance.

Furthermore, Vygotsky (1978) maintained that learners' comprehension is

encouraged by the activities' method, such as classroom interaction, discussion, and practice,

which need to be carried out outside and inside classrooms. Knowledge is social in

personality and built through a practice of collaboration, specifically interaction and

communication within social contexts and backgrounds (see Wertsch et al., 1995; Donato,

2000; Roebuck, 2000; Poehner & Lantolf, 2005; Tusting, 2005; Brooks, 2009; Swain et al.,

2011). Albers et al. (2008) disagreed that the engagement in the ZPD was needed for learners

to gain knowledge, while Brooks and Swain (2009) mentioned that ZPD is developed through

social interaction. As a result, the ZPD's conceptualization in this study may extend to the

teacher and students interaction as a potential way of exploring the classroom interactional

competence by EFL teachers, as shown in Figure 2.2.

 Scaffolding instruction and collaborative learning are also key points discussed in

the present study as they are part of the process of innovative teaching and learning.

Figure 2.2 A dynamic process of ZPD for classroom application adapted from Vygotsky

(1978)

Scaffolding

 As examined in the past section, ZPD is an approach to train a learner's ability

to figure out learning and to become more accomplished in finding out the solution in

authentic situations. Subsequently, scaffolding is an appropriate practice to support such an

approach and is hence closely related to the zone of proximal development, where each

concept informs the other. Wood *et al.* (1976) defined scaffolding as "an interactional role

between learners and teachers while providing help related to the assigned tasks or problems,

and learners' problem-solving skill is highly expected after the use of this technique" (p. 98). The assistance may even take the form of a guideline, facilitation, or alternate suggestions (Chang et al., 2002).

In language learning, Raymond (2000) a scholar in linguistics, pointed out that the comprehension to gain or pick up information and knowledge in scaffolding or social interaction supports gaining a new perception (p. 176). Olson and Pratt (2000) recommend that scaffolding guidance ought to bring in new assignments further than learners' actual ability level to assert that they cannot achieve them alone by themselves, and this conveys them toward the ZPD. Scaffolding features and activities have been studied by a number of scholars; for instance, Bransford et al., McKenzie, and Wood et al. The framework for scaffolding features and activities is applied in the study in the following way.

The teachers use questions to guide learners or problems in a real situation to gain learners' attention, encouraging small group discussions as a form of socialization to give all participants a similar knowledge objective to define the learning goal. Then, the teacher explains to the learners what they need to do to accomplish the goal in a step-by-step way to simplify the activities' directions. The teacher would then observe the learners' difficulties and give advice if necessary and to reduce learners' frustration. Moreover, the teacher should give feedback on learners' work to check both the teacher and learners' thoughts about further development. Also, the teacher would supports learners' learning, such as by suggesting sources of information. An example of this is teacher 'repair,' whereby learners are asked to explain or a teacher self-selects a learner when there is no volunteer from the learners. In this process, the teacher builds on what the learner knows about language and then seeks to extend that knowledge.

However, there are some disadvantages to scaffolding, including it may be time-consuming in terms of meeting the individual interests of individual learner; the challenges of

implementing tasks in a large-sized class; the requirements for teacher training; teacher

ignorance of class control and the errors made by learners; and limited applications in

specific lessons. However, it is a worthwhile strategy to promote active learning due to the

fact that the full engagement of the learners is required in order to complete the tasks.

Moreover, as the students become aware of their valuable potentiality once they can complete

tasks, it provides them with encouragement and reduces negative attitudes toward

overcoming other difficult tasks.

Collaborative learning

Collaborative learning is one of the primary systems that can build an

appropriate learning atmosphere for ESL students to promote positive social interaction. One

of the advantages of collaborative learning is that it allows ESL students to adjust to

academic and social demands. Another advantage of collaborative learning is that it allows

students to work simultaneously effectively, regardless of their race, language, or appearance.

Collaborative small-group or pair-work instruction offers students opportunities to clarify,

investigate, and internalize ideas through peer interaction. According to Coelho (1994), this

kind of classroom discussion encourages learners to increase higher-level thinking skills

through the analysis, evaluation, synthesis, and application of new information.

Vygotsky (1978) perceived peer interaction as an effective way to develop English language

skills and strategies. He recommended the use of collaborative learning exercises, in which

less competent children are assisted by their more competent peers, that is, for those in the

zone of proximal development. He claimed that when a student is in the zone of proximal

development, they should be provided with appropriate assistance for a particular task, which

may provide the student with enough of a boost to complete that task.

Vygotsky's (1978) socio-cultural theory provides a deep understanding of the development process through the interaction between professionals and novices. In this study, the focus is on how student–student interaction competence is developed and teacher–student interaction occurs. Through the phenomenon of the zone of proximal development (ZPD), scaffolding and collaborative learning are the interaction processes that could possibly help develop interactional competence. The discussion above presents a critical view of interactional competence in the socio-cultural theories of education and learning. In the next section, the conversational analysis approach to investigate interactional competence in classroom discourse is presented.

Conversational Analysis (CA)

Conversational analysis (CA) is an approach that agrees with naturally occurring information and rejects approaching data with any assumptions. It underlies the social context does not relate to statistics but relevant to the language used by the participant.

Conversational Analysis or CA is an appropriate means of the study for many reasons. According to Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, (1974), CA is a methodology for analyzing a broad range of speech exchange systems that are collectively known as talk-in-interaction. Generally, information is exposed to a fine-grained successive analysis based on an innovative way of translation. In addition to successive analysis, coding approaches have also been used recently for determining repeated styles. The use of coding in conversational analysis, however; is inquired as for an appropriate way of analysis by some.

CA is also selected over other methods of research such as discourse analysis (DA) for its capability to look into the procedure of linked discourse. It is a method that gives understanding into how individuals perform in the success of their daily matters both in common and institutional configurations (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). It also

provides the specialist with a set of specific techniques of how to approach the information inside.

Some proponents of CA provide some overlook of CA. Have (2007) says, "what CA tries to do is to explicate the inherent theories-in-use of members' practices as lived orders, rather than trying to order the world external by applying a set of traditionally available concepts, or invented variations thereof." (p.31) He summarizes the main features of CA approaches. First, CA looks carefully at the information with special attention given to the fact connections showed by specific records. Other methods, on the other hand, use coded or described information. CA does not choose trial information. On the opposite, it functions with normally sourced information "because it considers talk-in-interaction as a 'situated achievement' rather than as a product of personal intentions" (p.9).

Hutchby and Wooffit, (1998) justifying the significance of CA stating "talk is a central activity in social life". He considered the significance of everything in a talk in interactional that produced. It is not just speaker's information transferring or knowledge and conveying messages to other speakers but the talk is considered as "a joint orientation on the part of the participants who use interactional procedures and resources to accomplish social actions and achieve mutual understanding." Consequently, Barraja-Rohan, (2013) states that CA is not about testing and confirming hypotheses, although about uncovering how participants co-construct meaning and actions and what mechanisms underlie the procedures and methods employed by conversationalists.

Conversational Analysis in the Classroom Context

CA also explores talk in different settings, for instance;

"in medical, legal, political, pedagogical, media, aviation, emergency services, commercial contexts, etc. Thus various other forms of talk-in-

interaction are studied such as interviews, talkback radio programs,

business meetings, classroom interactions, medical interactions,

psychotherapy interactions, service calls, emergency calls, cockpit talk, and

internet chat-rooms".

Taken from Barraja-Rohan, 2013

The reason of CA methodology in a classroom context is to represent the courses in which setting is made for and by the participants in relation to the goal-oriented activity in which the teacher and students are engaged (Heritage, 1997, p.163).

Moreover, the advantage of using CA is its main focus on the interaction. Goffman (1983), proposes that CA, as an approach to the study of social action from sociolinguistics, focuses on variation in language (such as accent and dialect). On the other hand, Markee (2000) argues for the use of CA in SLA. He argues that CA is not suitable for learning theory or a method to assess long-term processes. Meanwhile, Walsh (2002, 2006) maintains that "understanding the interaction inside the classroom makes easier to create opportunities for learning." The most characteristics of spoken language interaction are presented in the following section.

Characteristics of Spoken Language Interaction in Conversational Analysis

Many researchers have conducted conversational analysis through video-recording or transcribing audio. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1977) used the method based on a sequential turn-taking mechanism of conversations.

Turn-taking

Turn-taking is a foundational study in conversation analysis (CA). According to

Sacks et al. (1974), turn-taking is considered as a tool for conversational analysis, described as being "locally managed, party-administered, interactionally controlled, and sensitive to recipient design" (p. 696). Turn-taking can be defined as "the process of how people take turns in conversation" (Burns, Joyce, & Gollin, 1996, p. 18). The focus in the analysis is on the ways in which the participants in an interaction hold turns, pass turns, and use this process to get in and out of a talk. On the other hand, if people do not want to take a turn, they may use also backchannel responses, such as, *mm, yeah, right, really,* to indicate that they do not wish to participate (McCarthy, 2002, p. 27). Turn-taking may also vary as a result of socio-cultural factors. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) stated that turn-taking can be constructed out of units, which widely communicate to linguistic types, for instance, sentences, clauses, single words (for instance, 'Hey!' or 'What?') or phrases (pp. 49–50).

According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), the three very basic facts about conversation turn-taking follow the way that one speaker tends to talk at a time, and turns are taken with as little gap or overlap between them as possible (p. 47). Walsh (2012) found that interactional competence demonstrated by turn-taking considered interrupt, hold, and pass turns. In terms of interruption, the speaker may not finish the talk as the listener wants to interrupt during the talk. This means that the speaker (he/she) wants to convey the message before they forget or before it's too late. Hold turn can be defined as keeping the conversation going. In order to keep the conversation going, the speaker holds the turn because he/she cannot think of what to say or speak at that time. Moreover, the speaker stops talking and let others speak or take a turn to carry on the conversation or until they have finished the talk. Stenstrom (1994) stated that holding the turn means to carry on talking. It occurs when the speaker cannot manage or when they hold the turns all the time since it is not easy to plan what to say and speak at the same time, so they may have to stop discussing and start replanning half-way through the turn (p. 75). A passed turn can mean that the speaker has

nothing to say or think of. So they passes the turn to another speaker by e.g., calling another speaker's name or by using a question to ask the next speaker or to ask for more information.

Repair

The study of repair has also been extended to the analysis of interactions involving L2 speakers. Cook (1989) discussed how participants in an interaction can make corrections through repair, either on their own initiative (self-repair) or may be required by the other participants (other-repair) (p. 55). Have (2007) defined repair as a way of dealing with problems in the interaction, for instance, a misunderstanding or mishearing. The aspect of repair has numerous sources and types, as well as a different trajectory to other approaches. However, this factor depends on the context, such as who initiated and who is carrying out the conversation. Linguistics focus on utterances in need of repair and has a preference for the organization, which also depends on the context. For example, other-initiated and self-repair is the most preferred combination, while other-initiated and other-repaired is the least preferred method. Shegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) stated that the most preferred type of correction is self-correction, while another-correction is the more typical; they also argued that this is particularly so in an adult–child conversation (p. 381).

Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) defined conversational repairs as strategies used by students for resolving miscommunication problems involving speaking, hearing, and understanding. Drew (1997) suggested that "self-repair is also a mechanism of remedying mistakes in conversation" (p. 96). Research on repair has identified a variety of repair strategies, namely self-initiation, self-repair; other-initiation, self-repair; other initiation, other repairs; repetition; paraphrase; confirmation checks; clarification requests; and comprehension checks (Schegloff et al., 1977; Schegloff, 2000; Nagano, 1997 & Drew, 1997). Moreover, Walsh (2012), as cited by Firth (1996), in reference to "the 'let it pass'

principle, stated that, in many business contexts where English is used as a lingua franca, interactants largely ignore errors unless an error causes a problem for understanding.

Overlap and interruption

In the field of sociolinguistics, overlaps have been paid much attention when investigating turn-taking. Sacks et al. (1974) believed that overlaps happen "by competing self-selectors for a next turn, (…) when each projects his or her start to be the earliest possible start at some possible transition relevance place (TRP), producing simultaneous starts" (pp. 706–707) (ibid,). McCarthy (2003) referred to overlaps "as good 'listenership': they signal to a speaker that she has been understood, that the channels are open and that the communication is working well." As Wynn (1995) summarized: "Most researchers think that an interruption involves some sort of simultaneous [overlapping] speech. The additional criteria seem to vary, however" (p. 75). Nonetheless, not all overlaps are interruptions in verbal interaction. For instance, "backchannels cannot be regarded as interruptions because they do not disrupt the topic or claim the floor" (James & Clarke, 1993).

Overlaps and interruptions are necessary for an interaction and can help to prevent communication problems and breakdowns from occurring. Minimal responses act as indicators of active listenership and interest in the topic development and build a sense of co-participation in the interaction that is necessary to provide support to the current speaker (Coates, 1990; Hannah and Murachver, 1999; & Tzanne, 2001). More often than not, the use of minimal responses encourages the current speaker to continue their turn developing the topic further (Zimmerman & West, 1975), also promoting a good rapport among the interactants. As a deliberate strategy, overlaps give critical clues to speakers that they are being understood and that something is being communicated.

Topic management

To begin an analysis of the discourse topic, one must establish the topic as

a framework for the data. Studies on topic management in spoken language have exposed

different strategies in how topics are raised, dropped, developed, changed, and diverted

(Kramarae et al, 1983, p. 287). Walsh (2012) stated that topic management is a key indicator

of the coherence of a piece of spoken interaction, which includes: topic management and

development. According to Fishman, (1983), and West and Zimmerman, (1983) the

supportive interaction work and the topics raised by males in cross-sex conversations is an

exhibition of male dominance over women (pp. 89-90 & p.107). As in Coates' (1990) study,

the participants supported and developed topics by asking the speaker questions which not

only showed their interest in the topic but also invited the speaker to tell more about what

was under discussion.

Related Research in CIC

Many previous researchers have studied classroom interactional and interactional

competence. The following related research studies use the same framework.

Bosch (2004) presents a quantitative investigation of the turn-taking component

as confirmed in 93 phone discourses taken from a 9-million-word Spoken Dutch Corpus. The

outcomes demonstrated that speakers adjusted their turn-taking conduct in line with the

questioner's behavior. Besides, the outcomes demonstrated that male–male exchanges

involved a higher proportion of overlapping turns than female–female discourses.

Du-Babcock's 2006 study re-examined the earlier published framework of Du-

Babcock (1999) by analyzing the topic management patterns and turn-taking behaviors of 10

additional groups of Hong Kong bilingual Chinese businessmen in their first- and second-

language decision-making meetings. Whereas eight of the 10 additional groups matched Du-

Babcock's earlier findings, two groups did not follow the original findings, and the author offered new reasons for such a result. The new findings revealed that the meeting participants would investigate the troublesome issues in their first-language meetings, thus illustrating their strategic discomfort for interactive second-language exchange with complex issues. The topic management pattern in the English meetings was the composition of second-language proficiency of the group members' international business communication.

Cekaite (2007) investigated a youngster's advancement of interactional skill in a Swedish L2 classroom. The examinations uncovered systematic changes in the learner's interactional engagements. A transaction of language aptitudes and turn-taking abilities affected the young learner's interest in multiparty talk amid three timeframes, casting the learner as: (1) a silent child, (2) a noisy and loud child, and as (3) a skillful student.

Skuse (2012) investigated how repair sequences and their subsequent discourse within a task do or do not support the current probability for learning; specifically, how members of the classroom orient to particular roles and identities inside the talk-in-interaction to facilitate studying and to promote the classroom as a place for learning. Finally, the research investigated the dynamic and complex nature of language classroom discourse. The results showed that repair and other side sequences and their subsequent discourse within a task generally provide an opportunity for negotiation for meaning and modified input, which by extension, presents an opportunity for language learning; that expert/novice, teacher/student identity dichotomies are oriented during the project to aid in the mastering process; that the collaborative nature of classroom discourse provides a lot of opportunities for learning, and that turns within the discourse may feature concurrently on a wide variety of levels and facilitate both the forming and renewing of the language classroom context. The research also suggested that conversation analysis (CA) can add to our understanding of the social nature of second language acquisition (SLA).

Krug (2011) investigated English students' interactions in a conversation room within an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) institution in Japan regarding the use of CA techniques. In particular, Krug examined short video excerpts of small-group discussions carried out between intermediate level EFL learners. The focus was on the turn-taking practices displayed. In particular, this investigation uncovered how the interactants self-selected so as to become the next speaker. This paper demonstrated that, in spite of linguistic difficulties, language students can make capable utilization of verbal and non-verbal interactional resources to participate in social interaction.

Ibrahim (2012) examined the impact of classroom communication in the second language (L2) educating and learning of English language educators in the UAE. He found that classroom interaction encourages SLA and the appropriate treatment of input amid cooperation emphatically influences SLA. Besides, he proposed that proper patterns of classroom interaction not only contribute to L2 adaption but in addition, positively inspire the students from them having participated in the learning procedure and shown improvement. Maulana, Opdenakker, Stroet, and Bosker (2012) examined teacher–student communication in an Indonesian setting. Their findings uncovered that Indonesian educators spent most of their time addressing the classroom. There was not really any collaboration with students. Most instructors indicated little familiarity with their students' learning procedure and did not give careful consideration to mistakes and misconceptions.

Barraja-Rohan (2013) studied the second language interactional competence of international students in Australia using CA. The findings showed that to develop second language interactional competence, key conditions should be met: (1) introduction to communication, (2) active listening-in-interaction, which includes orienting to the co-conversationalist(s), (3) creating activity sequences involving turn expansions, for example,

extended reactions to questions and storytelling, (4) starting extraordinary and new actions, and (5) having an ongoing social relation with a specialist speaker.

Young (2013) examined interactional competence in academic English conversation. The resources included rhetorical script, the register of the practice, the turn-taking system, management of topics, the participation framework, and means for signaling boundaries and transitions. He argued that knowledge and interactional skill are local and practice-specific and that the joint construction of discursive practice includes participants making use of the resources that they had gained in past instance of undertaking similar practice.

Suryati (2015) studied the interaction strategies used by teachers in English language teaching (ELT) at lower secondary level in Indonesia. She stated that the most frequent strategies were initiation response feedback (IRF) patterns, display questions, teacher echo, and extended teacher turns, while students' use of extended turns were rare. With the results, she argued that in order to improve the Indonesian ELT, there was a need to provide an alternative to ELT classroom interaction.

Doehler and Berger (2016) investigated second language (L2) interactional competence and its improvement over time by zooming into a conversational activity that is pervasive in our social lives: storytelling. The findings proposed that the advancement of L2 interactional competence centrally depends on a speaker's expanded capacity to configure talk in a way for it to be attended to and comprehended by others, and for it to convey context-sensitive conduct based on both sequential and semantic resources.

Faizah and Kurniawan's 2016 research highlighted two aspects of turn-taking: interruption and overlap, and their frequency in male–female discussions in the television show Mata Najwa. The methodology utilized in this investigation was CA proposed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974). The results demonstrated that female speakers used

interruption and overlap more than male speakers. The results likewise uncovered that competitive interruption was frequently used by female speakers and that noncompetitive overlaps prevailed in discussions.

Watanabe (2016) investigated a novice student's development of interactional competence in English as a foreign language based on data collected over a 4-year period at an after-school English program in Japan. Utilizing CA, the study focused on how a student creates techniques to participate in the multiparty classroom interaction. The participants in this study were an experienced English instructor and nine students who attended the class once a week. The utilization of appropriate language choice, turn-taking strategies, and going up against various social roles and patterns of participation, exhibited the student's expanding L2 interactional ability.

Sundari (2017) examined the interaction in a language classroom in a foreign language setting in Indonesia. Interviews, as the major research instrument, were conducted with 20 experienced English language instructors from eight lower secondary schools (SMP) in Jakarta, complemented by focus group discussions and class observation/recordings. Classroom interaction could be comprehended against the background of a number of interrelated components: interaction practices, instructors and learners factors, learning objectives, materials, classroom settings, and external settings, encompassing the interaction practices. A model of interaction for the language classroom was created that could give a strikingly profound portrayal on how considerable interaction happens in a foreign language classroom at a lower secondary school from an instructor's points of view.

Mestriani, Seken, and Putra's (2018) research aimed to identify, describe, and clarify communication strategies used by an English native speaker teacher at Dyatmika Kindergarten in Indonesia during English sessions as part of the educating and learning process. This investigation used a descriptive qualitative design, and information was

gathered through observation and interview. The recorded data were analyzed using the taxonomy of communication strategies by Dornyei and Scott (1995). The results revealed there were 13 communication strategies used by the English native speaker teacher in the teaching and learning process. The use of communication strategies by the English native speaker teacher was relied upon to inspire other teachers inside and outside Dyatmika Kindergarten when they speak with students and to help ensure their students can comprehend the messages passed on to them by their educators.

Conversational Analysis in Interactional Competence (IC)

The practice of CA in language classroom discourse is getting popular. It has been encouraged by key CA concepts nevertheless; no CA analyst has summarized IC in a single definition because interactional phenomena "are discoverable matters" (Psathas, 1995) and it is not the aim of pure CA to give it a definition. On the other hand, an important element that appears in this definition is the notion that an individual's IC is variable and this is exemplified to show; where it shows that Akiko's L2 IC can vary between the L1 speaker and her L2 speaker friend (p.5). Also of interest is that IC brings to light the participants' identity, which has been demonstrated by work conducted in CA (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). Young (2003) made another key point in his definition that IC is not situated in an individual's mind, and it cannot be reduced to an intrapsychological state, a point that Kasper and Wagner (2011) concur with. In other words, IC does not arise from each individual's ability to employ interactional and linguistic resources but emerges from joint management of these resources by the participants involved or a "shared knowledge of procedure and practice" (Hellermann, 2008a, 2008, p.102). Moreover, IC varies for the individual participant, since it depends on his/her co-participants and on different interactional practices.

This point is reinforced by Kasper and Wagner (2011) who state that IC cannot be isolated from the performance.

The limitations of CA approach is it cannot be generalized which is relevant to the statement of Markee (2000). In comparing CA and other approaches, for example; CA and Ethnomethodology (EM), many researchers agree CA emerged from EM of Harold Garfinkel (1967), however; nowadays it has departed from that and separated and become independent (Maynard & Clayman, 2003). This is because EM emphasizes on how people deal with everyday orders whereas CA focuses on a naturally occurring social action. Another approach is CA and Discourse Analysis (DA), according to Levinson (1983) the difference between CA and DA is that DA is mainly linguistics approach by looking at a set of basic categories and formulating rules that are stated in order to divide that into well-formed and ill-formed sequences whilst CA is mainly from sociology and look at talk-in-interaction. Levinson (1983) further suggested that the most important that DA lacks is the ability to handle the interaction of more than two people who are engaged in a goal-oriented conversation. Therefore, CA is considered well suited in this study to examine interactional competence in a natural classroom setting where the goals are on interaction in a relation between language use and educational purpose. In the next section will turn to interactional competence in the classroom.

Classroom Interactional Competence

Classroom verbal interaction can be created in sociolinguistic situations (Cazden, 1988) that enhance communication in the classroom and group discussion (Hall & Verplaetse, 2000), in which the activities of the classroom contribute to learners' language advancement. Walsh (2012) mentioned that learners or speakers with different abilities and competencies in spoken interaction may utilize variety to clarify their thoughts and

expression in order to improve language communication. Hall and Verplaetse (2000) performed a survey of studies based on the range of classroom collaboration and language and found that interactive processes are not entirely individual or identical across over learners and circumstances; language learning is a social activity, mutually developed, and naturally connected to learners' rehashing what they have heard and utilizing it by taking part in classroom activities.

Classroom interaction (CI) is particularly important in the aspect of the teaching and learning process because it gives students the opportunity to develop oral fluency in English (Suryati, 2015), both socially and academically (Beyazkurk & Kesner, 2005). CI normally occurs in a second or foreign language class that includes teachers' instruction, students' participation in a whole class discussion, and pair-work or group discussion, as well as in teacher–student interaction in an assignment.

In Ellis' study (1990), the term "classroom interaction" was used to include everything that happens in the classroom that involves communication and was defined broadly to refer "… not only to those exchanges involving authentic communication but to every oral exchange that occurs in the classroom, including those that arise in the course of formal drilling" (Ellis, 1990, p.12). Rivers, on the other hand, argued that "… through interaction, students can increase their language store as they listen to or read authentic linguistic material, or even the output of their fellow students in discussions, skits, joint problem-solving tasks, or dialogue journals. In interaction, students can use all they possess of the language – all they have learned or casually absorbed – in real life exchanges …" (Rivers, 1987, pp. 4–5)

In the field of classroom interaction and language learning, the relationship between learners and teachers is one of the most popular topics in the areas of both the classroom and second language acquisition research (Wu, 1998, cited in Khamwan, 2007).

Two types of classroom interaction have been identified, namely, teacher–student and student–student. Numerous studies on the topic of classroom interaction have focused on the spoken language of teacher–student (Hassaskhah, 2013; Pennings, 2014).

Several scholars have different perspectives on classroom interaction (CI), which relate to the patterns of verbal and non-verbal communication and the types of social relationships that occur within classrooms, such as described by Richards, Platt, and Platt (1992). In brief, classroom interaction is the process in which the teacher and student communicate in the classroom.

Classrooms Interaction of the Teacher-Student Type

Many scholars have highlighted the significance of effective classroom interaction strategies to support students' language development. Kramsch (1986) claimed that in order to achieve communicative competence, students must be given opportunities to interact with both students and teachers through asking for clarification, initiating communication, receiving feedback, and turn-taking. Rivers (1987) disagreed, arguing that to support students' communicative competence in the effective classroom interaction, teachers should keep away from dominating one-way talk and should encourage two-way talk and consider each student's emotional variables, while Mackey (1999) emphasized the importance of students' active participation in classroom interaction. Clearly, teachers need to construct the classroom environment to be conducive to more active participation in order to create more conversation and to allow students to join in active classroom interaction through turn-taking, feedback, clarification requests, and negotiation, thereby allowing students the opportunity to produce the target language.

Within the classroom, the teacher regularly asks students' questions and students reply to the questions or the teacher will get the students to take part in learning activities.

These parts are called teacher–student interactions. Normally, this interaction happens between the teacher and the class and/or a student in person. Within the conventional classroom, the teacher usually sits or stands behind the work area or desk and spends most their time addressing the class and giving instructions, while the students sit, tune in, and take notes latently. The center of interaction is overwhelmingly between the teacher and students. The interaction is, as a rule, started and controlled by the teacher. The role of the teacher is to take the lead and dominate in terms of the talking time and the running of the lesson. The teacher manages the subject for the classroom talking, and decides when to begin and stop talking within the classroom (Tsui, 1995; Cazden, 1988).

The interaction starts with the teacher reviewing what has already been taught, and he or she introduces the new lesson, explains the answers to any problematic issues, and clarifies any advanced requests and activities throughout the lesson. At the end of the lesson, the teacher summarizes the new lesson studied and gives some feedback. This shows that the teacher is central to the classroom interaction, while the students are passive listeners. Sometimes, students are asked to participate only by answering questions for which the teacher already knows the answers. They do not even have time to raise queries and thus continually depend on the teacher's directions and cannot solve several issues. According to Chaudron (1988), teacher talks make up the most important proportion of classroom talk and represents roughly the most common part of the discourse in each L1 and L2 classroom. The findings of a study of teacher–student interaction conducted by Musumeci (1996) showed that the teacher speaking time occupies 66–72% of the lesson time. Kundu (1993) observed a similar phenomenon: "Most of the time, we talk in class, hardly ever giving our students a chance to talk, except when we occasionally ask them questions. Even on such occasions, because we insist on answers in full sentences and penalize them for their mistakes, they are always on the defensive " (Kundu, 1993, cited in Tuan, T. & Kim, T., 2010); thus, this type

of interaction doesn't clearly offer a remarkable learning atmosphere. However, teaching is often a shared-relationship job. It involves the participation from many people, as Brown (2001, p. 99) recommended: "Teacher talk should not occupy the major proportion of a class hour; otherwise, you are probably not giving students enough opportunity to talk." This is in line with the views of Harmer (1991, p. 49), who stated that, to foster learners' communicative outputs, learners ought to be engaged in communicative activities. This suggests that the teacher's intervention ought to be avoided in these activities.

A number of classroom interaction studies emphasize specific interaction strategies' for patterns of interaction; for example, teacher questions, teacher corrective feedback, teacher scaffolding, and teacher target language use (Hardman et al., 2003; Abd Kadir & Hardman, 2007; Vaish. 2008; and Wedin, 2009)). Regarding teacher–student interaction research, this covers classroom interaction for promoting or hindering specific interactional strategies and on the cultural identity of teacher–student interactions. These studies present a pattern of interaction between teachers and students using IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, 1992). The IRF pattern may dominate classroom interaction and may limit the abilities of the students to contribute in class. On the other hand, Hardman et al. (2003), Abd Kadir and Hardman (2007), and Vaish (2008) argued that the IRF pattern fails to achieve the communicative goals of English language instruction. This is because the teacher takes a major role in classroom interaction.

In common classroom settings, classroom interaction refers to teacher–student interaction, which means the teacher and students in the whole class. This means that the teacher starts the conversation and controls the class in the interaction. In relation to van Lier (1996), teacher–student interaction provides a different outcome when compared to student–student interaction for negotiation, as the researchers argued that student-initiated interactions play a significantly important role in students' initiating interactions by bidding to speak and

by calling out. The next part of this thesis will consider the classroom interaction from a student–student viewpoint.

Classrooms Interaction of the Student-Student Type

Research on classrooms interactions involving student–student interactions mostly concerns small group discussion or pair work. The studies have examined the patterns of interaction, type of tasks, and how they can promote target language production (Al-Zahrani, 2014). In this context, the teacher takes part as a monitor and/or facilitator, while the students play the major role as participants. This means that the students share ideas and information with their friends in the class together with presenting, commenting, and providing feedback to each other.

Student–student interactions occur between students. During this type of interaction, the teacher plays the role of e.g., a monitor and the students are the participants. Student–student interactions that happen in groups are called student–student interaction, while those in pairs are known as peer interaction.

In pair work and group work, several researchers assert that observation is the most helpful when administered together with small teams or peers instead of with the teacher or in a whole-class setting, especially considering that students nearly always initiate queries easier when in a small-group setting rather than when involved in whole-class activities. Open discussion in cooperative teams can build up knowledge and the clarification of concepts and views in a context free from the perpetual scrutiny of the teacher and also the wider class (Gillies, 2006). Further, learners do not depend on the teacher to be their sole interlocutor and supplied of language input (Nunan, 1992). It also offers the potential for peers to bring language models to the fore and to act with one another (Erten, 2000). Peers act as natural interlocutors, leading to the provision of a way to observe the bigger form of

models at play (Long and Porter, 1984). Peers are typically additionally more aware than academics about the issues of understanding (Gillies, 2006). In fact, collaboration in teams additionally contributes to an additional relaxed atmosphere within the classroom and lessens anxiety and inhibitions, and therefore results in a rise in both the amount and quality of the observing (Ur, 1996; Altay and Ozturk, 2004). Collaborative work typically exerts a helpful impact on task performance (Storch, 2001). Therefore, it can be concluded that collaborative observation ought to facilitate language development.

Student-student pattern is an attractive alternative to teacher-student interaction (Long and Porter (1985). Moreover, for every student in the classroom, pair work/group work facilitates students to increase the talk time (Harmer, 2001). Without the necessary guidance of the teacher this help student to work interacts independently, consequently promoting independence students learning. Furthermore, it gives teacher time to talk or work with other pairs or groups work whiles other students working. This provides the classroom environment to become more comfortable and relaxed. According to Sullivan (2000), "pair or group work is considered the most interactive way. It does not pay attention to the socio-cultural and personal experience that guide learners' behavior in the classroom. It has three value systems of choice, freedom, and equality. The reasons are that learners in pairs or groups have the right to talk freely and are also free from the teacher's control".

Several studies have focused on the effect of the number of students and the quality of classroom participation with regard to L2 achievement, but the results have been inconclusive. Long (1980) and Newton (1991) claimed that the way in which the two-way interactional conversation was performed resulted in an increased negotiation of meaning. Furthermore, Long, Adams, McLean, and Castanos (1976) maintained that students working in small groups had a higher rate of language production compared to learners working individually. This finding suggests that group work may offer further opportunities for

learners to produce language. Similarly, Rong (2000) argued that a greater quantity of interactive speech had the result of speakers exchanging utterances and the extra information contributed by the participants provided further opportunities to produce language.

Many scholars mention the importance of classroom interaction in an EFL language instruction context for various reasons. Allwright (1984) suggested that classroom interaction gives credible correspondence opportunities in the classroom. Moreover, classroom interaction offers particular approaches for learners to acquire particular language usage. Furthermore, an interaction is fundamental for language improvement and results in a cooperative exchange of information, thoughts, or the negotiation of meaning (Brown, 2000; Yules and Tarone, 1991, as cited in Khamwan, 2007). Therefore, to complete the classroom interaction, the teacher and student should also have interactional competence to raise the ability to communicate and produce language within the classroom.

Interactional Competence in Classroom

It is clear that diverse speakers have distinct levels of competence and shifting capacities to express their thoughts and to accomplish the understanding of talking interaction. According to Sun (2014), "Interactional competence differs from communicative competence in its focus on interactions from a constructivist approach to the development of spoken English—they believe that conversational competence is co-constructed by speakers involved in the conversation." Basically, an individual appears to ready to interact with others, while a few individuals appear to experience difficulty in passing on a simple conversation. If we put this into second language learning, this would make it difficult to learn and understand.

The first scholar who investigated interactional competence in teaching was Kramsch (1986). She focused on how the communication interactions of humans should be

considered in terms of collaboration, negotiation, and accommodation, whereas other researchers emphasis accuracy. Moreover, Kramsch also considered interactional competence in an intercultural framework. She defined spoken language as a complex medium of communication. "I propose (…) a push for interactional competence to give our students a truly emancipating, rather than compensating foreign language education," Kramsch (1986, p 370).

Hall (1995) examined the concept of interactive practice in the L2 classroom by focusing on conversation practice, which is conversation-repeated, goal-directed, and plays a socially cohesive role in a community. In 1999, Hall studied guidance for L2 learners and found that the greater the participation with the expert, the greater the chance to implement interactive learning. Young (1999) explained the interactional competence (IC) as L2 knowledge was brought about with co-construction during the interaction. Young (2003) identified specific features of interaction competence, including interactional strategies, like turn-taking, topic management, and signaling boundaries.

Markee (2008, p. 3) pointed out that interactional competence involves learners in a second language as "co-construct[ing] with their interlocutors locally enacted, progressively more accurate, fluent, and complex interactional repertoires in the L2." He proposed three features of interactional competence: (1) "language as a formal system (including grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation); (2) semiotic systems, including turn-taking, repair, sequence organization; and (3) gaze and paralinguistic features," As cited in Walsh (2012).

