

## **A Conversation Analytic Study of Classroom Interactional Competence**

Sumita Supakorn

College of Interdisciplinary Studies, Thammasat University, Thailand  
ruanpan@hotmail.com

### **Abstract**

Classroom interaction has been the subject of investigation in a number of different settings but it remains an under-researched area in the Thai context and to date, in Thailand, there has been little published data that has adopted “Conversation Analysis” (CA) as an analytical tool to develop an in-depth understanding of classroom discourse. This study thus utilizes CA to investigate Walsh’s (2006) “Classroom Interactional Competence” (CIC) in EFL classrooms at a university in Thailand. The focus in this research is on the teacher’s role and in particular, the alignment between pedagogic goals and language use, the spaces made available for learning, and the shaping of learner contributions. Talk-in-interaction between a native English teacher and Thai learners were video recorded, transcribed and inductively analyzed. This paper illustrates how the teacher skillfully employed a range of interactional features in post-expansion sequences to shape learner contributions while at the same time opening a space for interaction/learning at times when the pedagogic purpose was on meaning-and-fluency (Seedhouse, 2004) or classroom context mode (Walsh, 2006). This study argues that if teachers are aware of their roles concerning CIC, they can acquire greater insights into their local context and this may result in professional development.

**Keywords:** classroom interactional competence, conversation analysis, shaping learner contributions, space for learning

### **Introduction**

Over the past several decades, advocates within the field of teacher development and classroom discourse research have encouraged investigation into classroom interaction as a way of uncovering what actually happens in the course of classroom talk between teachers and second language (L2) learners during teaching and learning activities, with the aim of developing a deeper understanding of the process of second language acquisition (SLA). A growing body of literature now recognizes the importance of the teacher’s role in enhancing learners’ participation and fostering learning through classroom interaction (e.g. Johnson, 1990; Richards, 1990; Bailey, 1996; Thornbury, 1996; Tsui, 1996; Thompson, 1997; Cullen, 1998; Walsh, 2006, as cited in Walsh, 2013). Taken together, these studies have added significantly to our understanding of how languages are learnt, while also offering implications for teachers’ improvement regarding their interactional competence (IC).

To date, however, few studies of classroom discourse have been conducted within the Thai context, although there have been a number of critics of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (e.g. Bilasha & Kwangsawad, 2004; Saengboon, 2004; Kanoksilapatham, 2007) and the ‘learner-centered’ approach introduced over the last few decades in pursuit of the reform of curricula. Questions have been raised about whether the implementation of this approach has in fact resulted in providing learners with opportunities to develop their communicative competence (CC), since CLT has tended to neglect the English as a foreign language (EFL) context where it is employed, and therefore it may have had negative effects on learning (Bax, 2003). Indeed, CLT has failed to prepare Thai learners with sufficient IC

and current pedagogical approaches to English language teaching (ELT) in Thailand are conspicuously failing to help learners become competent English-language users; specifically, the teaching of English speaking skills is rather ineffective (Kongkerd, 2013; Teng & Sinwongsawat, 2015). Walsh (2013) has also observed that, while CC has contributed significantly to advances in language teaching methodologies, especially with regard to the teaching of speaking, it focuses overwhelmingly on individual rather than joint competence, whereas communication is in fact a joint activity that involves the collective competence by all parties, and should not be seen to operate only at the level of the individual. Concerns of this type have therefore led to calls for greater attention to be paid to IC because while “CC focuses on how speakers employ linguistic, semantic, discourse, pragmatic and strategic resources to convey meaning (Walsh, 2013, p. 46)”, “IC is defined as the capability to employ different interactional resources, such as turn-taking devices and repair mechanisms in dealing with problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding (Teng & Sinwongsawat, 2015, p. 15)”.

Building on the idea of CC and IC, Walsh (2006) offers a conceptualization of “Classroom Interactional Competence” (CIC), and by placing interaction at the center of language learning and adopting “Conversation Analysis” (CA) as a research methodology to examine particular features of CIC in relation to how spaces for interaction/learning are created and how learner contributions are shaped, we can gain greater insight into L2 classroom practices. The richer understandings gained from an investigation of these may then highlight the need for classroom activities that are centered on spoken interaction, and these understandings may then suggest alternative teaching approaches that enhance learning and learning opportunities (Walsh, 2012).

In Thailand, although some research on classroom discourse has been carried out using CA (e.g. Abhakorn, 2014; Wanphet, 2016; Abhakorn, 2017), to examine naturally-occurring classroom interactions co-constructed by EFL teachers and learners and particularly on IC and CIC (e.g. Ngowanancha, 2015; Kampittayakul, 2017; Tharawoot, 2017), more evidence of teacher’s pedagogic talk is needed in order to fully understand these highly context-specific classroom practices. This understanding will accordingly be the basis for teacher development in terms of our roles as the classroom manager and facilitator and the individual responsible for the learners’ improvements in speaking English, and in this study, CIC, which is located within classroom discourse, is therefore the subject of investigation. The findings extend the existing work in CA on CIC, which it is hoped will help to improve ELT in Thailand.

## **Review of Literature**

### **Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC)**

As defined by Walsh (2011), CIC is the “teachers’ and learners’ ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning” (p. 132). CIC places interaction at the core of teaching and learning since the core activity in the L2 classroom is learning a language, and this is accomplished through interaction. This is in compliance with van Lier’s suggestion (1988) that the interaction which takes place “is” the learning; they are one and the same thing and so “CIC focuses on the ways in which teachers’ and learners’ interactional decisions and subsequent actions enhance learning and learning opportunity.” (Walsh, 2013, p. 52). In order to obtain a fine-grained picture of what constitutes CIC in a particular classroom, Walsh suggests that the following evidence is demonstrated in the transcripts obtained from the video and audio data:

- (1) the teacher and learners are using discourse which is both appropriate to specific pedagogic goals and to the agenda of the moment;
- (2) the teacher's and learners' classroom interactions create a "space for learning" (Walsh & Li, 2013); and
- (3) the teacher is able to "shape" (accept and improve) learner contributions by scaffolding, paraphrasing, reformulating, reiterating or extending.

The study of CIC from CA perspectives is starting to become influential in different teaching and teacher development contexts, including, teachers' limited wait-time practices and learners' participation opportunities (Yaqubi & Rokni, 2012), the shaping of learner contributions (Can Daşkin, 2015; Cancino, 2017; Moradian, Miri & Qassemi, 2015; Saadati Daroneh, 2015); the relationship between CIC and multimodality (Park, 2017); understanding CIC through multimodal conversation analysis in content and language integrated learning contexts (Escobar Urmeneta & Walsh, 2017); and building CIC through a teacher development workshop (Perkins, 2018). From these studies, it can be said that by investigating the CIC that takes place within classroom interactions and learning from this, we can understand in some detail our local context and how the interactional and linguistic resources employed by teachers and learners create and maintain the flow of the classroom discourse and thus enhance effective classroom communication; by improving their CIC, both teachers and learners will build greater opportunities for learning and will strengthen the learning that does take place.

