Using CA-Informed Transcription Symbols in Conversation Teaching to Improve Thai EFL Learners' English Stress and Intonation

Natnicha Dankanjanakpan[a], Kemtong Sinwongsuwat[b, *]

[a] dp.natnicha7@gmail.com, Applied English Language Studies, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus
[b] ksinwong@gmail.com, Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus
* Corresponding authors, ksinwong@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research explores the effectiveness of Conversation Analysis (CA) transcription symbols in teaching English stress and intonation, as well as students' attitudes toward their role in understanding prosody. A quasi-experimental study was conducted with 43 undergraduates enrolled in an English conversation class. Participants were divided into control and experimental groups, both receiving identical materials. Over five weeks, the experimental group was taught using CA transcription symbols, while the control group used transcripts without these visual cues. The findings indicate substantial improvement in pronunciation accuracy among students in the experimental group, while the control group demonstrated minimal progress. An independent samples t-test revealed a significant difference in post-test performance between the two groups (t = 8.37, p < .001, 95% CI [8.95, 14.65]), with a large effect size (Cohen's d = 2.614). The experimental group's mean scores increased significantly from 47.09 (SD = 7.56) to

66.19 (SD = 6.71), whereas the control group's scores rose only slightly from 54.77 (SD = 8.61) to 62.06 (SD = 7.37). Qualitative data indicated that learners developed greater awareness of English stress and intonation, finding the symbols helpful in enhancing their pronunciation. The study supports integrating CA transcription symbols into English conversation teaching to enhance students' prosodic awareness and pronunciation skills.

Keywords: conversation analysis, CA transcription symbols, stress and intonation, English pronunciation teaching, speaking skills

Introduction

English conversation has become an indispensable lingua franca for cross-cultural interactions among global citizens, highlighting how important intelligible pronunciation is for effective communication (Srakaew, 2021). With clear and accurate pronunciation, speakers stand a better chance of being instantly understood by their interlocutors. Pronunciation is, thus, a vital skill for learners to acquire early, alongside vocabulary and grammar. However, despite starting English from kindergarten, many Thai university students struggle with segmental and suprasegmental pronunciation, hindering their ability to express themselves clearly in oral English (Piyamat & Deekawong, 2021).

Such suprasegmental elements as stress and intonation are crucial in language learning, as their misuse can lead to misunderstandings, even with correct vocabulary and grammar (Harmer, 2007). Thai students often struggle with English stress patterns due to differences between stress-timed English and syllable-timed Thai; the latter emphasizes the final syllable or stress of all syllables equally (Khamkhien, 2010). Intonation, involving pitch shifts that alter utterance meanings, is another challenge for EFL learners, as incorrect rising intonation, for instance, may confuse listeners during a command (Harmer, 2007). Most ELT courses provide little focus on suprasegmental features, making it difficult for learners to acquire English stress and intonation. Thai undergraduates, for example, struggle to distinguish between *yes-no* and *wh*-questions, often using incorrect rising tones (Piyamat & Deekawong, 2021).

There are several approaches proposed to handle these issues in ELT, such as providing IPA transcription, which is commonly used in pronunciation lessons, or via such a teaching approach that can complement Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as conversation analysis-informed language teaching (Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Han, 2024; Tantiwich &

Sinwongsuwat, n.d.). Conversation Analysis (CA), which examines how social actions are organized through turns at talk, offers valuable insights for enhancing language teaching and learning, particularly regarding spoken language features such as stress and intonation. CA is a methodology that analyzes naturally occurring conversations to better understand the organization and social structure underlying everyday interaction (Seedhouse, 2004; Sidnell & Stivers, 2012; Ten Have, 2007). It also allows learners to understand the machinery of natural conversation, making language input more comprehensible for the construction of more comprehensible interactive output (Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Martin, 2000; Richards & Seedhouse, 2016; Wong & Waring, 2010). CA-informed teaching supports learners in developing their English conversational abilities by raising awareness of both linguistic and interactional strategies required to organize talk to accomplish social goals (Teng & Sinwongsuwat, 2015; Wong & Waring, 2010).

Integrating CA transcription into conversation instruction has significant benefits as an analytical and teaching tool. CA transcription helps to improve our comprehension of conversational interactions by examining spoken language within its natural, interactional environment (Ten Have, 2007). Without CA transcription, it would be difficult to capture such subtle intricacies of conversations as pauses, prosody, and structural units that are beneficial for interactions (Dema & Sinwongsuwat, 2021). Most previous studies relied on the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) for teaching pronunciation and addressing suprasegmental issues (Dandee & Pornwiriyakit, 2022; Riza, 2021). However, the IPA system focuses mainly on accurately representing particular speech sounds rather than capturing how these sounds are produced during naturally occurring, real-time talk-in-interaction, which is the primary focus of CA. Differentiating speech sounds and using IPA symbols to represent them additionally require specialized phonetic training.

Previous CA-informed studies on conversation teaching have mainly focused on enhancing conversational skills without emphasizing pronunciation, and few have explored the potential of CA transcription symbols in pronunciation instruction. This highlights a significant gap in ELT curricula regarding the use of CA transcription symbols to raise learners' awareness of spoken language and to improve pronunciation teaching within conversational contexts. This study, therefore, seeks to assist teachers and educators in improving EFL learners' pronunciation skills by highlighting the importance of transcribing talk-in-interaction to understand authentic features of spoken English, particularly regarding stress and intonation patterns.

The following research questions are addressed in the study:

1.   Do CA-informed transcription symbols in conversation lessons help improve students' English stress and intonation? If so, how?

2.   What are Thai learners' attitudes towards the use of transcription symbols in English conversation lessons?

Literature Review

Challenges of English Stress and Intonation for Thai EFL learners

Pronunciation, the process of articulating segmental and suprasegmental speech sounds, plays an important role in oral practices of all languages, significantly impacting the meaning of an utterance. Mispronunciation can easily lead to misunderstandings and disrupt conversation flow. Since sentence stress and intonation are integral to conveying the speaker's intended meaning, accurate pronunciation of these features can notably enhance English communication skills (Zhang & Yin, 2009). However, despite the essential role clear pronunciation plays in effective communication, English stress and intonation have proven challenging for many Thai EFL learners.

English stress, particularly, is difficult for Thai learners due to its complexities and apparent arbitrariness. The term *stress* describes the syllable within a word or phrase where pitch rises, vowels lengthen, and loudness increases (Roach, 2009). Since stress is fundamental to English pronunciation (Yangklang, 2013), learners need to comprehend and accurately produce it to be able to communicate clearly in the target language (Scrivener, 2005). While Thai is syllable-timed, placing relatively equal stress on each syllable, English manifests three main stress levels with primary stress being the most intense, followed by secondary and tertiary stresses (Essberger, 2016). However, inconsistencies do occur. For instance, generally, nouns and adjectives are stressed in the first syllable, and verbs in the second. Compound nouns generally stress the first syllable, while compound adjectives and verbs usually stress the second. Despite these predictabilities, word length and loanwords from other languages are contributing causes of stress variations (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). Research shows that Thai learners often either emphasize the last syllable or equally stress every syllable in words (Wei & Zhou, 2002). Therefore, mastering English stress requires awareness-raising activities, continual practice and exposure to the target language in authentic situations.