Young (2008) developed IC from previous studies and stated that "interactional competence is a relationship between the participants' employment of linguistic and interactional resources and the contexts in which they are deployed; the resources that interactional competence highlights are those of identity, language, and interaction (…)." Young further explained IC as such.

"Interactional competence, however, is not the ability of an individual to employ

those resources in any and every social interaction; rather, interactional

competence is how those resources are employed mutually and reciprocally by all

participants in a particular discursive practice. This means that interactional

competence is not the knowledge or the possession of an individual person, but is

co-constructed by all participants in a discursive practice, and interactional

competence varies with the practice and with the participants."

(Young, 2008, p. 101)

Young (2008) also argued that IC differs from communicative competence (CC),

which was elaborated by Hymes (1972), summarizing that IC is a different competence and a

skill of its own, inconsequential to the general communicative competence. Moreover, Walsh

(2011) made a critical point in that he recognized IC as being different from communicative

competence in various perspectives (p. 165). He stated that IC is a process of co-construction

dependent upon the setting in which it happens.

According to Walsh, (2011) the concept of classroom interactional competence

(CIC) is defined as "teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating

and assisting learning." (p. 158). This is the beginning stage to recognize the centrality of

collaboration to instructing and learning. In this study, CIC concentrates on the routes by

which teachers' and learners' interactional choices and the ensuing activities upgrade learning

and learning opportunities. This means teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a

tool for mediating and assisting learning (Walsh, 2011, p. 158) and teachers' and learners'

ability to use interaction as a tool for conversation and language learning. This relationship

between 'the linguistic and interactional resources' is used by interactants in specific

contexts. At this stage, it might be helpful to look at some data in order to clarify some of the ideas we have discussed so far on interactional competence.

Walsh (2012) claimed that classroom interactional competence (CIC) can occur in a number of different contexts and "it creates an interaction between teaching and learning…Both teachers and learners will immediately improve their learning and opportunities for learning." A clear comprehension of classroom discourse will have a constructive influence on learning, mainly when learning is considered as a group activity, which is strongly impacted by engagement, involvement, and participation; where learning is considered as slightly more doing than having (c.f. Larsen-Freeman, 2010). Nevertheless, Allwright (1984), as cited in Khamwan (2007), suggested that "interaction does not happen automatically, especially when the communication is in a foreign language." As a result, both teachers and students need the proper implements to make classroom interactions occur (Walsh, 2012). In this study, classroom interactional competence (CIC) is selected as a tool for students to initiate interaction and communication with their teachers and peers.

Examples of interactional resources between student-student and teacher-student based on Walsh's conceptual of classroom interactional competence are shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Classroom Interactional Competence Resources

	Student-Student	Teacher-Student
Extract 1	turn-taking, repair, overlap, and topic management	
Extract 2		Extensive use of pausing, a lack of repair, signposting in instructions extended learner turns, and

	Student-Student	Teacher-Student
		seeking clarification
Extract 3		the use of extended wait time, the use of requests for clarification, minimal response tokens, and evidence of content feedback

In Walsh (2012) studies, he examined CIC in different contexts. In the first Extract, it refers to the student-student talk of an adult international student at a university in the UK. Extract 1 describes a clear example of turn-taking in which a student can interrupt, hold and pass turns. Repair means most students are ignored or "let it pass" by Firth (1996).

7.   L1   =relationship [yes

8.   L4   [and know each other=

9.   L3   =yeah I think I now him very well now (laughs) (4)

10.   L3   well lets talk another topic=

In extract 1, the main repair comes in lines 7-10, where the word 'relationship' is needed in order to clarify meaning.

According to McCarthy (2003), overlaps and interruption refer to good 'listenership'. They provide an important idea for speakers that they understood and communicated. Lastly, topic management illustrated spoken interaction of the coherent discourse.

Topic management: In extract 1, we can see how the main topic of 'relationships' is introduced, developed and discussed at length despite one attempt to switch topic in line 14 – which is ignored until much later in line 28.

14.   L3   I think eh that is is humorous ok he is not very handsome and not very

but I think he is very clever [ehm and he

15.   L1   [a lot like you

16.   L3   no (laughs) I think he is clever than me and (laughs) (3)

17.   L3   he do everything very (.)[seriously

18.   L1   [seriously

19.   L3   yeah (3 sec unintelligible) eh and eh in some eh...in some degree...eh

I...admire him (laughs)=

20.   L1   = thats a good [thing

21.   L   [Yeah (.) lets change another topic (10)

Besides, another study also has been done by Walsh (2012) in the context of second class in China. The topic was about "way young people no longer visit museums." In Extract 2 shows the interactional strategies of teacher and student in pausing this creates space in the interaction of learner to take a turn.

1. Extensive use of pausing for example lines 1, 3, 6 and 17:

1   T: class begins (3) good afternoon everyone

3   T: sit down please (3) so our topic today is museums(.)

17   (.) the last time (4)? ((gets microphone from another

2. A lack of repair, students make some mistakes in this extract (line 34, word order; line 46, verb form 'wasting of time').

34   S: (.) why young people don't go to museums

46   S: (3) I think going to museums is a wasting of time because

No repair, in this type, the teacher may ignore the error correction due to its unnecessary in communication.

3. Signposting in instructions. This teacher twice calls for a choral response (in lines 23 and 28).

23   ok actually can you tell me together do you often go to

28   title of this piece of news together ((points to

Signposting is another strategy that gives the teacher's instruction in the whole class discussion in giving response together.

4. Extended learner turns (in lines 46-47, for example).

46   S: (3) I think going to museums is a wasting of time because

47   because I'm not interested in those old-fashioned things

Extended learner turns, this means that teacher give learners to complete a turn, make a full and elaborated response.

5. Seeking clarification (lines 34-37).

34   S: (.) why young people don't go to museums

35   T: they don't go to museums very?

36   S: often

37   T: very often thank you very much (.) and (.)so actually

Taken from Walsh, 2012, p. 8

Lastly, seeking clarification, the teacher wants to make sure that the point which she makes accurate.

In his analysis, Walsh (2012) paid more attention to the strategies between teacher-student. Walsh also considered another CIC feature in his study which focuses on "an adult EFL class in the UK, where the teacher is working with an upper-intermediate group of learners who are preparing to do a listening comprehension about places of interests."

(Walsh, 2012: 9) In Extract 3, another example of teacher and student presents the feature of interaction.

Teacher extended time to wait, pauses, permit learners to have time to think before giving a response.

- the use of extended wait time, pauses of several seconds (in 12 and 42)

12 → T: anybody else? (4) Have you been anywhere Tury?

42 → T: mm anywhere else? (3) no well I'm going to talk to

Requests for clarification are to let the teacher ensure the whole class understanding.

- the use of requests for clarification (in 3, 5, 15) which serve to ensure that understandings have been reached.

3   T: [where've you been?

5   T: down (.) here? (pointing to map)

15   T: =so here here ((pointing to map))=

Minimal response tokens like *right or mmhh* give another speaker to understand the meaning in conversation.

- Minimal response tokens which tell the other speaker that understanding have been reached without interrupting the 'flow' of the interaction (see, for example, 11 (right), 21(mmhh).

- Evidence of content feedback by the teacher who responds to the message and not the linguistic forms used to articulate a particular message.

To understand classroom discourse, it is important to understand the interaction in the classroom. This is because the interaction is the most considered necessary component in the curriculum (van Lier, 1996 cited in Kampittayakul, 2017). This is similar to Ellis (2000) that "learning arises not through interaction, but in interaction" (p.209). Moreover, it is

essential for teachers to understand classroom interaction since "good teaching" is beyond

good planning (Walsh, 2006). Unquestionably, teachers necessarily understand classroom

interaction to promote learning among L2 learners. The next section gives information to

related research in CIC.

In the study, the CIC framework was not only analyzed interactional strategies of

the Thai student-student but also used by the Thai teacher-students conversation to enhance

the student interactional competence. Specifically, CIC framework was analyzed using CA to

encourage oral interactions of the students, teacher, and to analyze data of the study. The

researcher justifies the adoption of the CIC framework that fitting in this study (Walsh,

2012). As a result, it was a suitable mechanism to support and measure IC of a small group

discussion of Thai student and a Thai teacher teaching a whole class the university. In the

study, the ability of teachers in managing movement between student-students to follow the

discourse for learning objectives and social purposes toward the whole to the teacher-student

is essential for second language or foreign language classroom interactional competence

experience.

The researcher inspects turn-taking; taking the turn, passing a turn

holding a turn and self-selecting. The researcher ensures to get a better understand the pattern

of conversational of the students' interaction and teacher may led to interactional competence

in the classroom context. Moreover, the researcher examines self-repair (self-initial and self-

repair), peers-repair (other-initial and other repair) and teacher repair (teacher-initial and

teacher-repair) because the researcher believes that these three resources of every day

communication, and that know how and why these strategies could help Thai students

become aware of using strategies when they have conversation with other interlocutors both

in the classroom and outside the classroom settings. Then, investigates listenership and

speakership that is necessary to give support to the teacher and the students' participation in

the interaction. Last, topic management includes on topic introduce, topic development and shift in conversations between student in group discussion and teacher and student as a whole class. In this study focuses on both the communication between language teacher and student as well as student communicate with their peers (Tsui cited in Carter and Nunan, 2001).

Chapter Summary

This chapter has reviewed literature related to a research study in the aspects of practices and theories which has discussed interaction in both a social process and classroom context. Consideration has been given to the construct of interactional competence and how this construct enlightens in this study. Various learning's' concept has been discussed and the theory of learning in the socio-cultural has been reviewed. The use of different resources in helping classroom interactional competence has been examined. The analysis chapter requires a comprehension of the phenomena discussed in this chapter in accumulation to the forthcoming chapter, which introduces the methodology that is used in this study.

Form the review literature of CIC (Walsh, 2011), conversational analysis, classroom interaction, I have developed the conceptual framework and make use of those concepts and components in this study. The researcher focus on CIC framework conjunction with CA in analyzing IC of student-student and teacher-student oral interaction that will be illustrated more in chapter three. (See conceptual framework in Chapter I, p. 12.)
The next chapter, Chapter three, discusses the research design and research methodology applied in the study. This includes research methods, the context of the study which consists of population and participant selecting, research instruments, pilot study, data collection, and the final section is devoted to the analysis of data collected.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides an overview of the research methodology employed in this study. It begins with research design, population and participants, research instrument, data collection procedures, data analysis, and lastly summary of the research process. The next section presents the context of the study.

This research aimed to explore the discourse classroom to enhance communication fluency and interactional competence based on the review literature of the conceptual framework in classroom interactional competence (CIC) (Walsh, 2012). The purpose was to examine oral interactional strategies used by both the teacher and students to enhance interaction and improve opportunities in learning English. This study hopes to assess the improvement of the strategies in oral discourse to reach a better understanding of the CIC in a Thai classroom context.

Restatement of Research Questions

The research methods applied in this study were used to answer the following two research questions:

1. What components of classroom interactional competence (CIC) are used by a small group of Thai university students in spoken English?

2. What oral interactional strategies are used by both teacher and students in order to engage in interaction in a Thai university?

Research Design

The design of this study is qualitative research composing; 1) questionnaire 2) semi-structured interview, 3) teacher and students' oral interaction observation, and 4) audio and VDO recording. All of these methods were applied in the data collection and the analysis stage due to the characteristic aspects of this study. This study also looks into consideration how interactional competence is manifested by students and their peer and also their teacher. The analysis of Walsh (2012) framework focused on the classroom discourse shows interactional competence in the research question one and two. The pilot study helped to refine the research design in the pilot studies and the main study and research design.

Context of the Study

This section describes ethical concerns and the context of the study

The researcher considers the ethical regulations and formally asked permission from the following individuals (see Appendix A): (1) the Director of Innovative Learning Center of Srinakharinwirot University, for the permission on questionnaire administration to the students, (2) all the participants were informed of their participation in having their voice recorded, (3) and that their participation or lack thereof in this research would not have a positive or a negative effect in terms of their class grades. In this research, the participants were informed for recording. The participants were informed that the data of this research were not intended for any use beyond this study. They were informed that it was not intended for commercial purposes, would not be released publicly and no one but the researcher would have access to it.

Population

Population: the population of this study consists of fifty-five Thai students and a Thai teacher at the university level. From teacher-students interaction, the researcher selected the five students from those group interactions for a small group discussion of student-student interaction. This research employed purposive or non-random samples due to the fact that these participants possessed certain key characteristics related to the purposes of the study (DÖrnyei 2007). Students' levels of English speaking proficiency should be at least at an intermediate level, according to the CEFR or FRELE, in order to successfully interact with one another.

Students as participants

This study was conducted as a part of the intact class. The participants consisted of fifty-five first-year Thai students at the Faculty of Humanities who took General English (GE): English for Effective Communication I and II courses (SWU121 and SWU122) at Srinakharinwirot University in Thailand. The students were non-English major and their major was Japanese. These students were from 18 to 20 years of age and had been studying English from the primary and the secondary school for approximately 8 years. The whole class participated in the teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction. Five students who had the TOEIC score during 405 – 600 were selected for a small group discussion. The reason is that the score of TOEIC during 405 – 600 placed at B1 level meet the requirement of the Ministry of Education stating that the students who enter the university. The students took the TOEIC test as the requirement of the Faculty of Humanities to select the students who are able to get an opportunity to further their study overseas when they are in the second year. In addition, university graduate must have B2 level on CEFR (TOEIC score 605-780) or FRELE at B2+. At the B2 lower end of the scale, the learner should be able to produce language "with a fairly even tempo" and "few noticeable long

pauses" (Council of Europe, 2001: 28). At the B2 level, the learner ideally could 'interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party' (Council of Europe, 2001). This statement associates fluency with spontaneity and makes reference to interaction with another speaker, even if somewhat implicitly (McCarthy, 2010). Therefore, these students could develop their interactional which would enhance their communication.

Teacher as participant

The researcher was participating as the teacher in the study. The teacher has been employed at Srinakharinwirot University for five years at the time this research was undertaken. The teacher taught General English (GE): English for Effective Communication I and II courses (SWU121 and SWU122) at Srinakharinwirot University in Thailand. The teacher communicated with the students while collecting the data using a tape recorder.

According to the course syllabus and course description, the course focuses on to develop students' communicative skills in globalization, particularly focusing on language skills, knowledge and vocabularies of English as a Foreign Language.

Research Instrument

Five research instruments were used to draw out information from both the teacher and students to answer research questions 1 and 2. The research tools included a questionnaire, interview, observation, and audio and VDO recordings.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was used to gain an understanding of students' ability of interaction in the classroom of a general English course. The questionnaire was designed to examine students' ability of their participation in the classroom and the student-student interactional strategies.

The questionnaire was constructed with reference to the literature and in line with the research questions. The questionnaire (see Appendix B) has two parts: part one is to the respondents' personal information. Part two is to investigate Thai university student-students' perception interactional strategies during group work in the classroom by using a self-reported questionnaire. A 3-point rating scale ranging by Tekin (1996) was adopted as follows:

2.34-3.00   Yes, I can do this easily and well.

1.67-2.33   Yes, I can do this but not quite well.

1.00-1.66   No, I cannot do this.

The questionnaire of students' perceptions of student-student interaction contains 19 items which consist of four parts: turn-taking (items 1-6), repair (items 7-12), overlap and interruption (items 13-15), and topic management (items16-19), (see Appendix D). The questionnaire was sent to 55 students in the class of this study. The students took 15 to 20 minutes to do the questionnaire after the end of the class.

The advantage of using a questionnaire is convenience and it takes less time. It has yet some limitations rely on participants' self-reported. To check the credibility of the information about what happened in EFL classrooms, the data were triangulated with those gained from students' interview and teacher's observation.

Validation of the questionnaire

The interactional strategy questionnaire based on the CIC framework was validated by three experts in the evaluation form with a three-point rating scale, -1 = rejected, 0 = not sure, and 1 = accepted, were provided to the three experts. The mean scores from the experts were calculated and the items with scores lower than 0.50 were revised according to the experts' suggestions. The interactional strategy questionnaire in the English version was distributed to the three experts after the returned from students' answer. All items were

accepted, but some wordings were adjusted according to the experts' suggestions. Criteria for selection of the experts of questionnaire and interview were the same, (more details of the experts such as position, workplace See Appendix C) for who hold a Ph.D. or Assistant Professor in English or language, and interest in discourse, sociolinguistics, or linguistics with at least five years teaching experience in English, and conduct research in discourse, sociolinguistics, or linguistics or relevance aspects.

Pilot study and reliability

The questionnaire was piloted with a group of 30 students, 29 were returned because one of the students dropped off the course in January 2017 (second semester of 2016 academic year). Three items were deleted because they were not relevant to the area of the study. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient reliability value of the questionnaire was .561. Therefore, the researcher deleted unclear items and unrelated items before resending them to the same participants. The reliability value of the questions was .742, indicating that the questions were reliable and appropriate for the study.

Interview

The interview was conducted at the end of the course to elicit students' perceptions towards the CIC. The purpose of the interview was to have a better understanding of students' perceptions of student-student interaction, and classroom interaction's barriers. The students were required to answer 'yes' or 'no' questions and provided an explanation. It consists of fourteen questions (see Appendix D). Questions No. 1 to 13 examines students' perceptions about the benefits and drawbacks of CIC; questions No. 1 to 5 are about turn-taking, questions No. 6 to 8 are related to repair, questions No. 9 and 10 are involved in overlap and interruption, questions No. 11 to 13 are talking about topic management. Question No. 14 elicits students' suggestions on how to improve interaction in the classroom. Five students were asked for the interview. The audiotape was used for the purposes of

transcription. Each student took 10-15 minutes' interview. Students could select Thai or English language as a means of communication during the interview. This would make the student more comfortable in answering the questions and can provide more details. The interviewer used both Thai and English for asking the questions but most of them responded in English. Students were asked in English first but if they did not understand the question then the teacher translated it into Thai. This would make the question clear and easily understood by the student and the teacher could get accurate information.

Validation of interview questions

The thirteen semi-structured interview questions based on the CIC framework were validated by the three experts using the evaluation form of item content consistency and applicability (see Appendix E). The items with Mean scores lower than 0.50 and 1.00 were revised according to three experts' suggestions.

Findings of the validation of semi-structured interview

The result shows the mean scores obtained from the experts' validation. All items were rated 1.0 except item 4 and item 9 were rated 0.67 which meant that there was agree on accepting these items to be used in this study. Nevertheless, the experts left some suggestions for item 10 was rated 0.33 be adjusted. Moreover, the experts suggested that some accepted items 7 and 8 were rated 0 be needed to make it clear. Based on the experts' evaluation, the interview questions have content validity of 0.74 (see Appendix E). Criteria for selection of the experts of questionnaire and interview were the same, (more details of the experts such as position, workplace See Appendix A) for who hold a Ph.D. or Assistant Professor in English or language, and interest in discourse, sociolinguistics, or linguistics with at least five years teaching experience in English, and conduct research in discourse, sociolinguistics, or linguistics or relevance aspects.

Pilot study of the semi-structured interview

Six students joined in the study for the interview. The findings showed that the interview items were set in order and proper. The content of items was clear to elicit students' perceptions. The questions were used in English; students were allowed to respond in English and Thai. The data were transcribed and categorized by the researcher.

Oral interactional observation

The teacher and student's oral interactional observation provided data on strategies from both student-student and teacher-student oral interaction in the classroom. When the teacher taught the class and students were working in a group, a tape recorder was used to record the oral interaction of the selected group work, while the main tape recorder was usually placed on a student desk. The reason for using extra equipment was explained to students and a member of the group whose interaction was being recorded was asked to operate the tape recorder.

Validation of the oral interactional observation

The oral interactional observation based on the CIC framework (see Appendix E) indicating the taxonomy of each strategy and its examples were validated by experts to confirm the content and construct validity. Criteria for expert selection, (more details of the experts such as position, workplace See Appendix A) who hold a Ph.D. or Assistant Professor in English or language, and interest in discourse, sociolinguistics, or linguistics with at least five years teaching experience in English, and conduct research in discourse, sociolinguistics, or linguistics or relevance aspects.

To examine the validity and reliability of the congruence between the objectives and the oral interactional observation, the Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC) was calculated using the formula below (Rovinelli and Hambleton, 1977).

$$\text{I-O} \quad = \quad \frac{\Sigma R}{N}$$

ΣR	=	Total scores from experts
N	=	Number of Experts

Score from each item when

Yes	=	1 (means the observation is congruent with the objectives)
NO	=	-1(means the observation is not congruent with the objectives)
Uncertain	=	0 (means the observation is uncertain to be congruent with the objectives)

According to Sukamolson (1995), the overall content validity should be equal to or more than 0.75. Based on the experts' evaluation for the observation used as the instrument for data collection has content validity of 0.84 (see Appendix E).

Inter-coder for reliability check for transcribing

The transcription with interpretation was sent to three experts (more details of the experts such as position, workplace See Appendix A) for validation and interceding, who hold a Ph.D. or Assistant Professor in English or language, and interest in discourse, sociolinguistics, or linguistics with at least five years teaching experience in English, and conduct research in discourse, sociolinguistics, or linguistics or relevance aspects. They were asked to code the transcribing for the validity and inter coder after finished transcription in June 2018 (second semester of 2017 academic year).

Video and audio recording

As the data in this study occurred naturally in everyday social interactions, audio recordings were utilized to capture the interaction of each Episode as the content of the analysis in the classroom. The researcher used a video recording and an audio recording as

well as CIC observational framework (see Appendix D) to capture both teacher-student and student-student interaction. The recordings were used as the main instrument for data collection in this study.

Collection of Data

In terms of the data collection procedures need in the study, the researcher used the following criteria. This study was conducted over a period of two semesters; one and two of the 2017 academic year (B.E. 2560). The data collecting took place in the first second semesters for 2 episodes of a small group of five student-student and teacher-student as a whole class and additional data for 1 Episode of teacher-student in the second of the 2017 academic year. In developing methodological triangulation as a means of enhancing the study's reliability and validity, three types of data collection were used to cross-check the findings: 1) questionnaire 2) semi-structured interview, 3) oral interaction observation, 4) audio and VDO recording. Ethical concerns with gathering data also for content analysis were considered.

Five students participating; the researcher asked students to form a small group of five by themselves. It allowed a window into student interactions in authentic situations. Grouping students into odd rather than duos was a deliberate strategy in the classroom as it allowed students to improve their communicative competence and spoken language interactions and was an aspect of collaborative learning, which focused on teamwork as a method of solving problems and completing tasks.

Table 3.1 Data Collection Student-Student Interaction

Student-Student		
Course Duration	1st (August-November) SWU121	Approximately 4 months
Amount of Data	Dependent on students' talk approximately 5-10 minutes / group (1 groups) (collect 2 times) Total = 15 minutes	Approximately 2 times (15 minutes)
Steps to Analysis	1. Transcribe the whole Episode(1 and 2) 2. Analyze the Episode using CA with four components: turn-taking, repair, overlap and interruption, and topic management. 3. Frequency count to the different components in its episode. 4. Present tabulation of information about the result.	

To investigate student-student interaction competence, the researcher recorded a group discussion with no time limit so students would have sufficient time to achieve the goal for two separate episodes: cultural awareness and quality service. This Episode was selected because it was the topic based on the course syllabus.

Table 3.2 Data Collection Teacher-Student Interaction

Teacher-Student		
Course Duration	1st (August-November) SWU121 2nd (January-April) SWU122	Approximately 4 months
Amount of Data	3 hours/week (traditional classroom setting for 2 times) (a natural setting for 1 time) Total = 60 minutes	Approximately 3 times 60 minutes
Steps to Analysis	1. Transcribe the whole Episode (1,2 and 3) 2. Analyze the Episode using CA with four components: turn-taking, repair, overlap and interruption, and topic management. 3. Frequency count to the difference components in its episode. 4. Present tabulation of information of the result.	

The researcher planned to collect the data for teacher-student interactions two episodes in the first semester and one Episode in the second semester. The class met for three hours a week; nevertheless, the rest of the classroom instruction was focused on watching VDO, listening practice and testing that related to the teaching hour. Therefore, it was necessary to use tape recording three times during the classroom instruction was taking. Three separate episodes were selected according to the course syllabus: writing-email, presentation and holiday.

It was important for researchers to identify whether or not their chosen method of data collection allows them to meet the aims and objectives of the project. The data were collected in the Thai CIC classroom with undergraduate students at SWU. The use of audio recording equipment and the material collecting from it allowed the researcher to analyze the data both repeatable and in details. Therefore, the data collection procedures were dependent on factors like the goals of the research and the advantages and disadvantages of each method (Ibid). After finishing recording the audio, the researcher then transcribed it in order to translate the meanings of the words.

Conducting the Main Study and Collecting Data

The first semester of 2017 academic year, week 1: Class introduction, the teacher introduced the courses to the class and did some activities in class. The teacher found out the students who had the same demographic characteristics that had been set as a criterion in the study.

Week 2-3: Teacher and student, student-student got familiar with each other.

During week 4 to week 10, the main study was conducted. The participants were informed about the regulation of the research study. In order to help students succeed in interact in the class, the teacher explained the classroom interactional competence and voice recording. The teacher showed the video of the teaching cycle process and problems that happened during the pilot study for the participant. This was to point out the students what the classroom interaction was. After that, the researcher distributed the students' questionnaire.

Week 5: The data from the teacher's voice recording were collected in week 5 and 7 and students' voice recording was collected in week 5 and 7.

The classroom interaction activities have done each week were discussed as follows:

Week 5: Teacher gave details about writing the e-mail. Students expressed their idea about cultural awareness "Do's and Don'ts in Thailand". They were supposed to give example, explain, and write the e-mail.

Week 6: Quiz

Week 7: Teacher gave details about the presentation. Students brainstormed about quality service: "how to keep customers happy". Discuss good and bad services that you had experienced and solved the problem.

Week 8:-9 During these weeks, there were review and midterm examination

Week 10: Individual interview was conducted.

The second semester of the 2017 academic year, it began in week 4. This was because the first three weeks were an introduction and the lesson had just started in week 2 and week 3 was still in the content of the lesson. Therefore, collecting data in week 4 was appropriated for the "holidays and traditions".

Data Analysis

Qualitative methods were used to reveal the procedure that shaped spoken interaction and interactional competence in the classroom and how interactional ability conceivably creates. The qualitative data were then transcribed, and the transcriptions were inter coded and analyzed by experts in the English language. The data were analyzed through the use of different tools according to each research questions demonstrate as follows:

Research question 1

1. What components of classroom interactional competence (CIC) are used by a small group of Thai university students in spoken English?

Analysis of student-student interaction transcripts was notified by the type of task involved. Group work activities and tasks were classified and according to four interactional resources take from Walsh (2012). The interactional resources were turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management.

Three research instruments were used to find out the answer for Research Question 1: questionnaire, students' interview, and students' oral interactional observation.

Research question 2

2. What oral interactional strategies are used by both teacher and students in order to engage in interaction in a Thai university?

To answer the research question 2, the data gained from the teacher's oral interaction observation sheet. The teacher-student was employed to capture the use of the target language. In this case, Thai as the mother tongue (L1), English (L2), or a mixture of the target language and the mother tongue (Tognini, 2007) and other languages as Japanese were used.

CIC instruments that characterize teacher-student interaction, developed by Walsh (2006), had been adapted for the student survey. According to Walsh (2006), there were four interaction strategies: turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management (see Appendix D).

The strategies of teacher-student evaluation were analyzed using a framework devised by Walsh (2012) which he identified as CIC that used spoken content to identify different modes of the discourse in classroom interaction.

Data analysis of questionnaire

After receiving the completed questionnaire, the researcher got information and analyses in each part. The statistics included the number of participants (N), mean (M), and standard deviation (SD). The frequencies and percentages were used to calculate and analyze

personal data. Means were used to analyzing the Thai university student-student interactional strategies; turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management during group work in the classroom.

Data analysis of interview

The structured interview was used as a research instrument. The interview consisted of fourteen questions eliciting students' perceptions of interaction strategies that took place in the classroom and preferences for classroom interaction, and one question for eliciting students' suggestions on how to improve the course each student takes 10-15 minutes interview. The interview was done after the end of the process of the main study. The data were transcribed and categorized by the researcher.

Transcribing the interviews

To gain data from the students' voice recording, of the interviews were transcribed by the researcher. The researcher also translated the interviews into English, in case that students use Thai.

Data analysis of voice recording

Students' voice recording was transcribed and analyzed by the researcher based on transcription conventions Gumperz, J and Berenz, N (1993) for conversation analysis. The results from conversation analysis revealed categories of interactional resources. These interactional resources included turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management which were categorized by the researcher and inter coder who experienced English instructor. The differences were discussed for the agreement. The Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) adopted the framework of Walsh (2012) consisting of four classifications of turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management.

Data analysis of oral interactional observation

The data from the classroom observed, recorded, and analyzed in terms of their pattern of the interaction student-student and teacher-student interaction were transcribed then analyzed using interaction strategies by the CIC framework. The taxonomy adapted from Walsh (2012) (see Appendix D) was employed to analyze and identify each strategy used at a Thai university level. The interactional resources were turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management. To report the frequency of interactional strategies, descriptive statistics of frequency was employed then, each strategy was calculated in terms of percentage and presented in the table.

The inter-coder checked the frequency of oral interactional strategies that needed to be investigated from the transcription and voice recording. To make an effective and reliable data collection, the rater could also view the video-recording of the class.

Data Analysis of Teacher-Student Oral Interaction

The data analysis was based on the script of the Tuesday morning session, with two different date and time recordings. The interaction involved interaction among students when they were discussing in a group. This interaction provides student-student interaction (S-S) in this study. The students were asked to form a group of five. They sat in a circle and two topics: cultural awareness on "how do people greet each other when they meet for the first time in Thailand and Thai's table manner" and quality service on "how to make customers happy" was given to the students. They shared their idea in the discussion. Their oral interaction was audio recorded with some observation notes.

Physical feature of classroom setting

A typical classroom, with the session, starts with a slide of PowerPoint, material teaching such as active teach and other activities. It can also start with a small talk to the students then followed by calling up name to check attendance. Instead of calling students name by the last three digits of their identification number were called because there are fifty-five students in the class and it takes about twenty minutes to call out all the name of fifty-five students. Students were asked to give their ideas on the topic of the session to learn. The purpose is to check their background information and understanding of the topic. Then I do believe that the introduction of the lesson encourages students to speak. The video and conversational models were shown at the beginning of the lesson. After that, students are asked to do language conversation practices they used from the book and practice it with their peer. In listening and reading, the students mostly interact with the book and exercises. Students were assigned for a topic discussion in speaking activities. In the meantime, the teacher facilitate them to interact with each other through group work. Through the lesson, the teacher mostly gives students instructions and direction to do the activities. Moreover, the teacher gets involved in the lesson and encourages them to speak. In order to interact with students in the classroom using English, varieties features need to take into account.

At an introduction class, the teacher came into the classroom and greeted the whole class and all the students greeted me back. After that, explained the purpose of the session and what was going to do with the students and the data both in Thai and English in order to make sure that students understood. The teacher also asked students for their cooperation, especially who was going to give their information. Moreover, informed them that we would have a voice and video recording. Then, provided them with a video teaching cycle and asked them to check their understanding about what they have learned from the

video. Afterward, distributed the students' questionnaire and explanation details in Thai so that students would have a clear idea.

The data from the classroom observed, recorded and analyzed in terms of their pattern of the interaction. The classroom divided into three episodes depending on the topics and each Episode is marked by the beginning and the end.

In the first episode, the classroom starts with the teacher beginning of the session, all the students are greeted in class with "Good morning, everyone! It is a beautiful day, isn't it? The teacher uses a question tag, to begin with the conversation. Some students answer "yeah and some say No". So the teacher asks them back "No, why not? Look around, look around, it sunny". Then, she asks other students "Are you O.K.? Are you O.K.?" Then the student answers "Yes". The teacher looks around to other students then begins to check the students' attendance to see who is here today by calling their ID number and using the last three digits. This is because it takes a shorten time. After checking their attendance name, the teacher begins the lesson of e-mail writing which is related to the lesson. In this the analysis, the beginning of the Episode is made by *"Do you know or have you ever write an e-mail to your friends? ..."* and it ends up with ".*O.K. Let see when you write an e-mail this should be useful when you writing e-mail..."* in the script.

In the second episode, the teacher comes in the classroom and explains what she is going to do in the class today by using Thai. Then she sets up the material on the computer and prepares the lesson. After that, she greets all the students, "good morning, how are you all today?" Not too long a student replies "I'm doing well, yes." Then the teacher keeps asking for the others. Some students answer "so sleepy" then she turns to the lesson "How to give the effective presentation" because, at the end of the term, students will have to give a presentation on the topic "Country". Another opening activity is asking them who is absent today and whether they have done their homework. "In this, the analysis took the beginning

of the Episode which starts from *"I'd like to ask you to share your idea about giving presentation…"* and end up with "*. O.K. Three steps here: the first one making an introduction, telling the main part, and last drawing a conclusion." is* in the script.

In the third episode, the teacher walked in the class, put down all her staff then she set up the computer then she asked the student in the whole class to sit in a semi-circle. After that, she asked a volunteer student to do a VDO camera. A male student volunteer to be a cameraman this time. She explained how to use the camera to the student. Then she got back to the table, picked up a microphone to greet students in the whole class. "In this, the analysis took the beginning of the Episode which starts from *"We want to talk about…"* and end up with "*OK, OK. Let me show you some um… part of… the story, OK?"* as in the script.

Data analysis of conversational analysis

In general, CA uses a transcription system, which will be selected by the researcher because it is based mainly on verbal interactions. However, non-verbal interactions may not be added to the transcription. In this study, the method of transcription notion purpose proposed by McCarthy (2004) was used.

CA transcription

With regard to the methodology of audio transcription, the following information was considered as the steps of analyzing the talk of the data:

1. the study of transcription conventions,

2. the study of how to transcribe symbols,

3. the study on how to transcribe four components in terms of turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management,

4. the study of the transcription of translanguaging, echo, wait time, and significant strategies that occur,

5. accounting the percentage of the four components to find out interactional competence in S-S and T-S conversation, and

6. giving the conclusion of the analysis results.

Analysis of the study was based on review literature of the combination of Classroom Interactional Competence by Walsh (2012. Stenstrom (1994:68), Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977), Cekaite (2007), and Barraja-Rohan (2013), below are classroom interactional strategies, definition and examples.

Turn-taking

The turn-taking is the process in which the teacher and students decide who will speak next in their conversation. It shows the changing roles of a speaker and as a listener in a conversation. Thai teacher and student used to interact in the classroom, the components with four sub-components; to take turn, hold turn, pass turn, and self-select were interpreted as follows.

Take turn refers to teachers and students taking the floor to contribute to their talk or to their conversation. *e.g. use fillers; well, you know, okay um, or, uh. Use repetition; like like, what about what about. Repeat; repeat question or topic or utterance from previous speaker.*

Example: A: It's very cold, you know.