However, it is apparent that more research is required to fully understand how CIC is manifested in different settings, and more specifically in Thai contexts, and making this data available will provide us with a more comprehensive insight into teaching and learning procedures in EFL classrooms in Thailand. Despite the fact that CIC had previously been studied in the Thai context, no attention had been paid to the fine-grained details of the convergence between the pedagogic goals and the interactional features adopted by the participants in their talk-in-interaction suggested by Walsh (2006). Ngowananchai (2015) has attempted to relate Walsh's CIC to English speaking skills of a group of learners from a Rajabhat University. However, superficial analysis of CIC and outside classroom interaction have been presented. This study showed the prevalence of learners' individual performance rather than joint competence. In addition, the teachers tended to evaluate learners' ability based on correct utterances, rather than to negotiate meanings or clarify a point or idea. More recently, Kampittayakul (2017) proposed a conceptual framework of translanguaging (bridging monolingualism between Thai only by Thai teachers and English only by native speakers) as a pedagogical tool to promote learners' CIC. This concept suggests that when translanguaging space is established, learners have more space for learning through interactions with the teachers. It implies that translanguaging classroom context promotes Thai learners' CIC.

As far as the author is aware of the scarcity of the direct studies of CIC in Thailand, in particular through a meticulous lens of CA as supported by the aforementioned research of CIC in other settings and as suggested by Walsh (2011), the present study argues that the investigation of the micro-details of CIC in Thai EFL classrooms should thus be given special attention. This is a vital step for developing an understanding of classroom interaction, improving the ways in which interaction is organized, and improving teaching of English speaking skills. The following section then discusses how CA is adopted as the research methodology.

## **Methodology**

### **Research Focus**

This qualitative and data-driven study aims to explore how CIC occurs during teacher's and learners' naturally-occurring interactions within EFL classrooms in relation to the following research questions:

- (1) To what extent are the teacher's pedagogic goals and language use aligned?
- (2) How is a space for learning created and maintained?
- (3) How are learner contributions shaped?

### **Research Methods**

The theoretical underpinnings of CA are adopted here to examine CIC through a micro-analysis of classroom discourse. As a research methodology, CA focuses on the explication of talk, and the focus of the analysis is on investigating the speakers' sequential organization of talk and how speakers mutually orient themselves to their conversation (Seedhouse, 2005). CA is also concerned with how language functions as a means of social interaction (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974), which is studied in relation to meaning and context, the social context being a dynamically created circumstance that is expressed in and through the sequential organization of interaction.

CA analysis is based on recorded and transcribed naturally occurring data, that is, actual occurrences of talk and so CA data are not gathered from interviews, observations, or experimental interventions, since these are the result of manipulation, selection, or reconstructions by an analyst or informant based on preconceived ideas of what is possible or significant (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984). CA discourages analysts' interpretation of the participants' intentions or other psychological states (Mori & Zuengler, 2008) and CA also avoids making prior connections between any observed behaviors and the participants' macro-sociological variables, such as age, gender, personal background, ethnicity or native/nonnative status, unless such a category is overtly displayed as being relevant. Rather, CA encourages analysis of the observable structures of participants' talk, including segmental features of talk and prosody. Through these features, which influence the ways in which participants develop their talk-in-interaction and organize their participation, the analyst may be able to infer the participants' understanding of prior talk.

Conversation analysts (e.g. Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974) have also defined classroom discourse as a type of institutional talk marked by an asymmetric power speech exchange system that occurs between teacher and learners (Markee & Kasper, 2004). Teachers are acknowledged to have both the right and the power to control classroom interactions, to allocate turns to learners, and to evaluate the quality of learners' contributions to any emerging interactions through other-initiated, second-position repairs (Markee, 2000). In this study, the main focus of the investigation and analysis thus includes the organization of "turn-taking", "sequence" and "repair", varieties of interactional organization suggested by Heritage (1997) as being likely to occur in any investigation of institutional and other types of talk.

Additionally, in line with the particular perspective of CA, this study takes in the analysis of talk-in-interaction in that the author, as the analyst/researcher, begins with "unmotivated looking or being open to discovering patterns or phenomena ... rather than searching the data with preconceptions or hypotheses" (Richards, Ross & Seedhouse, 2012, p. 44). The purpose of this CA study is to provide analytic portrayals of the organization of talk-in-action by taking a participant's perspective, that is, adopting an "emic" view (ten Have, 2007). In other words, this CA study follows the suggestions of Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998, p. 15) to uncover the organization of talk from the perspective of how the teacher and learners display for one another their understanding of "what is going on".

## **Research Setting and Participants**

The data were collected at Thammasat University, Lampang Campus from an English speaking and listening course taught in two classes. The teacher participating in this study is a male native speaker of English. The teacher is highly qualified, holding an M.A. in English teaching and having more than ten years teaching experience. 71 learners of mixed-ability participating were, at the time of the recordings, second year non-English majors. Classes with 35 learners in one and 36 learners in the other included both females and males, and all learners were between the ages of 19 and 21.

## **Data Collection Methods**

Recent L2 classroom research into communication has considered between five and ten lessons a reasonable sample from which to generalize and draw conclusions (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 87). Although the objective of this research is not to generalize or to draw broad conclusions, six lessons were recorded, each of which was approximately three hours long. Following the proposals of ten Have (2007, p. 68), the general process for this study involved the four steps of: (1) making a recording of natural interaction; (2) transcribing the recordings, wholly or partially; (3) analyzing selected extracts; and (4) reporting the research. Each classroom was recorded using two tripod-mounted video cameras; one was placed in the front corner of the classroom and the other was placed at the center back of the room to capture the teacher-learner interactions during class and group discussions. Three small digital audio recorders were also used by placing at the center of the group when the teacher approached each group. The audio recordings were used to complement the video recordings in order to capture the teacher-learner interactions that the video recordings might not be able to capture. During the recording procedure, the author stayed in the classroom to monitor and adjust the recording devices as necessary, and the technical quality of the recordings was the most pressing concern. All participants were requested to pay no attention to the audio/video recordings and to participate in the class as usual. The teacher was also requested to provide the author with the relevant lesson plans and teaching materials, and these were used in the data analysis when appropriate.

## **Data Selection**

In order to relate the data to the stated research questions, this had to be selected for analysis and accordingly, the research findings are highly applicable to professional development, particularly with regard to instructional practices. In terms of the strategy used for data selection, initially all the video recordings of the lessons were carefully watched and extracts were then selected by identifying interactional practices that illuminated the main interests of this study, CIC. To ensure the accuracy of the transcripts, all selected data were listened repeatedly to and transcribed using Jeffersonian transcription conventions (Jefferson, 2004 see Appendix). Due to limitations of space, data has had to be selected for analysis and inclusion in this paper. So, these are presented below, with very detailed analyses, thus making the process of analysis transparent and the data repeatable and replicable (Bryman, 2012).

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Data Analysis**

To demonstrate “the alignment between pedagogic goals and language use”, Walsh’s (2006) “L2 classroom modes” were applied in the analysis. Each classroom mode has its own typical interactional features and these are aligned with particular pedagogic goals since language use and pedagogic goals must be congruent in relation to particular modes. The main focus

here is how language use and interaction vary according to the teacher's pedagogic purpose and what is occurring at any given moment (Seedhouse 2004; Walsh 2006). The four modes, in conjunction with their interactional features and specific pedagogic goals, are outlined in Table 1 below.

