

Conversation analysis in the classroom interaction: A literature review

Tiara Nove Ria, Desi Surlitasari Dewi, Eka Wilany
Dosen Universitas Pandanaran, Dosen Universitas Riau Kepulauan Batam, Dosen
Universitas Riau Kepulauan
tiaranoveria@unpand.ac.id / belldaisy46@gmail.com/ekaluney@gmail.com

Abstract

This article presents the outcomes of empirical investigations employing Conversation Analysis (CA) to analyse classroom interaction, which is based on a review of 20 academic papers. In this review, we describe (1) Conversational analysis in classroom interactions, (2) Classroom interaction problems discovered through conversational analysis, and (3) Pedagogical implications of conversational analysis in teacher training through reflective practice. Findings show that by analyzing the studies of conversation analysis in classroom interaction, the researchers tried to figure out the pattern of interaction in several aspects such as verbal and nonverbal interaction, turn-taking, repair management, and adjacency pairs. They also used conversation analysis to look at a problem that happened in classroom interaction. In addition, conversation analysis is used in a reflective practice with pedagogical consequences in teacher education. This review adds to our understanding of CA while also providing important information for those who want to use it to better understanding of classroom interaction.

Keywords: *conversation analysis, classroom interaction, reflective.*

Abstrak

Artikel ini menyajikan hasil penyelidikan empiris menggunakan Analisis Percakapan (CA) untuk menganalisis interaksi kelas, yang didasarkan pada review dari 20 makalah akademis. Dalam ulasan ini, kami mendeskripsikan (1) Analisis percakapan dalam interaksi kelas, (2) Masalah interaksi kelas yang ditemukan melalui analisis percakapan, dan (3) Implikasi pedagogis analisis percakapan dalam pelatihan guru melalui praktik reflektif. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa dengan menganalisis studi analisis percakapan dalam interaksi kelas, peneliti mencoba untuk mengetahui pola interaksi dalam beberapa aspek seperti interaksi verbal dan nonverbal, pergantian giliran, manajemen perbaikan, dan pasangan ketetanggaan. Mereka juga menggunakan analisis percakapan untuk melihat masalah yang terjadi dalam interaksi kelas. Selain itu, analisis percakapan digunakan dalam praktik reflektif dengan konsekuensi pedagogis dalam pendidikan guru. Ulasan ini menambah pemahaman kami tentang CA sambil juga memberikan informasi penting bagi mereka yang ingin menggunakannya untuk pemahaman yang lebih baik tentang interaksi kelas.

Kata kunci: *analisis percakapan, interaksi kelas, reflektif.*

Introduction

We spend our days conversing with one another, forming families, societies, and civilisations. We communicate directly through conversation. It is

happened between speaker and listener. The conversation will be productive to each other if both parties know when it is their turn to talk and comprehend each other's objectives. It is also happened in classroom interaction between teacher and students.

Teacher talk is an extremely important aspect of classroom interaction. Furthermore, many English as a foreign language courses have been shown to be dominated by teacher talk. This dominance, however, is unrelated to the quality of the teaching and learning process. Some teacher discussions in EFL classrooms, according to (Gharbavi & Irvani, 2014), do not allow students to participate more in the classroom and do not encourage comfort in communicating with their teacher.

Characteristics of classroom interaction could be defined through Conversation Analysis. As He in (Gardner, 2013) stated that CA is well-suited to elucidate the collaborative, creative, and transformable aspect of classroom engagement. Through CA, the classroom analysis can be the reflective tool in English classroom.

Conversation Analysis (CA), according to Farrel in (Gill & Hooper, 2020), is part of an analytical interaction used as a tool for analyzing data that was evaluated both individually and collaboratively in peer conversations. We can investigate the relationship of the teacher beliefs and students' visible behaviours in the classroom by evaluating the CA data (Farrell & Vos, 2018).

This study identified 20 research articles about conversation analysis in classroom interaction. By identifying those research articles, the result of this paper first will review on CA in classroom interactions. This article also will look into the problems found in classroom interaction through conversation analysis. The last, this article will summarise the pedagogical implications of conversation analysis in teacher training through reflective practice.

Methodology

The literature review was selected in this article as the research method. The literature review will obtain explanations from several experts (through

writing) about the conversation analysis approach used in analysing interactions in the classroom between teachers and students.