            B: Yeah.

                                          Taken from Muhsinin, N.

Analysis of the example, the speaker A uses "you know" to give the turn to listener B. The speaker B directly answers what the speaker A said.

Hold turn refers to teachers and students waiting for other speakers' utterance to finish and giving his/her turn to respond. *e.g. Filled Pause // Verbal Filler // Silent Pause // New star*t.

Example: B : those posts are . always free . or filled by dunderheads . during a peacetime

A : then we. lose the first few battles

B : when – then you . lost the first few battles . then you sack these fools like lord

A : Uhm

B : Gort and people like that during the last war . and iron side and people like this you know and the old plodders

A : Uhm

B : and suddenly - - - - - the more brilliant people appear.

Taken from Stenstrom (1994:77)

Analysis of the example, a very long pause, like the one after suddenly (- - - -), would most certainly have caused a shift of speakers if it had occurred in a different position, but silence immediately after conjunction and an adverbial not only makes it clear that there is more information to come, it also strongly emphasizes that information. A silent pause placed in a syntactically and semantically strategic place.

Pass turn refers to teachers and students passing their turn to other speakers. *Asking other name's, raise questions (e.g. what do you think? right, really?), Filler; um, ur. Pause (silent). I think so. I don't know.*

Example: F:'What university students do the demonstration?'

J: There are UMI students, HMI

Self-select refers to teacher and student selecting him/herself to talk without others ask him/her to speak.

Example: 01 B: Does anyone feel they know where wer'e we are headed with this?=

               02 A: *<0> Well, if we decide that one category is more important then the

                        others,=

               03 B: = *<0> did that help? *<95>

Analysis of the example, in line 01 speaker B self-selects, offering an adjacency first pair part to select both other participants.

Example: 48 A: *<0>C - What kind of qualities should these people have?

               49 C: =who come from different areas to give some type of color.

                              Taken from Anderson, J.F., Beard, F. K., & Walther, J.B. (n.d).

Analysis of the example, one instance of the current speaker selects next was identified at line 48 in the conversation as A selects C as the next speaker.

Repair

        To investigate a way of dealing with problems in speaking, understanding, and hearing in terms of meaning or message that Thai teacher and student used to interact in the classroom, the components with three sub-components; self, peer, and teacher were analyzed as follows.

Self-repair refers to teachers and students saying something to correct him/herself after he/she notices/realizes problems in his/her previous communication.

Example: P1: personal statement you write you want PhD you want study something you

               want know this C thing is more important

                  <more important> <u>than test</u> important

Taken from Simpson, B. Eisenchlas, S. A. & Haugh, M. (2013)

Analysis of the example, 'A personal statement you write that you want a PhD, you want to study something, you want to know this thing is more important, <more important>, it's more important <u>than the test</u>'.

Peer repair refers to students saying something wrong in meaning and other students correcting it. *e.g. asking question, checking information, adding information.*

Example: A: Actually I didn't use, uh...

                    B: <u>chopstick</u>?

                    A: chopstick yet.

Taken from Schegloff, Emanuel A., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977) cited as Hoa, N.T.Q. & Hanh, N.T.M., (2015).

Analysis of the example, speaker (A) has trouble speaking as he/she could not find the exact word needed, so he/she tries to initiate repair by the pause *uh...* and the hearer (B) helps him/her to solve this problem.

Teacher repair refers to teacher asking for repeating the wrong meaning or wrong words after he/she notices/realizes problems in his/her previous communication initiated by student.

Example: -

Overlap and interruption

            To examine the overlap and interruption that Thai teacher and students used to interact in the classroom, as good listenership and speakership that the interactant shows a speaker that (he/she) has been understood that signal the communication is going well. The

components with two sub-components; listenership and speakership were analyzed as follows.

Listenership refers to the process in which teachers and students make a sound while the other person is speaking so as to show that he/she is understood. *e.g. Filler; um, ur, oh! Repeat; repeat words.*

Example: -

Speakership refers to the process in which teachers and students speak up while the other person has not finished speaking yet and want to convey the message before (they) forget. *e.g. adding information and asking for information.*

Example: Female: So uh you really can't bitch when you've got all those on the

same day (4.2) but I uh asked my physics professor if I

couldn't chan[ge that]

Male: [Don't   ] touch that

Taken from Tannen (1998)

Analysis of the example, the example above consider this as being an interruption because the second speaker starts speaking while the first one was in the middle of a word, whereas Tannen (1998) looks at it as being procedural rather than substantive. Looking at the context it obviously is an overlapping because the female speaker is not infringed in her speaking rights. The interaction was analyzed as the male speaks up while the female has not finished her talk the overlap and interruption that show speakership.

Topic management

       To look into the topic management in paying attention to the coherence of a topic or piece of spoken interaction that Thai teacher and student used to interact in the classroom. The components with three sub-components; topic introduce, topic development, and topic shift was analyzed as follows.

Topic introduce refers to the way in which a teacher and student want to introduce a new topic to the discussion. *e.g. speaker shows short phrases: joking, kidding, oh! or introduce new information to the topic discussion.*

Example: 001 T: [(unclear) oh did you see the other girl now in Bombay (talking about

          some Asian

    002 T: programme on television)

    003 S: [(laughs) every time

    004 T: um I'm kitty I'm I'm [mitty the showbiz kitty and

    005 S: [no

    006 T: she goes like that (making a gesture with her hands) (laughs) and she goes

        like that =

    007 S: =(laughs)

    …

    079 M: (.01) have you watched east is east=

    080 T: = oh (laughs)yeah =

    081 M: = it's so [disgusting

    082 T: [I (laughs) know I

                      Taken from Coates' (1996, 1998)

Analysis of the example, T introduces the topic of the portrayal of Asians in the media by discussing the content of a comedy programme on television (lines 001 - 045) M matches her

contribution with T's by introducing the subtopic of East is East, a comedy film on Asians (line 079),

Topic development refers to the way in which a teacher and student support points to stay on the same topic and succeeds in maintaining the topic for a while.

Example: 080 S: [I know I look back at it and I just laugh=

081 T: = exactly=

082 M: = I enjoy when I do something

083 M: (laughs) silly [like that

084 T: [yeah exactly oh my (unclear) tell her tell her about that day when you

085 T: fell (laughs) off the chair in the library=

Taken from Coates' (1996, 1998)

Analysis of the example, in the discussion section of the topic of embarrassing moments M matches her contribution to S's contribution "I know I look back at it and I just laugh" (line 080) by saying "I enjoy when I do something silly like that" (lines 082 - 083) which is then followed by the joint narration of how she fell off a chair in the library.

Topic shift refers to how a teacher and student deal with changes in a topic or bring the discussion back to talk about the same topic discussed earlier.

Example: Joe: Finally I got it done, did you?

Bill: I left the file on her table, though I couldn't find some information

she wants. Anyway, I'm excited about the cruise trip to the Caribbean.

Example: 13 L3 =yeah I think I now him very well now (laughs)

(4)

14 L3 well lets talk another topic=

15 L2 =I remember one thing when they choose register in Coleraine and they

        organizer know you [reg…register…register L [are single girl and they

        don't know you have a boyfriend

Taken from Walsh 2012.

Analysis of the example, "Following an extended pause of 4 seconds, L3 attempts to change topic in line 13. However, the change of topic does not occur immediately as L2 interrupts in line 14 with the telling of an anecdotal story about registration and the fact that the students doing the registration are able to know who is single." by Walsh 2012.

Pilot Studies

The researcher as a teacher conducted 2 pilot studies. The first pilot study was done in the first semester of 2016 academic year and the second pilot study was conducted in the second semester of 2016 academic year.

The purposes of the first pilot study were:

1) to find out whether this method would work or not in a Thai context, and

2) to examine student-student interaction on spoken language without teacher intervention. Do the students with good sufficient level of fluency be able to benefit from using CIC to develop their oral skills?

The purposes of the second pilot study were:

1) to see whether student understand the classroom interaction,

2) to explore students attitudes' towards classroom interactional competence, and

3) try out the instruments i.e. semi-structure interview and oral classroom observation.

The findings based on the objectives of two pilot studies were discussed as follows:

The First Pilot Study

Selection criteria of the first pilot study

The first and second pilot studies were tried out with the students' selected group purposive sampling. The samples were 6 in the first pilot study and 29 in the second pilot study of undergraduates at Srinakarinwirot University (SWU) in Thailand. They were groups of students enrolling in General English (GE) course of which the teacher was working with. Samples were selected based on their midterm scores and their grades. The students were divided into groups of six.

The topic of tasks those students did during student-student interaction is real-world language use. The teacher elicited responses from the class about introducing attractions or interesting places in Thailand. The tasks were also employed in the second pilot study.

Procedure of the first pilot study

The first pilot studies were conducted during the class in the first semester of the 2016 academic year. Groups of students were asked to stay and to participate in a conversational activity for one topic. All groups got the same topic. By observing the same topic, the researcher was able to investigate student-student spoken language interaction in the same direction and language use. Steps in the pilot study included: a mixed ability students were asked to form a group of six to have a group discussion. This was to see the competence of student in a group discussion. From the interview, the students were willing to do a group discussion among familiar friends. Because they felt comfortable to speak and share ideas, but with students from different majors, they were shy, felt uncomfortable to discuss with, and dared not to give comments or suggestions. With six students in a group,

students suggested that 4-5 in a group would be better. This was because all students would get an equal chance to speak and provided their opinion. From the researcher observation, it was noticed that students with low English proficiency were not able to give a group discussion in English. They used Thai more often to help the discussion flow due to the fact that they couldn't think of the vocabularies and make sentences. Students who had a high ability in English speaking but worked with different group major were not given good cooperation in group discussion. Some students were playing the phone, sleeping or doing their own work while a few students worked in a group to get the idea. Therefore, the participant in this study had enough English proficiency to communicate. When forming a group, there should be 4-5 students in a group to provide effective discussion.

Collecting and analyzing data of the first pilot study

As in the first pilot study, an audio recording was used to record the classroom interaction for student-student spoke language interaction. To answer the pilot study's questions, the conversation was analyzed by using Conversation Analysis in order to examine student-student interaction in EFL class of SWU in Thailand.

Results of the first pilot study

The results of the first pilot study showed that in order to enhance learning opportunity, students should begin developing their own interactional competence. In addition, students made a few mistakes during the conversation. It might be because these students were put as a sufficient level of ability in using English. In terms of the interactional competence demonstrated in extract 1, a number of observations about the interactional resources were employed to study and their impact on the overall flow and coherence of the discussion: topic management, turn-taking, overlapping, and repair can be investigated.

Extract 1

…

5.   S5:   Then let's go to Maldives

6.   S 6:   OH! It's so far and so expensive.

7.   S 3:   What's about Nepal?

8.   S 6:   Do you go swimming at Nepal? Sure?

9.   S 1:   But I think Samui.

10.   S 5:   Pha Ngan

11.   S 2:   Atlantic?

12.   S 4:   Krabi?

13.   S 3:   Phuket?

14.   S 2: Shut up! I want to go Kha Pha Ngan.

…

26.   S 2:   How do you go there?

27.   S 1:   By plane?

28.   S 6:   NO! It's so expensive. I have no money.

29.   S 4:   Why don't we walk?

30.   S 2:   Walk? [

31.   S 3:   [Walk but you're old more than walking.

      1. Analysis of topic management (introducing topic, topic shift, and ending topic), shows that the introducing topic of interest places begins in line 5 by S5 to develop the discussion in which the students attempted to switch topic in line 14.

      2. Turn-taking, the analysis reveals that all of the six students managed the turn-taking very well and were able to keep the conversation continues with a few breakdown conversations such as in Line 9-13, S1, S5, S2, S4, S3, take a turn to share an idea of the interesting places. Students waited for their turn to speak and avoided interrupting another person.

3. Overlapping, in line 26, S2 attempts to shift the topic after all laugh and further reinforced in the overlapped confirmation by S3 in line 31.

4. Repair to clear any misunderstanding or mishearing, moving into leaving taking. Even though errors did occur in many ELF contexts where English was used as a lingua franca, students ignored errors.

In the second extract below indicated that, first, there was recognition on the part of S1 that the appropriate reaction to a question was a response. Secondly, there was no repair, but there were some errors throughout the extract (see, for example, lines 16, 18, 30, 35), the learners choose to ignore them because error correction was not encouraging to allowing learners to have space to express themselves as mention by Walsh. Thirdly, several learners attempted to wait time, for example, line 17, 21, 28 (I think), line 37 (But for me I think), line 47 (So I think) this allowed learners time to think, prepare and give a response. Fourthly, turn-taking, students managed the turn-taking very well and were able to keep the conversation continues with a few breakdown conversations. Moreover, S1 also showed CIC in terms of the ability to deal with turns, hold the floor and hand over his turn at a particular point in the interaction.

Extract 2

…

16   S2:   today I haves er the = I need some (1.2) your advices for (2)

Thailand attraction Can you give me some advice about this?

17   S4:   I think maybe Phuket is a good choice to enjoy and spend our time on the

beach, also you.. we can see the sunset at the view point at Laem Phromthep

It's such a beautiful scenery to relax How about you Bell?

18   S6:   Oh! Your place is interesting Erm… Maybe I'm going to Nakhon Nayok in

the Sarika waterfall I used to go there once with my family and friends. It's

such a good place and the water is very nice ar…and also I can swimming,

relaxing, enjoying with my family and my friends. Yeah! The weather is good

too Yeah (

19   S4:   (I think+

20   S6:   +You should go there once

21   S4:   +I think this place is interesting, too

…

28   S3: Um I think the bus is easy to go to Koh-Lan because it cheaper than the other

  ways

29   S2:   How about the environment the Koh-Lan is beautiful or crowded? er.. the

  accommodation is expensive

30   S3:   Koh-Lan is beautiful island that have clear sea beautiful sand and teenager of

  Thailand alway go there in the school break and it has not many people it not

  crowded It's um.. yes.

…

35   S1:   Yes, there have many activity. er So the Koh-Lan is very clear sea you can

  do scuba at the sea. er if they have many sea creators in the sea Ur It is very

  worth if you do scuba and if you like the exciting activity you can do

  parasailing it's very excited You shouldn't miss it and another thing by the

  dark if you don't have a thing to do you can fishing the squid yeah The villa

  will take you there+

36   S3:   +and the food there is also delicious and not much expensive

37   S5:   +But for me I think Chiang Mai is the best choice now because in this season

  we can't deny that Chiang Mai is one of the place that has the nice weather.

….

47   S5:   So I think if I have another chance I think we sh… I think I would like to

recommend you to go there with me.

The result of the observation show that before performing their work, students

provided information in the Thai language as if to check their understanding to their friends if

they understood the question. Some groups also asked questions in Thai to repeat their

understanding with the teacher or 4-5 students repeated asking the questions and the teacher

answered the question in Thai to avoid misunderstand the concept and asking them to

produce oral work in the English language. At this point, it was found that it was acceptable

to use Thai (L1) to explain difficult questions for weak students; hence they could join the

conversation with their friends. While performing their work, some students used Thai to

start the conversation.

The Second Pilot Study

The purposes of this point were:

1) to see whether the students understand the classroom interaction,

2) to explore student's perception interactional strategies in the classroom, and

3) to validate the research instruments such as questionnaire and interview

questions.

The findings based on the objectives of two pilot studies were discussed as

follows:

Selection criteria of second pilot study

The participants enrolled in General English (GE) at a university in the Bangkok

metropolitan area. A purposive sampling method was employed to select the participants; 29

students who met the requirements of students' competence at an intermediate level in

English were selected to fill in a questionnaire of student's perception interactional strategies

in the classroom. A group of six students was asked to participate in the pilot study for the

interview. The second pilot study conducted General English courses in the second semester of the 2016 academic year.

The procedure of the second pilot study

The questionnaire and interview were used and both instruments were developed based on the review of related studies, and validated by three experts in the fields of linguistics, teaching, and communication. Thirty questionnaires were administrated but it returned back by twenty-nine. This was because one of the students dropped out of the course.

The group interview was set up by six volunteer students who were willing to answer the questions. In the first part, interview questions were used to gather information regarding the learning practices in General English Courses. In the second part, the students' respondents toward oral interactional problems in their classrooms were investigated.

The pilot tested instrument

The pilot tested instruments study was carried out for three hours in the second semester of the academic year 2016 with six students who were not in the sample group of the study but with the same demographic characteristics. After the validation by three experts, the instruments were pilot-tested included the teaching cycle process and a group interview.

The second pilot study aimed to measure the reliability of the questionnaire. It was conducted with 29 non-English-major undergraduate students who were representative of the population but were not participants of the main study. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient reliability value of the questionnaire was .561. Therefore, the researcher revised unclear items and resent the questionnaire. The reliability value of the questionnaire was .1 indicating that the questions were reliable and appropriate for the study.

Collecting and analyzing data of second pilot study

The pilot study of questionnaires was collected in the second week of the semester. The group interviews were conducted in Thai (six students) in this study. The interviews were conducted after the class session.

In the first part, the data were analyzed by using descriptive statistics, and in the second part, the interview data were carefully transcribed and analyzed to find the problem of classroom interaction in English.

Results of the second pilot study

The results of the second pilot study revealed that the student's perception in using interactional strategies was at 3.55 which were quite positive. Thai students strongly agreed to use repair strategy when the message was not clear, students asked the other people to clarify directly. Students corrected themselves when they noticed that they had made a mistake and when other people said something wrong during the discussion, they quite agreed that they mistake after the conversation. Students were agreeing to correct another person when they said something wrong, right away. The problems in the interactional in the classroom were the topic management, students didn't have enough background knowledge and the topic was not interesting. Moreover, the fluency in language use and the necessity of language proficiency for their oral interactional in the classroom needed to be practiced.

Table 3.3 Shows Phase 1 Pilot study

Procedure	Research Instrument	Results
Pilot study 1 1. Groups of students were asked to stay and to participate in a conversational activity for	The topic: introducing attraction or interesting places in Thailand.	1. Students were able to use the English language during there discussion

Table 3.3 Shows Phase 1 Pilot study (Cont.)

Procedure	Research Instrument	Results
one topic. 2. All groups got the same topic about an interesting place in Thailand. 3. Students discuss the topic. 4. Data collection then transcribe and analysis.	Audio recording and cell phone. The conversation was analyzed by using conversational analysis.	without teacher help. 2. The selected sample should be students who have a high level of English speaking proficiency these students were put as a sufficient level of ability in using English and developing their own interactional competence.
Pilot study 2 1. Thirty questionnaires were administrated. 2. The group interview was set up by six volunteer students who were willing to answer the questions relating to perceptions of oral interaction strategies. 3. Oral Interactional Observation was sent to the three experts.	The questionnaire, interview, and observational sheet.	1. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient reliability value of the questionnaire was .561. 2. The findings showed that the sequence of interview items was proper, and the content of the items was clear and effectively elicited students' perceptions as intended.

Table 3.4 Shows Phase 2 Construction of Research Instrument

Procedure	Research Instrument	Results
Quantitative Data The students' questionnaire is constructed with reference to the literature and in line with the research questions. The survey is designed to inspect students' ability of their participation in the classroom and the student-student interaction strategies	*Questionnaire* The students' questionnaire has 19 items which consist of four parts: turn-taking, repair, overlap and interruption, and topic management with 3 degrees of what can do can do this but not quite well or cannot do these oral interactional strategies yet.	Students' perception of the use of strategies in conversation
Qualitative Data The interview questions were based on previous research. In the beginning, there were 14 questions with YES/NO questions and follow up with an explanation. After the tried out with students and experts, the researcher removed unclear items which were irrelevant to the topic and revised some questions to reduce	*Interview* 14 questions were asked to students	Confirming students' perception of CIC in the classroom

Table 3.4 Shows Phase 2 Construction of Research Instrument (Cont.)

Procedure	Research Instrument	Results
misinterpretation to the participants. The observation items were based on the question from the questionnaire which includes four parts: turn-taking, repair, overlap and interruption, and topic management.	*Observation* Includes of four parts: turn-taking, repair, overlap and interruption, and topic management and also blank space of rater and teacher to count the frequency of each oral strategy.	Teacher and students' in oral interactional strategies

Table 3.5 Shows Phase 3 Data Collection in Authentic Settings

Procedure	Research Instrument
Quantitative Data The researcher showed the video of the teaching cycle process and problems that happened during the pilot study for the participant. The researcher distributed the questionnaire in week 4.	*Questionnaire* Questionnaire of student's perception interactional strategies in the classroom during group work in the classroom.

Table 3.5 Shows Phase 3 Data Collection in Authentic Settings (Cont.)

Procedure	Research Instrument
Qualitative Data	
The interview is conducted at the end of the course to elicit students' perceptions toward the CIC.	Interview questionings of students' perceptions of interaction strategies that take place in the classroom and preferences for classroom interaction.
Five students are asked for interviewing and interviews were audio taped for the purposes of transcription. Each student takes 10-15 minutes interview.	Audio recording
The researcher used video recordings and audio recordings as well as CIC observational framework (see Appendix D) to capture the classroom interaction for both student-student and teacher-student interaction.	Observation of teacher-students and students-students oral interactional competence in the classroom. Audio recording and VDO recording

Table 3.6 Shows Phase 4 Data Analysis

Procedure	Analysis Tools
Quantitative Data *Questionnaire* After receiving the completed questionnaire, the researcher gets information and analyses in each part.	The statistics include the number of participants (N), mean (M), and standard deviation (SD). The frequencies and percentages were used to calculate and analyze personal data. Means $(\overline{X})$ was used to analyze the Thai university students- students interactional strategies; turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management during group work in the classroom.
Qualitative Data *Interview.* Transcribed audio recording from word and interpretation coding of the data for both student-student and teacher-student interaction was undertaken by the researcher and a second rater who is fluent in English and Thai.	The transcribing and describing the data. The frequencies and percentages were used to calculate and analyze the YES/NO answer.

Table 3.6 Shows Phase 4 Data Analysis (Cont.)

Procedure	Analysis Tools
Observation The inter coder and the teacher checked the frequency of oral interactional strategies that need to be investigated from the transcription and voice recording. To make an effective and reliable data collection, the rater can also view the video-recording of the class.	Oral International Observation To report on the frequency of interactional strategies, the researcher employs descriptive statistics of frequency then, the researcher calculated each strategy in terms of frequency count and presented in the table.

Summary of the Research Process

Table 3.7 Summary of the Research Process

Research Question	Instruments	Data Analysis
1. What components of classroom interactional competence (CIC) are used by a small group of Thai university students in spoken English?	- The questionnaire, - The semi-structured interview, and - The observational sheet	- Conversation Analysis - Percentage, mean (M), and standard deviation (SD). - Frequency count
2. What oral interactional strategies are used by both teacher and students in order to engage in interaction in a Thai university?	- The observational sheet	- Conversation Analysis - Frequency count

Consequently, it could be considered that the instruments for data collecting of the study were validity and reliability.

Chapter summary

This chapter presents the methodological background employed in this research and introduces details information about the procedures and data collection tools as well as various issues including ethics, validity, reliability and data analysis.

The research instruments included 1) questionnaire 2) semi-structured interview, 3) oral interaction observation, 4) audio and VDO recording, and the data analysis was conducted through utilizing conversation analytic methodology then transcribed and analyzed, and data interpretation were the most suitable for the purposes of this research. The participants were a total of five students aged between 19 and 20, and a local teacher with at least five years teaching experience, and qualified teacher (researcher) status officially recognized in Language and Academic Services Centre at Srinakharinwirot University.

The data collection was conducted twice during the first semester for student-student interaction and in the first semester and one more time in the second semester for teacher-student interactions of the 2017 academic year. Furthermore, in order to investigate the interactional strategies used by both teacher and student, the conversational analysis was designed for classroom use. The two pilot studies were conducted to examine student-student interaction on spoken language without teacher intervention or/and teacher assist and to find out whether this method and instrument are effective or not and whether the students would have a sufficient level to be able to benefit from using CIC to develop their oral skills. The findings from the three data sources were analyzed, in the following three chapters.

Summary of the Research Procedure

Figure 3.1 Summary of the Research Procedure

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter reports the findings of oral English speaking classroom interactional between student-student and teacher-student. The findings of data collected from approaches composing two sections; section 1 the findings to answer the research question no.1; student-student interaction and the questionnaire and interview and section 2 to answer the research question no 2, teacher-student interaction.

The Findings of Student-Student Oral Interaction

This section reports the findings to answer the research question number 1 in interactional strategies used by the student-student (S-S) in the classroom. What components of classroom interactional competence (CIC) are used by Thai university students in spoken English classroom? Based on the four components the script of classroom interactional competence (CIC) of Thai university students' turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management namely was analyzed and investigated in terms of the strategic use and the frequency.

Table 4.1 Lessons and Time Duration of Student-Student

Type of Interaction	Lessons/Episodes	Approximate Time Duration (minutes)
Student-Student	Cultural awareness	8.11
Student-Student	Quality service	3.59

Table 4.1 presents topics of interaction topics of the Episode and time duration for group discussion conducted by students. Students spent approximately 8.11 minutes discussing "cultural awareness" and 3.59 minutes on the topic "quality service".

Results of Student-Student Oral Interactional Observation

This section presents student and student's oral classroom interaction. The students and the classroom setting are shown. Then, the students initiated during group discussion interaction are described in the classroom.

Overall of Frequency of Interactional Strategies Used by Student-Student

    Oral Interaction

This section presents the data concerning the interactional strategies used by the students. The data reveals the most frequent components of interactional strategy and the least frequent components of interactional strategies used by the student-student interaction. Remark: FREQ stand for Frequency and Ep. stand for Episode.

Table 4.1.1 Frequency of Interactional Strategies Used by Student-Student Oral Interaction in Two Episodes

Components	Freq Episode1	Freq Episode2	Total
1. Turn-taking	33	26	59
2. Repair	24	17	41
3. Overlap & interruption	23	33	56
4. Topic management	28	21	49
Total	108	97	205

The data present in Table 4.1.1 shows the total frequency of interactional

strategies used by students, based on the analysis of two Episodes from two different topics:

cultural awareness and quality service. The total frequency of the two episodes is 205

interactions occurred; from the most to the least interaction, in Episode1 shows the total

frequency of 108 interactions in which the students and students interacted is greater

interaction than the total frequency of in Episode2 which was 97, meaning to identify the

classroom interactional competence used by students' group discussion. Surprisingly, the

students were less interact in developing interactional competency in Episode2.

From the analysis, there are four major components; turn-taking, repair, overlap

and interruption, and topic management. Start with the total of the two episodes from the

most to the least interaction. Interestingly, turn-taking shows the total frequency of

interaction was 59; students take 33 turns in Episode1while students take 26 turns in

Episode2, meaning student used interactional strategies with greater in Episode1 than in

Episode2. This shows the student collaborative exchanges the ideas feel or information

between the students in group discussion. Next, the total frequency of interaction in overlap

and interruption were 56; the student uses 23 overlaps and interruptions in Episode1 with

lesser than 33 overlaps and interruption in Episode2 for group work interaction, representing

that the student development in interactional competence in listening and speaking to group

discussion interaction since he interacted with his familiar friends in Episode2. Then, the total

frequency of topic management was 49; students interested by using 24 topic management in

Episode1 with greater than 15 topic management in Episode2, signifying that the students

failed to engage in topic management to improve in interactional competence in those

episodes. Surprisingly, the last total frequency of repair in both Episodes was 41; student

used 24 repairs in Episode1 with greater than 17 repairs in Episode2, indicating that the

students' development in interactional competence was not shown the sufficiency of the

students' ability to interact with verbal interaction.

The most frequently used of the students' interactional strategies in four

components is turn-taking, followed by overlap and interruption, topic management and

repair respectively. The student should be aware of each component to encourage in the

classroom interaction, and language learning.

Frequency of Sub-Components Used by Student-Student Oral Interaction

The data present in Table 4.1.2 shows the frequency of sub-components used by

students. There are twelve sub-components: take turn, hold turn, pass turn, self-select, self-

repair, peer repair, teacher repair, listenership, speakership, topic introduces, topic develop,

and last topic shift of classroom interactional competence.

Table 4.1.2 Frequency of Sub-Components Used by Student-Student Oral Interaction

Sub-components	Freq Episode1	Freq Episode2	Total
Take turn	4	8	12
Hold turn	1	2	3
Pass turn	17	11	28
Self-select	TH 2/ EN 9	TH 1/ EN 4	16
Self-repair	3	4	7
Peer repair	21	13	34
Teacher repair	-	-	-
Listenership	11	20	31
Speakership	12	13	25
Topic introduce	10	8	18
Topic development	8	5	13
Topic shift	10	8	18
Total	108	97	205

The data in Table 4.1.2 shows the frequency of interactional strategies used by students in two episodes. There are 205 interactions occurred to identify the classroom interactional competence used by the students in Episodes 1 108 interactions in with the students is greater interaction than in Episode2 which was 97, to show how the contributions of turn-taking, repair, topic management, and overlap interruption help the students to get the talk to the goal of communication.

This Table gives a better picture of the students' total number of verbal interactions in the classroom, although it still does not reflect much of their participation in chorus interaction nor their contributions in the pair and group activities.

In terms of turn-taking, there are four sub-components: take turn, hold turn, pass turn, and self-select . Interestingly, the students frequently used pass turn during group discussion and the total number of the student used pass turn in two episodes was 28; in Episode1 (17) and Episode2 (11) times. This indicates that students develop the interaction to exchange idea, solving the problems with friends more in Episode1 than Episode2. As for the students self-select in turn-taking provided more interaction in total was 16; in Episode1 (11) and Episode2 (5). This means that the students willing to encourage themselves to speak without anyone forcing them to speak or calling his name or when the group is getting silent in Episode1 than Episode2. Take turn was frequently used in the student interaction as in total was 12; in Episode1 (4) and Episode2 (8) times. This show that interaction in the group was not well performed in fulfills the need for an effective conversation. The occurrence of the students holds turn in the total number was 3; in Episode1 and 2 are 1 and 2 times. This point out that interaction competence was not well developed. Overall of the students used sub-components in turn-taking of two Episodes were pass turn (28), self-select (16), take turn (12), and hold turn (3). The highest frequency shows the students in the group interacted with

each other through the IC development. The number of students that used pass turn is the highest frequency and hold turn is the lowest frequency in turn-taking.

In overlap and interruption, there are two sub-components: the listenership and speakership. It is important to note that the listenership displayed in total was 31; in Episode1 (11) and Episode2 (20) occurrences, meaning the students used interactional strategies with greater in Episode2 than in Episode1 giving signals that the interaction going well. Another common feature in the overlap and interruption was the students' speakership. The frequency of occurrence of the students' speakership was 25; in Episode1 (12) and Episode2 (13), pointing out that students engage interaction competence in group talk. The total number of students that used overlap and interruption of two Episodes were listenership (31) interaction is greater than speakership (25) interaction gained from the students' oral interaction. This shows the male student, and the topic of the discussion can be considered as interaction competence well, as a deliberate strategy like overlaps give an important idea to the speakers that they are being understood and communicated.

In topic management, there are 49 occurrences of topic management used by Thai students. The frequency of student topic introduce was 18; in Episode1 (10) and in Episode2 (8). This point outs that student improves IC through making a contribution of greater topic introduce when interaction with friends in Episode1 (10) than in Episode2 (8). The students used topic development in both Episodes were 13; Episode1 (8) and Episode2 (5) and only a few students manage the topic used topic shift was 18; in Episode1 (10) and Episode2 (8). This shows the relationship of the students that the students are willing to engage with the topic and does well in continuing it for a while and from a range of views. The total number the students used topic management of two Episodes were 49; topic introduces (18) used, occurrences of topic shift (18), and occurrences in topic development 13 gained from the students' interaction.

Repair is one of the strategies in interaction; it is appeared to use in the student group discussion. The Table 4.1.1 shows, the total number of repair found in the student group was 41. Peer repair was occurred (21) in Episode1 and occurred (13) in Episode2. The result seems to indicate that the students develop in interactional competence more language production to deliver the message or getting and checking information, their peer in the group. The interaction in self-repair (3) occurred in Episode1 and (4) in Episode2. The data seem to indicate that the students' fluency of getting and checking information to their peer in group discussion to get to the goal of their communication so they rarely give any self-repair. There was no teacher repair during the student's group discussion. This shows student need no help for teachers to interact with them during their discussion. The total numbers of students repair were 41; occurrences of peer repair (34), and occurrences of self-repair (7).

The frequency of interactional strategies used by student-student in two Episodes: turn-taking (59) is the highest frequent interaction, overlap and interruption (56), topic management (49),) and the lowest frequent interaction is repaired (41). The total frequency of sub-components is peer repair 34 times, listenership 31 times, pass turn 28 times, speakership 25 times, topic introduces 18 times, topic shift 18 times, self-select 16 times, topic develop 13 times, take turn 12 times, self-repair 7 times, hold turn 3 times, and no teacher repair. It can be concluded that the most frequent components of interactional strategies used by the students were peer repair while the least interactional strategies used was holding a turn.

Frequency of Interactional Strategies Used by the Students

This sub-section presents the data reveals the interactional strategies used by the students. The report illustrates the most frequent of interactional strategy and the least frequent of the interactional strategy used by the students. Table 4.1.2 shows twelve sub-components which take turn, hold turn, pass turn, self-select, self-repair, peer repair, teacher

repair, listenership, speakership, topic introduces, topic develop, and last topic shift of classroom interactional competence used by the students.

In Episode1, it can be reported that take turn occurred 4 times, hold turn once, pass turn 17 times, self-select in Thai 2 and in English 9 times, self-repair3 times, peer repair 21 times, no teacher repair, listenership 11 times, speakership 12 times, topic introduces 10 times, topic development 8 times, and topic shift 10 times.

In Episode2, it was found that take turn occurred 8 times, hold turn twice, pass turn 11 times, self-select in Thai 1 and in English 4 times, self-repair 4 times, peer repair 13 times, no teacher repair, listenership 20 times, speakership 13 times, topic introduce 8 times, topic development 5 times, and topic shift 8 times.

When the student-student oral interaction observe were examined, it was observed that the time duration of the topic talk was the difference; Episode1 was 8.11 and Episode2 was 3.59 minutes. This show the areas of the learning interaction occurred, pass turn and self-select were grouped, listenership and speakership were performed through fasteners and the students easily adapted to these strategies.

The total frequency of sub-components is peer repair, listenership, pass turn, speakership, topic introduces, topic shift, self-select, topic develop, take turn, self-repair, hold turn, and no teacher repair. It can be concluded that the most frequent components of interactional strategies used by the students were peer repair while the least interactional strategies used was holding a turn.

Other Interaction Strategies Occurred during Student-Student Group Discussion

From the researcher's observation, it can be seen from Table 4.1.3 that the students use translanguaging to interact in group discussion.