**Table 1. L2 Classroom Modes**

Mode	Pedagogic Goals	Interactional Features
Managerial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* To transmit information</li> <li>* To organize the physical learning environment</li> <li>* To refer learners to materials</li> <li>* To introduce or conclude an activity</li> <li>* To change from one mode of learning to another</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* A single, extended teacher turn which uses explanations and/or instructions</li> <li>* The use of transitional markers</li> <li>* The use of confirmation checks</li> <li>* An absence of learner contributions</li> </ul>
Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* To provide language practice centered around a particular language learning item</li> <li>* To elicit responses in relation to the material</li> <li>* To check and display answer</li> <li>* To clarify when necessary</li> <li>* To evaluate contributions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Predominance of the IRF pattern</li> <li>* Extensive use of display questions</li> <li>* Form-focused feedback</li> <li>* Corrective repair</li> <li>* The use of scaffolding</li> </ul>
Skills and systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* To enable learners to produce correct forms</li> <li>* To enable learners to manipulate the target language</li> <li>* To provide corrective feedback</li> <li>* To provide learners with practice in sub-skills</li> <li>* To display correct answers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The use of direct repair</li> <li>* The use of scaffolding</li> <li>* Extended teacher turns</li> <li>* Display questions</li> <li>* Teacher echoing</li> <li>* Clarification requests</li> <li>* Form-focused feedback</li> </ul>
Classroom context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* To enable learners to express themselves clearly</li> <li>* To establish a context</li> <li>* To promote oral fluency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Extended learner turns</li> <li>* Short teacher turns</li> <li>* Mini repair</li> <li>* Content feedback</li> <li>* Referential questions</li> <li>* Scaffolding</li> <li>* Clarification requests</li> </ul>

This paper intends to exemplify the teacher's CIC in classroom context modes. The three sample extracts selected for analysis below supply fine-grained details of how the teacher's interactional features are aligned with his pedagogic goals which allow him to shape learner contributions and create space for learning.

Evidence showing the presence of the first feature of CIC is demonstrated via the teacher's use of language that is appropriate both to a particular pedagogic goal and to the activity of the moment. As specified in the teacher's lesson plans and teaching materials, the objectives at this point are getting learners to use a range of skills related to speaking in an academic context while discussing different topics. The interactions of the teacher and learners are corresponding to the "classroom context mode" from Walsh's (2006) L2 classroom modes in Table 1 above, when the pedagogic goals are "to enable learners to express themselves clearly"; "to establish a context"; and "to promote oral fluency". The teacher skillfully employs a range of interactional features in post-expansion sequences to shape learner contributions while facilitating the creation of a space for interaction/learning.

The participants in each extract are identified by their initials: T for the teacher, Ls for learners as a whole, and L1 to L6 for six individual learners in each particular group. In

Extract 1 below, after dividing learners into groups of 5-6 and getting each group to discuss the question “What are good ways to relax and reduce stress?”, the teacher asks the group to give reasons to support their suggestions.

### Extract 1

1 T: Can you explain why?  
2 (3.0)  
3 T: ((laughs)) can you explain why?  
4 (3.0)  
5 L1: Explain-  
6 T: Why does that make you feel relaxed.  
7 (3.0)  
8 L1: Em::: Er::: computer game is (1.0) is ah fun and make me  
9 to learn and the same time in in in video game (1.0) it's  
10 story in game (1.0) yeah.  
11 LS: ((laugh))  
12 L1: Um::: game adventure=  
13 T: =[Yeah  
14 L1: [It's story adventure  
15 (3.0)  
16 T: So it's=  
17 L1: =Make me interest  
18 T: Ah:::=  
19 L1: =And and and me::: have to learn er::: English  
20 T: Ah:::=-

21 L1: =Subtitle  
22 T: It's (1.0) it makes you feel:: relaxed when you learn  
23 English?  
24 L1: Ah Yeah=  
25 T: =Yes ah:: that's interesting it makes you feel good  
26 L1: Yeah  
27 T: when you learn English you're learning and you're having  
28 fun at the same time.  
29 L1: Yeah  
30 T: Okay what about you guys?  
31 L2: Ah I think good way to relax ah travel=  
32 T: =Travel?  
33 L2: Yeah because ah::: example I go to Chiang Mai  
34 T: Yep  
35 L2: Doi Inthanon International Park  
36 T: Right  
37 L2: Ah::: I::: it's it's help make a make a healthy body.  
38 T: Makes your healthy body why? Can you explain?  
39 L2: Ah::: Because ah I I go to the forest and  
40 T: Yeah  
41 L2: Ah::: :  
42 L3: into the silent  
43 L2: ((laughs))  
44 T: Sorry?  
45 L3: Silence (2.0) in in forest=  
46 L2: =Yeah=  
47 L3: =is ( ) silent  
48 L2: Yeah  
49 (3.0)  
50 T: Yeah okay so that's relaxing?  
51 L3: Yeah  
52 T: Why it's good for your body it's good for your body?  
53 (3.0)  
54 L3: Ah::: I think::  
55 (3.0)  
56 L2: Climb up (1.0) climb up to the mountain.  
57 T: Yeah, right, okay so it's (1.0) basically it's good  
58 exercise (1.0) walking in the mountain (1.0) is that what



59           you mean?  
60   L3:    Yeah  
61   T:    Okay, so you you enjoy the exercise is what you talk  
62           about actually the FEELING is nice because it's very  
63           quiet (1.0) okay what about you guys? how do you like to  
64           relax?  
65   L4:    Ah:: the good way to relax is watching movie and listen  
66           to music because when I watch a movie that I like I feel  
67           so relaxed.  
68   T:    Yeah what kind of movies make you feel relaxed.  
69   L4:    Animation  
70   T:    Oh  
71   L4:    Yeah and Action  
72   T:    I see  
73   L4:    Yeah it make me feel so excited.  
74   T:    Okay and what about you?  
75           (3.0)  
76   L5:    A good way to relax exercise  
77   T:    Exercise okay what kind of exercise?  
78   L5:    Because::  
79   L4:    khao tham wa okkamlangkai aria  
          ((He asks what exercise you do))  
80   L5:    Huh? everything  
81   LS:    ((laugh))  
82   T:    Everything,?  
83   L4:    Everything  
84   T:    Football?  
85   LS:    ((laugh))  
86   L5:    Yeah ((smiles))  
87   T:    Yeah, okay ((laughs))  
88   L5:    because easy sleep  
89   T:    Oh [okay  
90   L4:    [OH::  
91   T:    it is the sleep (1.0) yeah (1.0) that makes you feel  
92           healthy.

In Extract 1 above, the teacher deploys a range of conversational resources, including: the pervasive use of referential questions (Lines 1, 3, 6, 22, 30, 38, 50, 52, 58-59, 63-64, 68 and 77) to elicit genuine information from the learners; exact repetitions (lines 32 and 82), used as confirmation checks and to invite further talk; reformulation of the teacher's own question (line 6); and minimal acknowledgement tokens that function as continuers and so provide learners with opportunities to take a further turn (lines 13, 18, 20, 34, 36, 40, 70, 72 and 87). Note too how the teacher's pauses are used to allow learners time to think and to articulate their responses (lines 2, 4, 7, 53 and 75).

What have been termed by Jefferson (1983) 'strong acknowledgement tokens' (*yes, yep, yeah, right, I see* and *okay*) and 'passive reciprocity tokens' (*ah* and *oh*) occur throughout the extract and these carry out a dynamic role to maintain listenership, while also helping learners by providing them with time to prepare their answers. The use of these minimal acknowledgement responses not only recognizes the learners' previous turn but also invites further talk during the learners' current turn.