According to (Snyder, 2019), a literature review is a research methodology that aims to collect and extract the essence of previous research and analyse several overviews of experts written in the text. (Snyder, 2019) also concludes that literature review is the basis for various types of research because the results provide an understanding of the development of knowledge, a source of stimulus for policymaking, trigger the creation of new ideas, and are helpful as a guide for research in a particular field.

The stages of the literature review carried out according to (Snyder, 2019) are (1) designing a review, (2) conducting a review, (3) analysing, and (4) writing a review.

We identified 20 journal articles in which authors self-identified using CA to study classroom interaction. We chose to focus the use of Conversational Analysis on classroom interaction because this is still the most common type of communication and most relevant to our areas of education research. We excluded books because, as a field, it is essential to know how issues and topics are represented in peer-reviewed journals. Books are essential to consider for their historical perspective on the field's emergence. They contextualized our work and cited our analysis's introduction and discussion.

Result and Discussion

Conversation Analysis in Classroom Interaction

Conversation Analysis (CA) is a method for analyzing natural sources spoken interactions. It is a multidisciplinary approach that is used in a broad variety of professional and academic settings (Paul, 1996). CA aims to describe the interactional organization by extracting from exemplars of conversation excerpts and revealing the emic reasoning underpinning the organization as well as the way participants understand and evaluate each other's actions to establish a mutual understanding of the interaction's progress. It is the concern of some studies conducted by (Suárez Ramírez & Rodríguez, 2018), (Barraja-Rohan, 2011), (Sari, 2020), (Ilmi et al., 2019), (Donald, 2020), (Stephenson & Hall,

2021), (Indarti, 2018), (Atar & Seedhouse, 2018), (Mozaffari et al., 2018), (Sert & Balaman, 2018), (Earnshaw, 2017), (Wang, 2014), (Paulus et al., 2016), and (Huth, 2011).

(Suárez Ramírez & Rodríguez, 2018), as well as (Barraja-Rohan, 2011), (Huth, 2011), and (Sundari, 2017), examine interaction in the English classroom. (Suárez Ramírez & Rodríguez, 2018) focus on tasks that encouraged collaborative work and student and teacher involvement (TBLT) and what determines what occurred and resulted in improved participant interactions in class, as well as to identify verbal and nonverbal interactions. Through collaborative TBLT, language interaction between EFL primary learners and their teacher demonstrated how they employ their native language and nonverbal language to express meaning.

On the other hand, (Barraja-Rohan, 2011) focuses on the interactional competence of adult EFL learners from lower to intermediate levels. It describes how the students perform in introductions to greetings, topic management (present the topic, topic change, and end the topic), invitation, preferred and non-preferred organization, turn-taking strategies, repair, and leave-taking. While (Barraja-Rohan, 2011) analyzed adult EFL learners, (Sundari, 2017) describes the interaction practice of high school students in Indonesia. The findings indicate that the verbal interaction component embodies the language of instruction used in the classroom, as well as the types of teacher input and student output; and a nonverbal aspect in connecting communication gaps. It also shows that teachers are aware of the implications of developing positive relationships with students through praise and humor. In addition, (Huth, 2011) conducted a review of studies on classroom interaction from the perspective of conversation analysis. The findings suggest that all studies under consideration did not infer how talk in an interaction could potentially perform, they document how it works in instructed discourse educational contexts.

The other aim of CA is to see the conversational strategy of the participants to organize the flow of their interaction, known as turn-taking. (Lavrinenko & Shevchenko, 2019). (Sari, 2020) and (Ilmi et al., 2019) investigate the turn-taking patterns of the teacher-student interaction. Both studies describe how the students demonstrate their intention to take a turn. Sari analyses an

unscripted classroom interaction video recording by Wakefield (2010). It examines how the speakers appointed themselves to take the turn, the topic of the speakers' turns constructional unit (TCU), and the expressions used to organize the turn allocation. In the finding, the teacher appears to be the main speaker, which allocates the turn and keeps the teacher-student interaction effective. However, it was also found out that the students still made an unspoken attempt to take their turn by raising their hands even before the teacher finishes her speech, although some were most likely waiting to be nominated to speak. It indicates that students also have power in the interaction, but not as much as the teacher.