These learners also experience difficulties with English sentence stress patterns owing to phonetic variations and the nature of their L1. English uses sentence stress to emphasize keywords or ideas. Often, content words such as main verbs and nouns get stressed, while function words such as determiners and auxiliaries do not. Given the nature of their native tongue,

Thai learners may stress every word equally and struggle to identify which words in the sentence to stress, leading to incorrect or unnatural-sounding speech patterns (Jangjamras, 2011; Khamkhien, 2010). Furthermore, Thai is a tonal language where meaning is conveyed through tone, making the learners prioritize tone over stress and struggle to recognize words based on stress in a sentence (Narksompong, 2007).

In addition to stress, English intonation is a key aspect of speech that provides essential information beyond literal meaning through the rising and falling of the speaker's voice (Harmer, 2007). Generally, there are two different types of intonation in English: rising and falling intonation. Intonation is crucial for distinguishing between different types of utterances, such as statements and questions. A fall-rise intonation frequently indicates a *yes*-or-*no* question, while only a falling intonation signals a statement. The pattern of intonation fundamentally represents the level of certainty in a speech, whether it is a statement, inquiry, or recommendation. Asking confirmation questions typically ends with a rising intonation, while asking *wh*-questions (e.g., *who, what, where, when, why*, and *how*) usually concludes with a falling intonation. For example, the sentence *This is your cat* conveys disbelief or amazement with rising intonation, while sounding like a statement with falling intonation.

In Thai, intonation is not utilized to differentiate between questions and statements. Consequently, Thai students often apply rising intonation to both *yes-no* and *wh*-questions without distinguishing between the two types of questions (Piyamat & Deekawong, 2021). For instance, in English, while *wh*-questions generally conclude with a falling intonation, Thai students often use rising intonation, making them resemble *Yes-No* questions. Intonation has traditionally received little attention in language instruction and has only recently been recognized as a key component of linguistic fluency, competence, and proficiency (Demirezen, 2009). This delayed recognition has contributed to the challenges associated with teaching and learning intonation in language classrooms. Due to the rigid school curriculum that prioritizes test performance, especially reading and writing, little attention has been given to pronunciation teaching (Bai & Yuan, 2018). In countries such as Thailand, the national curriculum places greater emphasis on preparing students for standardized assessments, including the O-NET and university entrance exams, rather than cultivating authentic communication abilities (Islam & Bari, 2012). As a result, many second language learners struggle to master English intonation due to the lack of proper training.

Conversation Analysis (CA)

Conversation Analysis (CA) is a method for analyzing natural conversations to uncover how social structures and order are established and sustained through communication, which is an essential aspect of social existence (Seedhouse, 2004; Sidnell & Stivers, 2012; Ten Have, 2007). CA principles were originally developed in the 1960s by three sociologists: Harvey Sacks, Gail Jefferson, and Emanuel Schegloff to deal with audio and video documentation of naturally occurring conversation. The purpose of CA is to comprehend the typical underlying reasoning techniques and sociolinguistic competencies that facilitate creating and understanding talk-in-interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Widely regarded as a valuable tool for examining ordinary conversation, CA allows linguists to discover how language is employed and to investigate human talk-in-interaction by employing three basic principles: data collection, transcription, and analysis (Seedhouse, 2004; Sinwongsuwat, 2007). CA analysts, particularly, consider how talk participants analyze and interpret one another's turns to gain knowledge of social interaction (Seedhouse, 2004). Conversation analysts are interested in both casual and institutional talks in various settings (Wong & Waring, 2010). In the past few years, CA has been implemented as an instructional tool to improve interactional competence (IC) to uncover and identifying difficulties in communication (Fujii, 2012; Martin, 2000). It is widely recognized, especially in the domains of instruction in second languages and applied linguistics (Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Sinwongsuwat et al., 2018; Wong & Waring, 2010). CA has significant implications for L2 learning and has been accepted as a useful teaching and diagnostic tool in L2 pedagogy. Various studies have shown CA to be an effective instructional tool for improving interpersonal skills and acquiring L2 talk-in-interaction (Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Richards & Seedhouse, 2016; Seedhouse, 2004; Wong & Waring, 2010).

Moreover, recent studies have demonstrated the successful deployment of CA in the EFL classroom for a variety of goals. Barraja-Rohan (2011) discovered that a CA-informed pedagogical technique increased participants' speaking, listening, and confidence skills, resulting in more successful conversations. Teng and Sinwongsuwat (2015) noticed that Thai students' speaking skills improved in an experimental group receiving explicit CA-informed teaching. Sinwongsuwat et al. (2018) found that CA-informed instruction significantly improved learners' conversational ability. Dema and Sinwongsuwat (2021) additionally revealed that CA-informed language-in-talk log assignments positively influenced the development of undergraduates' grammar, fluency, vocabulary, and pronunciation. They enhanced the students' ability to notice language features, while transcription

helped them capture functionally relevant aspects of continuous talk-in-interaction.

Transcription Conventions for Conversation Analysis

While transcript conventions were originally developed by Gail Jefferson to represent the details of natural conversation, such a system is also effective for interpreting and understanding what is said based on how it is spoken within an interaction (Jefferson, 2004). Jefferson's transcription system aimed to capture, on paper, the features of talk as recorded in audio or video, in ways that retain and highlight significant components contributing to the ongoing interaction (Bolden & Hepburn, 2018). Moreover, transcription symbols offer a nuanced and detailed understanding of both what participants say and how they say it. These interactional features—such as pauses, intonation, overlap, and emphasis—can only be fully captured through detailed transcripts and serve as essential resources for analyzing and understanding conversational exchanges (Park & Hepburn, 2022).

When it comes to teaching spoken or conversational English, transcription symbols help students to attend to multiple aspects of oral communication, allowing them to better understand daily interactions they engage in. These symbols offer a more detailed and extensive view of what is said and how social action is performed through talk. Transcription also allows conversation analysts to examine the social interactional environment as it naturally unfolds and allows a broad range of readers to witness what happened during the interaction. To fully comprehend what is accomplished through talk, transcription should capture not only what talk participants say but also the manner and timing of their speech delivery (Bolden & Hepburn, 2018). Furthermore, transcription enables analysts to meticulously record all characteristics of speech, including pauses, prosody, and structural units that carry functional significance in ongoing talk-in-interaction (Dema & Sinwongsuwat, 2021). By engaging with transcription symbols, learners can gain valuable insights into pronunciation and improve their oral fluency. These symbols can serve as effective tools for mastering pronunciation and enhancing conversational competence.

As illustrated in Table 1, CA transcription can be conveniently adapted to highlight emphasis at the syllable and word levels, shifts in intonation, and variations in sound duration and volume—all of which are essential components of effective interaction.

Table 1

Example of conversation transcription

1	Coal**:**	<u>**So**</u>, (.) <u>**what**</u> shall we <u>**do**</u> ↑<u>**now.**</u>
2	Rob**:**	<u>What</u> do you <u>**want**</u> to <u>**do**</u>.
3	Coal**:**	<u>Well</u>, (.) I <u>**have**</u>n't been on a <u>**dance**</u> floor for <u>**weeks**</u> now. (.)
4		I've got to <u>**move**</u> my <u>**bo**</u>dy, Let's go ↑<u>**danc**</u>ing.

