Improving Thai Undergraduates' English Conversation through Explicit CA-Informed Instruction

Bunthan Teng

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts in Teaching English as an International Language
Prince of Songkla University
2015

Thesis Title   Improving Thai Undergraduates' English Conversation through Explicit CA-Informed Instruction

Author   Mr. Bunthan Teng

Major Program   Teaching English as an International Language

---

Major Advisor

…………………………………….…
(Asst. Prof. Dr. Kemtong Sinwongsuwat)

Examining Committee

…………………………………….…
(Asst. Prof. Dr. Compol Swangboonsatic)

……………………………………….
(Asst. Prof. Dr. Premin Karavi)

……………………………………….
(Asst. Prof. Dr. Kemtong Sinwongsuwat)

The Graduate School, Prince of Songkla University, has approved this thesis as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts Degree in Teaching English as an International Language.

……………………………………….
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Teerapol Srichana)
Dean of Graduate School

This is to certify that the work here submitted is the result of the candidate's own investigations. Due acknowledgement has been made of any assistance received.

…………………………….Signature

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Kemtong Sinwongsuwat)

Major Advisor

…………………………...… Signature

(Mr. Bunthan Teng)

Candidate

I hereby certify that this work has not been accepted in substance for any degree, and is not being currently submitted in candidature for any degree.

……………………………… Signature

(Mr. Bunthan Teng)

Candidate

Thesis Title   Improving Thai Undergraduates' English Conversation through Explicit CA-Informed Instruction

Author   Mr. Bunthan Teng

Major Program   Teaching English as an International Language

Academic Year   2014

ABSTRACT

With the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) on the horizon, every member nation is putting forth their best efforts to get citizens ready for the integration, the most notable of which is to equip them with a good command of English, the lingua franca of the AEC. An effective approach to teaching English conversation is, therefore, becoming even more crucial for developing competent human resources. The purpose of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of explicit Conversation Analysis (CA)-informed instruction. The participants in the study were 36 Thai non-English major undergraduate seniors with elementary-level English proficiency (A2) enrolled in an English conversation course at the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University. The participants were selected and equally divided into (1) an experimental group taught using explicit CA-informed instructional strategies and (2) a control group taught using the teaching strategies prescribed in the teacher's manual of a Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)-oriented commercial textbook.

The findings from the statistical analysis revealed that the experimental group improved their conversational abilities in all aspects assessed, outperforming the control group. The moderately large effect size of the CA-informed instruction, 0.64, also verified its effectiveness. Moreover, the findings from a close analysis of students' interactions strongly confirmed that the explicit CA-informed instruction led to an improvement in students' English conversational performance and increased their confidence in speaking English. This was not the case with students in the control group. It is recommended that to boost learners' interactional competence, teachers of English conversation develop an understanding of CA so as to utilize it as an instructional tool to raise students' awareness of conversational practices, thereby

enabling them to converse more effectively in naturally occurring English conversations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

A SYNTHESIS REPORT

PAPER 2

LIST OF PAPERS

This thesis is based on the following papers:

1. INTRODUCTION

With globalization, the English language unquestionably serves a vital role, not only as a language of wider communication but also as a medium of social advancements. Having long been used as an official language by world organizations such as UN, UNESCOS and EU, English has more recently been adopted as a working language and as a lingua franca by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) community, which currently has ten members and a population of approximately 600 million people (Kirpatrick, 2012). With the ASEAN Economic Community on the horizon, English becomes an integral part in developing the economy and human resources in each member country. Therefore, English language teaching (ELT) must be efficient in helping every member nation benefit from the economic merger.

In order to survive and even advance in the AEC, ELT must pay most attention to speaking skills as a primary goal because for many, learning to speak English fluently is a challenging skill to master; it often takes time and considerable effort. As argued by Luama (2004), being able to speak a foreign language is at the heart of language learners' ability to use the language in interaction. In Thailand, ELT has therefore shifted from such traditional teaching methods as grammar translation and audio lingual to communicative language teaching (CLT), hoping to invigorate Thai learners' communication skills. In fact, English has been introduced at every level from primary school to university, and new policies have been implemented to promote English immersion through English programs (Darasawang, 2007; Kongkerd, 2013; Punthumasen, 2007). Moreover, the Thai government has launched educational reforms, at the heart of which lies CLT, in order to develop Thailand into a knowledge-based society (Nonkukhetkhong, Baidauf.Jr., & Moni, 2006). Teachers have been encouraged to assume new roles as facilitators or guides, replacing their traditional roles as tellers and they also learn to create teaching materials to enhance learners' meaningful communication and constructive self-learning.

CLT has been around in Thai EFL contexts for over the past two decades (Kustati, 2013, Kwangsawad & Yawongsa, 2009, Saengboon, 2002). It is apparently

the most popular and widely employed ELT approach in Thailand (Methitham & Chamcharasti, 2011). This is also evidenced in many research papers listed in the Thai Library Integrated System (ThaiLIS) (2015). However, the true merit of CLT is yet to be seen since most Thai students' English remains poor (Atagi, 2011; Bruner, Shimray, & Sinwongsuwat, 2014; Khamkhien, 2010; Kongkerd, 2013; Noom-ura, 2013).

Teng and Sinwongsuwat (2015) have in fact reported some limitations of CLT leading to a mismatch between theory and practice in EFL contexts like Thailand. According to Saengboon (2002), Thai students have experienced unpleasant feelings with CLT because they prefer to assume a passive role, rather than challenge or confront the teacher. Bax (2003) argues that CLT has neglected the local ELT context where it is employed, especially in EFL countries, which has negative effects on students' learning. Lin (2009), for instance, remarks that Chinese EFL teachers have experienced problems with CLT implementation within the Chinese context since CLT-oriented textbooks used are mostly based on Western social and cultural settings.

Having realized that every approach to teaching English has its own limitations, Saville-Troike (2006) argues that 'there can be no "best" method that will fit all, and a combination of different methods is undoubtedly the wisest approach" (p. 178). Aligned with this, many Thai researchers, methodologists, and teaching practitioners have resorted to various innovative approaches such as content-based approach, task-based approach, computer technologies and web based-instruction to help improve Thai students' English in conjunction with CLT.