Evidence of the interactional features of SLC is apparent throughout this extract (lines 22-23, 25, 27-28, 57-58, 61-63 and 91-92). In lines 22-23, the teacher's paraphrasing of the learner's previous response combined with a rising intonation on "it makes you feel:: relaxed when you learn English?" functions as a confirmation check, while an alternative paraphrasing in line 25 of "it makes you feel good" is followed by the summary assessment "that's interesting". In lines 27-28, the teacher finally offers a summary, "when you learn English you're learning and you're having fun at the same time." The SLC process evident here may facilitate the teacher's and L1's mutual understanding, as well as clarifying for the whole class L1's contribution.

Likewise, in lines 57-58, after acknowledging L2's response with "Yeah, right, okay", the teacher shapes the learner's contribution by paraphrasing "so it's (0.1) basically it's good exercise (0.1) walking in the mountain (0.1)". This is again followed by a confirmation check in the form of the interrogative "is that what you mean?" (lines 58-59). The teacher's summary of L2's and L3's co-construction of responses in lines 61-63 with "Okay, so you you enjoy the exercise is what you talk about actually the FEELING is nice because it's very quiet" also provides evidence for SLC. The teacher again employs a paraphrasing strategy as an interactional feature to end the sequence involving the current participants, before allocating the turn to the next speaker. At lines 91-92 at the end of the sequence, the teacher's use of the CIC feature of "shaping" also acts as a closure to this group activity.

In the next two extracts, there are several features that provide more evidence of CIC, seen particularly in the teacher's ability to manage feedback in an open and effective way.

## Extract 2

1 T: Now we're studying unit (1.0) what unit are we studying?  
2 (1.0) what unit are we studying?  
3 LS: Unit five=  
4 T: =Unit five yeah what is unit five about.  
5 L1: Movement  
6 T: [Movement]  
7 LS: [Movement]  
8 T: So::: what's ah::: what have you studied so far about  
9 movement what what was your listening::: text about (1.0)  
10 what was the first listening about can you remember?  
11 LS: Yes  
12 T: What was listening number one about.  
13 (2.0)  
14 L2: Identity?  
15 (1.0)  
16 T: No::: listening one not unit one listening one.  
17 L3: globalization  
18 T: G1::obalization globalization yeah?  
19 L3: ((nods))  
20 T: What does it mean globalization?  
21 (3.0)  
22 L1: Er:::  
23 (1.0)  
24 T: ((laughs)) what is globalization.  
25 LS: ( )  
26 T: Okay you know in Thai::: that's (1.0) that's good:::  
27 that's something (1.0) can you try to explain to me?  
28 cause I don't know in Thai globalization.  
29 (3.0)  
30 L2: change of the world=  
31 T: =Changing the world? In what way it changing?  
32 (4.0)  
33 T: Alright you're right it is about the world is changing  
34 but how?  
35 L4: Develop  
36 T: Developing? Yeah?

37 (2.0)  
38 L4: Technology  
39 T: Okay about technology okay  
40 (1.0)  
41 L4: [( )]  
42 T: [Actually I was] sorry ((L4's name))?  
43 L4: globalization  
44 T: Yeah  
45 (1.0)  
46 T: What does it mean for you.  
47 L1: City  
48 L5: City has grown up  
49 T: Cities grow up?  
50 L5: yeah  
51 T: Cities grow up? what you mean grow up.  
52 L5: Er::: the city have develop (0.1) and (0.1) in the past  
53 it's (0.1) small city but (0.1) in the future the city  
54 will be bigger than the past.  
55 T: Okay so this is starting to be the process of::: actually  
56 listening number two:: listening number two (0.2) what's  
57 listening number two about?  
58 L3: urba[nization  
59 T: [UR:::BANIZATION (0.1) what's ur::banization.  
60 (4.0)  
61 T: Maybe you know the word in THAI (0.1) I hope you know the  
62 word in THAI (0.1) what does it (0.1) what does it mean  
63 in English (0.1) I mean what what does it mean for you  
64 ur::banization.  
65 (3.0)  
66 L6: ( )  
67 T: Sorry?  
68 L6 Extend of the city  
69 T: Extend of the city? What do you mean?  
70 L6: urbanization right?  
71 T: Yeah what does it mean what do you mean can you explain?  
72 (3.0)  
73 T: ((L1's name)) (1.0) do you want to say something?  
74 (3.0)

75 T: ((laughs)) Well urbanization maybe the::: the growing:::  
 76 growing cities ah::: it's also kind of (1.0) process of  
 77 people moving from (1.0) from where::  
 78 L6: outside  
 79 T: Countryside  
 80 L6: yeah  
 81 T: Moving from a countryside to:::  
 82 (3.0)  
 83 L1: Rural  
 84 (1.0)  
 85 T: from from rural? (0.1) to::: urban (0.1) from countryside  
 86 to city this MIGRATION of people (0.1) MOVEMENT of people  
 87 from rural life to city life (0.1) more and more people  
 88 moving (0.1) this is process of urbanization.

In Extract 2, the teacher starts by trying to establish a connection between the previous topic from the listening exercise (globalization) and the next topic to come (urbanization). The focus of the day's lesson is thus made clear in the teacher's efforts to get his message across and his repeated attempts to engage the learners in academic conversation, in spite of their limited proficiency in English. In order to achieve this pedagogic goal in this materials mode, the teacher uses a variety of conversational strategies, including the persistent use of display questions to set out his demands (lines 1-2, 4, 8-10, 12 and 20), reformulations (lines 9-10, 12 and 24) and explicit repair (line 16). These interactional strategies then allow the teacher to share the pedagogic agenda with the class.

Subsequently, a number of interactional strategies are used by the teacher to create a space for learning as the pedagogic goal is shifted to classroom context mode. First, there is evidence of extensive use of pauses throughout the interaction (lines 13, 21, 29, 32, 37, 40, 45, 59, 64, 71, 73, 81 and 83), though note too how in lines 26-28 and lines 60-63, the teacher tries out another strategy by encouraging the learners to take turns explaining a word in English, while reminding them that he doesn't understand the learners' native language (Thai). The teacher's strategy indicates that the learners' version will be accepted, and this provides them with thinking and rehearsal time, so helping learners to formulate their responses.

The teacher shapes learner contributions by recasting learner input (Lyster, 1998), seeking clarifications, reformulating and providing scaffolding to help the learner to articulate what they mean. In line 31, the teacher's utterance "Changing the world?" recasts L2's response "change of the world", which occurs in line 30. The rising intonation of the teacher also functions as a confirmation check, and this is followed by the clarification request, "In what way it changing?" After pausing for 4 seconds, the teacher acknowledges that an answer has not been given by reformulating his question in lines 33-34. L4 takes a turn to respond by saying "Develop" at line 35, and the teacher recasts the word, saying "Developing" and handing it back to the learner with rising intonation and a confirmation check "Yeah?" The teacher's recast and acknowledgement tokens (at line 36) invite L4 to extend his contributions and so, after a 2 second pause, L4 tries again with the response "Technology" at line 38, which is subsequently accepted through the teacher's paraphrasing at line 39.

The real-time conversational decisions made by the teacher to challenge L2 interaction succeed in engaging learners and inviting them to co-construct their contributions. This can be seen in lines 47-48, where L1 and L5 co-construct an explanation to the teacher's clarification request in line 46. This is then succeeded by the teacher's recast (line 49) acknowledging the learner's contribution, and this is followed by a repetition and another clarification request, seen in line 51. This time L5 takes the floor (lines 52-54) offering an elaboration in a multi-turn construction unit (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974), while in the next turn (lines 55-57), it is noticeable that the teacher begins by trying to summarize the learners' responses to the term "globalization", making a connection to the topic of the day, "urbanization". This is done by letting the learners complete the missing word and directing them to the next focus in the lesson. L3 takes this opportunity to self-select a turn by providing the response in line 58, which partially overlaps with the teacher's repetition and a further display question (line 59).