As seen in Table 2, CA transcription conventions use common keyboard symbols and punctuation marks to indicate emphasis, pitch direction (up or down), and intonational patterns such as leveling, rising, or falling. They can also be adapted to represent syllable stress.

Table 2

Example of CA Transcription Symbols

No.	Meaning	Symbols	Definition and Use
1	Pause, short	(.)	Brief interval, usually between 0.08 and 0.2 seconds
2	Overlap	[ ]	Overlapping talk
3	Cut-off word	wor-	A cut-off. In phonetic terms, this is typically a glottal stop.
4	Terminative	.	A stopping fall in tone
5	Continuative	,	A continuing intonation, like when you are reading items from a list.
6	Appeal (final)	?	A rising intonation
7	Primary accent	<u>**word**</u>y	Heavier stress on the syllable underlined
8	Secondary accent	Pass<u>word</u>	Lighter stress on the syllable underlined
9	High pitch	↑word	Marked in pitch, up (↑)
10	Low pitch	↓word	Marked in pitch, down (↓)
11	Latching	=	There is no pause between turns or utterances; the turn continues down at the next similar symbols.

Methodology

Participants

Persistent challenges with prosodic features among Thai undergraduates—highlighted in previous research (Khamkhien, 2010; Piyamat & Deekawong, 2021)—indicate a critical need for pedagogical intervention. This quasi-experimental study consequently focused on undergraduates to investigate their improvement in English stress and intonation via the intervention. Forty-three students from two intact classes at a university in southern Thailand participated in the study. These classes were selected primarily because they were taught using a CA-informed syllabus. Initially, 80 students were informed about the research, but data were obtained from only the 43 who agreed to participate and complete the pre- and post-tests on English stress and intonation. These students, enrolled in an English conversation course for non-English majors, had no prior knowledge of CA transcription symbols. Taught by the same teacher, the experimental group (n=24) used CA transcription symbols, while the control group (n=19) studied without them. The materials were adapted from *English in Interaction 4*, designed following a CA-informed syllabus aimed at teaching action-driven English conversation lessons to undergraduates.

Instruments

English Stress and Intonation Pre- and Post-Test

Three assessment tools were used in the study as follows.

a) Reading aloud a wordlist

This part of the test focused on evaluating word stress. The wordlist was created based on the *English in Interaction* (Lesson 4) materials (see Appendix B) and tailored to align with students' real-world language needs. To ensure both consistency and relevance to their proficiency, the researcher cross-referenced the selected words with a preliminary B1 vocabulary list from Cambridge University Press and Assessment. This process ensured that the vocabulary matched the students' CEFR level and reflected words they commonly encounter in daily life. This part of the test included 20 multisyllabic words commonly used in everyday conversation, such as *congratulations*, *client*, and *complaint*.

b) Reading scripted conversation

This section of the test focused on stress and intonation in turn construction. Participants were assigned to choose one scripted conversation (13 turns), read it aloud, and audio recorded themselves. The conversation was adapted from a university textbook and covered scenarios involving bad news. To avoid duplicating content from the CA-informed lessons, the scripted conversation for the test differed from the one presented in the treatment.

c) Unscripted roleplay conversation

A role-play was also used to determine the participants' ability to utilize stress and intonation in natural conversation. In groups of two to three, they conversed without scripts while the researcher videotaped their performance. The assigned role-play scenario, sharing bad news, was the same as in the scripted test.

Importantly, the CA transcription symbols were excluded from pre- and post-test conversations, as they could aid the students' pronunciation and are intended solely as pedagogical tools, not typically included in written conversation excerpts beyond the classroom context. Additionally, the scope of evaluation is word-level assessment concentrates on individual words, evaluating aspects such as pronunciation, meaning, and usage.

Treatment

This study divided participants into two groups: a control group, which followed typical CA-informed conversation lessons without CA transcription symbols (see Appendix A), and an experimental group, which received identical lessons with the transcription symbols (see Table 2). Both groups were introduced to English stress and intonation using class handouts, and audio/video samples of English stress and intonation. For instance, they learned that nouns and adjectives are typically stressed on the first syllable, such as **ta**ble, and **hap**py; and verbs on the second syllable, as in ex**port**, and pro**vide**. The teacher, as researcher, also illustrated intonation patterns, using falling intonation to convey specific information and rising intonation to indicate inquiry or doubt. The researcher presented five units of English conversation lessons adapted from *English in Interaction 4*, the in-house materials used for a university-level English conversation course (see Appendix B). The units focus on such interactional functions as making a suggestion, giving and returning a compliment, giving and asking for opinions, making a complaint, and delivering bad news. Both groups received

handouts, watched identical videos, and practiced English conversations through various activities, including listening to dialogues, answering questions, labeling actions with appropriate expressions, and reading aloud transcripts. In the experimental group, CA transcription conventions were introduced through class handouts to help students understand their function and usage. The teacher guided students to adapted CA symbols, such as **word** and <u>word</u> syllables indicating heavier and lighter stress, a period ("·") representing a stopping fall in tone, and an upward arrow (↑) marking a rising pitch. To reinforce understanding, the teacher consistently encouraged students to focus on these symbols. Students then practiced reading the transcribed conversations aloud (see the example in Table 1), improving their pronunciation of words and sentences. When mispronunciations occurred, they received immediate and explicit feedback.

A Close-Ended Questionnaire

A closed-ended questionnaire was used to investigate the students' perspectives on the use of transcription symbols in English conversation lessons and their perceived impact on stress and intonation pronunciation. It addressed the second research question, focusing on how transcription symbols might assist learners in improving their stress and intonation. Adapted from Dema and Sinwongsuwat (2021), the questionnaire was divided into two sections: demographic information and participants' ability to acquire knowledge. The second sections included eight questions about students' perceptions of transcription symbols and their effects on pronunciation (see Appendix C).

An Open-Ended Questionnaire

An open-ended questionnaire was administered via Google Forms to gather participants' opinions on the use of transcription symbols to enhance English stress and intonation. Five questions were designed to elicit detailed information and clarify earlier responses, such as *How did CA transcription symbols help improve your English stress and intonation?* and *What obstacles did you encounter while learning CA transcription symbols?* To eliminate language obstacles, all questions and responses were asked in Thai.

Data Collection Procedures

Due to the semester's time constraints, the treatment lasted only five weeks. Prior to instruction, all participants completed a stress and intonation pre-test. Both groups were then taught lessons on English stress and

intonation using CA-informed materials (see Appendix A). The researcher introduced different stress types and played audio examples, showing which syllables to stress and which intonation patterns to use. The researcher then used in-house materials to teach both groups.

The control group was taught identical conversations as the experimental group but without any CA transcription symbols or insights about their use. Lessons began with video recordings and transcripts without CA symbols. Students listened, answered questions, and practiced reading aloud while receiving immediate explicit feedback on their pronunciation. They then engaged in pair or group conversations to adapt and practice the model dialogues. By contrast, the experimental group learned the identical model conversations, but with explicit instruction on how to utilize CA transcription symbols for learning purposes. The researcher highlighted these symbols to support students' script comprehension, and consistently encouraged students to identify and interpret the symbols during practice.