Nonetheless, one CLT-friendly approach that seems to be missing from Thai ELT is Conversation Analysis (CA), a sociological approach to the study of talk-in-interaction. Many researchers and scholars have concurred that CA is really effective in helping develop students' English conversational skills (Barraja-Rohan, 1997, 2011; Markee, 2009; Richards & Seedhouse, 2005; Seedhouse, 2007; Wong & Waring, 2010). It is argued that CA can be used in ELT both as a teaching tool and as a diagnostic tool (Fujii, 2012; Martin, 2000). As a teaching tool, it can offer a clear picture of how the structure of conversation can be employed by students as a means

of receiving comprehensible input and making comprehensible output, thus shedding light on their language learning (Markee, 2009). Additionally, CA also provides an approach to teaching norms of interaction for teachers (Barraja-Rohan, 2011). It can thus help enhance learners' not only communicative but interactional competence. As a diagnostic tool, CA can further be used to reveal problems in classroom interaction, allowing teachers to understand what goes wrong in their pedagogical practice while enabling learners to recognize and fix problems in their interaction (Martin, 2000).

According to Teng and Sinwongsuwat (in press), CA has in fact been making inroads into L2 teaching over the past decade as evidenced by the growing body of both research articles and monographs in EFL countries such as Japan (see Fujii, 2012) and China (see Quan & Zhen, 2012). However, in Thailand, there were apparently no research papers or empirical studies adopting a CA methodology to address issues in ELT, especially in teaching and learning EFL speaking skills. In fact, there is a dearth of empirical studies using CA to help improve Thai students' English speaking in classes dominated by CLT. None of the research papers related to teaching English speaking (out of 107) listed in (ThaiLIS, 2015) has turned to CA to help improve Thai students' English conversation skills.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study therefore aimed to investigate the effectiveness of explicit CA-informed instruction in enhancing English conversation performance of Thai university students in CLT classrooms. It particularly attempted to answer the following research questions.

2.1 Does explicit CA-informed instruction help to improve the students' English conversation performance?

2.2 In what aspects can the explicit CA-informed instruction improve the students' performance?

2.3 To what extent can it help to enhance the students' English conversation performance?

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Despite some weaknesses reviewed by Teng and Sinwongsuwat (2015), CLT functions as a corrective approach to the limitations of the traditional teaching methods. Its advocates have argued that the approach can help learners to communicate effectively in real-life situations. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), CLT is seen by both of its American and British proponents alike as an approach focusing on communicative competence as the goal of language teaching and on procedures for teaching four skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication. CLT principles aim to make genuine communication as the center of language learning, to allow learners to induce grammar rules in context, and to provide learners with communicative opportunities to try out what they have learned (Richards, 2006). Adopting this approach, teachers have to tolerate students' errors, treated as interlanguage, by adopting the roles as facilitators or guides, allow students to develop the four main language skills (speaking, writing, listening and reading) from the beginning, and offer opportunities to them to improve both accuracy and fluency.

To carry out these principles, a number of meaningful and communicative activities have been introduced in a CLT classroom such as role-plays, information gap-filling and jigsaw with the goals of promoting communicative competence (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). CLT techniques are organized to involve students in the authentic use of language for meaningful purposes (Brown, 2000). Littlewood (1981) maintains that CLT in fact has the potential to equip learners with abilities to communicate in authentic interaction and its activities provide learners with a context for a vast variety of communicative functions, approximating genuine interaction situations.

3.2 Conversation Analysis (CA)

CA is a sociological approach to the study of talk-in-interaction. CA originated in the work of a sociologist, Harvey Sacks and his collaborators, Emanuel

Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, in the 1960s to examine and analyze naturally occurring talk through the means of recording and transcribing human talk-in-interaction (Have, 2007; Seedhouse, 2004; Sinwongsuwat, 2007). Martin (2000) explains that CA, through analysis of audio or video-recording transcriptions of a spoken interaction, can inductively teach learners language structures that naturally occur in spoken interactions. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998, p. 14) posit that CA has the aim to "discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus being on how sequences of actions are generated."

3.2.1 Fundamental CA Concepts

There are a number of fundamental concepts in Conversation Analysis.

3.2.1.1 Adjacency Pairs

An adjacency pair is a type of utterances which conventionally come in pairs. For example, questions are followed by answers; greetings are returned by greetings; and an invitation is followed by acceptances/declinations (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Cook (1989) maintains that in adjacency pairs, there is often an option of two possible answers (e.g. a response to a blame might be a denial or admission), and if there are no answers, it is interpreted as rudeness, lack of attention or deafness. However, adjacency pairs do not always occur in order (question – answer, but question –question). There might be an insertion sequence or side sequence (see also Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Seedhouse, 2004; Wong & Waring, 2010).

For example, *A: Did you enjoy the meal?*
B: (Did you?
A: Yes.)
B: So did I.

(Cook, 1989, p.54)

3.2.1.2 Turn-Taking

Turn-taking is an important component of interactional practices which can vary from culture to culture. Unintentional mistakes in cross-cultural interaction can arise if these differences in turn-taking are not fully understood (Wong & Waring, 2010). According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998, p. 47), in conversation, there are

three basic facts: "(1) turn-taking occurs; (2) one speaker tends to talk at a time; and (3) turns are taken with as little gap or overlap between them as possible". Revealed by CA, turn-taking comprises two important components: turn-constructional and turn-allocational components. The turn-constructional component consists of the building blocks of turns called turn-constructional units (TCUs), each of which has transitional relevance place (TRP), which makes speaker transition relevant (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Seedhouse, 2004)

3.2.1.3 Preference Organization

Preference organization is an integral part of an adjacency pair. It does not refer to liking or hating something, but refers to responses treated as preferred or dispreferred based on social norms. Typically, there are different possible second parts in adjacency pairs; for instance, a question may be followed by an answer or none. An invitation or offer may be followed by an acceptance (preferred action) or a declination/refusal (dispreferred action) (Seedhouse, 2004). Cook (1989) defines the notion of preference organization with respect to commonality; that is, the answer which most frequently occurs is considered a preferred action, whereas the other is a dispreferred one as it is less common. For example,

Question
- Expected Answer *(preferred)*
- Unexpected Answer *(dispreferred)*

Invitation/Offer
- Acceptance *(preferred)*
- Refusal *(dispreferred)*

(Cook, 1989, p.54; see also Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Seedhouse, 2004)

Boyle (2000), on the other hand, posits that preference organization deals with issues of affiliation and disaffiliation, noticeability, accountability and sanctionability of social actions. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) contend that preferred responses are characteristically delivered straightforwardly and without hesitation or delay, whereas dispreferred ones are performed with some delay, and often marked or prefaced by discourse markers such as *Well* or *Um.* The absence of the former is

noticeable and often signals a certain degree of problems or disaffiliation between participants. The second-part speaker is held accountable for such absence and may be negatively sanctioned if his or her dispreferred action is not accounted for. Seedhouse (2004) affirms that the acceptance of an invitation is seen but unnoticed because it conforms to the norms, functions as the default way of behaving, and is socially affiliative. On the other hand, the declination of an invitation does not follow the affiliative norms and therefore is dispreferred. A dispreferred response delivered without an account, mitigation or delay is considered sanctionable.