By seeking clarification, the teacher helps the learners to re-direct the flow of talk, as seen in L6's attempt to provide his answers in lines 68 and 78. Again, in line 69, the teacher uses the same strategies of repetition and a request for clarification to encourage the learner to go beyond himself in trying to articulate his message. However, the teacher fails to generate an extended contribution from L6, as is apparent in line 70, where L6 returns to confirm the key word. This leads to the teacher's reformulation of his question (line 71), an explicit speaker selection made with a question (line 73), and the teacher's provision of assistance in the form of scaffolding (lines 75-77). The 3 second pauses (lines 72 and 74) also act as transition-relevant places (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974), which are provided so that the learners can take turns, although this fails to happen.

In lines 77 and 81, the teacher again provides learners with a space for learning at the end of his turn construction units (TCUs) by eliciting answers regarding missing information. The teacher's question in line 77 generates a response from L6 in line 78 and this is then followed by the teacher's recast in line 79. In contrast, the teacher's deliberate explanation (lines 85-88) is made to counter L1's misleading response in line 83, which aims at completing the teacher's missing information at the end of his turn in line 81. The teacher's scaffolding at the end may thus perform the dual-function of shaping learner contribution by (1) repairing learner input and (2) summarizing and extending learner responses.

Finally, Extract 3 below also displays the teacher's CIC through a demonstration of his ability to shape learner contributions and create and maintain a space for learning when the pedagogic purpose was on classroom context mode (Walsh, 2006).

### Extract 3

1 T: What do you think is a healthy diet?  
2 (2.0)  
3 T: What do you consider a healthy diet?  
4 (3.0)  
5 L1: I think (1.0) organic food=  
6 T: =Organic food (1.0) what does it mean?  
7 (3.0)  
8 L1: Clean clean food  
9 LS: ((laugh))  
10 T: I don't know about organic food.  
11 L1: Vegetable (1.0) ah (1.0) from (1.0) organic-  
12 (2.0)  
13 T: What does it mean organic (1.0) can you explain? Organic.  
14 (2.0)  
15 L2: ( )  
16 T: Sorry?  
17 L2: Grow vegetable myself.  
18 T: Grow vegetable yourself (1.0) that well::: (1.0) does  
19 that mean organic?  
20 (2.0)  
21 LS: ((laugh))  
22 T: What does organic mean?  
23 (4.0)  
24 L3: Not not chemical=  
25 T: =Okay, thank you not not using chemi chemicals not using  
26 chemicals to grow (1.0) grow fresh fruits or vegetables  
27 (1.0) organic food::: good what else?  
28 L4: ( )  
29 T: Sorry?  
30 L4: Nutrients  
31 T: Good okay have food which have nutrients.  
32 L5: Nutrients?  
33 T: Nutrient is the ah:: nutrient is the:: NOUN you can say  
34 food which have nutrients or have nutritious food:::  
35 such as:::  
36 (3.0)

- 37 LS: ((laugh))  
 38 T: nutritious ( ) just mean food which is good for your  
 39 body which you need.  
 40 LS: ((laugh))  
 41 L5: ( )  
 42 T: Sorry?  
 43 L5: Protein protein  
 44 T: Sure okay different food groups such as protein or  
 45 carbohydrate okay and let's go to question TWO how  
 46 important is ah fitness and exercise to preventing  
 47 disease?  
 48 (4.0)  
 49 T: So do you think it's very important or not very  
 50 important?  
 51 L6: Very [important  
 52 T: [Very important why ((L6's name))  
 53 L6: It keep our body fit.  
 54 T: Keep your body fit why why does that help?  
 55 L6: If your body fit (2.0) the disease will not come.  
 56 T: Why not?  
 57 (3.0)  
 58 L6: Because you're healthy.  
 59 LS: ((laugh))

In Extract 3 above, the class discusses the topic of the day's lesson relating to their own context as seen in line 1 where the teacher constructs a first pair part (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) by posing a referential question that elicits learners' personal meanings regarding what they think a healthy diet is. After a 2 second pause, during which no response is made by the learners, in line 3, the teacher reformulates the question to make it more meaningful and then in line 5, L1 self-selects and responds by expressing his view that "I think (1.0) organic food".

In the non-minimal post expansion sequence, the teacher requests clarification by repeating the learner's response and in line 6, he asks a further question to encourage the learner to offer a more elaborate answer. In reply to the teacher's clarification request, in line 8, L1 extends his previous answer by giving a little more explanation but still not satisfied with the learner's response, in line 10 the teacher claims insufficient knowledge saying "I don't know about organic food". This type of interactional management, made by the teacher "claiming insufficient knowledge" (CIK), functions simply as another clarification request and is a reformulation of his previous question "Organic food (1.0) what does it mean?" in line 6. The teacher uses this CIK strategy to provide a space where more interactions may occur and which may thus provide learners with a space for learning. The interactional strategy of the teacher in this classroom is thus in line with Beach and Metzger (1997, p. 568), who say that "whether a recipient producing "I don't know" actually knows or not is a matter to be interactionally worked out".



Following this, L1 again tries to give an answer (line 11). The teacher is still not pleased with the answer and then reformulates his question in line 13. At line 17, L2 proposes a response and this is followed by the teacher's repetition, paraphrase and confirmation check, all in lines 18-19. To stimulate a greater response, the teacher again asks the question "What does organic mean?" in line 22, which then opens the floor for L3, who takes a turn to respond "Not not chemical=" in line 24. This time the teacher acknowledges the learner's response with "Okay, thank you", and then shapes the learner's contribution by paraphrasing and extending it before giving a positive assessment of "good" and asking the elaboration question "what else?" (lines 25-27).

In line 30, L4 takes a turn by responding with the word "Nutrients", and this is again followed by the teacher's positive feedback "Good", the acknowledgement token "okay" and a paraphrase of his contribution in the next turn. Following this comes L5's repetition of the word in a rising intonation. The next-turn proof procedure seen in lines 33-35 shows that the teacher recognizes L5's repeating as a doubt of the term "Nutrients" and scaffolds this to provide an explanation. However, the teacher does not provide a complete explanation, but instead opens the conversational floor to the learners, inviting them to complete the missing information with an elongation of the words "nutritious food::: such as:::". Seeing that after a 3 second pause, the learners make no attempt to contribute, the teacher provides more explanation in lines 38-39. L5's turn in line 43 displays his uptake of the teacher's scaffolding of the word "nutrients" and he supplies the relevant term "protein" repeatedly.

At this point, the teacher's "shaping" involves paraphrasing and extending a little, before moving on to the next topic of discussion (lines 44-47). After another 4 second pause, the learners again make no attempt to answer and so the teacher reformulates his question in lines 49-50. This time L6 takes the floor, offering a minimal response in line 51, and after repeating the answer, the teacher requests clarification and, at the same time, explicitly acknowledges L6's contribution by citing his name (line 52). In this sequence, L6 manages to take the floor and supplies a number of responses (lines 53, 55 and 58) to the teacher's clarification requests and elaboration questions "why" (line 52), "why does that help?" (line 54) and "Why not?" (line 56).