From week 2 to 5, the same instructional steps were repeated with new lesson topics. After five sessions, students took the English stress and intonation post-test, identical to the pre-test. Three experienced English users evaluated both the pre- and post-tests using a standardized assessment sheet (see Appendix D). For the wordlist test, each word was scored on a straightforward binary scoring system: 1 point for correct pronunciation and 0 for incorrect. The same assessment criteria used to evaluate language in turn construction established in previous studies (Choi & Sinwongsuwat, 2024; Dema & Sinwongsuwat, 2021) were applied to the evaluation of students' scripted and unscripted conversations. Following the post-test, the students completed both closed- and open-ended questionnaires via Google Forms to provide insights into their experiences using transcription symbols. Before data collection, questionnaire and test items were evaluated by three experts for content alignment using the Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC). The resulting IOC scores indicated strong content validity, with a composite score of 0.96 for the closed-ended questionnaires, 1 for the open-ended questionnaires and 0.93 for the English stress and intonation tests.

Data Analysis

Collected data were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. Statistic results were summarized in a table. The mean and standard deviation of raters' scores in the English stress and intonation pre- and post-test were calculated, and an independent sample t-test was used to determine important variations. All results obtained from the evaluators were compiled by aggregating the scores from the three assessors and applying proportional scaling to ensure consistency. Subsequently, the data were subjected to

statistical analysis using a paired sample *t*-test, the results of which are presented in the table below.

Table 3

Results of Paired Sample t-Test Analysis

Sec	Test	Pre (score=100)		Post (score=100)		t	df	p-value	Effectsize
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.				
EG (n=24)	A	43.54	10.00	61.11	9.89	12.45**	23	.00	5.191
	B	56.93	6.19	73.83	6.02	12.43**	23	.00	5.184
	C	49.09	7.80	75.47	5.43	17.47**	23	.00	7.286
	Overall	47.09	7.56	66.19	6.71	17.13**	23	.00	7.144
CG (n=19)	A	52.54	10.72	58.68	9.66	5.59**	18	.00	2.565
	B	59.95	6.31	69.61	6.77	8.68**	18	.00	3.983
	C	57.01	9.43	65.79	8.54	8.94**	18	.00	3.918
	Overall	54.77	8.61	62.06	7.37	10.08**	18	.00	4.625
Total (n=43)	A	47.52	11.16	60.04	9.75	9.88**	42	.00	3.050
	B	58.26	6.35	71.97	6.63	13.02**	42	.00	4.017
	C	52.59	9.34	71.19	8.43	11.32**	42	.00	3.495
	Overall	**50.48**	**8.83**	**64.37**	**7.22**	**12.19****	**42**	**.00**	**3.762**

However, due to differences in the number of students and their proficiency levels, an independent sample *t*-test was employed to determine the score differences between the two groups. This analysis aimed to illustrate the development of the experimental group that received CA symbols. As shown below, the score table demonstrates that the experimental group showed significantly greater improvement compared to the control group.

Role-play test recordings were transcribed using transcription conventions adapted from Seedhouse (2004) and Schegloff (2007), and the results were presented in the table. Likert-scale questionnaire data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Items were rated from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree), and mean scores were presented. Percentages reflecting students' attitudes toward using transcription symbols and improvements in stress and intonation were also shown. Additionally, data from the open-ended questionnaire were qualitatively analyzed through content analysis, with transcribed audio recordings being examined to gain deeper insights from the rich data.

Findings

Improvement in English Conversation Abilities

The pre-and post-test results revealed significant improvement in the experimental students' English stress and intonation after CA-informed lessons using transcription symbols. See Table 4 for score comparisons between control (CG) and experimental groups (EG).

Table 4

Students' English Stress and Intonation in Pre-and Post-Tests

	Group	Means	S.D.	t	df	p-value	Cohen's d Effect size
Pre-test (%)	EG	47.09	7.56	-3.11**	41	.00	-0.971
	CG	54.77	8.61				
Post-test (%)	EG	66.19	6.71	1.92	41	.00	0.600
	CG	62.06	7.37				
Diff	EG	19.10	5.46	8.37**	41	.00	2.614
	CG	7.29	3.15				

Notes: n=48, p $\leq$ 0.05

The independent sample t-test revealed that using CA transcription symbols in conversation lessons greatly enhanced Thai EFL students' English stress and intonation. The results, shown in Table 4, indicate substantial improvement among students in the experimental group (EG), while the control group (CG) demonstrated only minimal advancement. An independent samples t-test revealed a significant difference in post-test performance between the two groups (t = 8.37, p < .001, 95% CI [8.95, 14.65]), with a large effect size (Cohen's d = 2.614). The experimental group's mean scores increased significantly from 47.09 (SD = 7.56) to 66.19 (SD = 6.71), whereas the control group's scores rose only slightly from 54.77 (SD = 8.61) to 62.06 (SD = 7.37). Therefore, these findings confirmed that the treatments and materials provided to the experimental group strengthened their ability to pronounce English stress and intonation effectively.

Close Analysis of English Stress and Intonation Test

Beyond the statistical results, a detailed analysis of the English conversation pre- and post-tests revealed how participants applied stress and intonation in natural conversations, providing deeper insight into their language use before and after the intervention.

The analysis revealed that after the intervention, most students from both groups improved in part a), Reading aloud a wordlist, which focuses on word stress evaluation. However, some students continued to mispronounce target words despite the treatment due to the arbitrary relationship between English orthography and pronunciation. For instance, many notably mispronounced *client* as *[ˈsaɪ.ən]*, or *[ˈsæ.laɪn]*, instead of *[ˈklaɪ.ənt]* and *congratulation* as *[kənˈɡrædʒʊˈleɪʃən]* rather than *[kənˌɡrætʃ.əˈleɪ.ʃən]*. This was likely due to their lack of awareness of the unpredictable relationship between English orthography and pronunciation and the influence of their native tongue in the latter case, where the word is often clipped in casual speech and stressed in the last syllable, *[kənˈɡræd]*.

In part b), without any clues from CA-informed transcription symbols, students were required to read a scripted conversation, focusing on sentence and turn stress and intonation. The EG, which was treated with the symbols, outperformed the CG in the post-test. Initially, both groups struggled in the pre-test with turn-taking, adding emotion, spacing, and applying correct stress and intonation, resulting in unnatural conversation. However, in the post-test, EG students made conversations more natural by adding emotion, pausing, and delivering complete utterances. They accurately used English stress and intonation, while CG students continued to struggle with natural flow, making errors in stress, intonation, turn-taking, and spacing, which led to disfluent conversation.

In part c)unscripted role-play conversation, the role-play test involved students' groups performing social interactions such as greeting and leave-taking, delivering bad news, giving and responding, or making small talk. In Excerpt 1 from the EG, the initial conversation began acceptably with typical casual greetings, but was disrupted by silences, pauses, and cut-offs, leading to breakdowns in specific turns (i.e., lines 02 to 03). The students interacted without expressing emotion and often mispronounced stress and intonation. The high pitch was overused at the end of each turn, making the conversation sound unusual (i.e., lines 03 and 06, and several pauses (i.e., line 06) created an unnatural flow. The closing sequence was brief, as Student 2, merely replied *"Okay"* to an offer, rather than expressing gratitude, making the interaction end abruptly. Overall, there are fairly noticeable and problematic turns (i.e., lines 03 and 06), mispronunciation, inappropriate pitch use, turn-internal pauses, and fillers (e.g., *"uh"* or *"uhm"*).