3.2.1.4 Repairs

Repairs are problem-preempting mechanisms used by speakers in talk-in-interaction when they encounter and address problems of understanding such as incorrect word selection, mishearing, misunderstanding, and slips of the tongue. Wong and Waring (2010) remark that there are many mistakes in everyday conversation such as errors, imperfections, and Freudian slips, so repairs are brought into play to address all types of errors and keep conversation going. According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), there are four types of repairs: (1) Self-initiated self-repair (the speaker of the trouble source prompts and repairs the trouble); (2) Other-initiated self-repair (the speaker of the trouble source carries out the repair, but the trouble is prompted by the recipient.); (3) Self-initiated other repair (the speaker of a trouble source has the recipient clear the trouble); (4) Other-initiated other-repair (the recipient of a trouble source prompts and repairs the trouble).

3.2.2 CA as a Teaching and a Diagnostic tool

CA is a potential tool in second language research. Many researchers and teaching practitioners have used CA as either an approach to studying L2 interaction and learning or an instructional tool to develop interactional competence or both (See among others, Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Martin, 2000, Richards & Seedhouse, 2005; Seedhouse, 2004; Wong & Waring, 2010)

From CA perspectives, language learning takes place as learners develop their interactional competence (IC) through social participation. IC, often overlooked

in CLT (Wong & Waring, 2010), is defined as the ability to appropriately use different interactional resources, such as turn-taking and repair mechanisms, to deal with problems in interaction and accomplish interactional goals. Barraja-Rohan (2011) argues that CA can be employed to help teach L2 IC and enhance interaction-based learning (Martin, 2000). Wu (2013) adds that CA can be used to develop learners' interactional competence through the investigation of transcription of native speakers (NSs) or nonnative speakers' (NNSs) interactions, the sequences of a conversation, and various aspects of conversation organization including the way people take turns, and open and close a conversation.

CA is a unique and innovative tool that can be used to achieve the speaking teaching goal because it is able to uncover and capture all the natural features of conversation, and make explicit the underlying sociocultural norms (Barraja-Rohan, 1997, 2011; Wong & Waring, 2010). CA has managed to provide a firm direction in teaching conversation and discloses features of everyday conversation often seen but unnoticed (Barraja-Rohan, 2011; Seedhouse, 2004; Wong & Waring, 2010). Wong and Waring (2010) comment that ESL / EFL textbooks do not usually embody authentic language of what people say, and instructors themselves often do not know how to make that authentic language teachable because they do not have a good command of the interactional practices (IP), particularly the systematic verbal and nonverbal strategies participants use in social interaction. Huth and Taleghani-Nikazm (2006) posit that CA-based materials can serve as blueprints of sequences of social interaction (e.g. greetings: hello- hello; invitation –acceptance/declination) and are key resources for teaching and raising learners' L2 pragmatic awareness. They suggest that L2 teaching practitioners have a good knowledge of basic CA concepts so that they can effectively teach conversation to their students.

CA can also be used to diagnose and reveal communication problems participants encounter when they try to make sense of each other's contribution during interaction (Martin, 2000). In their studies, both Barraja-Rohan (2011) and Fujii (2012) showed that CA was a powerful tool to analyze L2 interactions as well as to identify causes for interactional problems. In Clifton's (2011) CA-integrated study, it was shown that the student participants were able to analyze transcripts of spoken

interactions using CA, reflect upon their practice, and develop their interactional skills. The researcher suggested that CA be used as a tool to analyze interactions between learners and instructors to improve communicative practices.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To answer the three research questions regarding the effectiveness of the explicit CA-informed instruction outlined in Section 2, a quasi-experimental study was conducted following Farhady's (1995) schematic pattern shown below, in which participants were divided into two groups: a control and an experimental group. Students in the control group were taught with the standard CLT prescribed in the teacher's manual of the coursebook, and the experimental group was treated with explicit CA-informed instruction. Both groups had to take a pre- and a post-test to assess their conversational performance.

| → | Control Group | → | Pretest | → | Placebo | → | Posttest |
| → | Experimental Group | → | Pretest | → | Treatment | → | Posttest |

4.1 Participants

The participants consisted of two classes of non-English major undergraduate seniors from different faculties taking an elective English course (890-212 English Conversation I) in semester 1/2014 at Prince of Songkla University (PSU). The participants had already completed the fundamental English courses (i.e., 890-101 Fundamental English Listening and Speaking and 890-102 Fundamental English Reading and Writing). To ensure the homogeneity of the participants, an online English proficiency test was administered. Based on the test scores, out of the two classes, 36 students with the majority level of English proficiency (A2/Elementary) were chosen as focal participants. Gender did not play a role in the selection process. One class was treated as the control group and the other the experimental group. The selected participants, 26 female and 10 male students, were in their early twenties.

4.2 Instructional Materials

A set of materials used for data collection included (1) a commercial textbook *Speak Now 3* (Richards & Bohlke, 2012). In this book, each lesson is structured following the same format: (a) *Vocabulary*, (b) *Conversation* (c) *Language*

Booster, (d) *Listening* or *Pronunciation* and (e) *Speak with Confidence*. The book was used in both groups. (2) CA-based handouts adapted from *Beyond Talk* by Barraja-Rohan and Pritchard (1997) as well as *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy* by Wong and Waring (2010) (see Appendix A for a sample lesson plan and Appendix B for a CA-based handout) and (3) video and/or audio recorded non-scripted conversations taken from English movies and IELTS tests. The purpose for using audio/video recorded conversations was twofold. First, the recordings were used to help students see a clear picture of conversation features used by native speakers engaged in naturally occurring interactions. Second, the recordings were used to consolidate the students' knowledge of CA concepts. CA-based handouts and video/audio recorded non-scripted conversations were used only with the experimental group receiving explicit CA-informed instruction.