Table 4.1.3 Other Interaction Strategies Used by Students

Others student-student interaction strategies	Freq Episode1	Freq Episode2	Total
Translanguaging	TH 14/JAP 2	TH 3/JAP 3	17/5
Echo	4	3	7

The students use translanguaging in Thai 17 times and Japanese 5 times in Episode1 and Thai 3 times and Japanese 3 times in Episode2. This indicates that the students use English and translanguaging (Thai and Japanese) makes a clear understanding of the context that he wants to use in English and more comfortable. Moreover, the students use echo in Episode1 for 4 times and Episode2 for 3 times, indicating that the students still stay on listening to the discussion.

It can be concluded that the student-student interaction in English course at a Thai university level in classroom interactional competence. The most frequency strategies used by students turned taking, overlap and interruption, topic management, and repair respectively. Students use sub-components, peer repair, listenership, pass the turn, speakership, topic introduces, topic shift, self-select, topic develop, take turns, self-repair, hold the turn, and no teacher repair correspondingly to develop themselves in the classroom interactional competence. It can be concluded that the most frequent components of interactional strategies used by the students were peer repair while the least interactional strategies used was holding a turn.

CIC in Student-Student Oral Interaction

At the beginning of the conversation, the students were trying to get engaged in the topic. S1 is asking their friends' to give an idea about what topic they should talk first in Line 1. S5 was thinking about the topic while S2 proposed the first topic which is "how do people greet each other when they meet for the first time" in Line 3. Then they laughed out loud and shift the conversation to talk about their mom and shift back to the topic. S4 shift the topic back in Line 11 by repeating the name of the first topic. Line 12, where S5 persuades other friends to discuss what S1 starts the idea of how to greet at the first time Line 13.

Episode1 *"how do people greet each other when they meet for the first time"*

1 S1:   hi guys what should we … chooses one of the topics (2) not not not one of

         the topics two of the topics. To discount today

2 S5:   um

3 S2:   I think first topic is the most easy easiest

4 S1:   (GGEZ haha)

5 S5:   laugh

6 S1:   no no no

7 SS: laugh

8 S1:   I didn't say that…

9 S3:   Do you mean to you love your mom?

10 S1:   yeah yeah I love my mom

11 S4:   the question is how do people greet each other when they meet for the first

         time?

12 S5:   [first let discussion this]

…

(See Appendix G)

Analysis of Episode1: Turn-Taking Examples

Take turn

21 S5:   Sawasdee krub

22 S1:   *for um,* yes Sawasdee krub a men and Sawasdee ka for woman .. women

23 S2:   *um   um*

25 SS: (4)

26 S4:   What your name?

27 S1:   My name is Un. I'm eighteen years old. (laugh) อันนี้มันออกแนว introduce นะฮะ ไม่

น่า

ใช่แล้ว <this is kindda like introduce oneself not greeting, isn't it>

28 S4:   *um*

Line 23 shows that S1 wants to take his turn; he uses a filler *for um* to start the talk and to

develop more idea about how to say hello.

Hold turn

15 S3:   สบายดีไหม? <How are you?>

16 S1:   *ur.. (2)*

17 S5 เป็นไงบ้าง? <How are things?>

18 S1:   [maybe] เป็นไงบ้าง <How are things>

19 S3:   maybe maybe um

In Line 17, S1 uses *ur..* and pauses for 2 second to hold his turn while S5 takes his turn by

asking เป็นไงบ้าง? <How are thing?> He uses Thai to get his turn.

Pass turn

1 S1:   Hi guys what should we … chooses one of the topics (2) not not not one of

         the topics two of the topics. To discount today

2 S5:   *um*

3 S2:   I think first topic is the most easy easiest

In Line 2, S5 wants to share idea by starting *um* to think about the topic discussion.

Meanwhile he has nothing to say yet so he pass his turn to someone else by using filler like

um

…

25 S4:   What your name?

26 S1:   My name is Un. I'm eighteen years old. (laugh) อันนี้มันออกแนว introduce นะฮะ ไม่

      น่า

         ใช่แล้ว <this is kind like introduce oneself not greeting, isn't it>

27 S4:   *um*

28 S1:   ก็ สวัสดีครับผมชื่ออัน ยินดีที่ได้รู้จักกับ <Hi, my name is Un. Nice to meet you> something

like

         that. So what next?

29 S3:   What type?

In episode1, we can make observations about turn-taking in terms of pass turn. As you can

see in Line 28, S4 uses *um* to pass his turn. This refers to his thinking of what he introduces

in line 24.

42 S1:   I don't know (1) about this.

43 SS: (laugh)

44 S3:   What topic?

45 S2:   [Table manner]

Line 43, S1 responds to his friends that he doesn't know about this information before. So he

passes turn by saying *I don't know*.

58 S1:   When your ur when your month is full of food. (3) *And what else? What*

                 else do you think?

59 S5:   Um

60 S2:   [What about the elbows?]

In Line 58, S1 corrects himself to make others understand what he has mentioned. And S1

asks for information by using *And what else?* Then he passes his turn to get some ideas from

the others by using *What else do you think?*

Self-select

72 S4:   I think so. I think everyone do it normally. Um…

73 S5:   *But actually you can't do when you eat on the Table.*

74 S4:   um

75 S5:   *But I always do it.*

In Line 73 and 75, S5 select in English to continue the clarifying to the group by selecting

himself.

Analysis of Episode1: Repair Examples

Self-repair

26 S4: What your name?

27 S1:   My name is Un. I'm eighteen years old. (laugh) อันนี้มันออกแนว introduce

                 นะฮะ ไม่น่า ใช่แล้ว <this is kind like introduce oneself not greeting, isn't

it>

In Line 27, S1 continues to develop the topic from S4. Then he realizes that what he is saying

not relevant to the topic. So he corrects himself using Thai for better understanding.

Peer repair

50 S2:   What about Don't

51 S1:   Don't?

52 S4:   Don't do?

53 S1:   Don't to do on a Table manners. I think is (2) eat eating loudly that 'ซู๊ดดดด'

                 <Zeed is a sound when having soup in Thai> this not good. This is not good.

        It's bad in Thailand.

In Line 51 and line 52, S1 asks what is S2 said to show the topic that they will focus on.

S4 is checking the information to S2 that the next topic will be *Don't do?*

28 S1:   ก็ สวัสดีครับผมชื่ออัน ยินดีที่ได้รู้จักกับ <Hi, my name is Un. Nice to meet you.> something

        like that. So what next?

29 S3:   What type?

30 S1:   What is the next topic that you want to discussion?

31 S3:   um   [We want to]

In Line 29, S3 checks information with S1 because he couldn't hear what S1 has said by

using question *What type?* In Line 30, S1 adds information to S3 to what he said.

60   S2:   [What about the elbows?]

61   S1:   elbows?

62   S4:   elbows?

63 S5:   What is elbows?

64 S2:   Can't put your elbow on the Table.

65 S5:   um

In Line 63, S4 uses question to repeat the question to get more clarification of what is elbow

that S2 talk about.

Analysis of Episode1: Overlap and Interruption

Listenership

37 S2:   About do and don't on Table manners

38 S5:   [Oh]

39 S4:   [Oh]

40 S1:   Sound interesting. So

S5 and S4 show he is paying attention using *Oh*. They are listening and they agree to S2 to

introduce the topic using *Oh*.

Speakership

56 S1:   And so? Don't speak when your mount full of food.

57 S2:   [When you eat]

58 S1:   When your ur when your month is full of food. (3) And what else? What

                else do you think?

59 S5:   Um

60 S2:   *[What about the elbows?]*

61 S1:   elbows?

62 S4:   elbows?

In Line 57, S2 speaks up to add more information and support the discussion while S1 is speaking. In Line 59, S1 has not finished his talk but S2 speaks up to express his thought in question such as *What about the elbows?*.

Analysis of Episode1: Topic Management

Topic introduce

81 S1:   *Did did did* your parents didn't teach you ur manners?

82 SS: laugh

83 S2:   ur

84 S1:   *Just kidding, Just kidding, Just kidding, Joking Joking man Joking. Just joking.*

85 S4:   *Joking Joking*

Line 81, S1 takes a turn by asking and using lexical repetition. S1 lets it pass for his mistake in the utterance, it should be your parents didn't teach you manner, did they?

Topic development

72 S5:   I think so. I think everyone do it normally

73 S5:   *But actually you can't do when you eat on the Table.*

74 S4:   Um

75 S5:   *But I always do it.*

76 SS: laugh

In Line 73, S5 continues to give deification to the group and in Line 72 S5 keeps discussing the same topic. S5 keeps discuss the same topic and corrects himself from the previous talk in Line 73.

Topic shift

110 S2:   I think *that's all.*

111 S5:   yeah *I think so.*

112 S3:   *I think so*, I think so.

113 S4:   *I think so.*

114 S1:   *I think so* every time.

115 SS: Laugh

In Line 110, S2 brings the conversation to the end by using *that's all*. From Line 111-113, S5, S3, S4, and S1 agree to finish the discussion. They use *I think so* to end the conversation.

Data Analysis of Episode1

The students discussed how people greet each other when they meet for the first time and Table manners in Thailand. First, they share the same belief that people use Sawasdee krub or Sawasdee ka for women to greet each other. If they meet for the first time, they say Sawasdee krub and then introduce themselves. The second is Table manners. In Thailand, Thai people eat quietly; that is, they do not talk when they eat. If they eat loudly, other people get annoyed and think that you are impolite. Don't speak when your mouth is full of food. When you finish your eating you should gather your utensils together.

In Episode1, a group discussion of the lesson activity, the students are engaged in the discussion of the topic of cultural awareness. Episode1 illustrates how the group discussion shapes the students' contributions by turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management. This reveals that the students are trying to reach some common agreement through interaction by using various interactional resources. The group activity is to encourage the students to interact naturally and they are free to communicate or to

contribute to their topic idea to the concept of the topic of the discussion without much

monitoring on the correct grammar. The focus is to improve their fluency in their language.

Analysis of Episode2: Turn-Taking Examples

Take turn

41   S2:   *or* just cut the queue and

42   S3:   [cut the queue]

43   S2:   [cut the queue and repair her shoes first]

In Line 41, S2 uses preposition *or* as to start his talk to take turn to introduce idea of the

topic.

Hold turn

12   S4:   10 o'clock *But*… the shoe

13   S1:   [So what what what should we do? What should we do? Should

            we do, man!]

14   S3:   [What should we do? *I*

                                don't know.]

15   S2:   What about what about   buy a new shoes from our store?

Line 12, S4 uses *but* to start a new conversation but he has not finished his talk. He has to

hold his turn because S1 speaks up during his talk. S1 is a good listenership using *repeat* to

repeat the questions by asking his friends for more information about problem-solving. Then,

S3 gets a chance to speak up by repeating the question from S1 and passes his turn uses *I*

don't know. S2 is as speakership asks for information *what about*.

Pass turn

32 S1:   Another shoes shop that can repair her for in time.

33 S3:   Ur…(2)

34 S4:   Shoe shop

35 S3:   *Ur…* (3) แค่นี้เหรอ <That's it>

36 S1:   *What else? What else? What else? What do you think?*

37 S4:   *What else?*

38 S3:   laugh

39 S1:   *What do you think?*

40 S3:   *Oh hoo* อะไรดีล่ะ <What should it be?>

In Line 33, S3 hold his turn by using *ur…* and give the talk to S4. S4 is as a speakership to share his idea after S1. Started in Line 35, S3 passes his turn using filler *ur…* and ask for more idea in Thai. S1 passes his turn using question *What else? What do you think?* to ask friends for information. S4 passes his turn using question *What else?* to ask friends for information. S3 passes his turn using the laugh. S1 passes his turn using question *What do you think?* to ask friends for information. S3 passes his turn using filler *Oh hoo* ask friends for information.

Self-select

47 S2:   I think recommend her to other store is the best choice!

48 S1:   [yeah! I think that too.]

49 S5:   *Change store or buy a new one from our shop.*

50 S3/S2/S4:   [Yes is a good choice.]

In Line 49, S5 selects himself to engage to the topic showing his idea.

Analysis of Episode2: Repair Examples

Self-repair

27 S1:   Maybe we should mention her to ur ur new shoe store?

28 S4:   [yes]

29 S5:   [yes]

30 S1:   เค้าเรียกว่าอะไรหว่ะ <*What is it call?*>

31 S2:   Another shop

32 S1:   [Another shoes shop that can repair her for in time.]

In Line 32, S1 uses Thai to ask friend for the English word. S1 corrects himself after he asks

his friend to repair. S1 corrects himself by repeat the hold sentence again after he got the

answer in English from S2 to repair.

Peer repair

 5 S5:   She has a trip two week and her flight was a Saturday morning.

 6 S4:   [ur she has a trip two week]

 7 S1:   [Saturday morning. She gonna go Saturday.]

 8 S4:   10 o'clock

 9 S1:   10 o'clock? Did she did she say that?

10 SS: yeah.

11 S4:   10 o'clock But… the shoe

Start in Line 7, S4 adds details while S1 is asking his friend to correct the time. All say *yeah*

to reply as to respond the agreement. And again in Line 12, S4 repeats the answer again to

make sure for everyone.

Analysis of Episode2: Overlap and Interruption Examples

Listenership & Speakership

52	S4:	Buy a new shoe is a good choice.
53	S1:	laugh tell tell
54	S3:	[why she so rich]
55	S1:	[tell tell her that postpone the flight.]
56	S4:	[um postpone the flight]
57	SS:	(laugh)
58	S2:	or use, I see… use the EMS and send the shoes
59	S3:	[send the shoes to her place]

Listenership

Line 54, S3 is as a good listener to listen to what is S4 says asking questions about *'why'* to show that he is listening and what to know more details. In Line 56, S4 uses filler *um* and repeats the same sentence as S1 as to say that he is listening. And again in Line 59, S3 is as a good listener to listen to what is S2 repeat the utterance to show that is still listening.

Speakership

In Line 55, S1 speaks up while S3 has not finished his talk to convey more information to the topic using repeat to initiate this talk.

Analysis of Episode2: Topic management Examples

Topic introduce and development

41	S2:	or just cut the queue and
42	S3:	cut the queue

43	S2:	[cut the queue and repair her shoes first]
44	S1:	[it's okay but it rude a other customers that
		came before.]
45	S4:	It not be happy
46	SS:	(3)
47	S2:	I think recommend her to other store is the best choice!
48	S1:	[yeah! I think that too.]
49	S5:	Change store or buy a new one from our shop.
50	S3/S2/S4:	[Yes is a good choice.]

Topic introduce

In Line 45, 42, and 41, this show S4 engages to the topic that S3, S2, and S1 are talking about. While S2 uses *I think* to take a turn and gets engaged to share idea and S5 engages to the topic showing his idea.

Topic development

Line 43, S2 speaks up while S3 is still speaking to develop more information on the topic. In Line 44, S1 speaks up while S2 has not finished his talk to convey the message of the topic develops for more details.

Topic shift

66	S3:	Need EMS in three day
67	S1:	Maybe she's come back
68	S4:	[yeah]

69	S1:	[She ends his/her conversation.]
70	S3	You think it two week?
71	S1:	no no it's two weeks

In Line 71, S3 shifts the topic to inquire his friend for clarification of the information that he is missing. S3 shifts the topic for S1 which is taking about how to get a shoes fix.

Data Analysis of Episode2

The students discussed how to make customers happy. They would recommend the customer to buy a new one but they think it's not quite good. So some students' suggested that they should mention her shoe shop. Then another idea comes up that they should cut the queue and repairs her shoes first but they think it's rude to another customer if they do that. Another idea came out that they should tell her to postpone the flight but they think it's a nonsense or they should send the express mail service (EMS) to her place that she takes a vacation on but takes time for delivery there maybe she would come back before the shoes are all ready to be delivered to. So the students think the best choice is to mention to the customer to go to another shoe shop that can fix her shoes on time.

In Episode2, a group discussion of the lesson activity, the students are engaged in discussing the topic of how to make customers happy. Episode2 demonstrates how a student gets to the goal of topic in a group discussion by using turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management. The analysis shows that the students are trying to reach the bottom line by using exchange information. This results in interactional competence among the students to reach the goal of the task.

Result of Data Analysis of Student-Student in Episode 1 and 2

Firstly, turn-taking is a sign of changing idea. The changing idea makes a changing topic. If a student chooses self-select to thing to do, they would like to contribute to the same topic from their own perspective that is shared the idea. In changing ideas the students self-select and they would like to change the topic to something else. The use of turn-taking is a sign of sharing experiences of each speaker to get to the point of the conversational talk. This encourages the active participation of the students. For certain people they choose to use turn-taking, they change the topic to something else. Fluency is to make the students engaged in certain activities in teaching and learning as to engage the students in more contribution and hopefully for more creativity. The results of turn-taking also reveal that students take turns by using *filler* to initiate their conversation. The student shows he wants to start the conversation and develop information that he has for the topic discussed. The students hold turn by using *filled pause* while the other speakers speak up during his talk. As for pass turn, the analysis shows that students use filler to pass the turn when he has nothing to say or lack of idea to share. The word I don't know is also used when the students don't know the information from the previous discussion. The questions like "what else's?" "what do you think?" or "what is next" are used to pass their turn to other speakers to get more information.

Repair is very important for students monitoring their mastery of the concept apart from communication strategy and learning strategy. The use of repairing is a sign of making attempts towards understanding and negotiation meaning to reach the goal. The repair features in passing turn also contribute to the students' participation. The result shows that the students self-repair in repair when he realizes that his conversation is not related to the subject talk. So he corrects himself by using Thai to be more understandable and clear to the point. Moreover, the students use peer repair in terms of asking the questions for

clarifying the previous utterance that he misunderstanding or mishearing. Checking information is another sub-components that the student use in this study in order to confirm the information of other speakers and from the problem of hearing from the speakers or while he was not paying much attention to what the other speakers are saying but thinking to the subject talk or doing or findings information. Adding information, the students use these sub-components by repeating the same utterance of previous speakers and to give clarification or suggestion to the topic talk.

Overlap and interruption is also effective in supporting the students' interaction to eventually reach listenership and speakership. Both sub-components can help to build leadership and become a leanership. From the analysis, the result show that the students spoken interaction in listenership use *filler* while the other speakers are conveying the talk. This shows that he is still paying attention to the speaker. Students also ask the question during the interaction to show he is listening to the speaker and ready to develop information. As good listenership, it contributes to a good speakership. The students speak up while one or more speaker is talking at the same time or conversation part while others keep talking without stopping to give others to join in the discussion. This is called the overlap and interruption. In this sub-component, the students are likely to use the question to ask, add more information, or give suggestion follow from other speakers or come up out of his own ideas.

Additionally, topic management can extend or shorten the conversation or bring or develop the new expression, and additional language contribution. These interactional features are obvious to effectively enhance these students' contributions in this group discussion conversation. The Table 4.1.2 shows the student interaction by using the topic introduces with the repetition of short phrases or to introduce information to the topic discussion (see Page 110). Meanwhile, student supports points to stay on the same topic and

succeeds in maintaining the topic for a while. This is called topic development. The last sub-component is topic shift, which students use to deal with changes in a topic or bring the discussion back to talk about the same topic discussed earlier. Student shift the topic because he wants to introduce new information and end with the discussion.

The Findings of Questionnaire and Interview

This section presents the findings of data collected from approaches composing; 1) questionnaire and 2) interview. The findings are examined in relation to research, question number one

Research question 1 to analyze classroom interactional competences (CIC) of a small group of Thai university students through four interactional resources: turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management in spoken English. Mean scores of the students' perceived in CIC from the questionnaire were examined moreover, students' opinions about interactional strategies from the semi-structured interviews were analyzed and the findings were triangulated with the analyses of students' conversational recording from oral interactional observation sheet.

Findings of Questionnaire

The objective of this part is to identify students' perceived self-interaction, fifty-five undergraduate students from the Faculty of Humanities enrolled in English for Effective Communication at Srinakharinwirot University. The number of eligible students identified was 55; of these, 55 returned the questionnaire.

Demographic Data of Questionnaire Participants

Descriptive statistics, including numbers, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to summarize the student demographic data. The demographic

characteristics of questionnaire participants are presented in Tables 4.2. Moreover, means and

standard deviations were used to analyze the Thai university student-student interactional

strategies; turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management during group

work in the classroom in Table 4.2.1.

Table 4.2 Demographic Data of Questionnaire Participants

Items	Number (Students)	%	($\overline{\text{X}}$)	(SD.)
Gender				
Male	11	20.00		
Female	44	80.00		
Age			18.00	.771
English score TOEIC			464.08	137.227
Total	55	100.00		

Personal data of participants include the gender, age and English score (see Table

4.2). The findings show that most students are female (80%) and male (20%) at the age of

means score 18 years old. The mean score shows students get TOEIC score at 464.08.

Analysis of Students' Perception Interactional Strategies during Group Work in the

Classroom

This part of the study presents students' perception in four interactional

recourses: turn-taking, repair, overlap and interruption, and topic management. Students are

responded to the 19 item questions and students' perception interactional strategies measure

by a 3-point rating scale (see Appendix B).

Table 4.2.1 Shows Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Students' Perceptions of

Turn-Taking Strategy

NO.	Strategies	$(\overline{X})$	(S.D.)	Interpretation
1	*Turn-taking* I use fillers when I want to take turn (e.g. well, you know, okay um, or, uh).	2.81	.480	Yes, I can do this easily and well
2	I select myself to speak up to take turn.	2.45	.558	Yes, I can do this easily and well
3	I wait for other speakers' statement to finish and give his/her turn to respond.	2.47	.539	Yes, I can do this but not quite well
4	I use fillers when I think of words I want to use (e.g. um, ur, or uh).	2.62	.527	Yes, I can do this easily and well
5	I call other speakers by name to share ideas.	1.20	.480	No, I cannot do this yet
6	I use questions to ask other speakers' idea or more information about the topic (e.g. what do you think? /what else?).	2.81		Yes, I can do this easily and well

As seen in Table 4.2.1 the mean scores indicated that students rate themselves as

they use fillers when I want to take turn (e.g. well, you know, okay um, or, uh) at 2.81 and

they use questions to ask other speakers' idea or more information about the topic (e.g. what

do you think? /what else?). The student interprets their perception as yes I can do this easily

and well. The rest 2.62 use fillers; such as um, ur, or uh when they think of words they want to

use, wait for other speakers' statement to finish and give his/her turn to respond at 2.47 and

select themselves to speak up to take turn 2.45. This interprets students yes I can do this

easily and well. Furthermore, students have a difficult time to call other speakers by name to

share ideas as yes, I can do this but not quite well is at 1.20.

Table 4.2.2 Shows Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Students' Perceptions of

Repair Strategy

NO.	Strategies	$(\overline{X})$	(S.D.)	Interpretation
7	*Repair* I correct myself when I notice that I have made a mistake..	2.05	.420	Yes, I can do this but not quite well
8	I correct other speakers when they say something wrong.	1.87	.567	Yes, I can do this but not quite well
9	I ask other speakers to clarify when the message is not clear.	2.81	.610	Yes, I can do this easily and well
10	I ask other speakers for a word using L1(Thai)	2.23	.564	Yes, I can do this but not quite well
11	I ask other speakers for checking information repeating the same words.	2.09	.589	Yes, I can do this but not quite well
12	I let it pass when speakers say something wrong.	1.85	.621	Yes, I can do this but not quite well

The students' perceptions of their repair strategies, students yes, I can do this

easily and well at 2.81 when the message is not clear, I ask the other person to clarify directly.

Students also percept they ask other speakers for a word using L1 (Thai) as Yes, I can do this but not quite well mean score 2.23. Students ask other speakers for checking information repeating the same words is at 2.09 as Yes, I can do this but not quite well. Students correct themselves when they notice that they have made a mistake at 2.05. Similarly, when another person says something wrong during the discussion, students correct other speakers (1.87) as Yes, I can do this but not quite well and students let it pass when speakers say something wrong at 1.85 as yes, I can do this but not quite well.

Table 4.2.3 Shows Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Students' Perceptions of Overlap and Interruption Strategy

NO.	Strategies	$(\bar{X})$	(S.D.)	Interpretation
13	*Overlap and interruption* I use sounds (e.g. um, oh, ur) while other speakers are speaking to show I'm listening.	2.45	.480	Yes, I can do this easily and well
14	I use questions to ask other speakers while he/she is speaking to show I'm listening.	2.09	.420	Yes, I can do this but not quite well
15	I speak up while the other speakers haven't finished speaking yet.	1.40	.567	No, I cannot do this yet

With respect to overlap and interruption, the students' perceptions of I make a sound while the other person is speaking so as to show that I am listening indicate mean score at 2.45 this interpret Yes, I can do this easily and well. Students use questions to ask other speakers while he/she is speaking to show they are listening at 2.09. Students' perceptions of

I speak while the other person hasn't finished speaking yet at 1.40 means No, I cannot do this

yet.

Table 4.2.4 Shows Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Students' Perceptions of

Topic Management Strategy

NO.	Strategies	($\overline{X}$)	(S.D.)	Interpretation
16	*Topic management* I select myself to introduce a new topic.	2.24	.420	Yes, I can do this but not quite well
17	I manage a talk to deal with changes in a topic.	2.00	.558	Yes, I can do this but not quite well
18	I encourage myself to discuss the topic.	2.40	.564	Yes, I can do this easily and well
19	I support the points to stay on the same topic for a while.	2.81	.549	Yes, I can do this easily and well

The findings show that the students' perceptions for topic management, students

support the points to stay on the same topic for a while at mean score 2.81. Students

encourage themselves to discuss the topic at mean score of 2.40 which means Yes, I can do

this easily and well. Moreover, students select themselves to introduce a new topic as Yes, I

can do this but not quite well is at 2.24. Students manage a talk to deal with changes in a topic

at 2.00 as Yes, I can do this but not quite well.

Table 4.2.5 Shows the Overall Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Students'

Perceptions of Interactional Strategy

NO.	Strategies	($\overline{X}$)	(S.D.)	Interpretation
1.	Turn-taking	2.39	.327	Yes, I can do this easily and well.
2.	Repair	2.15	.365	Yes, I can do this but not quite well.
3.	Overlap and interruption	1.98	.386	Yes, I can do this but not quite well.
4.	Topic management	2.36	.344	Yes, I can do this easily and well.
	Total	2.22	.212	Yes, I can do this but not quite well

As seen in Table 4.3.5 the means of the four strategies indicated that overall of

students rate themselves as yes, I can do this but not quite well ($\overline{X}$ =2.22, SD = 0.212) and

can use turn-taking in their interaction, which obtained the mean score ($\overline{X}$ = 2.39, SD =

0.327), followed by topic management ($\overline{X}$ = 2.36, SD = 0.344), repair ($\overline{X}$ = 2.15, SD =

0.365), and lastly overlap and interruption ($\overline{X}$ = 1.98, SD = 0.386).

In summary, the results revealed that Thai university students rate themselves

yes, I can do this easily and well. The highest mean scores are item 1 and 19 (2.81), which

belong to repair: when the message is not clear, I ask the other person to clarify directly and

topic management: I support the points to stay on the same topic for a while. The second-

highest mean score is item 3 (2.62), which belong to turn-taking; I use fillers when I think of

words I want to use (e.g. um, ur, or uh). And the third-highest mean scores is item 3 (2.4),

which belong to turn-taking; I wait for other speakers' statement to finish and give his/her

turn to respond. According to the data, it can be seen that the top three mean scores come

from a different strategy. Moreover, the overall of students' perceived in interactional

strategies was yes, I can do this, but not quite well in three components: turn-taking, topic management, repair, and overlap and interruption respectively.

Findings of Interview

According to the data from the semi-structured interviews, the students identified various problems, five students who participated in the English for Effective Communication at Srinakharinwirot University were interviewed about their perceptions of interaction in the classroom. Moreover, teacher-student and student-student interactional strategies were analyzed regarding four interactional resources; turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management. This data was used for discussion of the second research question, "what components of classroom interactional competence (CIC) help in developing spoken English of Thai university students".

Analysis of Students' Perception Interview

Descriptive statistics, including number and percentages, were used to analyze the Thai university students' perceptions of interactional strategies. Table 4.3.6 revealed that participants responses to 14 questions from five undergraduate Thai university students who took 10 weeks of English for Effective Communication at Srinakharinwirot University. The students required to answer 'yes' or 'no' questions and provided an explanation.

Demographic Data of Interview Participants

Descriptive statistics, including numbers, percentages, and means, were used to summarize the student demographic data. The demographic characteristics of interview participants are presented in Tables 4.3.6 to get a better understanding of student background.

Personal data of interview participants include the gender, age and English score
(see Table 4.3.6). The findings show that five students are all male (100%) at the age of
means score 18.6 years old. The mean score shows students get TOEIC score at 509.40. The
mean score shows students show five of the students have you been studying English 13.8
years. Five of them were the first-year student. The students were major in Japanese (80%)
and Thai (20%). They minor in English (60%) and no minor (40%). 80% of the students
studied a high school in English-Japanese and 20% in other programs like English-Chinese.
Five (100%) of the students never been abroad to countries where English is the first
language. Students studied English outside the classroom is 40 %. They studied conversation,
reading, and writing for 1-2 weeks of each skill. In the schooling system, 60% of students
studied English with native English speaking teachers in primary school, secondary school,
and high school. 80% of students ever traveled to other countries such as Singapore,
Malaysia, and Japan.

Table 4.2.6 The Frequency of Students' Perceptions of Interactional Strategies

Questions	YES	NO
	N (%)	N (%)
1. Do you like students-students interaction? (group discussion) Please, explain.	5 (100%)	-
2. Do you think speaking activities help you to create a successful interaction in the classroom? Give example (e.g. group discussion, presentation, or etc.) Please, explain.	5 (100%)	-
3. Do you understand, what turn-taking in the classroom is? Can you give some example?	1 (20%)	3 (60%)

Questions	YES	NO
	N (%)	N (%)
4. Can you hold the turn while you are in the discussion? Please describe.	4 (80%)	1 (20%)
5. Do you think about passing turn while you are in the discussion? Why?	5 (100%)	-
6. Can you make silent friends to interact in the group? How? Please describe.	1 (20%)	4 (80%)
7. Do you say anything when you say something wrong during interaction? Why?	3 (60%)	2 (40%)
8. Do you say anything when your friends say anything wrong during interaction? Why?	4 (80%)	1 (20%)
9. While discussing with your friends, have you started asking your friends for opinion? How?	5 (100%)	-
10. Can you make your friend talk or discuss in the group?	2 (40%)	3 (60%)
11. Is it possible to make all the friends participate in the speaking activities? Why?	2 (20%)	3 (60%)
12. Do you have any problem in participate in the class? (e.g. talkative, the topic, or fear, etc.) Please, explain.	3 (60%)	2 (40%)
13. Can you apply interaction strategies outside class? Please, explain.	5 (100%)	-

During the interview, the students were interviewed do they like students-students interaction in group discussion. All (100%) of the students said 'yes'. Similar to item 2, students think speaking activities help them to create a successful interaction in the classroom

and they can hold the turn while they are in the discussion in item 4. Moreover, students think about passing turn while they are in the discussion. Furthermore, students will say something when they said something wrong during interaction in item 7. Besides, students ask the friend for an opinion while they discuss with friends in item 9. Lastly, students can apply interaction strategies outside class, item 13.

For item 8, students say will something when their friends say something wrong during the interaction, the majority (80%) of the students said 'yes', and 20% of them said 'no'.

As Table 4.3.6 shows, (60%) of the students find that they can make silent friends interact in the group and the rest 40% said 'no' in item 6 which related to item 12, they have some problems in participating in the class. In a similar way, students said 'yes' it possible to make all the friends participate in the speaking activities, item 11.

Item 4 is intended to identify whether students understand, what turn-taking in the classroom is. The majority of the students (80%) said that they did not understand turn-taking in the classroom in item 3. Only 20% of them agreed with the statement. Question item 10 is intended to ask the students' opinion of making friend talk or discuss in the group. Accordingly, 60% of the majority said that they cannot make friend talk or discuss in the group. The rest percent, 40% said that they can make friend talk or discuss in group activities (Table 4.3.6).

To explore the particular ways of students viewed interaction in the classroom, students were asked about their perception in four interactional recourses: turn-taking, repair, overlap and interruption, and topic management. In the next section, the data drawn from interviews with students are shown.

Student-Student Turn-Taking

Asking and answering questions: five students mentioned that they perceived interactional strategies as they like student-student interaction in interaction in group discussion. In response to the question asked, the answers are in the followings:

Yes, I think it's fun and can improve our conversation skills. (S1)

Yes, I like it. Because we can share our opinion with catch others. (S2)

Yes, I can ask friends some English if I'm not well in English and I ask friends some difficult word or sentences. (S3)

Yes, I like because it good my English skills and to my friend it make our to more friendly than before. (S4)

Yeah, I student-student interaction is good. We can talk with each other or your friend. (S5)

Speaking activities: 5 students mentioned speaking activities help them to create a successful interaction in the classroom, group discussion, presentation, and etc:

Yes, I think group discussion. It's best way to improve our listening and speaking skills. And ask and answer with teacher like feedback. (S1)

Yes, group discussion because we used to like discuss an idea and everyone so we can approve our speaking skill and we can have participate in our discuss. (S2)

Yes, group discussion and game playing in English language. (S3)

Yes, I think it very help. I think group discussion very help me improve my English skill, my English accent because sometime I can use English any time because it in Thailand. In native language. In the classroom I can use English to speak to my friend it good. (S4)

Yes. I think group discussion is the best way it can make everyone to make interaction. (S5)

Four students did not understand what turn-taking in the classroom is, they were explained that:

No. I don't know if that my opinion wrong or something but I think turn-taking is like when I saying taking my friends should listening and when I stop saying um then my friend take turn to talk. (S1)

No, In my opinion when someone talk you just listen to them and when it your turn like สลับกันพูด *(turn-taking) (S2)*

No. Maybe we want to talk but my friend talking we should to put hand up and want talk to friend we want to talk. If another people taking we want to talk we can put hand up (in the class). (S3)

No, I don't know but I think turn talking is about waiting our turn to speak or talking. (S5)

Only one of student agreed on the statement.

Yes, when I have an idea I can say with my group when my friends have an idea I should to listening and silent. (S4)

Holding the turn while discussion: five of the students

Yes. I think if I want to hold the turn I will explain my idea to get more information. I think I can. (S1)

Yes wait until someone their talk is over and we can talk on our idea. (S2)

Yes, if anything people in group finish we can hold the turn. (S3)

Yes. I put hand up Hey I have an idea and tell my idea with my group. And say what about you think. (S4)

Yes, I think waiting until someone to stop talking or asking me to speak my opinion or my idea. (S5)

Moreover, five students think about passing turn while they are in the discussion.