Meanwhile, (Ilmi et al., 2019) seek the difference of turn-taking strategy between male and female students. The adjacency pair and insertion sequence from the sequence type of turn-taking were the most commonly used by the participants, according to the findings. Except for third-party mediation, almost all types of turn-taking come from the overlap turn-taking, and other-repair and self-repair come from the repair turn-taking. It also reveals that respondents learned their languages through practice in written or spoken communication, with female members dominating the conversation over male members. On the other hand, (Donald, 2020) focuses his study on students' initiation in an interactional sequence. It also explored how a teacher reacts toward ds learner's initiative in the classroom.

In line with (Donald, 2020), (Stephenson & Hall, 2021) also examine student's initiative in turn taking, he attempts to seek the difference between higher and lower achiever in higher achievers turn-taking. It is found out that the initiation of a higher achiever in an interrogative demanding format (e.g., can we...?) accompanied by an explicit acct (so we can decide) that offers a basis for her initiation, meanwhile the lower group is not moving quickly enough to deliver on time, but rather is moving in a way that is not adequately oriented to the perceived task remit by using pauses and topic hold. In addition, (Wang, 2014) in his study examining students' initiation found out that most of the students' turns were initiated by themselves, particularly during the task phase. This indicates that the teacher provided opportunities for students to maintain their tasks.

Examining adjacency pairs in the teaching-learning process as a unit of conversation analysis is coined by (Indarti, 2018). Adjacency pairs refer to expressions that include responses. In a classroom, the teacher and students utilize appropriate phrases to create a meaningful and dynamic teaching-learning process. The relationship between the teacher and the students in an adult class at BBC ETS (English Training Specialist) Semarang 2 was studied in this study. Questions, assessment, command, summons, complement, greeting, request, and leave-taking were the types of adjacency pairs employed by the teacher, according to the findings. Regarding preference organization, the students primarily used preferred replies, such as the expected answer to a question, agreement on an evaluation, compliance with a command, greeting, acceptance of a request, and leave-taking. The students' least favourite responses are unexpected answers to a question. Unexpected answers to questions, non-response summons, disagreement with an evaluation, rejection of a compliment, and non-compliance with a directive are among the students' least favorite reactions.

Besides interaction, turn-taking sequence, and adjacency pairs, repair mechanism is also a significant aspect in CA. Studies by (Atar & Seedhouse, 2018), (Mozaffari et al., 2018), (Sert & Balaman, 2018), (Earnshaw, 2017), and (Paulus et al., 2016). (Atar & Seedhouse, 2018) discovered three types of teacher-initiated repair mechanisms. OCRI, PR+WH, and OCRI are all type-specific questions. Initiation in repair such as “how?”, “where?”, and “why?” are type-specific CLA-initiations. The other type of OCRIs is “sorry” and “huh”. It is used when the teacher is having difficulty hearing a previous turn. The teacher activates a repair in PR+WH by asking students to clarify their sentences. In line with (Atar & Seedhouse, 2018), (Mozaffari et al., 2018) examine language teachers' repairing practices (his perception of repairable, repair completion type, and trajectory), as well as the shifting implications of various organizational patterns of repair and interactional awareness on learning opportunities. The data suggest that the teacher's repair provision in meaning-oriented circumstances was generally convergent, but it was divergent in form-oriented contexts, according to qualitative findings from the first (descriptive) phase. The qualitative changes revealed the teacher's increased attention to lexical errors and use of self-repair

types, especially in form-oriented contexts, as well as the teacher's progress in interactional awareness, which included context identification and repair organization, metalanguage use, and critical self-evaluation.

Contrasted to (Atar & Seedhouse, 2018) and Fatemeh and Allami (2018) that focus on teacher-repair in the interactional organization, Sert and Balaman (2018) focus on student's repair mechanisms. The study suggests the evolution from other repairs to self-repair as well as demonstrated the implementation of repair through policing. Meanwhile, a slightly different focus is a study by Earnshaw (2017) that conducted a conversation analysis to analyze the moments when transitions from speaker to speaker occurred in an online synchronous course. The findings revealed a variety of approaches to ensuring smooth speaker hand-offs. When handoffs were not smooth, participants attempted to correct the problem by either fixing it or moving on. This research looks at how chat can be used in a discussion-based, online synchronous course to identify and resolve technical difficulties that arise when a speaker is called upon. (Paulus et al., 2016) provide a literature review examining repair mechanisms in an online talk. It was found that most research concentrated on the implications of repairs in particular situations.