4.3 Teaching Procedures

4.3.1 Control Group

The control group was taught with a primarily CLT-oriented method prescribed in the teacher's manual of *Speak Now 3*. Following the structure of the lesson previously mentioned in 4.2, vocabulary from the lesson's topic was introduced first. Then a model conversation from either *Additions* or *Expansions* with CD recordings was presented. In a conversation from *Additions*, students had to listen and write down three extra sentences, not printed in the book. In a conversation from *Expansions*, students had to read four sentences below the conversation and locate the correct placement of the expansion sentences. Later, a few examples of the target language in a lesson were highlighted. In the listening stage, main ideas and details were pointed out, and some features of pronunciation or intonation were emphasized. Lastly, the students engaged in free practice of the target language introduced. At the end of every lesson, free practice activities were always offered to consolidate the goal of the lesson.

4.3.2 Experimental Group

With the experimental group the researcher, as the course teacher, taught the students using the same commercial textbook but spent 50-60 minutes introducing CA concepts during each lesson.

Raising students' awareness of conversation features	➡	Introducing CA concepts + videotaped or recorded non-scripted conversation Verbal ➡ Interaction ⬅ Non-verbal
Having students practice each CA concept-based conversation	➡	Having students construct short CA concept-based conversation as homework

The teacher directed students' attention to features of everyday conversation in which they were engaged, had them reflect on L1 and L2 conversations and raised students' awareness of the fact that participants employ both verbal and non-verbal language in everyday conversation. Next the teacher researcher introduced CA concepts such as turn-taking, adjacency pairs, preference organization, and repairs. Other conversation-related topics such as the role of listener, conversation maintenance, topic initiation and topic shift as well as telephone conversations were included in separate lessons. Video or audio recorded non-scripted conversations were used to consolidate the students' understanding of CA concepts. The participants were asked to practice each newly introduced CA-based conversation in each lesson. After each lesson with CA concepts or conversation-related topics, students were asked to write a short CA-concept-based conversation as homework.

4.4 Research Tools

A pre-course and a post-course oral interview were conducted to measure the students' performance in a conversation. A scoring criteria and descriptors for oral interaction adapted from Barraja-Rohan (2011), Luoma (2004) and O' Loughlin (2001) were employed with attention to five different features of speaking: fluency, vocabulary, appropriacy, comprehensibility and grammar. These features were used to rate students' conversation (see Appendix C). An evaluation sheet was given to two

raters to mark each student's performance (see Appendix D). The two raters were a native speaker of Thai and the other a native speaker of English. Both raters were English teachers. The reason behind this was threefold (1) these two raters have had a lot of experience in teaching speaking skills, and the Thai teacher has also had substantial exposure to English in its native-speaking context; (2) in the real world our learners will be assessed not only by native but nonnative speakers, as English is used as a lingua franca in the global context; and 3) raters of different nationalities would strike a better balance in the marking. The evaluation sheet was composed of a 5-point scale: 1= very poor / unacceptable; 2= poor; 3= average; 4= good and 5= excellent. A transcription convention adopted by Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) and Seedhouse (2004) was employed to transcribe students' interaction (see Appendix E). All the participants in both groups were informed of the research project and signed a consent form adapted from Robson (2011) (see Appendix F).

5. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

5.1 Data Collection

To conduct the study, a number of steps were taken in semester I of 2014. First, participants were selected from two classes of fourth year non-English major undergraduates from different faculties taking an elective course (890-212: English conversation I) at the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University: Sections 09 and 10 with 42 and 49 students respectively. Before the class started, all the participants were required to take an online English proficiency test from http://www.transparent.com/learn-english/proficiency-test.html to assure their homogeneity. The test is composed of four components: Grammar I and Grammar II, containing 15 questions and Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension, containing ten questions each. The test measured English proficiency on four levels: Just Starting, Beginner, Elementary and Intermediate. The majority of the participants tested at the Elementary level. All students in section 09 became the control group and those in section 10 ten were treated as the experimental group.

After the testing, all the participants participated in two oral interviews with an English native speaker teacher who had extensive experience teaching English. The first oral interview was referred to as a pretest and the interview after the treatment a posttest. Each interviewee had to speak with the native speaker for about one or two minutes. In the pre and post interviews, the interviewer got the students engaged in a talk using the same general questions about family, hobbies, personality traits and future plans. All the interviews were video recorded and then scored by the raters. The students' scores from rater 1 and rater 2 were added up, averaged, and considered the real score. To guarantee the reliability of the rating process, the scores of the pretest and posttest given by the two raters were compared, and the inter-rater reliability was computed. The results obtained from the two tests were 0.95 and 0.96 respectively, were considered highly acceptable. Based on the independent t-test run on the pretest scores, the two groups were also found to be homogenous in terms of their oral ability.

The teacher researcher informed the students about the training course and asked the participants to sign a consent form. During the course of the first semester of training, the students had to come for their 90-minute classes twice a week. As discussed previously in section 4.3, the teacher researcher gave the control group a CLT-oriented conversation lesson prescribed in the teacher's manual of *Speak Now 3*. The researcher used the same book to teach the experimental group but took 50 or 60 minutes of the lesson to introduce CA concepts and other conversation-related topics.

5.2 Data Analysis

The scores obtained from the two raters in the pretest and posttest interviews were statistically computed to arrive at mean and standard deviation, and independent *t*-tests were run to determine significant differences in the students' speaking performance before and after the training course. At the end of the semester, the posttest scores of both groups were also compared, and Cohen's d effect size was calculated to assess the impact of the CA-informed instruction. Additionally, close CA analysis of the videotaped interactions was conducted to verify performance differences between the two groups. The interactions were transcribed following the transcription convention below, as adopted by Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), Seedhouse (2004) and Schegloff (2007).

Symbols	Description
[	Point of overlap onset
[[	Starting a simultaneous turn
]	Point of overlap termination
=	a) Turn continues below, at the next identical symbol b) If inserted at the end of one speaker's adjacency turn, indicates that there is no gap at all between the two turns c) Indicates that there is no interval between adjacency utterances.
(0.5)	Numbers in parenthesis indicate silence, represented in tenth of a second; what is given here indicates 0.5 second of silence.
(.)	A dot in parentheses indicates a "micropause", hearable but not

	readily measurable; ordinary less than 0.2 second
hh ; .hh	hh for exhalation whereas .hh for inhalation
<u>Word</u>	Speaker emphasis
——	Abrupt cutoff
.	Falling (final) intonation
,	Low-rising intonation, suggesting continuation
?	Rising intonation, not necessarily a question
!	Animated or emphatic tone
(guess)	Indicates the transcriber's doubt about a word
[gibe]	In the case of inaccurate pronunciation of an English word, an approximation of the sound is given in square brackets
Ja ((tr.: es))	Non-English words are italicized and are followed by an English translation in double parentheses
⟶	Mark features of special interest

6. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

6.1 Conversation Improvement Based on Statistical Analysis

To ensure the homogeneity of the two groups of participants in terms of their conversational ability before the treatment, the pretest scores were processed to determine the mean and standard deviation; an independent t-test was also performed. As shown in Table 1, the participants in the two groups were homogenous in their conversational performance before the training. The overall mean score of the control group was quite similar to that of the experimental group and the result of the independent t-test showed no significant difference at the 0.05 level (t= -.69, sig=0.49). Nor was there any significant difference regarding discrete items, i.e., fluency, vocabulary, appropriacy, comprehensibility, and grammar. It can therefore be claimed that the two groups were not different in their English speaking ability before the treatment.