Yes, If I run out of idea my head blank then I should pass my turn to my friends. (S1)

Yes, I think this is good for sometime like when we don't have idea. (S2)

Yes, I think it good because when we not have idea we can pass it to. (S3)

Yes, when I want to pass turn I don't say anything or O.K. you can say I don't have an idea. Something like that. (S4)

Yes, I think passing may also happen with everyone when we have no idea or don't know when how we continuous speaking. (S5)

From the turn-taking, it can be summarized that students understand the interaction strategies as they participated in group discussion. These interactions are taking turn, holding turn, and passing turn. Interacting with students and other students in group discussion by sharing new idea, exchange information, and improving English speaking skill. Moreover, speaking activities encourages students to develop listening, speaking, and interactional skills. Being fully holding turn means students want to explain their idea to get more information so they will hold the turn until someone finished their talk. Additionally, students' perceptions of passing turn as they do not have any idea to say so they pass their turn to their friends.

Student-Student Repair

Three students can make silent friends interact, they reported that

Yes, I think. Asking them for an opinion. What do you think about this topic. (S2)

Yes, I can. I can ask some easy question. Or my friend not good in English do you have any idea. (S3)

Yes, I can do it. I will ask silent friend about his/her opinion and give turn to speak. (S5)

A few try to encourage silent friends to interact

50/50 if I encourage him I think he will speak. Try to ask him about his opinion. I will tell or ask him like what is your idea what is your opinion. (S1)

50/50,for example, I question him and I just say with him hey! Do you have an idea what do you think? (S4)

Five students will say something when they said something wrong during the interaction.

Yes. If I noticed it I will say sorry and make it right. Right away. (S1)

Yes, If I noticed I will change it in the correct word or sentence but if it not so important I will change it at the end or tell this is wrong. (S2)

Yes, say sorry and say again in correct may be if it not big wrong I can pass it. (S3)

Yes, This point what I want I will ask my friend I or end of time I will fix it. In wrong point. (S4)

Yes, I will say sorry everyone right now and make it correct. Right away. (S5)

Four students say something when their friends say something wrong during interaction.

Yes. If he didn't know that I will wait unit his taking is over. And then I will say that hey! You are wrong. What is the word or sentence that he make wrong or mistake. (S1)

Yes, If it is an important part or word I will put my hand up and tell him that this is wrong. You should change it this word or something. I will him right away because if it important every one will confuse if we don't change it right away. (S2)

Yes, if friend talk finish I can tell them to what wrong. (S3)

Yes, I will fix it at end of my friend and end of group discussion. Hey! You just wrong. (S4)

Only one student would not correct the friend when they say something wrong during the interaction.

Not yet. I will let it pass until the end of activities and tell them him/her that you mistake or incorrect something like that. (S5)

In brief, students perceived repair strategy as self-repair, other-initiated, and other-repaired respectively. Students correct word or sentence by themselves if they noticed. Students ask the silent friend to initiate their talk and share their opinion. In addition, students correct others when they say something wrong if they noticed.

Student-Student Overlap and Interruption

Five students started asking your friends for an opinion while discussing.

Yes, I will ask them by say "any ideas?" But not very often about 25%. (S1)

Yes. Sometimes, like taking about my own opinion first and then ask them what do you think in their own opinion. (S2)

Yes. say friends' name and ask some idea or any question on a discussion. (S3)

Yes, I will say anything else? or you have any ideas? (S4)

Yes, I always asking my friend about his/her opinion it always because I don't

know how to speak. (S5)

Three students cannot make your friend talk or discuss in the group while two of them can.

No, Encourage them, It's O.K just talk if it wrong I can fix this for you like that.

(S2)

No, Cause, some person can't speak English. I just try to invite him to group what

you think this topic and I just say my idea first present to my friend. (S4)

No, I think it's half to make someone join discussing. We don't know why his/her

don't participate or how does his/her feel. (S5)

These are the explanation of the two students.

Yes, I think is possible. If we try to encourage friend who shy to speak. (S1)

Yes, Ask some easy question or ask any idea. (S3)

To sum up, students' understanding of overlap and interruption strategies as they like talking about their own opinion first and it difficult to invite a friend to think of the topic. Furthermore, the student tries to encourage the friend to speak.

Student-Student Topic Management

It possible to make all the friends participate in the speaking activities: three students reported that

Yes, but very hard. Because some friend afraid of to make a mistake, like to shy something like that. (S2)

Yes, May be I can. Maybe they not well in English and they not want to talk. We can ask some question or ask any idea. (S3)

Yes, I think possible but it somebody can speak a lot somebody afraid to speak English because he afraid of wrong grammar. But I can, it possible. (S4)

Two students think that all students cannot participate in speaking activities.

It's not impossible 50/50 if friends to shy in their languages skills and trying not to talk. If we encourage him to talk by ask them I'll try to participant with him individual. (S1)

No. I think it impossible every activities all discussion will have someone don't do anything because they always shy. (S5)

Three students reported that they have some problems in participating. They said:

Yes. It's a problems I think it good. I think you should wait until his or her taking over and then I will put the idea out. Speak the idea out. (S1)

Yes, I have. I'm fear of making mistake and sometime I think if I share an idea what the other will think about me like. Are you wired? (S2)

Yes, because sometime I shy to say English and I afraid and was worried in English. This topic is not interesting. I don't to answer I not concentrate to what you say. (S4)

Other two students mentioned that

No. I'm not well English but I'm afraid some difficulty word or sentence and talk it though it wrong. (S3)

No. I always participate every activities that I can do. I like to talk with others and exchange ideas. (S5)

Briefly, students perceived topic management as afraid to make a mistake and topic not interesting. Students mentioned that to participate in class they need to encourage themselves to speak and don't need to worry about the grammar or mistake. While some explain that topic is not interesting, they don't have any background to continuous the talk.

All in all, the students' perceived value of interaction outside of the class. They felt that interaction is important and the students gave some benefits they gained from their class interaction as five students said:

Yes, take turn is a good strategies if everybody talk at the same time the listener will not understand it to what you saying. (S1)

Yes, I when someone talking something wrong I can tell them. Like turn-taking like wait until other finish their talk then we can interact or say something right after. (S2)

Yes, for example as friend some idea or question in group work. In conversation may in group in the classroom may not in English but in Thai as well. (S3)

Yes, with tourists come to Thailand where can you go I can suggestion him many Thailand places. Sometime I say with friend by turn-taking. (S4)

Yes, I was usually asked by travelers like how to go to someplace or exchange money, bring him to something /somewhere. Yes, for example I was usually asked how to go to someplace by travelers. (S5)

Students' Suggestions and Recommendations

The students gave some recommendations. These are explained by the students.

I think students should talk more but you know Thai student afraid of making mistake, you know? I think teacher is good now but us I don't to you like asking student like do you understand this or what do you think about this. (S2)

I think now is good teacher ask some help student for difficult word or still no idea teacher say or tell. (S3)

I think discussion is very good but sometime student is not concentrate what teacher say about. Good is you walk around the room because some student just play at the back and play game. (S4)

Teacher tries to make everyone talking in the classroom but not many one concentrates. (S5)

In summary, interactional strategies have been recognized by the students interviewed. They were expressing their opinion that interaction in group work or class activities has helped them to improve their learning English especially speaking and listening skills. Students' viewed in turn-taking as they want to exchange their idea while holding turn means they need to explain their information and they passing turn when they want some other ideas. For repair strategy, students correct themselves if they noticed, they ask a silent friend to initiate their talk and correct others when they say something wrong. For overlap and interruption strategies, it's difficult to invite a friend share the topic and they try to

encourage friends to speak. Students perceived topic management as a topic not interesting,

they don't have any background to continue the talk.

The Findings of Teacher-Student Oral Interaction

Section two reports the findings to answer the research question number 2

teacher-students' oral interaction observation. What oral interactional strategies are used by

both teacher-students in order to engage in interaction in a Thai university? The teacher-

students' oral interactional observation covered three lesson session in which the teacher

initiated interaction with typical teaching classroom and another two sessions of students

initialed interrelation sequence. Each session took about forty minutes and twenty minutes at

the beginning of the observed interaction which was analyzed.

Table 4.3 Lessons and Time Duration of Teacher-Student

Type of Interaction	Lessons/Episodes	Approximate Time Duration (minutes)
Teacher-Student	Writing e-mail	11
Teacher-Student	Presentation	10.1
Teacher-Student	Holidays and Traditions	21

Table 4.3 presents topics of interaction lessons of Episode and time duration for

whole class discussion conducted by teacher and student. Teacher-Student spent

approximately 11 minutes discussing "writing an e-mail", 10.1 minutes on the topic

"presentation", and 21 minutes on the "holidays and traditions" topic.

The teacher-students' oral interaction was observed, recorded, and analyzed to

derive the patterns of interaction. It was found that two main typical patterns appear in the

classroom: 1) teacher initiated interaction and 2) student-initiated interactions. The teacher initial interaction refers to interactions where the teacher takes the turn to talk to the whole class and typically interact with a sequence refer to a classroom of student while waiting for the rest of the other students' attention in the class. The researcher looks at the beginning of the lesson as its part of the introduction. It is the beginning of the lesson and the teacher can get some ideas on the topic from students' contribution based on their background knowledge. This interaction is initiated and controlled by the teacher, referred to as teacher-student interaction (T-S). On the other hand, student initiated interaction means a student a speaker starts their conversation either with a teacher, and other students or in the whole class.

Results of teacher-student oral interactional observation

This section presents the teacher and students' oral classroom interaction. The teacher and students and classroom setting are shown. Then, the teacher initiated and the students initiated during the interaction are described in the classroom.

Frequency of Interactional Strategies Use by Teacher-Student Oral Interaction

This section presents the data concerning the interactional strategies and frequency of occurrences in each strategy in the observed class used in teacher-student interaction. The data reveal the most frequent components of interactional strategies and the least frequent components of interactional strategies used in the teacher-student interaction.

Remark: FREQ stand for Frequency and Ep. stand for Episode

Table 4.3.1 Frequency of Interactional Strategies Used by Teacher-Student Oral Interaction

in Three Episodes

Components	Freq Ep 1 (11 minutes)		Freq Ep 2 (10.1 minutes)		Freq Ep 3 (21 minutes)		Total		Over all
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T-S
1. Turn-taking	12	12	13	13	31	33	60	57	117
2. Repair	9	0	5	0	19	5	33	5	38
3. Overlap & interruption	3	0	0	0	10	31	13	31	44
4. Topic management	11	11	12	11	30	30	53	52	105
Total	35	23	12	24	90	99	159	145	304
Over all	58		36		118		304		

The data presented in Table 4.3.1 show the frequency of interactional strategies

used by teacher-student, based on the analysis of three Episodes from three different topics:

writing e-mail, presentation, and holidays and traditions. The total frequency of the three

episodes is 304 interactions occurred and used by the teacher (159) and students (145) to

identify the classroom interactional competence from the highest to the lowest interaction

frequency. In Episode3 (35 and 23) shows the total frequency of interactions in which

students interacted with the teacher is higher than the total frequency of Episodes 1 (35 and

23), Episode2 (12 and 24), meaning to identify the classroom interactional competence used

by students' group discussion. Surprisingly, the students were less interact in developing

interactional competency in Episode2.

From the analysis, there are four major components; turn-taking, repair, overlap and interruption, and topic management. The total of the three episodes starts from the most to the least interaction, surprisingly; turn-taking shows the total frequency of interaction was 117; teacher takes 60 turns while students take 57 turns, meaning teacher used interactional strategies with greater than the student. This shows that teacher-student involve in the whole class discussion very well. Regarding topic management, it is not expecting the total frequency of interaction was 105; the teacher interested by using 53 topic management with greater than the students 52 topic management, telling that the teacher-student interaction in topic management help to improve in interactional competence. It is remarkable that the total frequency of interaction in overlap and interruption were 44; teacher uses 13 overlaps and interruption with lesser than the students use 31 overlaps and interruption for the whole class interaction, showing that the student development in interactional competence in overlap and interruption in the whole class discussion interaction. It is expecting that the last total frequency of repair in three Episodes was 38; teacher uses 33 repairs with greater than the students use 5 repairs, indicating that repair strategy was not ringing the bell of any interaction.

The most frequent use interactional strategies of teacher and students are turn-taking (117), followed by topic management (105), overlap and interruption (44), and repair (38) respectively. Teacher and student should pay attention to each component to promote the space of classroom interaction, and language learning.

Frequency of Sub-Components Used by Teacher-Student Oral Interaction

The data presented in Table 4.3.2 show the frequency of sub-components used by teacher and students. There are twelve sub-components: take turns, hold turn, pass turn, self-select, self-repair, peer repair, teacher repair, listenership, speakership, topic introduces, topic develop, and last topic shift of classroom interactional competence.

Table 4.3.2 Frequency of Sub-Components Used by Teacher-Student Oral Interaction

Sub-components	FREQ Ep. 1	FREQ Ep. 1	FREQ Ep. 2	FREQ Ep. 2	FREQ Ep. 3	FREQ Ep. 3	Total		Overal l
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T-S
Take turn	2	-	-	-	1	1	3	1	4
Hold turn	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	3
Pass turn	4	-	6	-	15	-	29	-	29
Self-select	6	11	7	13	15	31	28	55	83
Self-repair	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Peer repair	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	5
Teacher repair	8	-	5	-	19	-	32	-	32
Listenership	2	-	-	-	3	2	5	2	7
Speakership	1	-	-	-	7	29	8	29	37
Topic Introduce	1	8	2	11	5	16	8	35	43
Topic development	3	3	6	-	11	11	20	14	34
Topic shift	7	-	4	-	14	3	25	3	28
Total	35	23	12	24	90	99	159	145	304

The data presented in Table 4.3.2 shows the frequency of interactional strategies used by teacher and students in three episodes; 304 interactions occurred to identify the classroom interactional competence used by teacher (159) and student (145) and occurred in Episodes 1 (35 and 23), Episode2 (12 and 24), and Episode3 (90 and 99) to show how the contributions of turn-taking, repair, topic management, and overlap interruption help the teacher and students get the flow of talk to achieve the goal of communication.

The Table above gives a better picture of the teacher and students' total number of verbal interactions in the classroom; it reflects their participation in chorus interaction to their contributions in the whole class activities.

It is interesting that turn-taking is the most frequent components of the three episodes used by teacher and students in oral interactional strategy. Table 4.3.1 shows the total occurrences of turn-taking (117), the teacher used (60) and student used (57) turns taking, teacher turn-taking has a higher number than students turn-taking. There are four sub-components: take turns, hold turn, pass turn, and self-select. It is interesting to see that self-selection is the most frequently used by student (55), and teacher (28), meaning the students use self-select greater than the teacher. This strategy has found in native speakers, conversations while others might be limited in the second language. Teacher pass turn is 29 occurrences and student pass turn is no. It is noticeable that the students no passing turns in the classroom settings. Along with 3 occurrences of taking turn used by the teacher (3) and student (1). The number of hold turn is rarely used by the student (1) and teacher no use, pointing out that interactional competence was not ringing the bell in hold turn. Therefore, the interaction strategy of turns taking used by teacher-student is self-selection, pass turn, take turn and hold turn respectively. These strategies go some way to explain the frequent use of selection in changing speaker for the whole class interactions.

Unexpectedly, topic management reports the second frequently strategy during the classroom interactions. There are 105 occurrences of topic management, the teacher used 53 and students used 52 of topic management, the number of teacher topic management has slightly higher than the student. There are three sub-components: topic introduces, topic development, and topic shift. Topic introduce has occurrences by the student (35) and the teacher (8). While teacher topic development is occurrences (20) and student topic development is 14. These show the students put their thought and ideas into word or they

simply have enough confidence to speak in the presence of other people. This shows the

students' interactional competence development in the whole class talk. The teacher used

topic shifts (25) and student used (3). This means that the teacher does well in continuing it

for a while and from different views of information. Consequently, topic management used

by teacher-student is topic introduce, topic development, and topic shift, correspondingly.

Overlap and interruption is the third most frequently strategy used by teacher and

students are (44), the teacher used 13 and students used 31. There are two sub-components of

this strategy: listenership and speakership. The frequency of students' use of overlap and

interruption is higher than that of the teacher. The number of speakership student is (29) and

used by the teacher (8), pointing that student simply have enough confidence to speak in front

of other people. They are more interactive when they discuss in the whole class. The teacher

used listenership (5) and student used (2) in overlap and interruption, meaning the teacher

was not showing the expression to class discussion. The students should pay more attention

to the speaker who speaking at that time. Thus, the interactional strategy of overlap and

interruption used by teacher-student is speakership and listenership.

It is expected that the last interactional strategy used by the teacher and students

is repaired. There are three sub-components of repair: self-repair, peer repair, and teacher

repair. The result shows 38 occurrences of repair; teacher used 33 and students used 5 times.

The occurrence of teacher used repair is higher than the student used repair. Not surprising to

see that teacher repair is the most frequently used by teacher-student interaction; the number

of teacher uses repair (32) and student no teacher repair. This show the teacher gives some

information to the students or the class that the students might need for their discussion. The

students do not use the teacher as this can be interpreted that student fails in interaction or

initial with the teacher when in the whole class discussion. In peer repair, it shows students

use peer repair was 5 and teacher no peer repair, meaning that students lack confidence in the

whole class to ask or give other people repair. Lastly, the teacher used self-repair (1) while students did not use self-repair, indicating that teacher-student interaction is largely ignored although misunderstanding does occur during whole class interaction. As a result, the interactional strategy of repair used by teacher-student is teacher repair, peer repair, and self-repair in the same way. It is interesting to note that repair didn't ring the bell of any interactional competence in the large class discussion.

The frequency of the three episodes of teacher-student oral interaction in English: turn-taking (117) is the highest frequent interaction followed by topic management (105), overlaps and interruption (44), and the lowest frequent interaction is repairing (38). The total frequency of sub-components are self-select 83 times, topic introduce 43 times, speakership 37 times, topic develop 34 times, teacher repair 32 times, pass turn 29 times, topic shift 28 times, listenership 7 times, peer 5 repair times, take turn 4 times hold turn 3 times, and self-repair 1 time. It can be concluded that the most frequent components of interactional strategies used by the teacher-student were self-selected while the least interactional strategies used was self-repair.

Frequency of Interactional Strategies Used by the Teacher and Students

This sub-section presents the data reveals the interactional strategies used by the teacher and students. The report demonstrates the most frequent of the interactional strategy and the least frequent of interactional strategy used by the teacher and students. Table 4.3.2 shows twelve sub-components which take turn, hold turn, pass turn, self-select, self-repair, peer repair, teacher repair, listenership, speakership, topic introduce, topic develop, and last topic shift of classroom interactional competence used by the teacher and students.

In Episode1, it can be reported that take turn occurred 2 times, no hold turn, pass turn 4 times, self-select 17 times, self-repair 1 time, no peer repair, teacher repair 8 times,

listenership 2 times, speakership 1 time, topic introduce 9 times, topic development 6 times, and topic shift 7 times.

In Episode2, it was found that there was no take turn occurred, no hold turn, pass turn 6 times, self-select 20 times, no self-repair and peer repair, teacher repair 5 times, no listenership and speakership, topic introduce 13 times, topic development 6 times, and topic shift 4 times.

The teacher-student interaction was analyzed after the natural classroom setting; teacher front talk. When Episode1 and 2 were examined, it is noticeable that teacher-student interaction was less than that in Episode3 in which the classroom is arranged in a semi-circle.

In Episode3, it can be reported that take turn occurred 2 times, hold turn 1 time, pass turn 15 times, self-select 46 times, no self-repair, peer repair 5 times, teacher repair 32 times, listenership 5 times, speakership 36 times, topic introduce 21 times, topic development 22 times, and topic shift 17 times.

The teacher-student interaction was analyzed after the arrangement of the physical classroom in a semi-circle. When Episode3 was examined, it can be seen that teacher-student interaction was increased. It shows high interaction in this Episode that the teacher and the students are able to participate and concentrate on the topic, follow teacher questions, take the turn and completes the talk of the topic. It can be concluded that physical classroom arrangement made a contribution to teacher-student aforementioned interactional competence.

The total frequency of sub-components are self-select, topic introduces, speakership, topic development, teacher repair, pass turn, topic shift, listenership, peer repair, take turn, hold turn, and self-repair. It can be concluded that the most frequent components of interactional strategies used by the teacher and students were self-select while the least interactional strategies used was self-repair.

Table 4.3.3 Other Interaction Strategies Used by the Teacher and Students

Others teacher-student interaction strategies	FREQ Ep. 1	FREQ Ep. 1	FREQ Ep. 2	FREQ Ep. 2	FREQ Ep. 3	FREQ Ep. 3	Total		Overall
	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T-S
Translanguaging	2TH	5 TH	1 TH	-	5 TH 1 JAP	55 TH 8 JAP	8 TH 1 JAP	60 TH 8 JAP	68 TH 9 JAP
Echo	8	-	11	-	29	5	48	5	53
Response	1	4	-	2	8	22	9	28	37

Other Interaction Strategies Occurred during Teacher-Student Whole Class Discussion

From the researcher's observation, it can be seen from Table 4.3.3 that the students

use translanguaging to interact in the classroom discussion. The teacher-students use

translanguaging in Thai 68 times and Japanese 9 times this indicating that teacher-students

use of English and translanguaging (Thai and Japanese) make a make a clear understanding

of the teaching and learning and more at ease. Moreover, teacher-student use echo was

indicating that teacher-student still listening to the talk. The teacher-students use response 37

times, telling that interaction competence happens in the classroom very well.

It can be concluded that the teacher-student interaction in English course at a Thai

university level in classroom interactional competence. The most frequency strategies used

by the teacher and students were turn-taking, topic management, overlap and interruption,

and repair respectively. The teacher-student use sub-components self-select, topic introduces,

speakership, topic development, teacher repair, pass turn, topic shift, listenership, peer repair,

take turn, hold turn, and self-repair correspondingly to develop themselves in the classroom

interactional competence. It can be concluded that the most frequent components of

interactional strategies used by the students were self-select while the least interactional

strategies used was self-repair.

Conversation 1 Teacher-Student Discussion (11 minutes)

Teacher-Students' voice recording 1: writing an e-mail

Frequency of Interactional Strategies Use by Teacher-Student in Episode1

Table 4.3.4 presents the data related to the interactional strategies used by the teacher-

student. The data shows the most frequently used components of the interactional strategy to

the least frequently used components of the interactional strategy used by the teacher-student.

Remark: FREQ stand for Frequency and Ep. stand for Episode

Table 4.3.4 Shows Teacher-Student Oral Interaction in Episode1

Components	Sub-components	FREQ Ep. 1	FREQ Ep. 1
		T	S
1. Turn-taking *1 T-S =12-12	Take turn	2	-
	Hold turn	-	-
	Pass turn	4	-
	Self-select	6	11
2. Repair *1 T-S = 9-0	Self-repair	1	-
	Peer repair	-	-
	Teacher repair	8	-
3. Overlap & interruption *1 T-S = 3-0	Listenership	2	-
	Speakership	1	-
4. Topic management	Topic Introduce	1	8

*1 T-S= 11-11	Topic development	3	3
	Topic shift	7	-
Total T-S = 58		35	23
Others teacher-student interaction strategies Translanguaging		2TH	5 TH
Echo		8	-
Response		1	4

Frequency of Interactional Strategies Use by Teacher-Student in Episode1

In Episode1, the data in Table 4.3.4 shows the frequency of interaction between teacher and students to achieve the goal of communication. The teacher uses a range of interactional strategies, including self-select (6), pass turn (4) and take the turn (2) while most students use self-select (11) and no-take turn and hold turn are used in terms of turn-taking. The teacher uses repair (8) and self-repair(1) while students use none of the strategies in repair. In terms of overlap and interruption, the teacher uses listenership (2) and speakership (1) while the student's listenership and speakership have not occurred in Episode1. Regarding the topic management, the teacher shift topic (7), develop topic (3) and introduce the topic (1). Students show topic introduces (8) and topic development (3) whist shift topic is not used in this conversation.

Other strategies included in the whole class discussion are translanguaging, echo, and response. The teacher uses translanguaging (2TH) or the use of L1 in order to clarify the tasks, to comfort students and keep the conversation moving on both in Thai and English. But students use translanguaging (5TH) L1 to answer the question and try to explain their answer. Teacher's echo (8) emphasizes students' answer to ensure and confirm their answer while

students did not use echo in this Episode. The teacher shows a response (1) and students'

response (4) with a short answer.

As can be seen from Table 4.3.1.1 the most frequent strategies in Episode1 deal

with turn-taking (in 12-12) during the classroom interactions. Self-select (the most frequent

use in T-S interaction in 6 and 11) is the most features during classroom interaction.

Moreover, pass turn is the second frequent use by T-S (in 4 and 0). Take turn is the third

frequent use by T-S (in 2 and 0) and no hold turn appears. Topic management the second

highest frequent (in 11-11) shows a topic shift (in 7 and 0) used in teacher-student interaction.

Topic introduces (in 1 and 8) and topic development (in 3 and 3) is used by the teacher and

students. Next, repairing use (in 9 and 0) is the teacher (in 8 and 0), self-repair (in 1 and 0)

and peer repair is none. Overlap and interruption put as the last strategy used (in 3 and 0).

The teacher-students use listenership (in 2 and 0) and speakership is found during teacher-

student interaction are to traditional teaching (in 1 and 0).

In summary, in Episode1 the overall use of teacher-student interaction strategies was

35 and 23. Teacher-student used self-select , pass turn, take turn, topic introduces, topic shift,

topic development, listenership and speakership for whole class discussion respectively. But

other strategies such as hold turn and peer repair did not occur in Episode1. Furthermore, the

strategies including clarification, echo, translanguaging, and response were frequently used

by the teacher-student more frequently in this Episode.

Analysis of Episode1: Turn-Taking Examples

Take turn

40 S:　　Conclusion มันเป็นเหมือนประมาณส่วนท้าย สรุปว่าที่เราส่งจดหมายนี้มาเพื่อต้องการอะไรคับ <It likes the

　　　　last part, the conclusion of the letter what we want to send this letter for?>

41 T: *Ur!* Conclusion or in specific areas we call ending message. *Ur* ending message

or leave a message or asking for information later. How about over here anyone

from this side want to share your idea about writing e-mail? Yes, No, O.K. *ur...*

O.K. Let see when you write an e-mail this should be useful when you writing e-

mail.

The teacher takes her turn lead in with *ur* in Line 41. He encourages the student to give

information about email writing, then the teacher shifts the topic for clarification of the

information about the email writing.

Hold turn   -

Pass turn

21 T: Topic or we call subject, right? and you say date date. When you

write an e-mail you need to know what are the date or what is the date? O.K.

What else? (7) I think you know it but you just don't know what to say in

English. If you know put your hand up O.K. I'll walk around.

22 S: Contacting

23 T: *Contacting* what do you mean contacting?

In Line 21, the teacher is echoing to students response and she develops the topic by giving

the explanation to the class about the word *topic* and *subject* then pass the turn to students in

Line 21 using the question *What else?* She waits for 7 seconds to get a response from

students.

Self-select

9   T: No? e-mail writing? You're not using it? Are you using it nowadays?

10 S: Not often.

11 T: Really? Oh! Surprise me. When I was your age um e-mail just started

and them um um I write e-mail when um when I want to communicate with

other people from friends from busy from work O.K. and in order to contact

and sending a message. Something like that. So today. O.K. So what are the

components in the e-mail? Do you know the structure *(2)* in the e-mail?

What you have to write *(1)* in the e-mail?

12 S: *Topic*

13 S: *The address*

14 T: *Address*, who address?

Line 11 illustrates teacher select herself to give more explanation; this shows that the teacher

takes the turn by herself. Even to answer the question herself. Line 12 and 13 show students

select themselves to give response *topic* and *the address* to the teacher's question. The

students self-select to answer the teacher's question from in Line 11 and another student self-

selection to add another answer to the teacher's question from Line 11.

Analysis of Episode1: Repair Examples

Self-repair

15 S: หนูไม่มีเสียง <I don't have my voice>

16 T: ครูค่ะหนูไม่มีเสียง เพื่อนบอก พยายามจะตอบ <Your friend said she doesn't have her voice, she

is trying to answer> *who sends, who send means the sender.*

The sender's address? O.K. *What else should be in the e-mail? When you write an*

e-mail? Sorry!

17 S: Date

18 T: *Date* O.K. *data of what?*

19 S: Topic

20 SS: laugh

In Line 16, the teacher repeats what the student said in Line 15. Teacher translanguaging by using repetition to what the student said in Thai. And the teacher uses the question to ask for clarification about the information in Line 14. Then she passes the turn to students. In Line 16, the teacher also corrects herself as she realizes that she says something not clear in terms of meaning *who sends, who sends means the sender.* She says *sorry!* This shows that she said something wrong and she apologized.

Peer repair   -

Teacher repair

33 T: O.K. he explains the word postscript by using Thai <คำลงท้าย> in an e-mail we will use the verb in a specific area you'll see. I'll show you. Any other ideas? Another handsome?

34 S: Conclusion

35 T: *Pardon?*

36 S: Conclusion

37 T: *Conclusion. What do you mean conclusion?*

In Line 35 and 36, the teacher asks student *Pardon?* to clarify it because she couldn't catch what the student's response to her question in line 33 *Any other ideas* The student repeats what she has just said in Line 34, *Conclusion*.

Analysis of Episode1: Overlap and Interruption

Listenership

25 T: อ๋อ <I see> Style? เหมือน <like> style การเขียน <writing style> form ของการเขียน or

structure ว่าจะขึ้นต้น ลงท้าย ว่าอย่างไร right? <Form of writing or structure, How to write

the beginning or introduction, ending or postscript, right?> O.K. good What are this called? แล้วพวกเนี้ยเรียกว่าอะไร มีอะไรอีกไหมค่ะ <what are this called? Is there anything else?> Anything else? If you want to share. Yes, at the back. Handsome what's your name? what's your name?

26 S: Kitipong

27 T: [Yeah]

28 S: postscript

Line 27, the teacher responds to the student's answer by saying *yeah* while the student has just finished telling his name in Line 26. This is to show that the teacher is listening to the student's response.

Speakership

36 S: Conclusion

37 T: Conclusion. What do you mean conclusion?

38 S: สรุปสุดท้าย <Conclusion> (…)

39 T: [Wait I need to get a litter louder in here. This class is good.]

In Line 39, teacher interrupts student in line 38 to wait because she needs to take time and wants to get the real meaning of the word *Conclusion* in Line 36.

Analysis of Episode1: Topic Management

Topic introduce

1 T: Do you know or have you ever write an e-mail to your friends? Or your relatives?

2 SS: Yes.

3 T: Yes or No?

4 S: No.

5 T: No. Some of you No.

The teacher starts the Episode by using the question to introduce students about the topic
discussion for today in Line 1.

16 T: ครูค่ะหนูไม่มีเสียง เพื่อนบอก พยายามจะตอบ <teacher? I don't have my voice, your friend is

trying to answer> who send, who send means the sender. The sender's address.

O.K. What else should be in the e-mail? When you write an e-mail? Sorry!

17 S: Date

18 T: Date O.K. data of what?

19 S: Topic

20 SS: laugh

We can see that student self-selects to respond to the teacher's question from Line 16. In line
17 and 19, the students select themselves introduces a topic to the teacher's question in Line
16.

Topic development

17 S: Date

18 T: Date O.K. data of what?

19 S: Topic

20 SS: laugh

21 T: Topic or we call subject, right? and you say date date. When you write an e-mail

you need to know what are the date or what is the date? O.K. What else? (7) I

think you know it but you just don't know what to say in English. If you know

put your hand up O.K. I'll walk around.

22 S: Contacting

23 T: Contacting, what do you mean contacting?

24 S: Contact the institute or university about offering or appointment about เค้าจะมีการ

สมัครกันผ่านอีเมลแล้วเค้าก็จะมีต้องขึ้น dear ต้องจบด้วยอะไร ต้องเขียนด้วยอะไร จำเป็นว่าต้องเขียนยังไง <They

will apply by e-mail and will begin with 'dear'. What is the ending? How to

write? How is it necessary to write?>

In Line 21, the teacher is echoing to students response and she develops the topic by giving

the explanation to the class about the word *topic* and *subject* then pass the turn to students in

Line 21 using question *What else?* She waits for 7 seconds to get a response from students.

In Line 22, student use translanguaging to explain and develop more information about the

topic discussion using both English and Thai.

Topic shift

40 S: Conclusion มันเป็นเหมือนประมาณส่วนท้าย สรุปว่าที่เราส่งจดหมายนี้มาเพื่อต้องการอะไรครับ <It likes the

last part, the conclusion of the letter what we want to send this letter for?>

41 T: *Ur*! Conclusion or in specific area we call ending message. Ur ending

message or leave a message or asking for information later. *How about over here*

anyone from this side want to share your idea about writing e-mail? Yes, No,

O.K. ur *O.K. Let see* when you write an e-mail this should be useful when you

writing e-mail.

Teacher repeats *Conclusion* in Line 41 and follows with the question to pass turn *How about*

over here. Teacher shifts the topic to end the discussion because she wants to get into the

point by using *O.K. let see.*

Conversation 2 Teacher-Student discussion (10.1 minutes)

Teacher-Students' voice recording 2: giving presentation

Frequency of Interactional Strategies Use by Teacher-Student in Episode2

Table 4.3.5 presents the results of the interactional strategies used by the teacher and students in Episode2. It reveals the most frequently used of interactional strategy and the least components of the interactional strategy used by the teacher and students.

Remark: FREQ stand for Frequency and Ep. stand for Episode

Table 4.3.5 Shows Frequency of Teacher-Student Oral Interaction in Episode2

Components	Sub-components	FREQ Ep. 2 T	FREQ Ep. 2 S
1. Turn-taking *2 T-S =13-13	Take turn	-	-
	Hold turn	-	-
	Pass turn	6	-
	Self-select	7	13
2. Repair *2 T-S = 5-0	Self-repair	-	-
	Peer repair	-	-
	Teacher repair	5	-
3. Overlap & interruption *2 T-S = 0-0	Listenership	-	-
	Speakership	-	-
4. Topic management *2 T-S= 12-11	Topic Introduce	2	11
	Topic development	6	-
	Topic shift	4	-
Total T-S = 36		12	24

Others teacher-student interaction strategies		
Translanguaging	1 TH	-
Echo	11	-
Response	-	2

Frequency of Interactional Strategies Use by Teacher-Student in Episode2

In Episode2, Table 4.3.1.2 shows the interactional strategies use by teacher and students. The teacher uses a range of interactional strategies, including self-select (7) and passes turn (6) while most students uses self-select (13) but no pass turn and none of the teacher or student use take turn and hold turn for turn-taking strategy. The teacher uses teacher repair (5). Both teacher and students do not use either self or peer in repair. Regarding overlap and interruption, listenership and speakership were not found in teacher-student interaction in Episode2. In addition, teacher use topic developments (6), topic shift (4) and topic introduce (2). Students use topic introduce (11) but none of the topic development and topic shift are used in management the topic discussion.