The studies examining classroom interaction through conversation analysis emphasize the importance of giving attention towards some aspects of interaction such as turn-taking, adjacency pair, and repair mechanism in various circumstances. It reveals that students use self-repair as well as other repair in repair mechanism. In addition, student's initiation in turn-taking is also indicated various kinds of initiation.

Problems found in Classroom Interaction through Conversation Analysis

Some studies tried to identify problems in classroom interaction in addition to examining conversation analysis in classroom interaction. Conversation analysis has been used to investigate problems of classroom interaction in some studies conducted by Gill and Hooper (2018), (Hong Lien, 2019), (Hale et al., 2018) and (Shah et al., 2018). The problems found in three studies (Gill and Hooper, 2018; Hong Lien, 2018); Shah et al, 2018) in classroom interaction are students' minimal response and teacher domination in the

interaction, while one study found a problem in student's misunderstanding of turn-taking practices (Hale, et al, 2018). The finding of the three studies that address the issue of teacher domination in the classroom indicate that teacher has more power in determining the turns in interaction. It does not reflect a student-centred and student-led lesson. While Gill and Hooper's (2018) analysis were conducted through reflective practice in CA, Shah, et al (2018) investigate the differences between teacher-centred (TC) and learner-centred (LC) methodology as well as students' perceptions of these two methods. Problems were found in the TC method as the teacher dominates the TC method, with students acting as passive agents.

A more comprehensive discussion led by Gill and Hooper (2018) reveals that teachers managed turn-taking throughout the interaction and limited student responses to verbatim text repetition or a paragraph number. The teacher delivered a long and tedious narration in which he provided all answers as well as their text position. Such problems reflected the most significant misalignment between teachers' teaching beliefs and the practice. It also shows an excessive usage of explicit positive assessment (EPA) phrases such as "Yep, good, yep" and "Yeah, good, well done." According to (Jean & Hansun, 2010), EPAs function as sequential closers by identifying the preliminary student response as right. Another issue is that the interaction was one-sided, as the teacher kept adding answers without taking a moment to check students' understanding. There was a hurried, one-sided teacher description in which he ruled the most of the turns and students could only provide very little backchannel or repetition.

Meanwhile, (Hong Lien, 2019) conducted a case study in the setting of tertiary education in Vietnam. It reveals that the teacher is the one who starts the conversation, which is then followed by either students' exchanges or the teacher's continuation. Students have low opportunities to initiate the conversation due to the nature of instructional giving. Students' active participation, however, can still be discovered with the teacher's turn allocation.

On the other hand, Hale et al (2018) found problems in turn-taking practice in classroom interaction. The analysis reveals that the phrases are frequently unsuccessful in achieving the students' desired results. When the

students want to take a turn, they signal their intent to speak by using a backchannel such as “yeah” during other speakers’ turns rather than patiently waiting for a chance to interject using a memorized phrase. Moreover, sometimes they interrupt another speaker at the wrong time with a phrase like “sorry to interrupt”. Thus, assisting students in comprehending the significance of turn-taking practices would be crucial.

Some studies reported the problems in classroom interaction were teacher domination over the students. Even if they found similar results, the types and causes of the problems were different. However, the other studies found problems in students’ misunderstanding in turn-taking practice.

Pedagogical Implication of CA in Teacher Training

Several researchers attempted to conduct a study concerning the pedagogical implication of conversation analysis in teacher training. They were conducted by Atar and Seedhouse (2018), Hale, Nanni, and Hooper (2018), Teng and (Teng & Sinwongsuwat, 2015), Ramirez and Rodriguez (2018), and Gill and Hooper (2018).