Table 1 Pretest Conversation Performance

Group / Aspects	Control		Experimental		t	df	Sig(2-tailed)
	$\overline{X}$	SD	$\overline{X}$	SD			
Fluency	2.66	.90	2.77	.57	-.43	28.74	.66
Vocabulary	2.75	.67	2.92	.49	-.85	34	.40
Appropriacy	2.72	.73	2.94	.45	-1.09	28.24	.28
Comprehensibility	3.00	.92	3.19	.57	-.75	28.38	.45
Grammar	2.58	.75	2.61	.58	-1.24	34	.90
Overall Ability	13.72	3.77	14.44	2.30	-.69	28.11	.49

* Significant at 0.05 level

** Significant at 0.01 level

After one-semester's treatment, the post-test scores were processed in the same way as the pretest scores to address the research questions. To answer research questions 1 and 2, the dependent t test was used to compare the pre- and post-test scores of the experimental group. As shown in Table 2 below, the statistical results showed there was a difference in the improvement of students' speaking performance

at the significant level of 0.05, both in the participants' overall ability and in the discrete items. These results support the claim that the explicit CA-informed instruction did improve the students' speaking performance in all aspects; therefore research questions one and two were answered positively.

Table 2 Posttest Conversation Performance of the Experimental Group

Tests / Aspects	Pretest		Posttest		t	df	Sig (2-tailed)
	$\overline{X}$	SD	$\overline{X}$	SD			
Fluency	2.77	.57	3.69	.72	-5.71	17	.000
Vocabulary	2.92	.49	3.68	.65	-5.37	17	.000
Appropriacy	2.94	.45	3.60	.56	-4.51	17	.000
Comprehensibility	3.19	.57	3.87	.60	-5.70	17	.000
Grammar	2.61	.58	3.61	.55	-6.23	17	.000
Overall ability	14.44	2.30	18.46	2.96	-6.57**	17	.000*

* Significant at 0.05 level

** Significant at 0.01 level

To answer research question 3, the posttest scores of both groups were compared to determine the extent to which the explicit CA-informed instruction enhanced the students' conversational performance. Based on the statistical results shown in Table 3, the students in the experimental group performed better in the post-training interviews than those in the control group and a significantly greater difference was found in the aspects of *appropriacy* and *grammar*. The former is defined as the ability to use the target language appropriately and effectively according to sociocultural norms and to appropriately construct turns in response to the interlocutor's first- and second-pair-part turn as well as to unpredictable questions in the conversation. The term *grammar* is defined in the assessment as the ability to interact effectively by employing a wide range of structures or expressions with only minor mistakes. The computation of Cohen's *d* effect size of the explicit CA-informed instruction showed that *d* =0.64, which is considered moderately large,

suggesting that the explicit CA-informed instruction was quite effective in developing the students' conversational performance.

Table 3 Posttest Conversation Performance of Both Groups

Group / Aspects	Control		Experimental		t	df	Sig(2-tailed)
	$\overline{X}$	SD	$\overline{X}$	SD			
Fluency	3.25	.65	3.69	.72	-1.93	34	.06
Vocabulary	3.44	.52	3.68	.65	-1.19	34	.24
Appropriacy	3.22	.58	3.60	.56	-1.96	34	.05*
Comprehensibility	3.52	.58	3.87	.60	-1.96	34	.08
Grammar	3.24	.55	3.61	.55	-2.27	34	.03*
Overall Ability	16.68	2.58	18.46	2.96	-1.92**	34	.06

* Significant at 0.05 level

** Significant at 0.01 level

The positive outcome of the explicit CA-informed instruction might have been even greater if the participants were engaged in peer interaction during the pre- and post-tests, as peer interaction better approximates everyday conversation than does a casual interview (Ussama, 2013). According to Bachman (1990) and Young (1995), interview interactions, although made casual, still might not really reflect the true nature of authentic conversation. In fact, in the interview it was the interviewer who controlled the whole structural practices in the conversation such as turn-taking, topic initiation and sequence organization. Accordingly, students may have been deprived of opportunities to fully utilize the CA knowledge that they had gained in the training course. While the statistical results did not quite show significant difference between the two groups in the aspects of fluency, vocabulary and comprehensibility, noticeable improvement became more obvious in the close analysis.

6.2 Conversation Improvement through Explicit CA-Informed Instruction Based on Close Analysis

To further illustrate the effectiveness of the CA-informed instruction, students' pre- and post-training interview interactions are closely examined below. The interview interactions of the two groups of students with a native speaker were analyzed to determine conversation improvement in five aspects, namely, fluency, vocabulary, appropriacy, comprehensibility and grammar. In the talk excerpts shown below, Da (a pseudonym) represents students in the control group and Ha (a pseudonym) represents students in the experimental group.

6.2.1 Students' Performance in Pre-Course Interview

In the pre-course interviews, both Da and Ha can only construct simple turns with short single phrases in response to the interviewer's questions. Most of the turns are also delivered with some degree of delay, often requiring the interlocutor's repair, and a simple adjacency-pair such as a question-answer sequence often needs to be constructed over the course of several turns with repair and confirmation seeking from their interlocutor. Da's and Ha's conversation performances were on a par in all the aspects: fluency, vocabulary, appropriacy, comprehensibility and grammar.

In this study, the performance-scoring criteria and descriptors were adapted from O'Laughlin (2001), Luoma (2004), and Barraja-Robhan (2011). The term *fluency* is defined as the ability to speak fluently with only occasional hesitation and demonstrating an ability to keep the conversation going without long pauses or a breakdown in communication. The speed of the speech may be slower than that of the native speaker; however, the slower speed is not negatively assessed. The term *vocabulary* refers to the ability to use a wide range of vocabulary precisely, appropriately and effectively to express most ideas. The term *appropriacy* refers to the ability to use English appropriately and effectively according to L2 sociocultural norms and to appropriately construct turns in response to the interlocutor's first-and second-pair-part turn or to unexpected questions in conversation. *Comprehensibility* is defined as the ability to produce speech which can be understood effortlessly by the

interlocutor. The term *grammar* refers to the ability to interact effectively by employing a wide range of structures or expressions with only minor mistakes.