Another important feature of CIC is that of the "space for learning". This involves the teacher's extensive pausing throughout the exchanges (lines 7, 14, 23 and 57, for example). These pauses provided by the teacher create "space" in the interaction to allow the six learners in the group to self-select and to take their turn-at-talk. The learners therefore have time to think and to rehearse before formulating their response/contribution, and this also helps them to feel relaxed enough to take the risk of articulating an idea in English. Moreover, the teacher's lack of repair and his acceptance of the learners' minimal responses and pidginized forms, which show grammatical mistakes (lines 5, 8, 11, 17, 24, 30, 43, 51, 53, 55 and 58), all work to extend the space for interaction, thereby expanding the space of learning.

## Discussion

The analysis given above illustrates the extent to which the teacher's pedagogic goals and use of language are aligned (i.e. his CIC is demonstrated), how a space for learning is created and maintained, and how learner contributions are shaped. Besides the following discussion of each research question, in order to give a holistic image of what occurred in each extract, summaries of the interactional features used to focus on each aspect of the teacher's CIC are reported in Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4 below. Table 2 summarizes the teacher's interactional features that are aligned with the pedagogic goals in classroom context modes. While Table 3 focuses on the teacher's interactional features that create space for interaction/learning, his interactional features that shape learner contributions are highlighted

in Table 4. By doing so, English teachers may be able to integrate interactional features into their own practice.

In answering research question 1, the teacher's language use matches Walsh's (2006) classroom context modes and is suitable for a context in which the pedagogic goals are to enable learners to express their ideas and opinions on the given topics clearly, to establish a classroom context, and to encourage spoken fluency. Naturally-occurring conversation is thus facilitated by the teacher and this is characterized by a number of interactional features which are aligned with the pedagogic goals as summarized in Table 2 below. These include the use of referential or authentic questions, shorter teacher turns, scaffolding, clarification requests, extended learner turns, content feedback rather than feedback on linguistic forms, and minimal error correction.

The analysis above further supports the idea of Walsh (2002) that when the teacher's language use and pedagogic goal coincide, learning opportunities are enhanced. In this study, referential questions are mostly used by the teacher to establish opportunities for genuine communication, and his shorter turns provide learners with further interactional space. The teacher's prevalence of referential questions and content feedback (although slightly) are similar to Walsh (2002) that they resemble "real world" utterances and supports oral fluency. The teacher elicits learners' thoughts and gives them the opportunity to discuss a particular topic with reference to their personal experience which is resulted in their extended turns. This is in line with Walsh (2012) that it is quite common for teacher to interrupt and close down space when learners are attempting to articulate something quite complicated. However, the extended learner turns in Extracts 1 and 2 show that this teacher does the opposite and provides learners interactional space to make meaningful contributions.

Due to the fact that the teacher's objective is to create meaningful output and to maintain fluency, he does not make any explicit error corrections or comment on the accuracy of the learners' output, as seen from only minimal repairs in Extract 2 but they are absent in Extracts 1 and 3. Although learners make some mistakes on grammar and structure in their extended turns in Extracts 1 and 2, these are ignored by the teacher since they do not hinder communication. This lack of repair is consistent with that of Walsh (2012) that in these classroom context modes, error correction is not necessary and they are not of central concern. In the context of this classroom, the pedagogic goal is to maintain real communication, rather than displaying language knowledge, and this is thus in line with Seedhouse's (2004) meaning-and-fluency L2 classroom micro contexts, which are focused on expanding opportunities for classroom interaction. As shown in the analysis above, the teacher and learners talk about their immediate classroom environment, their feelings, their point of views, and the activities that they are engaged in and so the role of the teacher's scaffolding and clarification requests is on the expression and negotiation of meaning instead of on language forms. In other words, the pedagogic focus is on promoting fluency rather than accuracy (Seedhouse, 2004).

**Table 2. Alignment between Pedagogic Goals and Teacher's Language Use**

<b>Interactional Features in Classroom Context Mode (Walsh, 2006)</b>	<b>Alignment between Pedagogic Goals and Teacher's Language Use</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extended learner turns</li> <li>• Short teacher turns</li> <li>• Minimal repair</li> <li>• Content feedback</li> <li>• Referential questions</li> <li>• Scaffolding</li> <li>• Clarification requests</li> </ul>	Extract 1	<p>Short teacher turns (lines 13, 18, 20, 32, 34, 36, 40, 44, 70, 72, 82, 84, 87, 89)</p> <p>Referential questions (lines 1, 3, 6, 22, 30, 38, 50, 52, 58-59, 63-64, 68, 77)</p> <p>Scaffolding (lines 22-23, 25, 57-58, 91-92)</p> <p>Clarification requests (lines 38, 52, 68, 77)</p> <p>Extended learner turns (lines 8-10, 65-67)</p> <p>Content feedback (line 25)</p>
	Extract 2	<p>Referential questions (lines 20, 24, 27, 46, 59, 62-64, 68, 77)</p> <p>Short teacher turns (lines 18, 36, 39, 44, 49, 67, 79)</p> <p>Clarification requests (lines 31, 34, 46, 51, 69, 71, 81)</p> <p>Minimal repairs (lines 31, 36, 49, 79)</p> <p>Scaffolding (line 39, 75-77, 85-88)</p> <p>Extended learner turns (lines 52-54)</p> <p>Content feedback (line 33)</p>
	Extract 3	<p>Referential questions (lines 1, 3, 13, 18-19, 22, 27, 45-47, 49-50)</p> <p>Scaffolding (lines 18, 25-27, 31, 33-34, 38-39, 44-45)</p> <p>Clarification requests (lines 6, 10, 18-19, 52, 56)</p> <p>Short teacher turns (lines 16, 29, 42)</p>

Regarding the second research question, the “space for learning”, the emic perspective for analysis was based on:

“The ways in which teachers not only create opportunities for participation, but increase student engagement (both at individual and whole class levels), promote dialogic interaction, enhance affordances by allowing increased wait-time, by paraphrasing and by shaping learner responses (Walsh & Li, 2013, p. 250)”

It is evident that the teacher successfully creates and maintains a space for learning by providing room for interaction, and overall, the teacher’s use of these conversational resources includes: clarification requests, confirmation checks in the form of repetitions, minimal acknowledgement tokens (strong and passive) and extensive use of pauses as summarized in Table 3 below. Combined, these interactional features are evidence of the teacher’s CIC in terms of creating a space for interaction. Through opening and maintaining an interactional space, space for learning may thus occur.

The findings of this study are in line with previous research in the literature. As supported by Cancino (2017), the teacher’s clarification requests and confirmation checks which are vital components of SLA, at times result in correspondingly extended turns by the learners. In the aforementioned analysis, the teacher’s questions and clarification requests play a major role in guiding the learners towards providing responses that have some degree of discursive elaboration. In addition to elaboration questions that elicit further contributions from the learners, the teacher’s real time decisions regarding his use of CIK may also create learning opportunities for the rest of the class. The teacher’s repeats functioning as confirmation checks paired with clarification requests encourage further talk in this study, and are similar to those illustrated by Can Daşkin (2015). This is because these moves enable opportunities for interaction, and as a consequence, learning opportunities are maximized. In contrast, if the teacher only accepts learners’ first contribution, further interaction is obstructed; hence, opportunities for learning is hindered (Walsh, 2006). Additionally, the extended wait-time practice by the teacher in this study also confirms what has been found by Yaqubi and Rokni (2012) that teachers should extend wait-time occurring between learner’s response and teacher’s follow-up move to facilitate space for interaction that constitutes not only high-quality but also large-quantity contributions.