Studies conducted by Gill and Hooper (2018), Atar and Seedhouse (2018), and Hale, Nanni, and Hooper (2018) used a reflective approach in which the data emerged from conversation analysis. Reflective practices on English teaching of adult learners were conducted by Gill & Hooper (2018) and Hale, et al (2018). Two teachers of a private university in Japan are the respondents in Gale and Hooper’s study (2018). It was found out that two teachers proposed for less teacher talk time and more opportunities for student L2 interaction. Some of their classroom practices were discovered to be closing down "interactional space", and arguably a major concern in an EFL context such as Japan with few chances for L2 interaction. This study can serve as a starting point for teachers to engage in reflective practice in other organizations and contexts to improve their teaching training. Then, Hale, et al. (2018) presents a practical approach for professional language teachers in secondary and adult learning environments to enhance their teaching. The study attempts to identify issues that occur in English classrooms. The issue discovered is the teacher's lack of understanding of the power exchange system, as evidenced by his sheer existence in a pair-work activity, which can

result in less communication by the students. The process of recording, transcribing, and analyzing what happened during the picture-dictation task yielded valuable information about a variety of aspects that confirm the negative impact that the teacher's presence and approach were having on the amount and richness of interaction. The teacher's attempts were potentially counterproductive, and teachers could learn a lot from how the student-student group completed the task. The importance of providing repeated opportunities to hear new vocabulary items was highlighted by student-student transcription rather than dragging learners down with lengthy explanations. The strategies used by the students were extremely helpful in emphasizing issues in a teacher talk.

In addition, Atar and Seedhouse (2018) found that by analyzing and reflecting on their use, teachers can increase their skill of questioning and repair-initiation. In his study, it is found out that repair is not initiated randomly, and the materials used in CLA sequences are arranged in a pattern. Teachers' materials are responsive towards the TS and the scale of the epistemic gap. As a result, when CLA does not move smoothly or where students have difficulty performing the repair, teachers can determine whether using another resource would be a better option. It would be beneficial to improve the teaching. Teachers will be able to improve questioning skills using the CLA findings. Also, they can demonstrate how various types of initiations work and how some are superior to others in specific contexts.

Apart from reflective practices, some studies look at the role of certain teaching methods or approach towards classroom interaction through the views of Conversation analysis (Teng and Sinwongsuwat, 2015; Ramirez and Rodriguez, 2018). The study by Teng and Sinwongsuwat (2015) gives an overview of English language teaching and learning in Thailand, with a focus on teaching English Conversation skills. The research looks at the flaws in the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, which is currently the most popular pedagogical approach in the country, and how integrating Conversation Analysis (CA) can potentially address those flaws. It is proposed that CA can be utilized as a teaching tool to improve awareness of conversation mechanisms, which are potentially crucial to a successful interaction but are frequently overlooked by

both teachers and students. This article also suggests that CA can be used as a diagnostic tool for analyzing speech and detecting issues that may prevent students from meeting their communicative learning and teaching objectives. It is suggested that English teachers be educated to use CA in conjunction with CLT to help students improve their overall communicative skills. Meanwhile, Ramirez and Rodriguez (2018) use action research to examine interaction in the English classroom, focusing on Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). The research gave the researchers a new perspective on classroom management, student exchanges in the classroom, and tasks related to the students which formed them more self-assured and involved in their process of language learning.

Thus, the pedagogical implications of CA in teacher training in this review are categorized into two main aspects: reflective practice and the role of certain teaching methods or approach towards classroom interaction. Reflective practices offer the description and reflection of how classroom interaction was conducted through CA point of view while the other studies provide theoretical knowledge of implementing a certain approach to enhance classroom interaction.

Conclusion

This article presents and evaluates studies of conversation analysis concerning classroom interaction. It investigates a range of previous studies to contribute to classroom interaction through conversation analysis. By analyzing the studies of conversation analysis in classroom interaction, the researchers tried to figure out the pattern of interaction in several aspects such as verbal and nonverbal interaction, turn-taking, repair management, and adjacency pairs. They also examined the problem that occurred in classroom interaction through conversation analysis. Conversation analysis is also carried out in a reflective practice that has pedagogical implications in teacher training. It will give some insights to EFL teachers on how they should manage teacher-student and student-student interactions in the classroom. Thus, this study can be a starting point in enhancing better interaction. However, this study reviews limited articles published in 2011-2020. Based on the discussion, some aspects have not been explored thoroughly such as opening and closing, feedback, and preference

organization. Integrating CA into multimodal analysis that involved visual and video would result in a more comprehensive analysis that is missing from several studies. Further research could also explore the interaction across cultures or conduct conversation analysis in various international communities as well as in different cultures.