In Excerpt 1 below, Da has to postpone his answer to the interviewer's question in line 1 by first seeking to verify his understanding of the question through a delayed composite turn in line 2. Once receiving a confirmation of the question topic through a repair initiated by his partner in line 3, he then gives a single-phrase answer in line 4, delivered with an acknowledgement of the repair *yes* and a long pause, showing some degree of hesitation. The native speaker further repairs Da's response by seeking confirmation in line 5. In line 6, Da can only produce a single-unit turn of one word in reply. A simple question-answer sequence therefore has to be constructed over several turns.

Extract 1 (N is a native speaker (NS); Da a student in the control group (CG))

1   N: OK. What does your father do for a living?

2 → Da: Er, .hh my father (0.6) my father <u>occupation</u>?=

3 → N: =<u>Occupation</u>. <u>Your father's</u>? ((nodding))

4 → Da: Yes. A (.4) businessman=

5 → N: =He's a <u>businessman</u>?

6 → Da: Yes.

As shown in Extract 2, Ha, despite being able to respond to the interviewer's question with no delay, can only produce a single-unit turn of one phrase in line 2. It should be noted that Ha's seemingly quicker response to his partner's rephrased question might be due to the fact that the question was phrased in a more straightforward fashion and devoid of any unfamiliar idiomatic expression such as *(what someone does) for a living*.

Extract 2 (N is a NS; Ha a student in the experimental group (EG))

1   N: What's your father's job?

2 → Ha: A businessman=

3 → N: =A businessman?

4   Ha: Yes.

Given the single-phrase response in line 2, in line 3 the interlocutor has to seek his confirmation, which is in turn responded to with only a single phrase just as in Da's turn line 6, examined previously. Based on the close examination of these excerpts, prior to the course the students apparently failed to construct appropriate extended turns to keep the conversation going more smoothly.

Excerpts 3 and 4 further illustrate that both students lacked the ability to construct elaborate responsive turns and did not know how to appropriately fix the problems that could result in a communication breakdown. Question-answer sequences again can only be accomplished across several turns.

Extract 3 (NS-Da/CG)

1   N: OK. Erm (.) how would you describe yourself?= your personality? =What are you like   as a person?

2 → Da: (0.6)

3   N: Are you serious? =shy? = funny?= What are you like?

4 →Da: Er, hh. I'm (.6) I'm so <u>shy</u>.

5   N: A shy person?

6   Da: Yes. ((smile))

Extract 4 (NS-Ha/EG)

1   N: What is your personality then?

2 →Ha: (0.5)

3   N: = What are you like as a person? = Are you friendly?= happy; sad; shy?

4 → Ha: (0.6) .hhWhat?

5 → N: Ehm, how would you describe yourself? = your personality? Are you a happy person?

6   = a shy person?

7   Ha: (0.6) hh.

8   N: Are you a serious person? What are you like?

9 → Ha: So- so. (0.3) Relaxed=

10   N: =You're <u>relaxed</u>?

11   Ha: Yes.

In these excerpts, the pauses in line 2 indicate that Da and Ha neither understood the native speaker's question in line 1, nor tried to fix their understanding problems. Apparently, they lacked appropriate repair techniques such as *Sorry? Pardon me?* and *What do you mean?* to deal with the question they could not understand. Ha seems to have more difficulties understanding the partner's question than Da, causing the latter to conduct repairs in lines 5 and 8. Nevertheless, both students can only respond to the interviewer's question after several of his rephrasing attempts. Their responses were delivered with self-repair and some hesitation, indicated by fillers like *er* and a long pause. The question-answer sequences are again constructed over the course of several turns.

Prior to the course, both students seemed to especially lack fluency in turn delivery, shown in the following extracts, 5 and 6. Despite understanding the questions asked, both answered them with several long pauses. Compared to Ha, Da also seemed to lack confidence in constructing the response, indicated by his turn-preface in-breath seen in line 2. Both students also did not use any entry devices or discourse markers; not even common ones like *umm* and *oh* to preface their turns. Instead they relied on in-breath as the entry-device, as evidenced in Da's response (lines 2 and 4 in Extract 5) and Ha's response (line 4 in Extract 6), thus making the conversation lack the lubricants necessary to keep it going smoothly (Quan & Zheng, 2012).

Extract 5 (NS-Da/CG)

1   N: OK. Do you have any hobbies?

2 → Da: .hh My hobby is (0.4) play (0.5) computer game.

3   N: =Playing computer games

4 → Da: =.hh Read cartoon book ()=

7   N: =Good. What would you like to do in the future?

8 → Da: In the <u>future</u> (0.3) I want to be a businessman=

9   N: =Oh, good luck to you. OK. Thank you. Goodbye.

10→ Da: Goodbye.

Extract 6 (NS-Ha/EG)

1   N: OK. Do you have any hobbies?

2 → Ha: Yes, I have (.4) Ehm, play games (.3) game computer.

3   N: Great. After university, what job do you want?

4 → Ha: Hh. I will be a lecturer in university.

5   N: Oh, pretty good. A terrible job, you know; ((laugh))=

6 → Ha: =((laugh)) I really like lecturer because I study [engineer (.) engineering

7   N: [Oh, you want to be a

      teacher?

8   Ha: =I want to make new engineering.=

9   N:= Yeah, very good. Good luck to you. Thank you.

10 → Ha: Thank you.

11   N: OK. Bye bye.

12 → (.)

Additionally, the students in the pre-course interview appeared to fail to provide appropriate responses to a leave-taking turn. For instance, in line 10, Extract 5, Da chose not to respond to his partner's *good luck to you* but instead just said *goodbye*. As for Ha, even though in line 10 Extract 6 he might be able to respond appropriately to his partner's good wishes with *thank you*, he failed to reciprocate his partner's leave-taking, initiated in the preceding turn, indicated by the micro-pause in line 12, during which the latter apparently anticipated a response. This seems inappropriate according to the L2 norms of interaction.

According to the close analysis, the students demonstrated fairly limited conversing abilities in the pre-course interview interactions. They failed to construct complex turns and lacked the ability to appropriately deal with the trouble encountered during the interaction. They also lacked a command of any discourse markers to keep the conversation going smoothly. Moreover, they did not take the opportunity to initiate their own turns or to extend the conversation; instead, they just waited to be asked questions by the interviewer.