Excerpt 1

Pretest Role-Play, Experimental Group (EG)

01	M (S.1):	**Hi**↑ P.
02	P (S.2):	**Hi**↑ M.
((Waving at each other))		
03	M:	[**What's** wrong] with you↑
04		Uh: Why **did** you **ab**sence?
05	P:	Today(.) I'm **very** sick↓ (0.2)=
06		Umm(.) I **want** (.) to **learn** (.) uh:: your lecture↑
(0.6) ((Both nodding and silence))		
07	M:	**Yeah**↑ (.) of course=
08		Uh: I'm **sorry** to hear that (0.2)
09		Uh, Uhh, (0.2) Uh: (.) How can I **help** you↑
10	P:	Uhm I **want** to eat:: a noo**dle**↑=
11		Can you … ((the sound unclear)) it for **me**↓
12	M:	**Yes**,(.) of course.
13		I will buy a noodle for you.
14	P:	Okay. Bye::
15	M:	Bye::
((Waving at each other))		

Following the CA-informed treatment, Excerpt 2 showed significant improvement. The conversation became more authentic, with smoother transitions, proper fillers, minimal pauses, and acceptable cut-offs. Compared to the pretest, the posttest role-play revealed changes in intonation, stress, and emotional expressiveness, creating a natural flow and continuous turns. The interaction was smoother, organized, and structured, with emotions and stress and intonation were almost accurately pronounced. The content in Excerpt 2 was more engaging, resembling friend-to-friend interactions. Between lines 06 and 14, both students demonstrated role understanding,

ensuring a smooth flow. They also successfully communicated an invitation, which had not occurred in the pretest. In lines 15-18, Student 2 made a request and invited Student 1 to dinner to show appreciation, with Student 1 accepting in line 21, before the closing. Although the conversation was smoother and better organized, the opening (lines 01-02) and closing (lines 23-24) sequences mirrored the pretest, suggesting these areas need more focus in teaching. Some phrase errors remained, although fewer than in the pretest.

Excerpt 2

Posttest Role-Play, Experimental Group (EG)

01	M:	↑Hi P.
02	P:	↑**Hi** M:: ((Wave))
03	M:	**What's** wrong with **you**.=
04		=I **don't** see you in **class** today.
05	P:	**Today** ((coughing)) I am ((coughing)) **ve**ry sick.
((Coughing and pretending to feel sick))		
06	M:	**Oh**! what's a **shame.**
07		I'm **sor**ry to **hear** that.=
08		=Uh: Do you **want** **any**thing for **help**?
09	P:	**Could** you **buy** me some **food**?=
10		=And: can I **lend** your **lec**ture↓
11	M:	↑**Yes** Of ↑**course**
12		What do you want to ↑**eat**.
13	P:	I **want** to **eat** noodles.
14	M:	Okay. I will be **back**.
((Student1 said "After" to show the next situation))		
15	P:	↑**Hi** M=
16		=Are you **free** on ↑**Sunday**?
17	M:	↑**Oh** ↑ **Hi** P.

18		Um: (0.2) I'm **free** on Sunday.
((Nodding at each other))		
19	P:	I **appreciated** for your **help**=
20		=↑**So**, I **want** to **invite** you (.) to **din**ner at **rest**aurant.
21	M:	↑**Oh Thank** you.
22		Uh: But I **have** to go **now**.
23	P:	Ok Bye:
24	M:	[Bye:]
((Waving at each other))		

Excerpt 1 from the CG below revealed that students began the talk without greetings, with one expressing sadness over losing her belongings (line 01). Silences and pauses signaling trouble occurred continually within turns (i.e., lines 02, 05, 07, 12, and 15), causing unnaturalness and disrupted flow. The high pitch was overused at the end of phrases, resulting in an unnatural flow (i.e., lines 3, 4, and 6). The interaction ended unexpectedly, with Student 2 delivering a pre-closing turn (line 14) and receiving only a brief *"bye"* in response (line 15), causing a disrupted closing sequence. The findings show turn-construction problems, mispronunciation in stress and intonation, unnatural content, overuse of high pitch, and several pauses and silences, causing discontinuities in the interaction

Excerpt 1

Pretest Role-Play, Control Group (CG)

01	J (S.1):	((Crying expression))
02	N (S.2):	**What's** happened↓
03	J:	I lost my ↑wallet=
04		(0.3) I don't know **what** to↑**do**=
05		and (.) have (.) **no** money to **pay** (.) in my (.) **dinner**.
06	N:	I'm so **sorry** to hear ↑**that**
07		(0.2) How about I treat you this **dinner**?
08	J:	**Oh**! ↑**Really**

09	N:	↑**Yes**!
10	J:	Thank you **so** much::

((Suddenly act of eating))

11	J:	**Oh**, this delicious.
12	N:	↑**Sure** (.) Something is **free** (.) is always **delicious**.
13	J:	hhh that's so **true**.
14	N:	**Oh,** I have to go ↑**now**
15	J:	(.) Byee::
16	N:	Byee::

((Waving at each other))

Following CA training, CG's Excerpt 2 revealed that the pair's conversation had slightly improved. They conversed successfully but mostly repeated the pretest responses with minimal content differences. The opening (lines 02-03) and closing sequence (lines 18-19) were identical to those used in the pretest. Meanwhile, between lines 03-10, the conversation flowed well, though there were still some unnatural elements in their performance. There were hardly noticeable changes in English stress and intonation although the pair managed to carry the conversation until the end. There also remained some grammatical inaccuracies, turn delays and silences.

Excerpt 2

Posttest Role-Play, Control Group (CG)

01	J:	((Crying expression))
02	N:	**What's** happened.
03	J:	I **think** I lost my wallet=
04		=Now I'm broke↓
05		I **don't** know **what** to **do**=
06		=I have **no money** to **pay** dinner.
07	N:	Oh: **sorry** to hear that=
08		=What a **shame**!=
09		**=How** about I **treat** you for a **dinner**.

10	J:	↑**Oh** (.) Thank you **so** much
((Student 1 said "at the restaurant"))		
11	J:	↑**Oh** So: **deli**cious.
12		I'm so ↑**full**
13	N:	(.)
		Sure! Somethings is for **free** is absolutely deli**cious**.
14	J:	hhh **Thank** you!
15	N:	**That's** alright.
16		(.)
		I **have** to go **now**=
17		=See you ↑**later**
18	J:	Bye::
19	N:	Bye::
((Waving at each other))		

Therefore, comparing both groups, the results revealed the EG outperformed the CG, notably in terms of English stress and intonation. The former became more aware when words or phrases required stress or intonation, helping them to communicate more effectively. Meanwhile, the CG continued to struggle with English stress and intonation. Although both groups managed to carry the conversation to the finish, the CG's dialog remained rough and unauthentic. Additionally, both groups did not master opening and closing sequences, as their performance in these parts showed little difference.