References

- Atar, C., & Seedhouse, P. (2018). *A Conversation-Analytic Perspective on the Organization of Teacher-Led*. 11(2), 145–166.
- 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>
- Donald, S. (2020). Learner initiatives in the EFL classroom: A public/private phenomenon. *ELT Journal*, 74(2), 136–145. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ELT/CCAA006>
- Earnshaw, Y. (2017). Navigating turn-taking and conversational repair in an online synchronous course. *Online Learning Journal*, 21(4), 315–336. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v21i4.1029>
- Farrell, T. S. C., & Vos, R. (2018). Exploring the Principles and practices of One Teacher of L2 speaking: The importance of reflecting on practice. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 6(1), 1–15.
- Gharbavi, A., & Irvani, H. (2014). Is Teacher Talk Pernicious to Students? A Discourse Analysis of Teacher Talk. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 552–561. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.451>
- Gill, A., & Hooper, D. (2020). Integrating conversational analysis and dialogic reflection within reflective practice. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 8(2), 1–23.
- Hale, C. C., Nanni, A., & Hooper, D. (2018). Conversation analysis in language teacher education: An approach for reflection through action research. *Hacettepe Egitim Dergisi*, 33(Special Issue), 54–71. <https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2018038796>
- Hong Lien, N. (2019). Instruction Giving in Efl Classes From a Conversation

- Analysis Approach: a Case Study. *THAITESOL JOURNAL*, 31(2), 1–19.
- Huth, T. (2011). Conversation Analysis and Language Classroom Discourse. *Linguistics and Language Compass*, 5(5), 297–309. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2011.00277.x>
- Ilmi, S. N., Susilo, S., & Hermagustiana, I. (2019). Language Learning Process and Gender Difference Implied from the Turn-Takings Used in EFL Student Conversation Club. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1), 133–153. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1319>
- Indarti, G. . (2018). Adjacency Pairs Analysis on Teaching-Learning Process. *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings*, 2, 204–210.
- Jean, W., & Hansun, Z. W. (2010). *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy Interactional Practices: A Guide for ESL/EFL teachers*.
- Lavrinenko, I., & Shevchenko, I. (2019). Turn-Taking in Cinematic Discourse: Linguistic Characteristics and Practical Implications for Esp Teaching. *Advanced Education*, 6(12), 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.155922>
- Mozaffari, F., Allami, H., & Mazdayasna, G. (2018). Classroom repair practices and reflective conversations: Longitudinal interactional changes. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 36(4), 67–101. <https://doi.org/10.22099/jtls.2018.29384.2515>
- Paul, S. (1996). Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossibilities. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 16–24.
- Paulus, T., Warren, A., & Lester, J. N. (2016). Applying conversation analysis methods to online talk: A literature review. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 12, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2016.04.001>
- Sari, C. C. (2020). Conversation Analysis: Turn-Taking Mechanism and Power Relation Ij Classroom Setting. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 7(2), 118–136. <https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v7i2.12598>
- Sert, O., & Balaman, U. (2018). Orientations to negotiated language and task rules in online L2 interaction. *ReCALL*, 30(3), 355–374.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344017000325>

- Shah, M., Sharif, M., & Riaz, W. (2018). Learner-Centred Discourse in an English Language and Literature Classroom in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Distance and Online Learning*, 4(2), 129–142.
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104(July), 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Stephenson, M., & Hall, G. (2021). Organizing talk in group speaking tests: Learning from high-scoring students. *ELT Journal*, 75(1), 42–54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaa052>
- Suárez Ramírez, I. R., & Rodríguez, S. M. (2018). Language interaction among EFL primary learners and their teacher through collaborative task-based learning. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(2), 95–109. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v20n2.63845>
- Sundari, H. (2017). Analyzing Interaction Practices in a Typical EFL Classroom Setting: A Case of Indonesia. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal*, 11(2), 181–192.
- 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), 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n3p13>
- Wang, A. (2014). Managing student participation: Teacher strategies in a virtual EFL course. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 10(2), 105–125. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v10n2.170>