The above extracts illustrate that both groups of students similarly had limited conversational ability. They failed to keep the conversation going and use a wide range of vocabulary to expression their ideas. Additionally, they could not use

the language appropriately according to L2 interactional norms, and the interlocutor often had to seek clarification after a response was given. The students also failed to use a wide range of structures or expressions in the interaction. Therefore, it can be interpreted that the students had similarly limited ability to interact with their interlocutor, which confirmed the findings of the statistical analysis in Table 1.

6.2.2 Students' Performance in Post-Course Interview

After one-semester of training in which Da was taught with the CLT-oriented approach prescribed in the teacher's manual of the textbook, and Ha with explicit CA-informed instruction, close analysis of their post-course interview interactions revealed noticeable differences between the two in the improvement of their conversation abilities. The improvement in two of the aspects, namely appropriacy and grammar, was shown to confirm the statistical results in Table 3 and that of the other three aspects (fluency, vocabulary and comprehensibility) also became obviously different in the post-training interviews.

6.2.2.1 Improvement in Appropriacy and Grammar

The significant difference between the two groups in the degree of the improvement of appropriacy and grammar is illustrated below. In Extract 7, Da did not initiate his turns when interacting with the native speaker and his responses were simple and contained only single unit turns, which were not appropriate according to L2 sociocultural norms of interaction. His responses were similar to those of the pre-course interview interaction in terms of appropriacy and grammar. On the other hand, Ha appropriately initiated his turn in line 3 in Extract 8. Not only could Ha promptly reciprocate his interlocutor's greeting in line 2, but he could also appropriately initiate a different action sequence with the first-pair part turn in line 3, allowing him to be granted permission to sit down. His responses were more complex and contained multi-unit turns. In line 12, he used compound and complex sentences in his second pair part turn in response to his interlocutor's question. This indicates that he could use English appropriately and effectively according to the L2 sociocultural norms of

interaction. Moreover, he effectively used a wide range of structures or expressions to interact with his interlocutor.

Extract 7 (NS-Da/CG)

1   N: Hello.

2 → Da: (.2) Good morning, teacher.

3   N: Good morning=

4   N: =Do you have any brothers and sisters?

5 →Da: I have (.4) one litt::le sis::ter.

6   N: What's father's job?

7 →Da: My father's job is a businessman.

8   N: How would you describe your personality?

9 → (.5)

10   N: = What kind of personality are you?

11→Da: My ()? ((pointing to himself)).

12   N: Are you?

13→Da: I'm (.5) I'm so shy.

14   N: =Shy.

Extract 8 (NS-Ha/EG)

1   N: Hello.

2 → Ha: Hello=

3 →Ha: = Can I please sit here?

4   N: Yes, sure.

5   N: = Do you have any brothers and sisters?

6 → Ha: Yes. I have two brothers and sisters.

7   N: What's your father's job?

8 → Ha: Father job. Ah, my father job is a business(man). A little business.

9   N: OK. How would you describe your personality?

10→Ha: My personality?=

11   N: =(Nodding)

12——>Ha: Ah, I am a student who is lazy but sometime(s) I think I (am) hardworking
for my exam ((laugh)).

In the extracts above Da did not seem to improve in his speaking skills after one semester of the CLT treatment. As seen in line 8, he also tried to recycle his responses from the pre-course interview. Moreover, the turns he produced are only of the single-unit type in response to his interlocutor. On the other hand, Ha's speaking performance was far better than that of pre-course interview interaction. He did not recycle his responses from the pre-course interview. As seen in line 8, Ha employed a multi-unit turn and more complex turns in line 12, which was far different from the pretest interaction. This indicates that explicit CA-informed instruction could help the students use English appropriately and effectively according to the L2 sociocultural norms of interaction as well as a wide range of structures and expressions in interaction.

6.2.2.2 Improvement in Fluency, Vocabulary and Comprehensibility

As shown in Extract 9 below, Da seemed to recycle his responses from the pre-course interview interaction in lines 5, 9, and 13. He still had the same problems of understanding his interlocutor's question. He left many long pauses in his responses in lines 5, 13, 16 and 18. His answers were simple. His interlocutor sought clarification in several turns shown in lines 10, 12 and 14. He failed to keep conversation going or to impress his conversational partner by using a wide range of vocabulary in the interaction; his interlocutor still needed to seek clarification. Da appeared not to improve much in terms of fluency, vocabulary and comprehensibility.

Extract 9 (NS-Da/CG)

1   N: Hello.

2——> Da: (.2) Good morning, teacher.

3   N: Good morning=

4   N: =Do you have any brothers and sisters?

5 ——>Da: I have (.4) one litt::le sis::ter.

6   N: What's father's job?

7 ——> Da: My father's job is a businessman.

8   N: How would you describe your personality?

9 → (.5)

10   N: = What kind of personality are you?

11→Da: My ()? ((pointing to himself)).

12   N: Are you?

13→Da: I'm (.5) I'm so shy.

14   N: =<u>Shy</u>.

15   N: Do you have any hobbies?

16→Da: My hobby is (.5) hh play computer game and (0.4) read (0.3) cartoon book.

17   N: What would you like to do in the future?

18→Da: Er (0.6), I want to be a businessman.

19   N: Good luck to you. Thank you.

20→Da: Thank you.

Ha, on the other hand, improved in fluency, vocabulary and comprehensibility after receiving one semester of explicit informed instruction. As shown in Extract 10, Ha appeared to be more confident and fluent; he could deliver his turns with neither long pauses nor delays in all his responses to his interlocutor from lines 2 to 32. Noticeably Ha could use some discourse markers, such as *oh, ah, umm*, which were not used in the pretest interview interaction. According to Quan and Zheng (2012), these discourse markers function as discourse lubricants to keep interactions going smoothly. Ha seemed to be able to effectively put the CA knowledge gained from the training course into practice. In line 14, he used a response question, *and you?* to keep conversations going without having to be asked by his interlocutor. He employed turn-taking skills gained from the training course in the interaction, thereby allowing him to effectively hold more turns to appropriately say what he wanted in lines 22, 24, 26 and 28.