Students' Attitudes towards CA Transcription Symbols

According to closed-ended questionnaire results, most students have a positive perception toward utilizing transcription symbols in English conversation lessons. The mean results (see Table 5) showed that they considered CA transcription symbols as beneficial tools (M = 4.08) and agreed that these symbols enhanced their comprehension of spoken language (M = 4.04). The students became more aware of the differences between written and spoken English (M = 4.13) and claimed more effective pronunciation, especially with stress-timed rhythm and intonation (M = 4.21). They viewed CA transcription symbols as a useful aid for improving conversational abilities, with an average score of 4.11.

Table 5

Students' Perspectives on the Introduction of Transcription Symbols

Items	Means	S.D.
I've discovered transcription symbols to be useful for learning English conversation.	4.08	0.58
I believe transcription symbols improve in my comprehension of spoken language aspects.	4.04	0.62
Because of transcription symbols, I've been aware of the contrasts between written and spoken English.	4.13	0.74
I believe that using transcription symbols has helped me enhance my pronunciation, particularly in terms of stress-timed rhythm and intonation of spoken English.	4.21	0.72
(n = 24)	**4.11**	**0.52**

Furthermore, the students showed a favorable attitude toward improving pronunciation based on their understanding of the impact of English stress and intonation (see Table 6). More than half thought that CA transcription symbols assisted conversations, particularly in stress and intonation (M = 4.13). They recognized the significance of these elements in accurate pronunciation (M = 4.13) and showed greater awareness of word stress and intonation (M = 4.04). Most students (M = 4.17) agreed that accurate pronunciation leads to more effective conversations. CA transcription symbols were again viewed as a significant aid to pronunciation, with a mean score of 4.11.

Table 6

Impact on the Pronunciation of English Stress and Intonation

Items	Means	S.D.
After the treatment, I believe my English stress and intonation have improved.	4.13	0.74
I've discovered that English stress and intonation are essential for learning pronunciation.	4.13	0.68
I am becoming to be more aware of my word stress and intonation.	4.04	0.75
I believe that correct pronunciation could result to an effective conversation.	4.17	0.70
(n = 24)	4.11	0.54

Moreover, from open-ended questionnaire results, the study discovered that CA transcription symbols helped students become more aware of word stress and intonation when learning English conversation. It helped them enhance their pronunciation, allowing them to communicate more smoothly and naturally, and helping enhance their listener's understanding. It boosted students' confidence and motivated them to explore further pronunciation practice outside the classroom. Beyond the classroom, students noticed that watching subtitled videos on TikTok, vlogs, and YouTube helped them strengthen their English. However, several students struggled with CA transcription symbols due to their initial unfamiliarity, making understanding challenging. Even though they found it challenging to recall all of the CA transcription symbols, they still believed that it should be integrated into teaching pronunciation. They argued that employing CA transcription symbols was necessary since it assisted them by indicating where to stress and raise pitch with appropriate intonation. Thus, employing these symbols in lessons helped students recognize these prosodic features and practice correct pronunciation, their speaking and listening skills.

Discussion

The results demonstrated that students in the experimental group improved their English stress and intonation significantly after receiving CA-informed conversation lessons with CA transcription symbols, compared to those in the control group, which showed slight improvement. These corroborated the findings of previous research on the Thai EFL context that the utilization of CA insights in conversation classes can strengthen Thai learners' general conversational ability (Dema & Sinwongsuwat, 2021; Sinwongsuwat, 2018; Teng & Sinwongsuwat, 2015). The statistical findings from the experimental group were also consistent with the qualitative analysis of the English stress and intonation in the posttest role-plays, demonstrating smoother, more organized and orderly dialogues. The participants were able to construct more meaningful turns to finish the target social activities in a shorter time using more appropriate sequential structures. These findings encourage the adoption of CA as a tool for developing learners' English conversation abilities, as suggested in the previous research (Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Martin, 2000; Richards & Seedhouse, 2016; Wong & Waring, 2010); CA-informed instruction could offer learners a greater understanding of the procedure and general structure of natural conversation, making target language input more understandable (Barraja-Rohan, 2011) and enabling them to produce more comprehensible, interactive output (Martin, 2000). However, despite students' improvement in stress and intonation, findings

from the role-play still showed a few inaccuracies in their speech delivery. While mispronunciation of stress and intonation decreased, the students required additional time to practice and learn more about English pronunciation to further enhance their communication skills.

Furthermore, the questionnaire findings revealed that the majority of students in the experimental group became more aware of word stress and intonation. They found CA transcription symbols useful for learning English conversation and believed that using symbols improved their English pronunciation. Utilizing these symbols helped them enhance their pronunciation in spoken English while also reminding them when they needed to stress the word or use intonation in the sentence. Similarly, the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) clearly represents how the word sounds and is accurately pronounced. The use of IPA in every CA-T lesson that targets the pronunciation of each speech sound or phone is crucial for the acquisition of effective English pronunciation. Students agreed that the IPA assisted them in pronouncing words more accurately. Moreover, placing greater emphasis on teaching IPA symbols could provide EFL teachers with proficient pronunciation abilities, raising their awareness of the English sound system and allowing them to effectively teach pronunciation to their students (Riza & Kawakib 2021; Suryaleksana et al., 2022). The IPA facilitated learners' understanding of word sounds and supported accurate pronunciation. On the other hand, CA transcription symbols provided a more accessible and immediate visual cue that could easily be interpreted at a glance. These symbols represent reliable pronunciation and important aspects of English speech delivery, such as stress placement, intonational shifts, and conversational turn-taking, the representation of which may be neither easy to notice nor highlighted in conventional systems. This additional guidance provided by CA-informed transcription symbols improved the communication experience, leading to a more authentic and naturally flowing interaction.

Thus, it can be argued that utilizing CA transcription symbols can strengthen students' confidence in English speaking, motivating them to seek out more opportunities to improve their pronunciation outside the classroom. Even though the majority found it difficult to recall all the CA transcription symbols, they agreed that these symbols should be incorporated into pronunciation instruction because they prompted them to pronounce English words more accurately.

Conclusion and Limitations

This study examined the effectiveness of CA-informed lessons with transcription symbols in teaching English stress and intonation to Thai EFL

learners and explored their attitudes toward using these symbols to enhance pronunciation. The results indicate that the experimental group outperformed the control group in conversational skills. Statistical analysis confirmed that CA-informed lessons with transcription symbols helped students notice accurate stress and intonation, significantly boosting overall conversational abilities. For example, the experimental group completed sequences and turns more effectively, while some students in the control group struggled to finish their conversations. While both groups improved in English stress and intonation, the experimental group showed more notable gains in stress, intonation, and conversation skills. Additionally, most students expressed that CA-informed lessons integrated with transcription symbols were valuable, as they became more aware of stress and intonation and felt their pronunciation became clearer, allowing listeners to comprehend them accurately.