In spite of the fact that the teacher controls the turn allocation of the speakers, the teacher maximizes the learners’ interactions by assisting them in conveying their meaning clearly. It is clear that learners demonstrate some reluctance to speak and struggle to articulate their answers but the teacher’s wait-time allows learners to contribute more elaborate responses within a comfortable and stress-free atmosphere, while explicit repair of learners’ grammatical errors is absent. The teacher’s heavy use of minimal acknowledgement tokens as seen in Extract 1 and some in Extract 2 not only tells learners that understandings have been reached as supported by Walsh (2012, 2013), but such tokens also function as continuers found to create space for interaction. Throughout the interaction, the teacher downgrades expectations of the linguistic forms that the learners are expected to produce, understand, and so his acceptance of the learners’ interlanguage becomes evident and it is apparent that the teacher accepts as valid contributions the minimal, pidginized forms that are constructed by the learners. Moreover, the teacher continues to seek clarification in order to encourage further contributions, and this opens the floor to learners, who may then extend their interactions and this may result in expanding the space for learning.

**Table 3. Teacher’s Interactional Features to Create Space for Learning**

Extract	Teacher’s Interactional Features to Create Space for Learning/Interaction
1	Minimal acknowledgement tokens functioning as continuers (lines 13, 18, 20, 34, 36, 40, 46, 48, 70, 72, 87, 89)  Pauses (Extended wait time) (lines 2, 4, 7, 53, 75)  Confirmation check (lines 16, 22-23, 32, 50, 58-59, 82, 84)  Clarification requests (lines 38, 44, 52, 68, 77)
2	Pauses (Extended wait time) (lines 13, 21, 29, 32, 37, 40, 45, 60, 65, 72, 74, 82, 84)  Clarification requests (lines 26-28, 31, 34, 46, 51, 61-64, 67, 69, 71)  Acknowledgement tokens as continuers (lines 36, 39, 44)  Confirmation check (lines 49, 69)
3	Pauses (Extended wait time) (lines 2, 4, 7, 14, 20, 23, 36, 48, 57)  Clarification requests (lines 6, 10, 13, 16, 22, 29, 42, 52, 54, 56)  Confirmation check (lines 16, 18-19)

Concerning the last research question, the main focus of analysis here is on the teacher’s role in “shaping learner contributions” (SLC), that is, his ability to ‘shape’ (accept and improve) learner contributions by scaffolding. Walsh (2013, p. 84) gives a description of “scaffolding” as (1) reformulation (rephrasing a learner’s contribution); (2) extension (extending a learner’s contribution); and (3) modeling (providing an example for learner(s)). From the analysis, the teacher’s SLC by means of scaffolding includes reformulations, paraphrasing, minimally repairing learners’ input in the form of recasts or embedded corrections and extending learner’s input as summarized in Table 4 below.

The teacher’s reformulations in this study are in line with Walsh and Li (2013) that they are essential in this multi-party setting as it is necessary to ensure that all members of the group or the whole class have understood an individual learner’s contribution. His SLC by means of paraphrasing can be termed “appropriation” as suggested by Walsh (2012). The teacher takes a learner’s contribution and shapes it into something more meaningful. This process of SLC serves the dual function of checking meaning and moving the discourse forward. Scaffolding by recasting learner input in this study follows the idea of Cancino

(2017) that the teacher's embedded correction is considered "conversational repair" (van Lier, 1988) which promotes fluency rather than accuracy. Similar to the teacher's expanding found by Daşkin's (2015), the teacher's extending learner's input in this study is also revealed as interactional feature for SLC.

The teacher's scaffolding is used as the linguistic support given to learners. He takes learners' contributions seriously and turns those contributions into learning opportunities. This interactional feature of the teacher's SLC allows him to engage the learners in the interaction while keeping them aligned with his pedagogical goals. Therefore, what is also evident is that the teacher's shaping of learners' contributions successfully creates space for learning by providing space for interaction.

**Table 4. Teacher's Interactional Features for Shaping Learner Contributions**

Extract	Teacher's Interactional Features for Shaping Learner Contribution
1	Scaffolding (reformulations, paraphrasing, extending learners' input) (lines 22-23, 25, 27-28, 57-58, 61-63, 91-92)
2	Scaffolding (recasts, paraphrasing, extending learners' input) (lines 31, 36, 39, 49, 79, 81, 85-88)
3	Scaffolding (paraphrasing, reformulations, extending learners' input) (lines 18, 25-27, 31, 33-35, 44-45)

In summary, this analysis illustrates the teacher's mastery of CIC through the use of SLC, achieved by giving feedback that has the potential to influence learning, and this includes the ways in which the teacher acknowledges learners' contributions, evaluates these and makes modifications, while creating and maintaining a space for learning and keeping the pedagogic goal on meaning and fluency. The findings and analysis show the different ways in which a space for learning is created by the teacher when the teacher shapes learners' contributions through practices such as asking referential questions, repeating, providing scaffolding (reformulations, paraphrasing, recasting and extending learner input), supplying minimal acknowledgement tokens (strong and passive), increasing the length of pauses, and making requests for clarification.

### Limitations

This study does not engage primarily with language learning because the focal point is on the sequential organization of classroom interaction, so theories of language learning are not applied. Besides, in line with the nature of CA, this study is unable to present the whole data collected, and as a result, the data must be analyzed and presented selectively in order to illustrate particular points of focus. As the study focuses on only one teacher, it is possible that his language use or interactional features may be idiosyncratic.

### Conclusions

The current study complements prior CA studies that have noted the importance of CIC and highlighted a range of interactional patterns that are used by teachers. This study also notes the relationship between L2 classroom discourse and learning opportunities by investigating CIC in EFL classroom settings in Thailand. An in-depth analysis and discussion of the main features of CIC have been given, and by studying the fine-grained detail of interactions transcribed from empirical data (recorded in two academic English speaking and listening

classrooms), the analysis has explicated how the interactional and linguistic features employed by the teacher and learners work to achieve the teaching goals. The interactional strategies deployed by the teacher and illustrated in extracts 1 to 3 help to sustain the flow of classroom discourse and contribute to the co-construction with the learners of meaning, and this then helps them to achieve the goals of the class. The evidence presented in this study therefore offers an insight into the significance of the teacher's role in terms of how CIC affects learning.

In this study, 'learning' is viewed through the lens of the verbal and social procedures that learners engage in and locally manage through their interactions, and because of this, the teacher plays an important part in creating and maintaining the space for learning. Evidence has been presented above to show that learners' participation clearly supports their learning, and through the space for interaction that the teacher creates, learners are presented with opportunities to participate in these interactions by using language to construct meaning and to express their thoughts; this participation is thus considered their space for learning. The teacher's role in creating and maintaining this includes his employment of different interactional patterns when shaping learner contributions, and with regard to this, this study argues that learner participation affects their learning since they are provided with opportunities for reflection and thought through their classroom interactions.