Additional strategies found during the classroom interaction between the teacher and students include translanguaging, echo, and response. The teacher uses translanguaging (1TH) by using Thai to make student relaxed of using English in the classroom. Teacher's echo (11) is to repeat the student's responsibility to convey the message to other students so they can hear the answer. Students give two responses to the teacher's questions.

In Episode2, the teacher and students make the most frequent use of turn-taking in the classroom interactions (in 13-13). Self-select (the most frequent in T-S interaction (in 7 and 13) is the most frequently used components during the classroom interaction. While the teacher uses a pass turn to give a chance for student talk (in 6 and 0). The second frequent use is topic management (in 12-11), which shows the topic introduce (in 2 and 11). The third

strategy is repaired by teacher repair (in 5 and 0). Overlap and interruption is not used in teaching as a whole class in teacher-student interaction.

In brief, in Episode2, the total frequency of the interaction strategies used by the teacher and students is 12 and 24. They frequently used self-select, pass turn, teacher repair, topic introduce, topic development and topic shift to stimulate the big class. However, the strategies such as take turn, hold turn, listenership, and speakership, did not appear in Episode2. Besides, the strategies like echo, translanguaging were frequently used by the teacher and response use with the student in Episode2.

Analysis of Episode2: Turn-Taking Examples

Take turn   -

Hold turn   -

Pass turn

4 S: Introduce yourself

5 T: *Introduce yourself*, your group. *O.K*. good. *What's else? (4) Hand up or*

         you can speak louder. (2)

6 S: Prepare

7 T: Yes, Natty

8 S: Prepare

Teacher repeats what the S says in Line 4 *Introduce yourself* and passes turn to other students using *O.K What's else? Hand up or you can speak louder.*

Self-select

14 S: *Topic*

15 T: Yeah, prepare your information, prepare the topic that you want to talk about,

> Introduce yourself, introduce others if you present on group. Prepare by searching
>
> information of your topic, right?

16 S: *Practice*

17 T: Practice, yeah, some of you say practice, practice or rehearse. How many times

do you have to rehearse rehearse and rehearse. *Maybe ten times*, *within two*

minutes. Because each of you will give about approximately two minutes,

right? How long that you have to give presentation? *(2)* How long? Remember I

assign you?

18 S: 7-10 minutes

In Line 14 and 16 students select themselves to give response *topic* and *practice* to the

teacher's question. As in Line 17, the teacher repeats to what student says and reminds

students to what they have discussed so far and she selects herself to provide some

information *Maybe ten times*, *within two minutes*. This is to give a clue for students. Then

asks some more question about the topic.

Analysis of Episode2: Repair Examples

Self-repair -

Peer repair -

Teacher repair

20. S: Don't get nerve

21. T: *Pardon!*

22. S: Don't get nerve

23. T: O.K. don't get nerve during your presentation. Yes!

24. S: Eye contact

25. T: Eye contact, yeah. You need to have eye contact with your audiences, use body

language. What else? Yes!

Teacher asks student *Pardon!* to says again because she couldn't hear to what students said in Line 20. This is called teacher repair, the teacher complete student something missing word in line 23.

Analysis of Episode2: Overlap and Interruption

Listenership   -

Speakership   -

Analysis of Episode2: Topic Management

Topic introduce

1 T: *I'd like to ask you to share your idea about giving presentation.* Well, there are

steps to give presentation. Before you giving presentation, what do you have to

do?

2 S: *Introduce*

3 T: Introduce what?

4 S: *Introduce yourself*

5 T: Introduce yourself, your group. O.K. good. What's else? (4) Hand up or you

can speak louder. (2)

6 S: *Prepare*

Teacher starts the Episode2 by inviting students to share ideas about the topic discussion in Line 1 *I'd like to ask you to share your idea about giving presentation*. It can be seen that student response the teacher's question from Line 1 and student introduces a topic to the teacher's question in Line 2 *Introduce*, 3 *Introduce yourself*, and 6 *Prepare*.

Topic development

23 T: O.K. don't get nerve during your presentation. Yes!

24 S: Eye contact

25 T: Eye contact, yeah. *You need to have eye contact with your audiences, use body language.* What else? Yes!

26 S: Speak loudly and clearly

27 T: Speak loudly and clearly, sure. *So that check your audience at the back can you hear? Right? During your presentation ah ha some of you may have activities. It might be ah work shop presentation. It maybe ur role play of presentation you want your audience to join your presentation. So you ask them to join during your presentation, right?* O.K. What about after presentation?

28 S: Thank you.

29 T: Thank you. *Say thank you, yes. Say thanks to your audiences.* Anything else? (2 sec) Think about after the presentation what do you have to do?

In Line 25, 27, and 29 the teacher is echoing to students response and she develops the topic by giving the explanation to the class about the word *Eye contact* and *Speak loudly and clearly and* Thank you. Then pass turn to students in Line 29 using question *Anything else?* She waits for 2 seconds to get a response from students.

Topic shift

29 T: Thank you. Say thank you, yes. Say thanks your audiences. Anything else? *(2)*
        Think about after the presentation what do you have to do?

30 S: Question

31 T: *Question,* yeah. Invite questions, say thank you, leave the message for the end

of your Presentation, right? *So* there are many simple ways in giving presentation.

Just three steps: before, during, and after. And here are some tips that maybe

useful for you in order when you give presentation maybe like by the end of the

term. *O.K.* Three steps here: the first one making an introduction, telling a main

part, and last drawing a conclusion.

The teacher repeats the word to what the student says in Line 30 *Question* and she clarifies to

other students in the class after that she changes the topic to the main idea body off topic

discussion using *O.K.*

Conversation 3 Teacher-Student discussion (21 minutes)

Teacher-Students' voice recording 3: holidays and traditions

Frequency of Interactional Strategies Use by Teacher-Student in Episode3

Table 4.3.6 presents the data concerning the interactional strategies used by the

teacher and students. The data reveals the most frequent components of interactional strategy

and the least frequent components of the interactional strategy used by the teacher and

students.

Remark: FREQ stand for Frequency and Ep. stand for Episode

Table 4.3.6 shows Frequency of Teacher-Student Oral Interaction in Episode3

Components	Sub-components	FREQ Ep. 3 T	FREQ Ep. 3 S
1. Turn-taking *3 T-S =31-33	Take turn	1	1
	Hold turn	-	1
	Pass turn	15	-

	Self-select	15	31
2. Repair *3T-S = 19-5	Self-repair	-	-
	Peer repair	-	5
	Teacher repair	19	-
3. Overlap & interruption *3 T-S =10-31	Listenership	3	2
	Speakership	7	29
4. Topic management *3 T-S= 30-30	Topic Introduce	5	16
	Topic development	11	11
	Topic shift	14	3
Total T-S = 159-145		90	99
Others teacher-student interaction strategies Translanguaging		5 TH 1 JAP	55 TH 8 JAP
Echo		29	5
Response		8	22

Frequency of Interactional Strategies Use by Teacher-Student in Episode3

In Episode3, Table 4.3.1.3 presents the data concerning the interactional strategies

used by the teacher and students. The data reveal the most frequent components of

interactional strategy and the least components of the interactional strategy used by the

teacher and students.

Remark: FREQ stand for Frequency and Ep. Stand for Episode

Table 4.3.6 shows the interaction between teacher and students in Episode3 to

reach the objective of message, the teacher uses a range of interactional strategies, including

self-select (15), pass turn (15) and take turn (1) while most student uses self-select (31) and

take turn (1) none of the hold turn are used in terms of turn-taking. The teacher uses repair

(19) and students peer repair (5) while teacher and students use none of self-repair. In terms

of overlap and interruption, teacher uses listenership (3) and speakership (7) while student

use listenership (2) and speakership (29) in Episode3. According to the topic management,

the teacher shift topic (14), develop topic (11) and introduce the topic (5). Students show

topic introduces (16) and topic development (11) and shift topic (3) show in classroom

discussion in Episode3.

Further strategies that can be found in teacher-student interaction in Episode3 of

this study are interestingly, translanguaging, echo, and response. The teacher uses

translanguaging (5 TH) in Thai repeating student's' utterance in Thai to give to the whole

class and to repeat to what the student has just said (1 JAP). On the other hands,

translanguaging in Thai (55 TH) and Japanese are used by students (8 JAP). There is echo

(31) used by the teacher and student (5). Response (8) is used by the teacher where students

use response (22) to answer the questions.

In Episode3, the most frequent interaction strategy used to turn-taking in the

classroom interactions (in 31 and 33). Self-select (the most frequent from T-S interaction (in

15 and 31) was the most frequent components during classroom interaction. Teacher-student

used pass turn to give chance to student talk (in 15 and 0). The second highest frequency is

topic management (in 30 and 30); topic develops (in 11 and 11), topic introduce (in 5 and 16)

and topic shift (in 14 and 3). The third strategy uses was overlap and interruption (in 10 and

31) speakership (7 and 29) while listenership (in 3 and 2) occur in whole class teacher-

student oral interaction. Repair is less used than the other strategy as (in 19 and 5) by teacher

repair (in 19 and 0) and peer repair (in 0 and 5) but there was no self-repair.

In short, the teacher-student oral interaction strategy in Episode3 included 90 used by the teacher and 99 by students. The interaction strategies were self-select, pass turn, take turn, teacher repair, peer repair, speakership, listenership, topic development, topic introduce and topic shift.

Analysis of Episode3 Turn-Taking Examples

Take turn

226 S: คือส่ง...ส่งจดหมายไป… คือจูเลียตส่งจดหมายไปหาโรมิโอก่อน / ใช่ แล้วก็ได้จูบกับ

โรมิโอ แล้วก็เอายาพิษเข้าปาก ตาย < Sending ... sending a letter to… Juliet sent a

letter to Romeo first / yes and then they kiss. Romeo put the poison in his mouth

then he die>

227 T: *O.K.?* Are you ready?

In line 226, Teacher takes turn to lead in the topic conversation back to the floor after letting the student discussing the movie for a while by using *O.K?* in Lone 227 to give a signal and asking for confirmation *Are you ready?* If the student is ready, for the information to answer the question.

28. S: [Did some homework.]

29. T: Did some homework. What kind of homework? What homework you did?

30. S: Uh… Ah… Art.

31. T: Art!

In line 30, the student tries to take his turn by beginning with the filler to answer the teacher's question in Line 29.

Hold turn

87 T: Love is money. If you have money I'll love you? Some like that? And… What

about others? Anyone wants to share the idea, the meaning of love?

Like you think of… some vastly. Uh…Mm…Uh…? Well love, well boyfriend,

well life for me… Love does mean like well express, well love, well feeling. Not

just a… the word of couples or lovers but also for…for friends, and your family,

even your pet. They can feel that you love him or her. OK? It does mean word

'love' ; the well express to your… your boyfriend or your girlfriend. Love's

actually all of us, right? The love's all around. Oh…see? She… share her love by

very hug to her friend. What about you? Do you have… girlfriend?

88 S: Um… ( )

89 T: [Do you have girlfriend?]

90 S: Yeah.

In Line 88, the student holds *Um… ( )* his turn by using um while the teacher repeats the

question *[Do you have girlfriend?]* in line 89.

Pass turn

38. S: Evening, if possible and ride a bike.

39. T: Do you do the both in the morning?

40. S: Evening.

41. T: When evening. Well, you can do in the morning, you'll get fresh air. What about

those here, what do you do on your vacant time's day?

42. S: Works.

In line 41, teacher passes her turn to the floor by using question *What about those here* to get

more information from other sides of the class.

Self-select

13. T: Yeah, holiday. Festival and holiday. What holiday did we talk about?

14. S: *Chinese New Year*.

15. T: Chinese New Year. Aha.

16. S: *Valentine*.

17. T: Valentine.

18. S: *Ramadan.*

19. T: Ramadan. Yeah.

20. S: *Makha Bucha.*

Starts with Line 13, teacher repeats the words of confirmation, agreement and to clarify previous discussion to the class about the topic they talked about last week *What holiday did we talk about?*. In line 14, 16, 18 and 20 students select themselves to respond to teacher's question in line 13; *Chinese New Year, Valentine, Ramadan, Makha Bucha.*

87 T   เงิน... What does it mean to present your love?

88 S: Love is money.

89 T: Love is money. If you have money I'll love you? Something like that? And …
What about others? Anyone wants to share the idea, the meaning of love? (3)
Like you think of something. Uh…Mm…Uh…? Well love, well boyfriend, well
life for me Love does mean like well express, well love, well feeling. Not just a…
the word of couples or lovers but also for…for friends, and your family, even
your pet. They can feel that you love him or her. OK? It does not mean word just
express to your… your boyfriend or your girlfriend. Love's actually all of us,
right? The love's all around.

Line 89 demonstrates teacher select herself to give more information about *Love is money* in Line 88. This show the teacher takes the turn by select herself when there is no student answer to the question so she answers the question herself.

Analysis of Episode3: Repair Examples

Self-repair   -

Peer repair

216 T: Romeo and Juliet, OK.

217 S: เวอร์ชัน <version> Leonardo จับคู่กับ... <paired>

218 T: Yeah, OK. Can you tell me and your friends about it?

219. S: ย้อนกลับไปอีกรอบๆ <replay again>

220. S: คือ... *<what's it..?>*

221. S: คาปูเลตนี่ใครนะ... คาปูเลตนี่... จูเลียตปะ? <Who is Capulet? Capulet is? Is it Juliet>

In line 220, the student asks his friend คือ... *<what's it..?>* to clarify what the previous message in 217.

Teacher repair

 28. S: [Did some homework.]

 29. T: Did some homework? What kind of homework? What homework you did?

30 S: Uh… Ah… Art.

In Line 29, the teacher should say *What did you do for your homework?* But she said *What homework you did?*

Analysis of Episode3: Overlap and Interruption

Listenership

21 T: Makha Bucha. Really? Did we talk about Makha Bucha?

No, not, not really yet. Soon it's having Makha Bucha right? Soon it's having

in… next month. One of the days in next month; Makha Bucha's day So…

mostly we talked about holidays, mostly and also; Chinese New Year. What did

you do on your ah… valentine's day?

22 S: Ah… [Sleeping.]

23 T: Sleeping.

24 S: [Eating.]

25 T: [What? Pardon?]

26 S: Eating.

27 T: Eating. Oh!

Teacher responds to student's answer by saying *[What? Pardon?]* while student in Line 22

has not finished telling *[Sleeping.]* to her. This is to show that teacher is listening to the

student's response in Line 24 that she wants to hear the answer again.

75 S: Love is when I want to see his smile

76 SS Wow!! Woo!!

77 T: Oh… Love's when you see… his smile? โอป๊ะ <Opa>

78 S: [Opa]

79 T: โอป๊ะ <Opa> OK, anyone else?

In line 78, the student says *[Opa]* right after the teacher talk. This shows student was listening

to the teacher talk so she/he repeats the word from the teacher in Line 77.

Speakership

226 S: คือส่ง…ส่งจดหมายไป… คือจูเลียตส่งจดหมายไปหาโรมิโอก่อน / ใช่ แล้วก็ได้จูบกับ

โรมิโอ แล้วก็เอายาพิษเข้าปาก ตาย < Sending ... sending a letter to… Juliet sent a letter to

Romeo first / yes and then they kiss. Romeo put the poison in his mouth then he

die>

227 T: *[OK? Are you ready?]*

In Line 227, teacher interrupts student in line 226 while students are discussing because the

teacher wants to get the answer.

185. T: No? OK, OK. So many movies, right? And… can you tell me some of the names,

some more names of the movies or another movie or Korean movie? Korean

movie about… about love?

186   S: *[Train to Busan]*

187. T: Pardon? What about Thai movie?

188. S: *[REC Tacter ค่ะ <ka>]*

189. T: REC Tacter. The… the resented of the sun? No?

190. S: *[หอแต๋วแตก (หัวเราะ) <Ho-Taw-Tag> <laugh>]*

191. T: OK? What about Thai movie? What about Thai movie?

192. S: *[หอแต๋วแตก <Ho-Taw-Tag>]*

193. T: Thai play? Love at Siam? Love at Siam is… about is it about… boy and boy?

194. SS: Yeah.

195. T: *[Right? Yes or no? Boy and girl... what? นาคินทร์? นาคี? มันไม่ใช่...*

<Nakin? Nake?, isn't it?>

Students use speakership in Line 186, 188, 190 *[Train to Busan], [REC Tacter ค่ะ <ka>],*

[หอแต๋วแตก (หัวเราะ) <Ho-Taw-Tag> <laugh>] to convey the message while the other speakers

such as teacher is still speaking in front of class and other are discussing with their peer.

Analysis of Episode3: Topic Management

Topic introduce

1 T: *We want to talk about your holidays.* OK? Your holidays. I would like you to

speak English as much as you can, try to participate as much as you can. OK?

Ah… So last week, you talked about…? What did you talk about?

2 S: *Festival.*

3 T: Pardon?

4 S: Festival.

5 T: Louder.

Teacher leads in the Episode3 by using the question to introduce students about the topic that

they are going to talk about for today lesson in Line 1 *We want to talk about your holidays.*

29. T: Did some homework? What kind of homework? What homework you did?

30. S: Uh… Ah… Art.

31. T: Art!

32. S: *Jogging.*

33. T: What?

34. S: *Jogging.*

35. T: Jogging? You jogged?

36. S: Yes.

37. T: When? In the morning?

In Line 32, 34 a student introduce the topic *Jogging* to engage in the discussion since he has not talkd for a while.

Topic development

191 T: OK? What about Thai movie? *What about Thai movie?*

192 S:　　　[หอแต๋วแตก <Ho-Taw-Tag>]

193 T: Thai play? Love at Siam? Love at Siam is… about is it about… boy and boy?

194 SS:　　　　Yeah.

In Line 191, the teacher uses O.K. to shift the topic then she develops the topic by giving the explanation to the class about What about Thai movie?

101. T:　　　That's OK. Just speak louder, loud enough your practice manager.

102. S:　　　Uh… Love is like… I want to do something for someone or…I want to see her face every time and---

103. SS:　　*scream*

104. T:　　　Oh is she around here?

In Line 102 student tries to develop more information about the topic of *Love* to the class.

Topic shift

157 T:　　　Shape of water. Any other movie?

157. S: Call me by your name.

158. T: Again please?

159. S: Call me by your name.

160. T: อ๋อ! <I see>

162. T: *You can sit…*

163. S: ออกไปสิฯ <you go ahead>

164. T: OK.

165. SS: *clap*

166. S: [มันเป็นเรื่อง... เอ่อ ที่เกิดขึ้น...] <it's a story.. that happened…>

167. T: Were you two are the cinema fevers?

168. SS: No.

In Line 162, teacher shift topic to tell the student to sit down and she bring back the topic that she was talking about the movie.

11 T: Yes. What we talked about (2 seconds) festival? *What festival did we talk about?*

12 S: *Holiday?*

13 T: Yeah, holiday. *Festival and holiday. What holiday did we talk about?*

14 S: Chinese New Year.

15 T: Chinese New Year. Aha.

In Line 11, the teacher asks students about the festival, but student shift topic to a holiday so they are a little confused and not sure for the topic discussed.

The Other Components Relating to CIC

In interaction strategies used by the teacher and students in the classroom are translanguaging, echo, and response. There are 167 occurrences of interaction strategies; translanguaging used by teacher-student interaction. There are 60 translanguaging used by the student in Thai and in Japanese (8). The teacher also used translanguaging in Thai (8) and in Japanese (1). There is echo used by the teacher (48) and student (5), it can be seen that the teacher used echo more frequently than student echo. The response is another strategy teacher

used (9) and student used (28). The number of student response is much higher than the

teacher.

It can be concluded that much of the teacher-student interaction in General English at

a Thai university level on the classroom interactional competence. There are 304 interactions

occurred to identify the classroom interactional competence used by teacher and student. The

most frequent strategies focus in each sub-components on turn-taking is self-section (in 28

and 55), topic introduces (in 8 and 35), speakership (in 8 and 29) and teacher repair (in 32

and 0) used by teacher and students oral interaction. In Episode1, 2, and 3 show how the

process of contributions occurs by turn-taking, repair, topic management, and overlap

interruption in order to help the teacher and student get the flow of talk to achieve the goal of

communication direction. Some of these strategies are found in the Thai teacher-student

conversations, whilst others might be minimum value to the second or foreign language

context. Since the effective strategies used in classroom interactional competent engage in

interaction to solve the problem to achieve the goal of their communication.

Result of Data Analysis of Teacher-Student in Episode1, 2 and 3

Firstly, turn-taking is a sign of changing the role of a speaker and as a listener in

the conversation. Changing role introduce a changing topic. The student self-select to say

something they would like to contribute their talk to share information. In the role of the

students to be self-select is they would like to introduce the topic and share ideas. The use of

turn-taking is a turn at talk of allocation with the knowledge to other speakers to get to the

ideas of the talk. This promotes the dynamic interaction of the students. In a different context,

people use turn-taking to do something else. The confidence is making the students interact in

different activities in teaching and learning as to increase the students' ability to monitor the

details of the current talk and the appropriate use of interactional resources. The teacher self-

select at talk when she has a new idea to share and when there is no response from the class

so then she will continuous her talk as to select herself. The teacher role to be self-select is to

provide the content of the lesson, asking some questions, giving details, or explaining the

topic of the talk. The use of teacher turn-taking is facilitating the classroom interaction to a

speaker or to other speakers as a whole. This gives the opportunity for classroom interaction

learning to be more space between the teacher and the students. In many contexts,

interlocutors use turn-taking in conversation to participate in social life. The results of turn-

taking also show that teacher turn-taking has a higher number than students turn-taking. This

shows the teacher used interactional strategies with greater than the student. The number of

hold turn is rarely used by students and teacher no use, pointing out that interactional

competence was not ring the bell in hold turn. Teacher rarely passes the turn and student no

passes turn. It is noticeable that students no passing turns in the classroom settings.

Surprisingly, the students were less interacts in developing interactional competency in

Episode2.

Repair is very important for students monitoring their mastery of the concept

apart from communication strategy and learning strategy. The use of repairing is a sign of

making attempts towards understanding and negotiating to mean to reach the goal. Not

surprising to see that teacher repair is the most frequently used by teacher-student interaction;

the number of teacher uses repair (32) and student no teacher repair. This show the teacher

gives some information to the students or the class that the students might need for their

discussion. The students do not use the teacher as this can be interpreted that student fails in

interaction or initial with the teacher when in the whole class discussion. In peer repair, it

shows students use peer repair and teacher no peer repair, meaning that students lack of

confidence in the whole class to ask or give other people repair. Lastly, the teacher used self-

repair while students did not use self-repair, indicating that teacher-student interaction is largely ignored although misunderstanding does occur during whole class interaction.

Overlap and interruption is also effective in supporting the students' interaction to eventually reach listenership and speakership. The number of speakership student is higher than the teacher, pointing out that the student simply has enough confidence to speak in front of other people. They are more interactive when they discuss in the whole class. The teacher used listenership higher than the student in overlap and interruption, meaning teacher was not showing the expression to class discussion. The students should pay more attention to the speaker who speaking at that time. Thus, the interactional strategy of overlap and interruption used by teacher-student is speakership and listenership.

Additionally, topic management can extend or shorten the conversation or bring or develop the new expression, and additional language contribution. These interactional features are obvious to effectively enhance these students' contributions in this group discussion conversation. Topic introduce has occurrences by the student more frequent than the teacher while teacher topic development is higher than student topic development. These show the students put their thought and ideas into word or they simply have enough confidence to speak in the presence of other people. This shows the students' interactional competence development in the whole class talk. The teacher used topic shifts is higher than and student use. This means that the teacher does well in continuing it for a while and from different views of information.

The next is Chapter V, presents discussion of the major findings, conclusion, and implications and recommendations which take the research findings in chapter IV.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a discussion of the major findings, conclusion, and implications of the study on pedagogical study. The recommendations of the study for further research on learning opportunities in English at the university level are also provided in this section. The study has used CA methodology to analyze classroom interactional competence during student-student group discussion and the interaction between teacher and students in the class. The following is a discussion and conclusion of the main findings. The analysis displays how the talk-in-interaction that occurred during the task was collaborative in nature.

Purpose of the Study

In this study, classroom interactional competence of Thai university students was observed through four interactional resources; turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management in spoken English were analyzed to understand the strategies of CIC that students use. The researcher also analyzed the oral interactional strategies used by both teacher and students to enhance their interaction and opportunities for learning English in a Thai university. The original research questions are restated below:

1. What components of classroom interactional competence (CIC) are used by a small group of Thai university students in spoken English?

2. What oral interactional strategies are used by both teacher and students in order to engage in interaction in a Thai university?

Discussion of Major Findings

Discussion of the First Research Question

This section discusses the most frequent components of interactional strategies and the least frequent components of interactional strategies used in the student-student interaction in order to answer the following research question: 1) What components of classroom interactional competence (CIC) are used by a small group of Thai university students in spoken English? This question aims to analyze the classroom interactional competence (CIC) of a small group of Thai university students through four interactional resources: turn-taking, overlap and interruption, repair, and topic management in spoken English.

The results reveal that there were 205 interactions in two episodes; Episode 1 had 108 interactions and Episode 2 had 97 interactions. The most frequent components of CIC used in student-student interaction was turn-taking followed by overlap and interruption, topic management and lastly, repair. Based on the results, it can be inferred that the most frequent sub-component of interactional strategies used by the students was peer repair, while the sub-component of interactional strategies used least was taking a turn. The results will be discussed in detail in the following section.

Turn-Taking Strategy used in Student-Student Interaction

In the analysis, the use of turn-taking was found to be the most frequently used sub-component of interactional strategies in student-student group interaction. That is to say, student-student interactional competence in turn-taking as an interactional strategy is key to reaching the goal of communication. It is the collaborative exchange of ideas, feeling or information between the students in group discussion. Moreover, the highest mean score on

the questionnaire (2.39) was found to be for turn-taking. The questionnaire also indicated that students rated themselves with a mean score of 2.47 with regard to stopping while speaking in order to think of words that they would use in the conversation. The students interpreted their perception as '*yes I can do this easily and well'*. For example, Student S5 said, *"I student-student interaction is good. We can talk to each other or your friend."* This means that the students' turn-taking in the group discussion can support interaction skill. Through turn-taking, students can increase their language competence as they listen and speak to their peers in the discussion, and jointly solve problems. This finding supports the views of some experts in classroom interaction. Rivers (1987) stated, "… Through interaction, students can increase their language store as they listen to or read authentic linguistic material, or even the output of their fellow students in discussions, skits, joint problem-solving tasks, or dialogue journal. In interaction, students can use all they possess of the language – all they have learned or casually absorbed – in real life exchanges …" This study also relates to the views of Walsh (2011), who stated that students gained new knowledge, obtained and built up new skills, identified problems, and established and maintained relationships through language in interaction.

The turn-taking strategy can be divided into four components; taking a turn, holding a turn, passing a turn and self-selection. Of all these sub-components, passing a turn was found to be the most frequently used strategy by students in interaction. Students create more interaction with friends by passing the turn to the next speaker. This might be because the student wants to give other students the opportunity to speak out. From the questionnaire, it can be seen that when students faced some language difficulties, they left messages unfinished, since students rated themselves with a mean score of 2.05. The students interpreted their perception as '*yes, I can do this but not quite well'*. Accordingly, in the interview, student S1 said, *"If I run out of idea my head blank then I should pass my turn to my friends."*

Students also pass their turn by using questions, for instance, *"What do you think?"* and *"What else?"*. This is to get more information or ideas from other speakers. Fillers are also considered as passing a turn in this study; students use *um* or *ur* in order to pass a turn because they have nothing to say or they want to use a filler to give themselves time to think of some words. For instance, S5 said, *"I think passing may also happen with everyone when we have no idea or don't know when how we continuous speaking".* This finding corresponds to the study of Stenstrom (1994), who stated that the speaker has to pass a turn rather unwillingly.

Turn-Taking Contributions to Students' Cooperative Learning

Specifically, the analysis showed that when the students were asked to discuss a topic, they worked collaboratively and assisted each other on the task. It can be seen that students used *passing a turn* in order to think of an idea for their discussion. It is noticeable that the students achieved more and participated more in group discussions than they did by working individually or sharing ideas in whole class discussions. By doing group work, students are interactive and reach the goal of their communication easily. Students were also given the chance to show their learning of vocabulary produced within the task. This finding supports the view of Coelho (1994), who stated that in development of higher-level thinking skills, spoken English in the classroom encourages learners through the analysis, evaluation, synthesis, and application of new information. This benefits students' own learning as well as that of other participants, and encourages learning in the classroom. This is the same as when L2 (English) is valued over the L1 (Thai), at least when thinking of terminology and providing further opportunities to produce language. Long, 1980 and Newton, 1991, Long, Adams, McLean, and Castanos, 1976, Rong 2000, & Skuse, G.E. 2012.

Another interesting feature is self-selection, which is when the student chooses himself or herself as the next speaker to have a turn. This shows that students are more active and willing to be involved in the conversation by sharing their ideas. Students select themselves by sometimes using English and sometimes using Thai. In this study, student self-selection was performed by speaking up to the group without anyone forcing them to speak or anyone calling his or her name when the group was in silence. The previous speaker might select himself or herself when there is no one else speaking. In contrast, Sacks et al. (1974) suggest that turn-initial particles such as '*well*' or '*so*' or '*yeah*' and so on can be used to self-select. Some of these strategies are found in native speaker conversations, whereas others could be restricted to second language learners. Meanwhile, some students may avoid being the next speaker or may remain a passive speaker who may have a chance of being selected by other students to be the next speaker. Therefore, students should be trained in self-selection since it can open up opportunities in language learning and interaction.

Turn-taking was one of the interactional resources that students most frequently used. This shows that interaction in the group was not performed well enough to fulfill the need for an effective conversation. The report from the interview shows that four students did not understand turn-taking in the classroom. For example, Student S1 said, "*No. I don't know if that's my opinion wrong or something, but I think turn-taking is like when I'm saying, taking my friends should listen and when I stop saying um then my friend take a turn to talk.*" Student S2 said, "*No, In my opinion when someone talks you just listen to them and when it your turn like* สลับกันพูด *<changing a turn>*". Student S3 said, "*No. Maybe we want to talk, but my friend talking we should put the hand up and want to talk to friend we want to talk. If another people taking we want to talk we can put hand up (in the class).*" In addition, Student S5 said, "*No, I don't know but I think turn talking is about waiting our turn to speak or talking.*" This might be because students don't know when and how to take a turn as the next

speaker. The student begins the utterance by using filler, for example, *um* or *ur.* This shows that the student wants to initiate the speech but is not well prepared. The finding supports the views of some experts in classroom interaction. Stenstrom (1994) states that the speaker uses those filled pauses or verbal filler to indicate that s/he intends to mention one thing; however; the speaker wants more time to gather their thoughts and put them into words.

Holding a turn is the least frequently used strategy in students' group discussion, showing that interaction competence was not well developed. This indicates that students lack practice in holding a turn. In this study, students held turns by using a filled pause such as *ur...* The report from the interview shows that students can and do hold turns. For example, student S2 said, *"Yes wait until someone their talk is over and we can talk on our idea." (S2)* and student S5 said, *"Yes, I think waiting until someone to stop talking or asking me to speak my opinion or my idea."* This indicates that interaction competence was not well developed, meaning that a student may not have listened to other speakers because they were thinking of what to say. These findings contrast with those of Walsh (2012) since he found that interactional competence was demonstrated by holding turns as a way to keep a conversation going. In order to keep a conversation going, the speaker holds the turn because he/she cannot think of what to say or speak about at that time. Stenstrom (1994) states that holding a turn means others hold back on talking. It occurs when the speaker cannot manage to speak all the time since it is not easy to think of what to mention and speak at the same time, and he/she would need to stop the discussion. In other cases, the students hold turns by using a silent pause. This shows that the student wants other speakers to wait until the current speaker has finished talking. Stenstrom (1994) recommends that silence ought to be avoided, except when it is used strategically. The silent pause may be a sign that the current speaker is trying to keep the listener waiting until they have finished talking. Therefore, students should be

aware of holding a turn because it can demonstrate interactional competence in language
learning.

Overlap and Interruption Strategies used in Student-Student Interaction

The following is an analysis of the second-most frequently used strategy by the
students: overlap and interruption. Overlap and interruption includes two sub-components:
listenership and speakership. The results from the questionnaire show that overlap and
interruption had the lowest mean score (1.98), which means students' perception of this
strategy was '*No, I cannot do this yet*' during the group discussion. This might be because the
students, who were all male, were not clear about the meaning of overlap and interruption. In
other words, the students developed their interactional competence in listening and speaking
during group discussion interaction since they interacted with their friends, who were the
people they were most familiar with. This study relates to the study of Bosch (2004), who
presented a quantitative analysis of the turn-taking mechanism proven in 93 telephone
dialogues that were taken from the 9-million-word Spoken Dutch Corpus. The results show
that speakers adapt their turn-taking behavior according to the interlocutor's behavior.
Moreover, the results indicate that male-male dialogues have a higher proportion of
overlapping turns than female-female dialogues. According to a previous study (Smith-Lovie
and Brody, 2017), men are more able to discourage potential disorder when direct at them.
The interview data show that students had a difficult time when inviting friends to share the
topic and they tried to encourage friends to speak. An example of this from the interview is
when student *S5* said, "*No, I think it's half to make someone join discussing. We don't know
why his/her don't participate or how does his/her feel.*" Tannen (1983) argued that in a
failure to participate, a lack of interest would be perceived as a cause of failure in the

interaction. Hence, a student needs the knowledge of how and when to use overlap and interruption.

Overlap and Interruption Contribution to Students' Cooperative Learning

From studying the results that were contradictory to the earlier studies, it was found that two factors could be considered. Firstly, the students' backgrounds were quite similar. The similarity is that most of the students have fairly similar social status and language proficiency. Interruptions may be related to the social status characteristic of the students in the conversation, according to Eakins & Eakins (1979), as cited in Graddol & Swann (1989). The students in a group discussion show that they may feel that they are the same as each other, so they can speak naturally without pretense. Secondly, the topics of the discussion were nearly always about their daily life or the lesson of the study; subsequently, the conversations were fairly informal and casual. Since the students were the same gender and of a similar age, all the students were highly involved in the conversation and may have enjoyed discussing the topic together.

Student listenership shows that students are competent inattentive listeners; this can be demonstrated as normal participation as an interactional strategy to be used. The reaction of the listeners and the speaker proved that the listener understands and gives a signal that the interaction is going well. This relates to Furo (2001), who stated that overlapping can even naturally be used as an interactional strategy to show involvement if the overlapping speech has the potential to signal active listenership. In contrast, among students without listenership, the message of the talk in the interaction may be interpreted indifferently among members of multilingual/multicultural groups.

Student speakership shows that students' talk encourages and facilitates the continuing development of communicating at a higher level of interaction. Throughout the

conversations, the students may interrupt other students' discussions to show that they are listening to others and interested in the topic. This finding relates to the study of Tannen (1994), Ng et al., (1995), and Li, (2001), who claim that overlaps encourage productive contributions, and support and facilitate the continued development of the spoken language by expressing high involvement. As a result, the researchers remain convinced that those overlaps that arise from the flow of the spoken language, in which it is clear that participants are extremely involved, are not likely to be considered disruptive but supportive.