Despite the encouraging findings presented in this study, there remained certain limitations that should be addressed in future studies. Since the study employed intact experimental and control groups, the researcher could not control the participants' levels or relocate them to different classes. Since students came from various faculties, their English proficiency levels may have varied. Therefore, future research would benefit from selecting participants with similar proficiency levels or reorganizing groups to ensure more consistent language backgrounds. Additionally, due to time constraints, this study provided only five weeks of intervention. While most students demonstrated improvement, some still needed additional time to fully learn and practice the material. Thus, extending the treatment period in future studies would support students who need more time to learn the content and develop their skills. Moreover, CA transcription symbols warrant greater attention in future research, as several students found them challenging to remember due to their unfamiliarity with the symbols and their definitions. Although some students reported improvements in stress and intonation, they still needed more time to adjust to and practice using the symbols effectively. To address this, future studies should encourage regular practice outside of class, supported by transcripts, to help students build familiarity and strengthen their conversational abilities. Therefore, it is essential to place greater emphasis on both the meanings of the symbols and the extended practice period necessary for students to become proficient in comprehending CA-informed conversation lessons and applying CA transcription symbols successfully.

Acknowledgements

About the Authors

Natnicha Dankanjanakpan: A master's degree student in Applied English Language Studies at Prince of Songkla University, Songkhla, Thailand. She received a bachelor's degree in Liberal Arts from Prince of Songkla University. Her current research interests are conversation analysis, the pedagogical application of transcription symbols and pronunciation issues.

Kemtong Sinwongsuwat: An associate professor in the Department of Foreign Languages and the director of the Research Center for Language, Culture, and Human Development in Lower ASEAN, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Songkhla, Thailand. Her primary research focus is promoting CA-informed language teaching to enhance Thai EFL learners' interactional linguistic competence.

References

Barraja-Rohan, A.-M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the Second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research*, *15*(4), 479–507. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811412878

Bai, B., & Yuan, R. (2018). EFL teachers' beliefs and practices about pronunciation teaching. *ELT Journal*, *73*(2), 134–143. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy040

Bolden, G. B., & Hepburn, A. (2018). Transcription for conversation analysis. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.131

Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Goodwin, J. M. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: Hardback with audio CDs (2): A course book and reference guide.* Cambridge University Press.

Choi, H. S., & Sinwongsuwat, K. (2024). Vlogging: An alternative to role-play in improving EFL learners' conversation skills. *rEFLections*, *31*(2), 353–385. https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v31i2.273312

Dandee, W., & Pornwiriyakit, P. (2022). Improving English pronunciation skills by using English phonetic alphabet drills in EFL students. *Journal of Educational Issues*, *8*(1), 611. https://doi.org/10.5296/jei.v8i1.19851

Dema, C., & Sinwongsuwat, K. (2021). Harnessing conversation analysis-(CA)-informed language-in-talk log assignments to improve conversation skills of EFL learners. *Language Related Research, 12*(5), 111–142. https://doi.org/10.29252/LRR.12.5.5

Demirezen, M. (2009). An analysis of the problem-causing elements of intonation for Turkish teachers of English. *Procedia - Social and* Behavioral *Sciences*, *1*(1), 2776–2781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.492

Essberger, J. (2016). *Word stress and sentence stress: The golden key to English pronunciation.* English Club.

Fujii, Y. (2012). Raising awareness of interactional practices in L2 conversations: Insights from conversation analysis. *International Journal of Language Studies, 6*(3), 99–126.

Harmer, J. (2007). How to teach English (second edition). *ELT Journal*, *62*(3), 313–316. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn029

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis.* Polity Press.

Islam, M. J., & Bari, I. S. (2012). Implementation of CLT in Bangladesh and Thailand: Problems and challenges. *Outlooks: VUB, 15*(1), 87–105

Jangjamras, J. (2011). *Perception and production of English lexical stress by Thai speakers* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida]. https://ufdcimages.uflib.ufl.edu/UF/E0/04/12/02/00001/jangjamras_j.pdf

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. *Pragmatics & Beyond New Series*, 13–31. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef

Han, X. (2024). From conversation to interaction: A pedagogical exploration of applying conversation analysis in EFL classrooms. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language--TESL-EJ, 28*(3). https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.28111a7

Khamkhien, A. (2010). Thai learners' English pronunciation competence: Lesson learned from word stress assignment. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(6). https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.6.757-764

Martin, G. S. (2000). Conversation analysis. In M. Byram & A. Hu (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of language teaching and learning* (pp. 145–148). Routledge.

Narksompong, J. (2007). *A study of Thai phonological features that cause pronunciation problems for Thai people* [Master's thesis, Thammasat University]. https://digital.library.tu.ac.th/tu_dc/frontend/Info/item/dc:110916

Park, S. H., & Hepburn, A. (2022). The benefits of a Jeffersonian transcript. *Frontiers in Communication, 7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2022.779434

Piyamat, B., & Deekawong, K. (2021). Phonological variations and problems in English pronunciation among Thai EFL learners: A case study of undergraduate students at Huachiew Chalermprakiet University. *Liberal Arts Review, 16*(1), 70–84.

Richards, K., & Seedhouse, P. (Eds.). (2016). *Applying conversation analysis.* Springer.

Riza, A. (2021). *The implementation of IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) based phonetic transcription in teaching pronunciation for EFL students at Aphrodite English Club* [Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim].

Riza, A., & Kawakib, A. N. (2021). Utilizing the phonetic transcription of IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) to avoid EFL students' mispronunciation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Social Science (ICONETOS 2020)* (pp.464-468). *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research.* https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210421.067

Roach, P. (2009). *English phonetics and phonology: A practical course* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.

Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning teaching: A guidebook for English language teachers.* Macmillan.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective. *Language Learning, 54*(Suppl1), x–300. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2004.00266.x

Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2012). *The handbook of conversation analysis.* John Wiley & Sons.

Sinwongsuwat, K. (2007). Conversation analysis (CA): An introduction from a linguist's perspective. *School of Language and Communication, 12*(12), 38–57.

Sinwongsuwat, K. (2018). *English written and spoken grammar: The essentials for second language teachers and learners.* Nusa Centre & Institute of Translation & Books Malaysia (ITBM).

Sinwongsuwat, K., Nicoletti, K., & Teng, B. (2018). CA-informed conversation teaching: Helping Thai students unpack English conversations to become conversationally competent. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 15*(3), 700-720. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.3.9.700

Srakaew, P. N. (2021). The importance of pronunciation in English communication. *Journal of Asian Language Teaching and Learning (Online), 2*(2), 11–18. https://so10.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jote/article/view/491

Suryaleksana, B. B., Sari, M. N., Nadilia, M., & Bram, B. (2022). Utilizing the international phonetic alphabet to improve pronunciation of English education students. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris, 15*(1), 148–167. https://doi.org/10.24042/ee-jtbi.v15i1.11536

Tantiwich, K., & Sinwongsuwat, K. (n.d.). *Conversation analysis-informed lessons to foster repair practices in Thai EFL learners* [Manuscript submitted for publication]. SSRN.

Ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis.* SAGE Publications.

Teng, B., & Sinwongsuwat, K. (2015). Teaching and learning English in Thailand and the integration of Conversation Analysis (CA) into the classroom. *English Language Teaching, 8*(3). https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n3p13

Wei, Y., & Zhou, Y. (2002). Insights into English pronunciation problems of Thai students.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. Routledge.