Overall, this research complements earlier studies and underscores the significance of CIC, while the findings have implications for understanding how classroom interactions enhance opportunities for learning. The results of this research support the assertion that if the teachers are aware of the importance of their CIC and then develop this by: (1) using classroom language that is appropriate to the particular pedagogic goal being pursued at that moment; (2) shaping learner contributions through a range of interactional features; and (3) providing learners with a space for interaction, they will also be able to provide learners with extended opportunities for learning. By providing insights into how English language teachers' teaching strategies and classroom discourse might be improved, the findings thus have significant implications for future practice. This study also suggests how the teacher's role may be developed with regard to pedagogic talk and how this might shape learner contributions by promoting a space in which interaction and learning opportunities might occur.

Finally, although this study focuses on CIC occurring in the specific context of EFL classrooms at a particular university, it is hoped that the findings will have a bearing on other contexts where L2 teaching and learning takes place. This study may also offer an alternative approach that focuses on classroom interaction and so help to improve ELT in Thailand.

### **Acknowledgment**

This research was supported by College of Interdisciplinary Studies Research Fund, Thammasat University, Contract No.2/2560.

### **About the Author**

**Sumita Supakorn:** a lecturer of EFL at Thammasat University (Thailand). Her professional interests include L2 classroom discourse and Conversation Analysis, Task-Based Language Teaching, and Computer-Mediated Communication.

### **References**

Abhakorn, J. (2014). *Asking effective referential questions in an EFL classroom* [PDF file]. Retrieved from [http://papers.iafor.org/papers/ecll2014/ECLL2014\\_01820.pdf](http://papers.iafor.org/papers/ecll2014/ECLL2014_01820.pdf)

- Abhakorn, J. (2017). Pedagogical functions of sequences organization of talk in the EFL classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(1), 29-36.
- Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 278-287.
- Beach, W. A., & Metzger T. R. (1997). Claiming insufficient knowledge. *Human Communication Research*, 23(4), 562-588.
- Bilasha, O., & Kwangsawad, T. (2004). Factors influencing Thai teachers' abilities to adapt CLT in their classrooms: A collaborative action research study. *Thai TESOL Bulletin*, 17, 1-10.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Cancino, M. (2017). Shaping learner contributions in the EFL language classroom: A conversation analytic perspective. *Lenguas Modernas*, 49(Primer Semestre), 53-76.
- Can Daşkın, N. (2015). Shaping learner contributions in an EFL classroom: Implication for L2 classroom interactional competence. *Classroom Discourse*, 6(1), 33-56.
- Escobar Urmeneta, C. & Walsh, S. (2017). Classroom interactional competence in content and language integrated learning. In A. Llinares, & T. Morton (Eds.), *Applied Linguistics Perspectives on CLIL* (pp. 189-206). Amsterdam, Holland: John Benjamins.
- Heritage, J. (1997). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analysing data. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. (pp. 161-182). London, England: SAGE.
- Heritage, J., & Atkinson, J. M. (1984). Introduction. In J. M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Oxford, England: Polity Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1983). Proceedings from *Tilburg papers in language and literature*. Tilburg, the Netherlands: Tilburg University.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 1-23). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Kampittayakul, T. (2017). Developing Thai learners' CIC through translanguaging in one-on-one English tutorial sessions. *The New English Teacher*, 11(1), 69-95. Retrieved 31 March 2020 from <http://www.assumptionjournal.au.edu/index.php/newEnglishTeacher/article/view/2103/1762>
- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2007). Navigating pathways to success in ELT. *Journal of English Studies*, 3, 6-25.
- Kongkerd, W. (2013). *Teaching English in the era of English used as a lingua franca in Thailand* [PDF file]. Retrieved February from [http://www.bu.ac.th/knowledgecenter/executive\\_journal/oct\\_dec.../aw01.pdf](http://www.bu.ac.th/knowledgecenter/executive_journal/oct_dec.../aw01.pdf).
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 51-81.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 491-500.
- Moradian, R. M., Miri, M., & Qassemi, Z. (2015). Dynamic assessment and microgenetic development of EFL teachers' classroom interactional competence. *Teaching English Language*, 9(2), Fall & Winter 2015, 1-36.
- Mori, J., & Zuengler, J. (2008). Conversation analysis and talk-in-interaction in the classroom. In M. Martin-Jones, A. M. de Mejia, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.).



- Encyclopedia of language and education, volume 3: Discourse and education* (pp.15-27). 2nd edn. New York: Springer.
- Ngowanancha, J. (2015) *Classroom interactional competence of Thai university students* [PDF file]. Retrieved 8 March 2020 from <http://www.transconpublishers.org/full-articles/classroom-interactional-competence-of-thai-university-students.pdf?view=inline>
- Park, J. (2017). Multimodality as an interactional resource for classroom interactional competence (CIC). *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 121-138.
- Perkins, L. (2018). *Developing classroom interactional competence through a teacher development workshop* (Master's Dissertation). London, England: King's College London.
- Richards, K., Ross, S., & Seedhouse, P. (2012). *Research methods for applied language studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Saadati Daroneh, P. (2015). A conversation analytic study on teachers' role in shaping learner contributions in Iranian context with reference to classroom interaction competence. *International Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics*, 1, 45-49.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Saengboon, S. (2004). Second language acquisition (SLA) and English language teaching (ELT). *PASAA*, 35, 11-34.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 7, 289-327. Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Seedhouse, P. (2005). "Task" as research construct. *Language Learning*, 55(3), 553-570.
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. 2nd edn. London, England: Sage Publications.
- Teng, B., & Sinwongsawat, K. (2015). Teaching and learning English in Thailand and the integration of conversation analysis (CA) into the classroom. *English Language Teaching*, 8(3), 13-23.
- Tharawoot, Y. (2017). *Promoting students' interactional competence through teachers' questions and verbal feedback* [PDF file]. Retrieved 8 March 2020 from [http://arts.kmutnb.ac.th/file\\_article/1532507641.pdf](http://arts.kmutnb.ac.th/file_article/1532507641.pdf)
- van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. New York: Longman.
- 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, England: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. London, England: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL Research on Youth and Language*, 6(1), 1-14.
- Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Walsh, S., & Li, L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 247-266.
- Wanphet, P. (2016). Analyzing EFL classroom talk during class opening: Topic shift and negotiation. *Discourse and Interaction*, 2, 95-120.
- Yaqubi, B., & Rokni, M. P. (2012). Teachers' limited wait-time practice and learners' participation opportunities in EFL classroom interaction. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 10, 127-160.

## APPENDIX

### Jeffersonian Transcription Conventions (Modified from Atkinson and Heritage, 1984)

[	Beginning point of simultaneous speaking (of two or more people)
]	End point of simultaneous speaking
=	Talk by two speakers which is contiguous (i.e. not overlapping, but with no hearable pause in between)
OR	continuation of the same turn by the same speaker even though the turn is separated in the transcript
(0.2)	The time (in tenths of a second) between utterances
(.)	A micro-pause (one tenth of a second or less)
wo:rd	Sound extension of a word (more colons = longer stretches)
word.	Fall in tone (not necessarily the end of a sentence)
word,	Continuing intonation (not necessarily between clauses)
wor-	An abrupt stop in articulation
word?	Rising inflection (not necessarily a question)
<u>word</u>	(underline) Emphasised word, part of word or sound
↑word	Rising intonation
↓word	Falling intonation
°word°	Talk that is quieter than surrounding talk
hh	Audible out-breaths
.hh	Audible in-breaths
w(hh)ord	Laughter within a word
>word<	Talk that is spoken faster than surrounding talk
<word>	Talk that is spoken slower than surrounding talk
(word)	Approximations of what is heard
((comment))	Analyst's notes'
'word'	Idiomatic translation of Thai utterances