The results from both components of listenership and speakership come from different directions, but the meaning is still the same with regard to the conclusion of overlap and interruption. Students used overlap and interruption to extend their talk-in-interaction during group discussion and this was demonstrated in both strategies: listenership and speakership. In other words, use of overlap and interruption can be considered as an interactional strategy that enhances and benefits students' participation, as well as improving attentiveness, encouragement and facilitation among students learning interaction as a cooperative and vigorous aspect of their self-motivated communication.

Topic Management Strategy used in Student-Student Interaction

Topic management was reported as the third-most frequently used strategy by students. The topic management strategy is divided into three components: topic introduction, topic development, and topic shift. The result of the analysis data is an irrelevance to questionnaire. In analysis of the questionnaire, it was found that the second-highest mean score (2.36) belonged to topic management, meaning students perceived topic management as '*I use Thai when I want to construct an English sentence*'. This shows that students think they can use the English language well enough for their discussion. For example, Student S2 said, "*Yes, I have. I'm fear of making mistake and sometime I think if I share an idea what the*

other will think about me like. Are you wierd?". This shows that students were afraid of introducing a new idea because other students may not agree with that idea, and it meant that such students had failed to engage in topic management to improve their interactional competence by using English in the classroom. This finding is along the same lines as the Du-Babcock (2006) study which re-examined the analysis of topic management patterns and turn-taking. In this study, the participants were 10 additional groups of bilingual Hong Kong Chinese in their first- and second-language decision-making meetings. The results show that the attendees in the meetings faced tough problems in their first-language meetings, and as such, they then avoided the relative uneasiness of interactive second-language exchange. The topic management pattern in the English meetings was influenced by the second-language proficiency of the group members in international business communication. With regard to topic management in student-student oral interaction, students who were afraid of sharing ideas in English still contributed some ideas; they were still able to participate and contribute ideas on their selected topic areas at group discussions.

Student introduction of a topic was the most frequent component used among friends talking. This shows students improved IC through making a contribution of introducing further topics when interacting with friends. This is because the students are interested in the topic discussion based on their background and experience. On the other hand, students' lack of interest may mean students fail to achieve the goal of the topic. For example, Student S4 mentioned, *"Yes, because sometimes I shy to say English and I afraid and was worried in English. This topic is not interesting. I don't answer I not concentrate on what you say."* A good topic is one which students can relate to by using ideas from their own experience and knowledge. This result was in line with Escobar Urmeneta & Walsh (2017), who stated, "interactants are genuinely engaged with the topic and succeed in maintaining it from a range of perspectives until the problem is solved". Consequently, this is a good sign of reasoning

that a student who is engaged in the topic can develop more information to complete the conversation. Since student topic development is the second-most frequently used component of topic management, students have some idea of what to say about the topic or what they want to do to achieve the goal of the task.

Lastly, topic shift shows how students shift from the current topic and bring the conversation back to the topic that they were talking about. The reason that they shift the topic might be because they want to introduce a new topic, end a topic, or play a joke. Lack of interest in the topic may also cause topic shift. For example, Student S4 said, "*Yes, because sometimes I shy to say English and I afraid and was worried in English. This topic is not interesting. I don't answer I not concentrate on what you say."* The alternative topic can be traced back to earlier discourse and every topic has a tendency to steer itself to the next, to provide a gap for another topic.

Repair Strategies Used in Student-Student Interaction

The repair strategy was the least frequently used interactional strategy used in student-student group interaction. Analysis of self-repair, peer repair, and teacher repair reveal information about language acquisition and proficiency level. This is related to the findings of the questionnaire in this study, where students rated repair with a mean score of 2.15 and perceived it as '*Yes, I can do this but not quite well'*. Examples from the students' interview include Student S5, who said, "*Yes, I can do it. I will ask silent friend about his/her opinion and give turn to speak."* This shows language proficiency with regard to grammatical error correction and resolving misunderstandings of meaning. The finding supports the views of some experts in peer interaction. Walsh (2012) cited Firth (1996), who mentioned, "the 'let it pass' principle; in many business contexts where English is used as a lingua franca, interactants largely ignore errors unless an error causes a problem for

understanding". This is in line with Vygotsky (1978: 86), who defined the ZPD as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers." On the other hand, Albers et al (2008) disagree that the ZPD is needed for learners to gain knowledge, while ZPD is considered as developed social interaction by Brooks and Swain (2009).

The highest number of examples in this study involved interaction using peer repair, showing that the students had developed interactional competence in language production to deliver a message or receive and check information, to or from their peers in the group. The aspects of "asking for clarification", "checking information" or "adding information", can be seen in the following example from the interview; *"If I noticed it I will say sorry and make it right. Right away (S1)"*. This shows that students ask their friends when they have some problems with hearing, speaking, and understanding meaning when they need it to be clear in conversation. Another example can be seen in the interview of Student S3, who said, *"Yes, I can. I can ask some easy question. Or my friend not good in English does you have any idea."* These findings are similar to those of Schegloff (2000), whose studies of repair in L1 interaction found that such repair involves practices in the understanding of talk in conversation. The teacher needs to consider students and/or train listeners to be engaged in the conversation in order to create opportunities for successful interactions.

Meanwhile, using self-repair for grammatical issues or appropriateness is not done frequently in language learning. This might be because students know the correct grammar or meaning of the misunderstanding, but they do not want to interrupt their speech. In contrast, a student may not know how to correct the mistakes or does not notice that what they said is wrong. Markee (2008) points out that interactional competence involves learners

in L2 who "co-construct[ing] with their interlocutors locally enacted, progressively more accurate, fluent, and complex interactional repertoires in the L2", (p. 3). He suggests three features of interactional competence: (1) language as a formal system (including grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation); (2) semiotic systems, including turn-taking, repair, sequence and organization; and (3) gaze and paralinguistic features, as cited in Walsh (2012). Data from the questionnaire showed that students can perform self-repair but not quite well enough to correct themselves when they notice that they have made a mistake, and they can also correct another person when they notice he/she has said something wrong. This is related to some of the interview data; for example, student S2 said: *"If I noticed I will change it in the correct word or sentence but if it not so important I will change it at the end or tell this is wrong."* Previous research on the functions of self-initiated self-repair in the second-language Chinese classroom claimed that self-repair plays a vital role in the process of language learning. The less frequent use of self-repair implies that learners have low language proficiency. Camps (2003) points out that those grammatical errors that the learner performs self-repair on can tell us what the learner already knows, because the learner has to use their understanding and knowledge to notice the error and correct it. Nevertheless, even though the students might know the right structure, they may decide not to correct a grammatical error because they are focused on reaching the goal of communication. This is related to another point, which is 'let it pass'; for example; student S5 said: *"I will let it pass until the end of activities and tell them him/her that you mistake or incorrect something like that.".* This indicates that students don't focus on form but focus on meaning. Shegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) state that the most preferred type of correction is self-correction while other types of correction are ordinary; they also argue that it is an adult-child conversation (p. 381). Therefore, students need to pay a lot of attention to repair, especially self-repair, in order to gain competency in language use during a conversational discussion.

The results from both episodes seem to give some confidence to the conclusion that Thai students most frequently use and are aware of using repair strategies such as peer repair and self-repair. From the analysis of the repair, it was found that repair plays a vital role in student-student oral interaction in group discussions at the Thai university level. It is clear that making good use of repair strategies can facilitate and promote learners' fluency, accuracy, and effectiveness in their conversations, thereby contributing to the methods of teaching the English speaking skill.

Students' Interactional Strategy Contribution to Interactional Competence

It is observed that in the two episodes which affected the interaction skill of the students, such skill involved three aspects: self-interaction skill, active participants, and achieving the goal of the activity. Self-interaction skill: the students were observed to have used self-selection in the interaction, where the student talks when they are ready to talk, assumes leadership, and discusses and shares their ideas with their peers. Active participants: students frequently used listenership and speakership, which supports the students' participation skill of taking responsibility. Besides this, even though the interactional strategies were determined together with the students, very few students frequently used a self-repair strategy; this supports the students' desire to achieve the goal of communication by making efforts to be successful in interactional competence. Regarding interactional learning, the students don't know how to deal with self-interactional skills, such as active participation or feeling free to talk, during the discussion or completion of a task. From the findings obtained from Episode 1 and 2, it can be argued that the interactional skills related to student learning interaction led to improvements in the student's interactional competence regarding self-interactional skill, active participation, and achieving the goal of the activity.

Discussion of the Second Research Question

This section discusses the interactional strategies used in teacher-student oral interaction and the frequency they were used, according to in the second research question: 2) What oral interactional strategies are used by both teachers and students in order to engage in interaction in a Thai university? The purpose is to examine the oral interactional strategies used by both teachers and students to enhance their interaction and opportunities for learning English in a Thai university.

The results reveal that the four most frequently used interactional strategies by teacher and students were turn-taking (117), followed by topic management (105), overlap and interruption (44), and repair (38). The sub-components of such strategies were self-selection, topic introduction, speakership, topic development, teacher repair, passing a turn, topic shift, listenership, peer repair, taking a turn, holding a turn, and self repair. The teacher and students should pay attention to each component to promote a space of classroom interaction and language learning. The results will be discussed in the following section.

Turn-Taking Strategies Used in Teacher-Student Interaction

In terms of turn-taking, teacher and students used self-selection, passing a turn, taking a turn and holding a turn. Based on the findings of the current study, self-selection was most frequently used by teacher and students. The analysis shows that the teacher frequently used self-selection if there was no response from the student; the teacher had to continue speaking or else there would have been silence in the classroom and no one would have had the floor in the conversation. In this case, the strategy of self-selection should be used because a conversation should flow backward and forward. Teacher talk plays the main role; if the student lets a turn go or passes a turn but no one takes the turn, the teacher should self- select to continue the conversation. In other words, since the turn has gone already because the

teacher allowed the student to answer but got no response, the teacher has tried so many

things already that only self-selection remains. When the teacher throws open the question to

the students and nothing comes back, he/she must answer the question his/herself. Therefore,

the teacher really needs to self-select to keep the flow of the conversation going. Self-

selection to answer a question or give more explanation is shown by the teacher taking a turn

him/herself and even answering the question him/herself. This technique is called

scaffolding. Wood (1976) and Chang et al., (2002) view scaffolding as playing an

interactional role between learners and academics while providing help associated with the

assigned task or difficulties; they believed learners' problem-solving skill would be improved

once the this technique had been employed. Meanwhile, Raymond (2000) supports the idea

that understanding to gain or develop information and knowledge in scaffolding or social

discourse is support for the new perception. On the other hand, the disadvantage of

scaffolding is that it meets the individual interests of the individual learner. However, it is a

worthwhile strategy for promoting active learning due to the fact that the full engagement of

the learners is required in order to complete the tasks.

The students self-select by mostly using Thai and sometimes using English to respond

to the teacher's questions, to clarify the meaning of unknown words, to initiate the talk which

informs the listener that they did not understand the words in English. They self-select in

Thai because of the first language acquisition of interactional strategies. The students sort of

acquire the strategy to interact with people in conversation from their first language and it is

likely that they will apply the strategy in second- or foreign-language communication. Even

in the first language they use to interact, they can self-select in Thai. The motive of using this

strategy was to make the student willing to interact in classroom discussion. This result was

in line with Watanabe (2017), who observed the developing L2 interactional competence:

increasing involvement using self-selection in the post-expansion sequences. The analysis

shows that once the learners have taken their self-selected turn, they will increase their interactional competence in terms of turn-taking strategies, use of linguistic and non-linguistic resources, and shows of connection and appropriateness. The development of L2 interactional competence is displayed through the learner's increased ability to catch the main point of the continued speech and his/her applicable use of interactional resources. This is similar to the study of Krung (2011), where he explored English learners' interactions in a conversation room at an English as a foreign language (EFL) institution in Japan. Specifically, short video excerpts of small-group conversations conducted between intermediate-level EFL learners were examined. The focus was on turn-taking practices. In particular, this investigation uncovered how the interactants self-selected so as to become the next speaker. This paper demonstrates that, in spite of linguistic difficulties, language learners are able to make proficient use of verbal and nonverbal interactional resources to engage in social interaction. In Cekaite's study (2007), he demonstrated that student participation in teacher activities requires L2 learners to not only know how to produce the language and interpret ongoing talk but also to recognize "classroom turn-taking procedures, including rules for self-selection" (p. 47). Thus, this shows that in whole-class classroom interaction, a student has to pay a lot of particular attention to the teacher's talk as well as that of other peers in order to take turns that are relevant to the ongoing interaction. Thus, there are several ways that a student can exhibit turn-taking in interaction, for example, repeating the instructor's turn, obtaining the teacher's attention verbally and/or nonverbally, and initiating expected and unexpected responses in self-initiated turns.

The second-most frequent turn-taking strategy used by the teacher and students was passing a turn. The teacher used passing a turn to give the student chance to respond or answer the question, or to expand on their own ideas. A teacher uses this strategy because he/she wants to get ideas from the student. He/she passes his/her turn by using a question like

'What else?' or *'Is there anything else?'* instead of directly calling out a student's name. This is because using a Wh question means anyone can answer, which gives each student time to think and also discuss the question that they have got to answer with their peers. It is noticeable that students no passing turn in classroom settings. In the classroom interaction, the students have liberty to get into the conversation when they are ready. In other contexts, passing a turn might be rude in conversation to take your turn if the speaker off for the turn it rude. It means that the principle of cooperation does not work in a normal situation. Therefore, it may not apply fully to the Thai context of teacher-student interaction in a whole class discussion.

Holding turns and taking turns are the interactional resources that the students use least frequently in group discussion. This pointed out that interactional competence was not ringing the bell in hold turn. This indicates that a student may not have been listening to other speakers because they were thinking of what to say. In other words, they do not want to interact or it is not the time for that teacher or student to take a turn. On the other hand, if people do not want to take a turn, they may use backchannel responses such as, *mm, yeah, right,* or *really,* to indicate that they do not wish to participate (McCarthy, 2002, p. 27). Turn-taking may also vary as a result of socio-cultural factors.

Topic Management Strategies Used in Teacher-Student Interaction

With regard to topic management, topic introduction, topic development, and topic shifts are used in teacher student-interaction. Topic introduction was most frequently used by the teacher and the students. The teacher and the students used this strategy to support the points of discussion and develop more information, and stay on the same topic for a while. Meanwhile, they managed the topic by using Thai (as it is their first language) in a discussion to introduce the topics and sometimes explain more information. This strategy

helps both teacher and student to keep to the same topic and have more verbal interaction as the more they talk the more interaction occurs. In contrast to this study, Du-Babcock (2006), who studied and re-examined the topic management patterns and turn-taking behaviors of 10 additional groups of bilingual Hong Kong Chinese in their first- and second-language decision-making meetings. While eight of the 10 additional groups matched Du-Babcock's earlier findings, two of the groups did not follow the original findings and offered new reasons for such a result. The results show that the meeting attendees explored difficult issues in their first-language meetings, but avoided the relative discomfort of interactive second-language exchange. The topic management pattern in the English meetings influenced the second-language proficiency of the group members in international business communication.

Concerning topic shift it was found to be frequently used by both teacher and students. The teacher frequently shifted the topic to move on to other related details of the talk, to tell another story to the students, or to give a sign that she wanted to end the topic or change to another one. The teacher used this strategy because some students did not understand the topic she was talking about and they needed more detail than the book had. Shifting the topic can build more interaction in oral communication and include others in the conversation so that they can understand other details. This can also be a good way of using topic management to get to the point of the information.

It was noticed that if there is a relationship between the topic discussion and the speakers' background, so this was taken into consideration. Therefore, it is not surprising that topic engagement has quite different results from the previous studies. This could be due to the topic of the discussion, or it could also be because of Thai culture. Thai students have some anxiety in producing the language and are afraid that it might be wrong. The students feel frustrated because they are going to be tested on other subjects, so they are unwilling to participate in the classroom discussion, as can be seen in Episode 2. On the other hand, if the

topic of the discussion is familiar to the speakers and part of their daily lives, the situation could be different. The more familiar they are with the topic, the more they can talk about the topic in a lively and natural way.

Overlap and Interruption Strategies used in Teacher-Student Interaction

The last interactional strategy used in teacher-student oral interaction is overlap and interruption. Speakership is the sub-component most frequently used by the students. Students use speakership to express their message while other speakers' talk remains unfinished. This develops more information and makes the discussion go well since the more people talk, the more the ideas are developed. This is similar to the study of Faizah and Kurniawan (2016), who investigated two characteristics of turn-taking in terms of interruption and overlap, and their frequency in male-female dialogues in the talk show, Mata Najwa. They found that male speakers use interruption and overlap less than female speakers. The results also reveal that competitive interruption is frequently used by female speakers and noncompetitive overlaps are dominant in the conversations. The results of the present study appear to contrast the previous studies. These results show that women tend to pursue cooperative conversation strategies and their interruptions are more to show interest, high-involvement, support and solidarity rather than disruption and dominance, as stated by Coates (2004 cited in Fei, 2010). Leaning on the results that are contradictory to the earlier studies, two factors could be considered and the topic of the discussion.

Repair Strategies Used in Teacher-Student Interaction

The least frequently used strategy by teacher and students was repair. The teacher and students used teacher repair, peer repair, and self-repair. Repair was used in terms of correcting meaning, not in terms of correcting grammar. In terms of meaning, repair was used

to fill in missing information to complete the meaning. Lack of word, if you contribute, you repair it. With regard to teacher repair, teacher self-repair was shown when the teacher corrected the wrong meaning or words after she had noticed/realized problems in the previous communication. Normally, the teacher completed the students' sentences. Sometimes students were lost for words, so the teacher completed the students' sentences. If the teacher completes a sentence where a student has some missing words, that is *teacher repair,* a contribution from the teacher. This finding was supported by Cook (1989), who stated that participants in interaction will make corrections by using repair on their own initiative (self-repair) and if needed, by the other participants (other-repair). The teacher repaired when she was asking the students to talk more or to trying to gain more information from the students. The result of this study with regard to asking for clarification was the same as that of Wedananta (2014). The speakers requested an explanation of an unfamiliar meaning. The teacher asked the students to clarify their intention to make the information clearer.

A student uses peer repair in a whole classroom discussion by asking a speaker to repeat an utterance because he/she could not hear or understand the meaning of the earlier conversation (e.g. Pardon? What? etc). Moreover, the students use peer repair to check information and confirm that they have a problem in understanding by saying, *"I don't know",* meaning that students lack confidence in asking for repair or giving other people repair in front of the whole class. This allows an exchange for understanding a problem in conversation. This strategy can help students and others to better understand the previous utterance. This result was in line with Gumperz (2003), who stated, "as successful interaction depends on correctly inferring what others intend to convey while controlling how one's own messages are received possible cultural interference must be detected to avoid misunderstanding or misalignment". Without peer repairing the problems or understanding

the meaning from the previous conversation, signals may be given which could be interpreted differently among people of multilingual/multicultural groups.

With regard to self-repair, this strategy was used by the teacher but no student self-repair occurred in the whole-class discussion. In teacher repair, the teacher self-repaired her previous utterance as she realized she had used the wrong words; in order to avoid misunderstanding among the students, she immediately repaired herself. Teacher self-repair is when the teacher makes self-initiated corrections to their own speech. She used this strategy when she realized she had used the wrong words or meaning when she was explaining the topic to the students in the class. The teacher repaired herself to avoid misunderstanding of her speech from a student's perceptive. This result was in line with Drew (199), who suggested, "self-repair is also a mechanism of remedying mistakes in conversation" (p.96). Research on repair has classified a diverse range of repair strategies, which are "self-initiation self-repair, other-initiation self-repair, other-initiation other-repair, repetition, paraphrasing, confirmation checks, clarification requests and comprehension checks" (Schegloff et al., 1977, Schegloff, 2000, Nagano, 1997, & Drew,1997). Self-repair was used by the teacher to correct words or meaning in her speech to make the students understand the use of the right words or meaning later. The fact that no student self-repaired indicates that the interactional practices ensuing from the expertise of each individual is therefore not directly shared in a new group situation. If the speaker has no control, it will end up in a miscommunication that will successively break social relations and hinder the effective treatment of the task at hand. Self-repair is related to not only linguistic errors but also comprehension of the trouble source turn. It is interesting that the results show a few instances of self-repair in teacher-student oral interaction. This is related to the study of Shegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977), who stated that the most preferred type of correction was self-correction, while other types of correction were ordinary; they also argued that it

was an adult-child conversation. Since no student self-repair occurred in this study, it shows

that although there is something wrong with the words or errors have occurred, teacher and

students have not paid much attention to it. They self-repair problems of understanding or

meaning. This is because they pay more attention to the message they are conveying to get to

the goal of communication. It helps the conversation flow, and makes the students participate

more and interact in the whole-class discussion. In relation to this study, Walsh (2012) cited

Firth (1996) as it refers to "the 'let it pass' principle; in many business contexts where English

is used as a lingua franca, interactants largely ignore errors unless an error causes a problem

for understanding".

Teacher-Student Physical Classroom Arrangement Contribution to

Interactional Competence

It is noticeable that the analysis of Episode 3 shows that a physical classroom

arrangement in a semi-circle helps teacher-student interaction to be increased. The classroom

components are arranged to naturally complement the student's communication aptitude, to

encourage his/her adjustment to the class and to support him/her in setting up positive

connections. For example, teachers can set up a classroom talk with students in a semi-circle

instead of the teacher standing in front of the class in rows to teach the students. A semi-

circle classroom arrangement allocates enough space to the students for activities. The

physical plans in the interaction competence inside the setting of the present examination are

parallel to these strategies which are supportive to teacher-student interaction.

It can be concluded that interactional strategies were frequently used by both

teachers and students. Teacher-student interaction was focused mainly on turn-taking as self-

selection. It can be seen that there is a variety of choices to choose from in teaching and

learning. The component of CIC relates to the point of getting teachers and students to use

goal-oriented language. This point opens up opportunity for teachers and students to make choices which allow CIC to flourish by choosing appropriate interactional strategies that they really need to solve problems, facilitate classroom instruction, and demonstrate their understanding to each other. The strategies help to open up the space for teacher-student interaction and to maintain effective interactional communication in the classroom.

Other Strategies Used in Teacher-Student Interaction

Other general observations made on the teacher and student participants in this study are as follows:

In the classroom interaction, the teacher mostly imitated communication by using their mother tongue and used the target language when giving instructions, presenting materials, making inquiries, conveying syntactic items, and rectifying student errors; this is called verbal interaction practice. Most teachers think that students need more time to develop their language abilities, especially in language production. Teachers try to achieve their teaching goals of preparing students for examinations with certain integrated skills. Some students understand what the teacher teaches, although they don't have sufficient knowledge of verbal language production. This might influence their preferences in classroom interaction practice.

In translanguaging, L1 is used in teacher-student interaction as CIC is insufficient in terms of students' ability to manage passing a turn at a particular point in the interaction and to use peer correction as a way to clarify their message. With regard to translanguaging in a Thai classroom, the teacher uses Thai to explain the instruction, grammar, and new vocabulary, and he/she also translates from English to Thai when echoing previous words from the students. The students' uses of L1 in order to interact were found to be active. The students interacted in English at the beginning of the talk. Some used single words, while a

few used sentences to respond to the teacher. Later in the discussion, when the teacher asked for more details, the student used Thai with their peers to seek the answer. When returning to the discussion with the class or teacher they turned to English or Japanese. Nonetheless, the discussion in the class was found to be more interesting when the students used Japanese for their friend to translate into English and Thai than when the teacher only used English as the medium of instruction and did not use Japanese. This shows that there is more room to choose a strategy for teacher-student interaction, and they are more active and enthusiastic about the interaction. This study is in line with Al – Nofaie (2010), who studied the attitudes of students and teachers concerning L1 use in the EFL classroom. It was found that L1 was employed to check for meaning and understanding. Saito and Ebsworth (2004), as cited in Sharaeai (2012), conducted an investigation into the attitudes towards first language use in English classes among Japanese students. The investigation found that using the L1 was advantageous for EFL students. The results show Japanese students in EFL classes preferred Japanese teachers who spoke and understood their first language and were able to provide explanations of both the ideas and vocabulary in Japanese. In contrast, Amirkhiz (2011) indicated that L1 should be avoided in interaction in the English language classroom. Therefore, it can be concluded that when teacher and students orally interact, they are welcome to use L1 as a recourse of interaction in the classroom.

The use of echo serves to ensure that students have reached an understanding of the point(s) being made. Echo is to allow other students to hear or to repeat the answer again. Normally, the number of students who answer in the class is very low, and nobody notices that the teacher would like other students to know what is going on in the conversation and to contribute more to it. Therefore, echo allows students to think of words or utterances, express ideas, and contribute with a response. Echo utterance, repeat in contracting ironic or contrasting meaning. Echoing gives one a hint to keep the listener in mind, so it is like a hint

of what will happen in the future. Echo is performed to keep something in mind for further interaction but repetition means to repeat or be ironic; if one echoes something, it is like one is mirroring the previous speaker to get students to think about it. This is because the teacher means to be part of letting other students come in. On the other hand, repetition sometimes conveys a sense of correctness or learning by heart. It does not convey a sense of interaction or repetition to get clarification. Therefore, echoing can result in more contribution and more interaction.

The teacher's response to a message is used to perform specific fluent communication. In the teacher's use of questions, their purpose for using Wh- questions or open questions is to let students think in more detail and encourage them to interact and negotiate their answers. Moreover, yes/no questions or closed questions are used to rethink their answers and build student thinking in others' answers. In contrast, Walsh (2002) states, "Teacher verbal behaviors interrupt learners' language use such as latching or completing a learner's turn, echoing or repeating all or part of what learners have said and making learners lose the thread of their utterances."

It can be concluded that interactional competence should be part of the human conversation skills that people gain from first language acquisition. So, in second language acquisition, they are likely to apply those strategies and those interactional competences but it is a matter of making use of them in the second language. With the theoretical framework, translangauging is also part of the strategy. We can see that from the very beginning, this study has covered first language acquisition of interactional strategies. Learners sort of acquire the strategy to interact with people in oral conversation from the first language, and it is likely that they will apply the strategy in the second or foreign language communication. Even in the first language they use 1st to interact, they can self-select in Thai.

CONCLUSION

The use of interactional strategies is necessary for classroom interactional competence in the teaching and learning process. The teacher and students are expected to use interactional strategies to give themselves space for teaching and learning. In this study, interactional strategies used by both the teacher and the students at a Thai university level were analysed, and the most frequently used interactional strategy and the least frequently used interactional strategy were recorded.

Based on the research questions and discussion of the data presentation and analysis, the following conclusion can be made with regard to the analysis of classroom interactional competence, student-student oral interaction, and teacher-student oral interaction. This research focused on the four interactional strategies: turn-taking, repair, overlap and interruption, and topic management. The results reveal that the most frequently used interactional strategy by students was turn-taking, followed by overlap and interruption, topic management, and lastly repair. Meanwhile, both teacher and students most frequently used turn-taking, followed by topic management, overlap and interruption, and lastly, repair.

Regarding question 1 (What components of classroom interactional competence (CIC) are used by a small group of Thai university students in spoken English?), the results show that turn-taking is the most frequently used interactional strategy, followed by topic management, overlap and interruption, and repair, respectively.

The findings of this study show how students use different strategies to get a small group of participants in interactional discussion to engage in learning in classroom settings. This group does not represent the university as a whole. It gives a picture of typical classroom interaction but it cannot be generalized to all. The generalized findings of this study should be treated with caution. Moreover, analysis of teacher-student interaction still disclosed that traditional classroom interaction took place; however, it still showed the open

up of some movement toward classroom interactional competence in student-student group interaction. Previous research had found that use of interactional strategies helps to promote educational effectiveness and provides opportunity for learning (Walsh, 2012). The interactional strategy can enhance interactional skill and lead to increased levels of undergraduate learning. An experience of good interactional technique allows both teacher and students to understand attempts to communicate and enhances teacher and student confidence; the more strategies they have, the more opportunities they have to solve the problems. Reasons for the above are explained as follows:

Student-Student Interaction

The analysis has also shown that turn-taking is the most frequently used interactional strategy in student-student interaction. Students worked cooperatively and helped each other on the task, which was able to increase their levels of interaction and language development. In doing so, they achieved the goal of their communication more than would have been possible individually. The most frequent strategy that students used to interact was *passing a turn*. Students *pass their turn* by using questions, for instance, they used '*What do you think?'* or *'What else?'* to gain some ideas for their discussion. By doing so, they were given chances to show their learning of the vocabulary which came up in the assignment. Thus, the more frequent use of interactional strategies by students can inspire the classroom to improve its interaction competence, which can enhance its students' scholastic execution and allow provision of high-quality educational administration.

The analysis has also shown that repair is the least frequently used interactional strategy in student-student interaction. Students' participation in student-student interaction was limited in both peer repair and self-repair. In general, this group of Thai students rarely gave their view in English when working in pairs or groups; they rarely asked questions to

peers in English; they rarely answered a peer's question in English; they rarely corrected a

peer's error; they rarely received correction from a peer when they made mistakes; and they

rarely asked for clarification from a peer. Students reported that they had little opportunity to

work on interactive tasks in pairs or groups.

The analysis of this study reveals that the number of peer repairs initiated in

student-student interaction in Episode 1 was higher than in Episode 2. The difference

between their numbers is rather big. Additionally, the analysis of teacher-student interaction

comes to a different result. In the analysis, self-selection in turn-taking was used in teacher-

student oral interaction. The analysis demonstrates that self-selection is used predominantly

by the students, while the teacher does not appear in three of the episodes. Even though the

difference between the number of self-selections initiated by the students and by the teacher

is totally different, it is clear that the students take their turn to interact and produce language

engagement more than the teacher.

Teacher-Student Interaction

The analysis has also shown that turn-taking is the most frequently used interactional

strategy in teacher-student interaction. The most frequently used strategy in teacher-student

interaction was self-selection. Teacher-student self-selection is a technique where members

of the group become active participants in conversations through securing their turns and then

making their own contributions on their turns at talking. Additional aspects of turn allocation

in second/foreign language conversation are worthy of attention in future studies, including

such phenomena as the ways in which students avoid becoming the next speaker or the

passive means by which students may be selected by others as the next speaker, although

with limited linguistic resources the students exhibited proficient use.

The analysis has also shown repair is the least frequently used interactional strategy in teacher-student interaction. The least frequently used strategy in teacher-student interaction was self-repair. With regard to students' lack of participation in teacher-student interaction, students indicated that they had limited interaction with their teachers. Their participation was restricted to repair with the whole class or answering the teachers' questions. Only rarely did they initiate a question to ask for clarification or present their opinions in English. They lacked confidence and linguistic background in speaking English, and they felt anxious speaking in front of the class. Teachers were more comfortable with a traditional teaching approach and paid little attention to developing students' interactional competence. Students reported that inadequate English was the main barrier, followed by fear, not understanding what was being said, lack of experience interacting in English with peers, and few interactive tasks given by teachers. These interactional strategies assist with keeping the flow of the conversation going and effective communication in the classroom. Therefore, to increase teacher-student repair, both teacher and students need to support interactive activities that would result in students learning effectively.

To conclude, the results derived from the analysis of data gathering provide an indication that the frequent use of interactional strategies is necessary for the teaching and learning process in student-student interaction and teacher-student interaction at the Thai university level. The results reveal that the most frequently used interactional strategy by students was turn-taking, followed by overlap and interruption, topic management, and lastly, repair. Meanwhile, both teacher and students most frequently used turn-taking, followed by topic management, overlap and interruption, and lastly, repair. There is an indication that training teacher and students could improve these aspects of EFL classrooms. In general, training on classroom interaction has not been offered at the university level in Thailand. The teacher and the students should be aware of and concentrate on each interactional strategy in

sequence to be engaged and maintain interactional competence in language production. The frequent use of classroom interaction strategies by the teacher and the students will help increase interactional competence and to improve the quality of classroom interaction.

Implications of the Findings

The findings have a number of methodological and pedagogical implications.

The findings presented in this study may facilitate improvements in classroom research and increase awareness of both teachers and students. It is clear that interactional competence in natural conversation tasks relating to student-student group discussion could provide many opportunities for students to perform peer repair from the repair practices; this has pedagogical implications. This will help students to learn the English language and engage in discussions. Besides this, natural conversation in the classroom may be useful in terms of form and/or function based on classroom activities, and can enhance students' vocabulary and grammar. Moreover, the teachers can use the interactional strategies to scaffold the students' involvement in English class. For example, the Thai teacher can use translanguaging as an instructional tool to scaffold English for Thai students at the university level. This allows the student to create their own space of learning via interaction with the teacher. All these factors contribute to the CIC if the teachers and students know how to adapt the interactional components of educational goals.

Interestingly, topic management is the second-most frequently used strategy in teacher-student interaction in whole class discussion. The present research suggests a need to improve the effectiveness of classroom interactional competence in Thai university teacher-student interaction in the whole class discussion. When the students who are competent use English in group discussion, they are not only required to be interactive with regard to the topic but also manage the topic discussion to create a structure of communication which can

allow students to reach their potential with regard to interaction, communication and usefulness. In whole class discussion, not every student has a chance to get involved in the talk-in-interaction because of their language ability. Therefore, classroom interactional competence should be built with flexibility in mind, with the intention that the students be able to make a better contribution. Consequently, with regard to the practical implications, teachers should be able to transform the questioning in the classroom so that the students are capable of increasing their interactional competence. Teachers need to facilitate more language contribution by encouraging students to elaborate their responses. The teacher should also supply students with strategies regarding vocabulary or sentence structure. Therefore, the students can make use of the strategies in their interaction.

Based on the analysis of classroom interactional competence, self-selection in turn-taking was the most frequently used strategy in teacher-student oral interaction. It benefits the student to select themselves to respond to the teacher's question. This will encourage the students to be more willing to interact both inside the classroom, and perhaps outside the classroom when they have the opportunity to interact with other people or their interlocutor in the real world. The students learned how they can reduce their nervousness which leads to shyness in speaking in front of a lot of people. They select themselves to be part of the communication and they bring in their knowledge to contribute as part of the interaction. A teacher facilitating verbal communication in interactional components can promote the interactional competence of the students in order that they are competent enough to articulate their critical thinking confidently. For that reason, students speaking when they are ready to speak is much better than students speaking when they are assign to do so. That is where learning starts from.

The results of this study could benefit both teachers and students. As the data observation in three episodes of teacher-student oral interaction in the classroom shows, the

fewest occurrences were in overlap and interruption. It would be good to discover the reasons

for this issue, yet the present investigation aspires to work on the choice of oral interaction

strategies at the Thai university level. As a result, teachers can adjust their methods for

educating Thai students in speaking interaction, and think about and work on conversations

for such interaction. To enhance students' careful listening in order that they can contribute to

the conversation and participate in speakership. It is a natural phenomenon that when we start

speaking, we speak in the same way as everyone around us. English teachers are advised to

utilize suitable interactional methodologies in exercises on the students' classroom interaction

and focus on the students' conversations.