Yangklang, W. (2013). Improving English stress and intonation pronunciation of the first year students of Nakhon Ratchasima Rajabhat *University* through an e-learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *91*, 444–452. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.442

Zhang, F., & Yin, P. (2009). A study of pronunciation problems of English learners in China. *Asian Social Science, 5*(6), 141–146. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v5n6p141

Appendix A

CA-Based Lesson Plan

Duration: 120 minutes

Topic: Unit 6 Making a suggestion

Aims:

a) To enable students to ask opinions and make an introduction to a suggestion
b) To guide the students to make a suggestion, accept a suggestion, and refuse a suggestion
c) To provide examples and practices for the students to be able to improve their English stress and intonation

Learning Outcome: by the end of this lesson, the students will be able to

a) Ask for opinions and make an introduction to a suggestion
b) Make the sequences, turn, and expressions to make a suggestion, accept a suggestion, and refuse a suggestion
c) Understand the structure of English stress and intonation and be able to use it to improve their conversational ability

Sequence	Minutes	Activities	Material/ Resource
Warm up	5	Class Discussion about the topic	PPTs

Preparation	15	1. Introduce the English stress and intonation
		2. Provide examples about
		  - the word of English stress and intonation
		  - listen to the stress and intonation sound
			PPTs

Content-based activities practice	30	1. Hand out a CA-based handouts
		2. Have students practice each stage in individuals and pairs
		  - listen to audio and fill in the missing words in the sentences and match the words with the definitions
		  - Look up the pronunciation of the words and practicing pronounce the correct English stress
		  - Watch video clip and answer questions and label with the right expressions in the transcript of conversation (e.g., asking for opinions or making/accepting/refusing a suggestion)
			PPTs
			Audio file
			Handouts

The English Stress and Intonation practice	25	1. Have students listen to the recordings and read the transcript of conversation aloud 2. Have students practice pronounce the English stress and intonation when reading the transcript of conversation	PPTs Video file Handouts
Performance	30	1. Ask the students to get in pairs 2. Have students write expressions that can be used to perform each action and practice making a conversation that includes the actions their have learned (in pairs) - Greeting, make/accept/refuse a suggestion, and taking leave 3. Have students perform their practicing conversation in class	PPTs Handouts
Wrap up	10	Teacher recaps the important points	PPTs
Homework	5	Assign students to make a 1-minute video clip to practice making conversation	PPTs

Appendix B

Unit 6 Making a suggestion (Sample)

Activity 1: Class discussion

- ☐ If you want to tell your idea about going to a beach, what will you say?
- ☐ If you don't like your friend's idea, what will you say to refuse it in a polite way?

Activity 2: Listen to audio and fill in the missing words in the sentences below.

- ☐ When I was young, I wasn't _____ on playing table tennis, but now I play it every day.
- ☐ You may not like her, but you have to _____ that she's good at her job.

Activity 3: Match the words or expressions you wrote in Activity 2 with the definitions.

- ☐ _____(adj.) Meaning: very interested, eager, or wanting (to do) something very much
- ☐ _____(v.) Pronunciation Meaning: to agree unwillingly that something is true or that someone else is right

Activity 4: Watch video clip and answer the following questions.

- ☐ Where does the conversation take place?
  Ans:_____
- ☐ What are the roles of the speakers?
  Ans:_____

Activity 5: Label the actions below with the right expressions in the transcript of conversation

- Asking for opinions – Giving an opinion to make an introduction to a suggestion

- Making a suggestion – Refusing a suggestion – Accepting a suggestion

Transcription of conversation

1	Coal:	So, what shall we do now? (_____)
2	Rob:	What do you want to do?

      (_____)

      Well, I haven't been on a dance floor for

3 Coak: weeks now. I've got to move my body.

      (_____)

      Let's go dancing.

4

      (_____)

Activity 6: Listen to the recordings and read the transcript of conversation aloud with the correct English stress and intonation

1 Coak: So, what shall we do now?

2 Rob: What do you want to do?

3 Coak: Well, I haven't been on a dance floor for weeks now. I've got to move my body.

4   Let's go dancing.

Activity 7: Write expressions that can be used to perform each action and make conversation with your classmates with the expressions you have learned. You and your classmates have a conversation to decide where to have dinner together after class. Then, perform your conversation with your partners.

Practice 1	Practice 2	Practice 3
☐ Greeting ☐ Making an introduction to a suggestion ☐ Making a suggestion	☐ Refusing a suggestion ☐ Making another suggestion ☐ Accepting a suggestion	☐ Taking leave

Activity 8: Make a 1-minute video clip.

Assignment (Self-recording 6)
You and your friends want to get together on the weekend, so you are making a plan for some weekend activities. You need to discuss and decide on where to go, what to do, and when to meet.

Appendix C

QUESTIONNAIRE

Direction: The purpose of the research questionnaire is to assess the learning ability of the participants. All information gathered from this questionnaire will be used only for research purposes. Your responses will be kept privately. Please take the time to answer all the questions in the following questionnaire.

Personal Information

1.1 Gender: _____ Male _____ Female _____ Other

1.2 Date: _____

1.3 Faculty: _____

Language Information

1.5 Years of learning English:
_____ 1-3 years _____ 4-6 years _____ 6-8 years_____ 8 years or more

1.6 Other Languages spoken:

_____ Thai _____ English _____ Chinese _____ Malay _____ Others:____

Direction: Please indicate the degree to which you are in agreement or disagreement with each of these statements. Mark the most extensive/desirable replies with a " X ".

1-Strongly Disagree   2-Disagree   3-Neutral   4-Agree   5-Strongly Agree

Questions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Students' perspectives on the introduction of transcription symbols (4 items)					
I've discovered transcription symbols to be useful for learning English conversation.					
I believe transcription symbols improve in my comprehension of spoken language aspects.					
Because of transcription symbols, I've been aware of the contrasts between written and spoken English.					
I believe that using transcription symbols has helped me enhance my pronunciation, particularly in terms of stress-timed rhythm and intonation of spoken English.					
The impact on the pronunciation of English stress and intonation (4 items)					
After the treatment, I believe my English stress and intonation have improved.					
I've discovered that English stress and intonation are essential for learning pronunciation.					
I am becoming to be more aware of my word stress and intonation.					
I believe that correct pronunciation could result to an effective conversation.					

Appendix D

Evaluation Form for Pre-test and Post-test

Name:_____ Total Score:_____

Part 1: Test A: Reading aloud a wordlist (20 multisyllabic words)

Word list	Accurate pronounce	Mispronounce
20 words	1 point	0 point
Absolutely		
Neighbor		

Part 2 and 3: Test B and C: Reading scripted conversation and Unscripted roleplay conversation

Language Use in Turn Construction			
Items	3 pnt	2 pnt	1 pnt
Pronunciation (clarity and intelligibility)	Clear and intelligible	Occasionally unclear and unintelligible	Unclear and unintelligible
Pitch, stress and intonation (accuracy and appropriacy)	Accurate use of word and phrasal stress as well as appropriate use of pitch and intonation	Occasionally inaccurate use of word and phrasal stress as well as inappropriate use of pitch and intonation	Inaccurate use of word and phrasal stress as well as inappropriate use of stress and intonation