Recommendations for Further Studies

Based on the findings of the present study, there are three suggestions for future

study in relation to turn-taking, multinational participants and the factor of IC.

Since the most frequent interaction strategy used by the students was turn-taking,

student-student group interaction should be investigated. Passing a turn is a strategy to help

students to build upon their knowledge and gain more information during student group

discussions. The strategy of turn-taking in the classroom directly relates to how effectively

interactional competence is developed. The results of this study will benefit instructors, head

teachers, and directors by helping them to prepare training strategies that will support the

students in improving classroom interactional competence. Thus, the turn-taking standards of

the university will be met.

Based on this study, the teacher or the Thai university needs to look for a repair

strategy because it can promote student confidence and build interaction in the classroom.

This study found that the least frequently used strategy by the students was self-repair. Self-

repair was used even less during student group discussions. It would be interesting to explore

students' interactional competence in self-repair in EFL classroom discussion in Thailand. With a variety of multinational participants and abilities, it could be suggested that research should be performed on the CIC of international students who are studying in Thailand at the university level, the CIC of a different age group, or the CIC of a level of study in a different context. The same topic of discussion could be applied with a group of students who have the same ability (high or low) or are of mixed-ability. The results would provide helpful information for Thai teachers and Thai students for the enrichment of their interactional competence for a suitable education. The findings have added new information to L2 research on repair strategies and, pedagogically speaking, the findings of the study have implications for EFL teachers and students.

A study on the factors of classroom topic management for teacher and student interaction competence at the university undergraduate level should be performed. The results of this study show that classroom topic management for interactional competence was the second-most frequently used by students and teacher. An investigation of the individual importance of learning difficulties in various parts of classroom topic management would be valuable because topic management provides an opportunity for active interaction, and good topics enable good engagement in the interaction and strong motivation for teachers to encourage students in the university. This study also reveals that the topic introductions, another strong source of motivation for interaction, was at the highest frequency. In addition, this study shows that topic development is also at a high frequency. So, a study on topic management should be conducted to investigate its role in interactive activities which best serve the classroom interaction of teacher and students.

A study of how the physical arrangement of the classroom setting affects interactional competence should be explored. In this study, the frequency of teacher-student speakership increased, especially in Episode 3, which enabled more teacher-student interaction. It is

noticeable that self-selection, topic introduction, and topic development also become more

developed in teacher-student interaction from Episode 1 to 3. This may be due to the physical

classroom arrangement, especially in Episode 3, when the teacher asked students to sit in a

semi-circle to measure interactional competence. This was because the frequency of

interaction was based on the components used by each individual, irrespective of the

occurrences of each strategy that made the students ready to interact. The teacher should also

prepare activities that are challenging and interesting for students. The teacher provides

opportunities for students to work in small groups according to their interests. In order to

solve these problems, the teacher can use the following strategies: use different means of

communication besides oral communication; be a model for the development of interactional

skill; make students feel secure; provide them with the opportunities of choice; demonstrate

motivating and encouraging interaction with students. The results of this study could help the

teacher in adapting their physical classroom arrangement to one which enhances interactional

competence in order to improve the teaching and learning development of learners.

Chapter Summary

This study analyzed the classroom interactional competence of both the teacher

and students at the Thai university level. The study provides some in-depth information about

the most frequently used and the least frequent used interactional strategies among the

teacher and the students. The researcher recommend that CIC as language education

instrument which can be applied by all instructors to develop on IC among teacher-students

and also student-student verbal interaction. The position of CIC is to mediating teacher and

students scaffolding, ZPD, and collaborative learning by adopting the four components: turn-

taking, repair, overlap and interruption, and topic management to expand the potential

development. It hopes to provide a mechanism to promote a teaching model, interactional

competence training course, and factors in relation to interactional competence by involving

pre-service teachers, students, native speakers and non-native speakers.

REFERENCES

Abd - Kadir, J. & Hardman, F. (2007). The Discourse of Whole Class Teaching:

A Comparative Study of Kenyan and Nigerian Primary English Lessons. *Language and Education,* 21, 1, 1-15.

Albers, S., Hellermann, J. and Harris, K. (2008) 'A case of a student with little prior formal education: success and interactional practices in the language classroom', Low-educated Second Language and Literacy Acquisition. *Proceedings of the Third Annual Forum,* Newcastle University, pp. 109-125.

Al-Nofaie, H. (2010). The attitudes of teachers and students towards using Arabic in EFL classrooms in Saudi public schools-A case study. *Novitas-Royal Research on Youth and Language,* 4(1), 64-95.

Allwright, R. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 156-71.

Altay, M. & Öztürk P. (2004). Understanding and overcoming student anxieties in speaking lessons. *Sofia University Foreign Language Teaching Journal,* 19 (1), 23-28.

Al-Zahrani & Al-Bargi. (2017). The Impact of Teacher Questioning on Creating Interaction in EFL: A Discourse Analysis. English Language Teaching.*Canadian Center of Science and Education*, *10*, 6 Retrieved from https://doi: 10.5539/elt.v10n6p135

Anderson, J.F., Beard, F. K., & Walther, J.B. *Turn-taking and the local management of conversation in a highly simultaneous computer-mediated communication system.* Retrieved on December 9, 2018 from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/5dfc/6a6c0342dd11f755b4991774c110e8495e3a.pdf

Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (Eds.). (1998). *Identities in talk*. London: Sage.

Appadurai, A. (1996). Modernity at large: *Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource. *ELT Journal,* 41(4), 241–247.

Baker, C. (2003). "Biliteracy and Transliteracy in Wales: Language Planning and the Welsh National Curriculum." *In Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research, and Practice in Multilingual Settings*, (Ed.) by Nancy Hornberger, 71–90. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Barraja-Rohan, A-M. (2013). *Second Language Interactional Competence and its Development: A Study of International Students in Australia* (Doctor Dissertation). Monash University.

Beyazkurk, D. & Kesner, J. E. (2005). Teacher-child relationships in Turkish and United States schools: a cross-cultural study. *International Education Journal*,6, 547–554. Retrieved from http://www.ebscohost.com.

Birch, A. (1997). *Developmental Psychology: from infancy to adulthood*. PALGRAVE: London.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bolton, K. (2004). World Englishes. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.). In *The handbook of applied inguistics* (pp. 367-396). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Bosch. L.T. (2004).*Turn-taking in social talk dialogues: temporal, formal and functional aspects*. Retrieved November, 14 2018 from www.uni-bielefeld.de/.../TenBosch_Oostdijk_DeRuiter_SPECOM_2004.

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, and Experience & School*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brown, D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching (4th ed.).* New York: Longman.

Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using Surveys in Language Programs.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brooks, L. (2009) 'Interacting in pairs in a test of oral proficiency: *co-constructing a better performance',* Language Testing, 26 (3), pp. 341-366.

Brooks, L. and Swain. M. (2009) 'Languaging in collaborative writing: creation of and response to expertise' in Mackey, A. and Polio, C. (eds.) Multiple perspectives on interaction: second language research in honor of Susan M. Gass. New York: Routledge, pp. 58-90.

Buppanhasamai. W. (2012). Demands for English in Thailand: Meeting International, Regional, *National, and Institutional Expectations*. Retrieved from http://www.culi.chula.ac.th/Research/e-Journal/2012/Discussion%20Paper%20Demands%20for%20English%20in%20Thailand.pdf

Buranapatana, M. (2006). *Enhancing Critical Thinking of Undergraduate Thai Students through Dialogic Inquiry* (Doctor Dissertation). The University of Canberra, Australia.

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.

Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cekaite T., (2007). A child's development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2

    classroom. *The Modern language journal,* (91), 1, 45-62. Retrieved from

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00509.x

Chang, K., I, Chen., & Y, Sung., (2002). "The effect of concept mapping to enhance

    text comprehension and summarization." *The Journal of Experimental*

    Education,71 (1), 5-23.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning.*

    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Choomthong, D. (2011). A case study of learning English passive of Thai EFL learners:

    Difficulties and learning strategies. In Proceedings of the 1st Asian Conference on

    Language Learning, *"Connecting Theory and Practice. (ACLL)"* Osaka, Japan,

    73 - 87.

Chuanchaisit, S & Prapphal, K. (2009). *A Study of English Communication Strategies of Thai*

    University Students.

Coates, J. 1990. *Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of sex differences*

    in language. London: Longman.

Coates, J. (1996). *Women Talk.* Oxford and Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Coates, J. (1998). 'Gossip revisited: *Language in all-female groups'*, in Coates, J. (ed.)

Coelho, E. (1994). *Learning together in the multicultural classroom*. Scarborough, ON:

    Pippin.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *Canadian Modern*

    Language Review, 57(3). Retrieved March 5, 2016, from

    http://homepage.ntlworld.com/vivian.c/Writings/Papers/L1inClass.htm

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Council of Europe. (2004). The common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment. Retrieved 05 October 2017 from http://www.coe.int/T/DG4/Linguistic/Source/ Framework_EN.pdf

Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1999). "The future of Englishes". *English Today*, *15*(02), pp.10-20.

Crystal, D. (2003*). English as a Global Language (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2012). "A global language", in Seargeant, P.& Swann, J. (Eds.). *English in the world: History, diversity, change*. Abingdon: Routledge. pp.151-177.

Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, *89,* 585–592.

Deerajviset, P. (2015). The ASEAN Community 2015 and English Language Teaching in Thailand. Retrieved November 26, 2018 from https://www.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/eJHUSO/article/view/85666/68126

Doehler, S.P. & Berger, E. (2016). L2 Interactional Competence as Increased Ability for Context-sensitive Conduct: A Longitudinal Study of Story-openings. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 4, 1. pp.555–578. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw021

Donald, S. (2015). *A Study of Interactional Competence in the Taiwanese English as a Foreign Language Classroom Context.* (Dissertation) School of Education,

Communication and Language Sciences, Newcastle University.

Donato, R. (2000) 'Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom' in Lantolf, J. (ed.) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 27-51.

Domalewska. D. (2015). *Classroom discourse analysis in EFL elementary lessons*. International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics, 1(1), 6-9.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Drew, P. (1997). *'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation.* Journal of Pragmatics, 28, 69-101. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(97)89759-7

Du-Babcock, B. (2006). *An Analysis of Language Use and Topic Management in Business Decision-Making Meetings*. Intercultural Communication Studies.

Education First. (2018), *EF English Proficiency Index 2015*. Retrieved January 24, 2019, from http://www.ef.co.th/epi/regions/asia/thailand/

Education Minister Phongthep Thepkanjana (2013), *The Thai education system.* 26th June 2013. Retrieved October 17, 2016, from https://www.ajarn.com/ajarn-street/postbox/thai-education-system1

Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition: learning in the classroom.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2000). Task-Based Research and Language Pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 49, 193-220.

Erten, İ. H. (2000). Student teacher's perception of peer response in writing courses at the tertiary level. In M. Monty & T. Godfrey (Eds.) Işık University ELT conference 2000 proceedings: global problems, local solutions. İstanbul: Heinle and Heinle.

Faizah, I & Kurniawan, E. (2016). *A Study of Interruption and Overlap in Male-Female Conversations in the Talk Show Mata Najwa.* Barista, 3(1). Retrieved from http://stp-bandung.ac.id/ejournal/index.php/v01/article/view/53

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: on 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237–59.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communications, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81 (3), 285-300.

Fitzpatrick, D. (2011). *Making sense of English language policy in Thailand: An exploration of teachers' practices and dispositions.* (Doctor dissertation). University of Exeter.

Foley, J. (2005). English in Thailand. *RELC Journal*, 36(2), 223-234.

Fredrickson, T. (2105). *Thailand's English skills lagging, says training company. Bangkok Post*. Retrieved October 17, 2016, from http://www.bangkokpost.com/learning/learning-news/756536/thai-english-proficiency-drops-now-3rd-worst-in-asia-ef

Galaczi, E. D. (2014). *Interactional Competence across Proficiency Levels: How do Learners Manage Interaction in Paired Speaking Tests.* Retrieved from http://doi:10.1093/applin/amt017

Garc´ıa, O. (2007). Foreword. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. xi–xv). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Garc´ıa, O., Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Torres-Guzman, M.E. (2006). Weaving spaces and (de)constructing ways for multilingual schools: The actual and the imagined. In O. Garc´ıa, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, & M. E. Torres-Guzman (Eds.), *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in education and globalization* (pp. 3–50). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

García, O. (2014a). Countering the Dual: Transglossia, Dynamic Bilingualism and Translanguaging in Education. In R. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (Eds.), *The GlobalLocal Interface, Language Choice and Hybridity* (100-118). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Gass, M., & Varonis, M. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 283–302.

Gillies, R. M. (2006). Teacher's and students' verbal behaviours during cooperative and small-group learning. *British Journal of educational Psychology*, 76, 271-287.

Goffman, E. (1983). *The interaction order.* American Sociological Review, 48, pp.1–17.

Gnutzman, C. (2005). 'Standard English' and 'World Standard English'. Linguistic and Pedagogical Considerations. In C. Gnutzmann & F. Intemann. (Eds.), *The Globalisation of English and the English Language Classroom.* Tubingen: Gunter Narr.

Graddol, D. (1997). *The Future of English?.* London: The British Council.

Gumperz, J & Berenz, N. (1991).*Transcribing Conversation Exchanges*. In Edwards and Lampert (eds).

Hall, G. (2016). *The Routledge Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Abingdon; New York: Routledge.

Hall, J. K. (1995). "Aw, Man, Where You Goin?": Classroom Interaction and the Development of L2 Interactional Competence. *Issues in applied linguistics*, 6(2), 37-62.

Hall, J.K., Verplaetse, L.S. (eds.), 2000 *Second and Foreign Language Learning through Classroom Interaction.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1–15.

Hannah, A. & Murachver, T. 1999. "Gender and conversational style as predictors of conversational behavior." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18: 153-174.

Hardman, F., Smith, F., & Wall, K. (2003). Interactive Whole Class Teaching in the National Literacy Strategy. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33, 2, 197- 215.

Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 350-355.

Harmer, J. (1991). The Practice of English Language Teaching (New Eds.). London: Longman.

Hatch, E. (1978). *Discourse analysis and second language acquisition*. Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Have, T (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide (Second ed.).* London: Sage.

Hellermann, J. (2007). *The Development of Practices for Action in Classroom Dyadic Interaction: Focus on Task Openings.* The Modern Language Journal.

Hellermann, J. (2008a). *Social Actions for Classroom Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Hellermann & Pekarek Doehler, S. (Eds.), *L2 Interactional Competence and Development* (pp. 206-243). Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.). *Structures of Social Action: Studies in*

Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la
Maison des Sciences de l'Homme. pp. 299-345.

Hoa, N.T.Q. & Hanh, N.T.M., (2015). *Repair Strategies in English Conversations and Their
Application in Teaching English Interactional Skill to B2 Level Learners.* Retried
from http://www.vnseameo.org/TESOLConference2016/materials/1_1.pdf

Hodal, K. (2012). *Thai schools urged to boost speaking*. The Guardian. Retrieved October
17, 2016, from http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2012/feb/14/thailand-
speakenglish-campaign.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffit, R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis: Principles, practices and
applications*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In C. J. Brumfit, & K. Johnson (Eds.).
The communicative approach to language teaching. Oxford:
Oxford University Press. (2nd ed., pp. 5-27).

Ibrahim, M.E.H. (2012). *Classroom Interaction in Second Language Teaching and Learning
in the Vocational Education Development Centre (VEDC).* (Master's Thesis). Master
of Education – TESOL, the British University. Retried October 24, 2016 from
https://bspace.buid.ac.ae/bitstream/1234/181/1/90031.pdf
https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0c53/b4e4b805928868ca5199983b444d3e655fb2.pdf

James, D.– Clarke, S. (1993). "*Women, Men and Interruptions: A Critical Review". Gender
and Conversational Interaction* (ed. Tannen, D.), New York: Oxford University
Press. pp. 231–280.

Jadallah, M & Hasan, F. (n.d.). *A Review of Some New Trends in Using L1 in the EFL
Classroom*. Retrieved October 18, 2016, from

Jeharsae, F. (2012). *English Oral Communication Problems and Strategies Used by Thai
Employees in an International Workplace to Communicate with Native and*

Non_native English Speaking Customers (Master's Thesis). Bangkok: Graduate School, Srinakharinwirot University.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly , 40* (1), 157-181.

Jeong, K. O. (2018). Developing EFL Learners' Communicative Competence through Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology,*96, 5.

Juliari, I.G.A.I.T. (2014). *The Profile of Communication Strategy used by Junior High School English Teachers in Teaching and Learning Process in SMPN 2 Sukawati.* EPPUPG 2.

Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (eds.). *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 11-30.

Kampittayakul, T. (2017). *An Investigating of the role of translanguaging in Improving Thai Learners' Interactional Competence in Dyadic EFL Tutorial Sessions.* (Doctoral Dissertation). Graduate School of Human Sciences, Assumption University of Thailand.

Kano, N. (2013). Translanguaging as a Process and a Pedagogical Tool for Japanese Students in an English Writing Course in New York. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 74(10-A(E)).* ProQuest Information & Learning.

Karnnawakul, P. (2004). Summary of research report: Foreign language teaching in the southern part of Thailand. *Manusya Journal of Humanities*, 7, pp. 80-81.

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2011). A Conversation-analytic Approach to Second

    Language Acquisition D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language*

    acquisition, 149-177. Retrieved March 6, 2016, from

    http://MONASH.eblib.com.au/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=668755

Khamwan, T. (2007). *The effects of interactional strategy training on teacher-student*

    interaction in an EFL classroom (Unpublished master's thesis). Nakhon Ratchasima:

    Suranaree University of Technology.

Kimsuvan, A. (2004). Summary of research report: Foreign language teaching in the

    northern part of Thailand. *Manusya Journal of Humanities*, 7, 78-79.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and*

    English Language Teaching. Cambidge: Cambridge University Press.

Kramarae, C., Thorne, B., & Henley, N. (1983). 'Sex similarities and differences in

    language, speech, and non-verbal communication. *Language Gender And Society*.

    London and Tokyo: Newbury House Publishers.

Kramsch, C. J. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence.

    The Modern Language Journal, 70(4), 366-372.

Krashen, S. & Terrell, T. (1983). *The Natural Approach*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krug, P. (2011). *Becoming Next Speaker: Learners' Self-Selection in Group Talk*.

    Retrieved November 18, 2018, from

    http://nearconference.weebly.com/uploads/1/2/7/1/12718010/near-2011-02.pdf

Lantolf, P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In: Lantolf, J.P., ed. *Sociocultural theory*

    and second language learning. pp. 1-26. Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2010). 'Having and doing: learning from a complexity theory

    perspective'. In P. Seedhouse, S. Walsh, C. Jenks (eds.) *Reconceptualising Learning*

    in Applied Linguistics. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lemke, J. (2002). Language development and identity: Multiple timescales in the social ecology of learning. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization* (pp. 68–87). London: Continuum.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M. (1981b). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native language and foreign language acquisition. Annuals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 379, 259-278.

Long, M. (1983a). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input, *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126-41.

Long, M. H., Adams, L., McLean, M., & Castaños, F. (1976). Doing things with words: Verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations. On Tesol, 76, 137-153.

Long, M. H. & Porter, P. A. (1984). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 19 (2), 207-226.

Mackey, A. (1999). Input, Interaction and Second Language Development. An empirical study of question. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,*21, 557-587. Retrieved October 17, 2017, from http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263199004027

Mahmoudi, L., & Amirkhiz, S. (2011). The Use of Persian in the EFL Classroom–The Case of English Teaching and Learning at Pre-university Level in Iran. *English Language Teaching*, 4 (1), 135-140.

Markee, N. P. (2000). *Conversation Analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Markee, N. (2008). '*Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA'*. *Applied Linguistics*, 29, 404-427.

Maynard, D. & Clayman, S., (2003). Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis. In. L. Reynolds and N. Herman, (Eds.), *The handbook of symbolic interactionism*. Walnut

Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

McArthur, A. (2004). Is it world or international or global English, and does it matter? *English Today*, 79, 3-15.

McCarthy, M. (2002). *Discourse analysis for language teachers.* Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

McCarthy, M. J. (2003) 'Talking back: 'small' interactional response tokens in everyday conversation', *Research on Language in Social Interaction*, 36, 33-63

McCarthy, M. (2010). Spoken fluency revisited - Cambridge University Press. *English Profile Journal,* 1(20) Retrieved October 17, 2016, from https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/english-profile-journal/article/spoken-fluency-revisited/0B8F2A5012E80B3338F79BE948B61A70/core-reader

McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an International Language: Rethinking Goals and Approaches.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McKay, L. S. (2012). "English as an International Language". In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to pedagogy and practice in second language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*, 15-22.

McKenzie, J. (2000). *Scaffolding for Success. Beyond Technology, Questioning, Research and the Information Literate School Community*. Retrieved May 5, 2015, from http://fno.org/dec99/scaffold.html

Mestriani, N. M., Seken, K & Putra, N. A. J. (2018). *Communication strategies of English native speaker teacher in the teaching and learning process in a kindergarten*. SHS Web of Conferences 42, 00046 (2018) Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20184200046

Muhsinin, N. *Turn Taking Strategies used by Adult in Natural Conversation.* Retrieved

December 9, 2018, from

https://www.academia.edu/9511068/Turn_Taking_Strategies_used_by_Adult_in_Nat

ural_Conversation

Musumeci, D. (1996). Teacher-learner negotiation in content-based instruction:

communication at cross-purposes? *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 236-325.

Nagano, R. (1997). Self-repair of Japanese speakers of English: A preliminary comparison

with a study by W. J. M. Levelt. *Bulletin of Language Science and Humanities*, 65-

90.

National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education in Thailand (NQF-HEd).

(2006). *Implementation Handbook*. Retrieved October 17, 2016, from

www.mua.go.th/users/tqf-hed/news/FilesNews/.../NQF-HEd.pdf

Newton, J. (1991). Negotiation: *Negotiating what? Paper given at SEAMEO Conference on

Language Acquisition and the Second/Foreign Language Classroom.* Singapore:

RELC

Ngowananchai, J. (2013). Natural Occurring Conversation as an English Teaching Model in

Thailand. *European Scientific Journal*, Retrieved October, 25, 2016, from

http://eujournal.org/files/journals/1/articles/2379/public/2379-7160-1-PB.pdf

Nonkukhetkhong K., Baldauf, B. R. Jr., and Moni, K. (2006). Learner Centeredness in

Teaching English as a Foreign Language, Paper presented at 26 *Thai TESOL

International Conference, Chiang Mai, Thailand*, 19-21 January 2006, 1-9.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and

practice in the Asia-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 589-613.

Nunn, R. (2005). Competence and Teaching English as an International Language. *ASIAN EFL Journal*.

Office of the National Education Commission. (2000). *National Education Act (1999)*. Bangkok, Thailand: Office of the Prime Minister.

Office of the Basic Education Commission. (2008). *Basic education core curriculum B.E. 2551 (A.D. 2008)*. Bangkok: Ministry of Education. Retrieved May 28, 2014, from www.act.ac.th/document/1741.pdf

O'Keeffe, A., McCarthy M. J. & Carter, R. (2007). *From corpus to classroom: Language use and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olson, J. & Platt, J. (2000). The Instructional Cycle. *Teaching Children and Adolescents with Special Needs* (pp. 170-197). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). *Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner*. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11, 63-90.

Poehner, M. & Lantolf, J. (2005). 'Dynamic assessment in the language classroom', *Language Teaching Research*, 9 (3), pp. 233-265.

Prapaisit de Segovia, L., & Hardison, D. M. (2008). Implementing education reform: EFL teachers' perspectives. *ELT Journal*, 10, 1-9.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation Analysis:The Study of Talk-in Interaction* Vol. 35, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Rajeevnath, R. (2015). English Language Education in Thailand and AEC 2015. RJES 2(1), Retrieved October, 25, 2016, from http://rjes.rsu.ac.th/Article/Article_J_Article_RJES_V2N1_28-36.pdf

Raymond, E. (2000). Cognitive Characteristics. *Learners with Mild Disabilities* (pp. 169-201). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, A Pearson Education Company.

Richards, J.C., Platt, J., & Platt, H., (1992). *Longman Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics,*. Harlow, Essex, p.52.

Rivers, M. (1987). *Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication. In W. M. Rivers, (Ed.), Interactive language teaching* (pp. 3-16). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roebuck, R. (2000) 'Subjects speak out: how learners position themselves in a psycholinguistic task', in Lantolf, J. (ed.) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, (pp. 79-97).Oxford: Oxford University Press,

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G., (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), pp. 696-735.

Saengboon, S. (2002). *Beliefs of Thai teachers about communicative language teaching*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Saengboon, S. (2006). CLT revisited. *NIDA Language and Communication Journal*, 11(11), pp. 136-148.

Saito, H., & Ebsworth, M. E. (2004). Seeing English language teaching and learning through the eyes of Japanese EFL and ESL students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37, pp. 111-124.

Schegloff, E. A. & Sacks, H., (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8, pp. 289-327.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977). The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organisation of Repair in Conversation. *Language, 53*, pp. 361–382.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society,* 29, pp. 1-63.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, pp. 127-158

Sert, O. (2011). *A Micro-Analytic Investigation of Claims of Insufficient Knowledge in EAL Classroom* (Doctor Dissertation). Newcastle University.

Sharaeai, W. A. (2012). *Students' perspectives on the use of L1 in English classrooms. Teaching English as a Second Language/Applied Linguistics*. Master thesis. Iowa State University.

Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, R. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Simpson, B. Eisenchlas, S. A. & Haugh, M. (2013). *The functions of self-initiated self-repair in the second language Chinese classroom 1*. International Journal of Applied Linguistics 23(2). July 2013. Retrieved December, 9, 2018, from https://doi: 10.1111/j.1473-4192.2012.00323.x

Skuse, G. E. (2012). *A Conversation Analysis Approach to Interaction Within an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Class Information GAP Task*. Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language (TEFL/TESL). A Dissertation: the College of Arts and Law of the University of Birmingham.

Snorradóttir, A. B. (2014). *Language use in the English classroom: the role of students' first language in grades 9 and 10 in English classrooms in Iceland* (unpublished Bachelor's thesis). University of Iceland, Reykjavík, Iceland.

Smith, J. (2013, June 26). The Thai education system. Retrieved from https://www.ajarn.com/ajarn-street/postbox/thai-education-system1

Stenstrom, A.B. (1994). *An Introduction to Spoken Interaction.* London and New York: Longman.

Sukamolson,S. (1995). *Modern analysis of test items by computer [in Thai].* Bangkok: Vittayaphat

Sullivan, P. (2000). Playfulness as Mediation Communicative Language Teaching in a Vietnamese Classroom. *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*, edited by James P. Landtolf. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sundari, H. (2017) Classroom Interaction in Teaching English as Foreign Language at Lower Secondary Schools in Indonesia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies ALLS 8(6):147-154* ISSN: 2203-4714. Retrieved November, 16, 2018, from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1164991.pdf.

Sun, D (2014). *From Communicative Competence to Interactional Competence: A New Outlook to the Teaching of Spoken English.* Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 5, No. 5, pp. 1062-1070, September 2014. Retrieved December, 8, 2018, from http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/jltr/vol05/05/11.pdf

Suryati, N. (2015). *Classroom Interaction Strategies Employed By English Teachers At Lower Secondary Schools*. Retrieved February 12, 2016, from http://journal.teflin.org/index.php/journal/article/ download/268/252

Swain, M., Kinean, P. and Steinman, L. (2011) *Sociocultural theory in second language education: an introduction through narratives.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Tannen, D. (1998). *Du kannst mich einfach nicht verstehen: Warum Männer und Frauen aneinander vorbeireden*. Wilhelm Goldmann Verlag: München.

Tannen, D. (1996). *Gender & Discourse: Featuring a new essay on talk at work*. OUP: Oxford.

Thongwichit, N. (2013). L1 Use with University Students in Thailand: A Facilitating Tool or a Language Barrier in Learning English? *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts* Vol.13 (2), pp. 179-206, 2013. Retrieved October, 25, 2016, from http://www.journal.su.ac.th/index.php/suij/article/viewFile/361/386

Tognini, M. (2007). *Changing the Coastline : Three Short Stories ; and, Perceiving Differently, Respecting Diversity : Representing Disability in Fiction*. Retrieved from https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses_hons/1292

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign teaching, but …. *The Canadian Modern Language* Review, 57(4), 531-538.

Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204-218.

Tuan, T. & Kim, T., (2010). *Theoretical Review on Oral Interaction in EFL Classrooms*. Studies in literature and Language. Vol. 1, No. 4, 2010, pp. 29-48. Retrieved October 31, 2017. http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/viewFile/1415/1434.

Tusting, K. (2005) 'Language and power in communities of practice' in Barton, D. and Tusting, K. (eds.) *Beyond communities of practice: language, power, and social context*. (pp. 36-55).Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tsui, A.B.M. (1995). *Introducing classroom interaction*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Tzanne, A. 2001. ""What you"re saying sounds very nice and I"m delighted to hear it" Some considerations of the functions of presenter-initiated simultaneous speech in Greek panel discussions." In Bayraktaroğlu, A. & Sifianou, M. (Eds.) *Linguistic politenessacross boundaries: the case of Greek and Turkish.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company: pp. 271-306.

Ur, P. (2000). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Vaish, V. (2008). Interactional patterns in Singapore's English classrooms. *Linguistics and Education*, 19, 366–377

van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the Language Curriculum: awareness, autonomy and authenticity.* New York: Longman.

van Lier, L. (2008). The ecology of language learning and sociocultural theory. In A. Creese, P. Martin, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*: Vol. 9. Ecology of language (2nd ed., pp. 53–65). Boston: Springer Science+Business Media.

Velasco, P. & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the Writing of Bilingual Learners. *Bilingual Research Journal* 37(1):6-23. Retrieved from http:// doi: 10.1080/15235882.2014.893270

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological process*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or Obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), 3-23.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating Classroom Discourse,* London: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in action*. London /New York: Routledge.

Walsh, S., (2012). Conceptualisation of classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 2012, 6 (1), 1-14.

Watanabe, A. (2016). Engaging in an Interactional Routine in EFL Classroom: the Development of L2 Interactional Competence. Published online: Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 2016, 10(1), 48-70. Retrieved October 31, 2017. http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_10_1/watanabe.pdf

Watanabe, A. (2017). Developing L2 interactional competence: increasing participation through self-selection in post-expansion sequences. pp. 271-293 Published online: 18 July, 2017. Retrieved September 11, 2017 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19463014.2017.1354310?src=recsys&journalCode=rcdi20

Wedananta, K.A. (2014).*Communication Strategies Used by Mathematics And Science Teachers to Communicate in English in Morning Sharing in SMP* Nasional Plus Jembatan Budaya: A Sociolinguistic Analysis. EPPUPG 3

Wedin, A. (2009). Classroom interaction: Potential or problem? The Case of Karagwe. *International Journal of Educational Development.*

Wertsch, J., del Rio, P., and Alvarez, A. (1995) Sociocultural studies of mind. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwyieithog* (Doctor Dissertation). Bangkok University.

Wood, D., Bruner J., and Ross, G. (1976). "The role of tutoring in problem-solving." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17 (2): 89-100.

Wu, B. (1998), Towards an understanding of the dynamic process of L2 classroom interaction. *System*, 26(4), 525-540.

Wynn, R. (1995). *The Linguistics of Doctor–Patient Communication. An Analysis of the Methodology of Doctor–Patient Communication Research.* Oslo: Novus Press.

Young, R. F. (1999). Sociolinguistic approaches to SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 105-132.

Young, R. (2003). Learning to talk the talk and walk the walk: Interactional competence in academic spoken English. *North Eastern Illinois University Working Papers in Linguistics,* 2: 26-44.

Young, R. (2008*). Language and Interaction: An advanced resource book*. London and New York: Routledge.

Young, R. (2013). Learning to talk the talk and walk the walk: Interactional competence in academic spoken English. *Ibérica*, 25, 15-38. Retrieved December 9, 2018, from http://hdl.handle.net/10497/13662

Yule, G. & Tarone, E. (1991). The other side of the page: Integrating the study of communication strategies and negotiated input in SLA. In, R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith and M. Swain. *Foreign/second language pedagogy research: A commemorative volume for Claus Faerch Clevedon* (pp.162-71). Multilingual Matters.

Zimmerman, D. H. & West, C. (1975). Sex Roles, Interruptions and Silences in Conversation. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance* (pp. 105-129). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

APPENDICES

BIOGRAPHY

NAME&SURNAME: PANADDA PRATOOMRAT

DATE OF BIRTH: 27/05/1980

POSITION: Instructor

Language and Academic Services,

International College for Sustainability Studies,

Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand

EDUCATION

2014-2018   Ph.D. Doctor of Philosophy in English Language Teaching

Assumption University, Bangkok, Thailand

2005-2008:   M.A. (Business English for International Communication)

Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand

1999-2003:   B.A. (English for International Communication) Rajamangala

University of Technology Thayaburi, Prathumtani, Thailand

WORK EXPERIENCE:

2011-Present: Instructor, Language and Academic Services, International College for

Sustainability Studies, Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand

2009-2010:   Instructor, Western Language Department, Faculty of Liberal Arts,

Rajamangala University of Technology Thayaburi, Phrathumtani,

Thailand

2006-2008:   Teacher assistant, Mulberry House International Pre-school , Bangkok,

Thailand

PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

Pratoomrat, P. & Hiranburana, K. (2018). Classroom Interactional Strategies Use by

     Thai Students at a Tertiary Level. (E-Proceeding). Multidisciplinary Research,

     Innovation and Sustainability. *RMUTT International Conference on Social Sciences*

     and Service Industry. June 30, 2018, Lecture Hall, Rajamangala University of

     Technology Thanyaburi, Thailand**.** Retrieved from

     http://www.icss.rmutt.ac.th/programme/

Pratoomrat, P. & Hiranburana, K. (2018). An Investigation of Thai Student's Perception on

     Interactional Strategies in General English Course at the University Level. (E-

     Proceeding). 6th HCU National and International Conference Theme: *Research to*

     Serve Society. 22 June 2018 Huachiew Chalermprakiet University Bangphli District,

     Samutprakarn, Thailand . Handbook Full Paper.

Pratoomrat, P. & Foley, J. (2016). Conversational Analysis in Classroom International

     Competence of Thai Tertiary Level. (E-Proceeding). *Pedagogical and Cultural*

     Approaches in Western Languages. May 12-13, 2016. at Novotel Siam, Bangkok,

     Thailand.

     Retrieved from http://west.hu.swu.ac.th/Porta ls/13/files/Proceedings2016. pdf