Ha could impress his interlocutor by initiating his turns in lines 3, 22 as if he was interacting with his interlocutor in a casual conversation. He initiated his turns by employing some polite requests through *Can I please sit here? May I ask you some questions?* in the interaction. He used a wide range of vocabulary precisely, appropriately and effectively to convey ideas without causing his interlocutor to seek

clarification. In line 10, his interlocutor realized that Ha could understand the question so his interlocutor did not need to seek clarification, but just nodded his head to confirm Ha's understanding. In lines 12 and 20, Ha delivered his multi-unit turns precisely, appropriately and effectively to tell his interlocutor his ideas.

It is interesting to note that he was able to produce assessment tokens in lines 16 and 26 to keep his interlocutor interested in conversation and showed that he attentively listened to his conversation partner. Assessment tokens such as *oh, good, very good, that is cool, how nice!* have a key affiliative role in keeping the speaker interested in the conversation and showing how the listener attentively listens to and relates to the speaker (Goodwin, 1986). Ha also used verbal and non-verbal feedback to display his heightened involvement in an ongoing sequence, as in lines 12, 18, 26 and 30, which reflects the nature of conversation in which the interlocutors used both verbal and non-verbal language to converse with one another.

Extract 10 (NS-Ha/EG)

1   N: Hello.

2 → Ha: Hello=

3 → Ha: = Can I please sit here?

4   N: Yes, sure.

5   N: = Do you have any brothers and sisters?

6 → Ha: Yes. I have two brothers and sisters.

7   N: What's your father's job?

8 → Ha: <u>Father</u> job. Ah, my father job is a business(man). A little business.

9   N: OK. How would you describe your personality?

10→ Ha<u>: My personality</u>?=

11   N: =(Nodding)

12→ Ha: Ah, I am a student who is lazy but sometime(s) I think I (am) hardworking for my exam ((laugh)).

13   N: What's your favorite hobby?

14→ Ha: Oh, my favorite hobby; I like to play game (.)only the game. And you?

15   N: Ah, (.) I like to(.)travel.

16 → Ha:=Oh, travel is good!

17   N: = and walk.

18 → Ha: (laugh)

19   N: Do you have er .hh what is your plan for future? What do you want to do?

20 → Ha: Oh, I think my future I will be (.) a lecturer in university.

21   N: Good luck to you. Thank you.

22 → Ha: Umm, may I ask some question(s)?

23   N: Of course; Yes?

24 → Ha: Er, where are you come from?

25   N: I come from Canada.

26 → Ha: Oh, good. ((smile))

27   N: ((Nodding)).

28 → Ha: Ah, are you like Thailand?

29   N: I love Thailand ((smile)).

30 → Ha: ((laugh)). Yes, see you [later. ((shaking hands with the native speaker))

31   N: [OK. Thank you.=

32 → Ha: =Thank you.

33   N: Bye.

In the two extracts above, Da's responses were similar to those in the pre-course interactions. He did not use any discourse markers to facilitate his interactions and he still used long pauses or delays in his turns, indicating he was not fluent. He never initiated turns without being prompted, showing that he seemingly lacked confidence. He did not use a wide range of structures or vocabulary to express his ideas. His answers were bald and short, not appropriate according to the norms of the L2 interaction. His interlocutor still sought clarification during the interaction. Da's pre- and post-course interview interactions were almost the same. He did not seem to improve in his speaking in terms of fluency, vocabulary and comprehensibility after receiving one semester of CLT treatment

In contrast, Ha outperformed Da in the interaction. Ha's responses were quite different from those in the pre-course interview interactions. He delivered his turns without leaving any long pauses or delays; he could keep conversation going

smoothly. He also initiated his turns as if he was interacting in a casual conversation, impressing his interlocutor. This showed that he was fluent. He employed a wide range of vocabulary to express his ideas precisely and effectively and his interlocutor did not need to seek clarification, which showed an increase in his vocabulary and comprehensibility. He could apply CA knowledge learned in the training course in practice. He was able to employ discourse markers, assessment tokens and response questions taught in CA lessons effectively. These tokens not observed in the pre-course interview interaction were employed in the post-course interaction.

In closing, the close analysis of the students' post-course interview interactions confirmed noticeable differences between the two groups in the improvement of the three aspects not previously shown by the statistical results: fluency, vocabulary, and comprehensibility. This positive outcome has led to the conclusion that explicit CA-informed instruction as well as the use of recorded non-scripted conversation may facilitate the development of students' conversation skills. CA-informed instruction appears to help enhance L2 learners' conversation performance.

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study investigated the effectiveness of using explicit CA-informed conversation instruction with Thai university students. Based on the statistical analysis, the students in the experimental group improved their conversational performance overall as well as in its discrete aspects. The statistical results showed significant difference between the two groups in the areas of appropriacy and grammar, with the experimental group showing obvious improvement. The intergroup difference in the other three aspects, fluency, vocabulary and comprehensibility, became more noticeable when the students' interactions were more closely analyzed. The close analysis showed that the students in the experimental group outperformed those in the control group in all aspects of speaking skills. Consequently, it can be argued that employing explicit CA-informed instruction is more effective in enhancing students' conversational performance than employing the typical CLT-oriented approach as prescribed in many textbooks.

The study has shed some light on the merits of adopting an explicit CA-informed instruction in the English conversation class. However, research into the explicit CA-informed instruction is fairly new and more studies, particularly within the Thai EFL context, are needed. Specifically, long-term studies conducted with students at various proficiency levels are needed to confirm the findings of this study. Future research utilizing casual conversation, assessment or impromptu peer interaction should be conducted so that a clearer and more comprehensive picture of CA potentials can be revealed. Finally, given the suggested merits of explicit CA-informed instruction found in this study, it is recommended that teachers of English conversation acquire knowledge in CA and receive training in how to apply CA concepts in the classroom in order to boost students' interactional competence.

REFERENCES

Atagi, R. (2011). Secondary teacher policy research in Asia: Second teachers in Thailand. Bangkok: UNESCO Bangkok, 2011. Retrieved July 10, 2014, from www.uis.unesco.org/.../secondary-teacher-policy-research-asia-thailand-e.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Barraja-Rohan, A-M. (1997). Teaching language, teaching culture: Teaching conversation and sociocultural norms using conversation analysis and aspects of pragmatics. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*. Retrieved July 26, 2014, from www.academia.edu/.../1997._Teaching_conversation_and_sociocultural.

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

Barraja-Rohan, A-M., & Pritchard, C. R. (1997). *Beyond talk*: *A course in communication & conversation for intermediate adult learners (Teacher's book).* Melbourne, Australia: Western Melbourne Institute of TAFE.

Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *English Language Teaching Journal, 57*(3), 278-287.

Boyle, R. (2000). What happened to preference organization? *Journal of Pragmatics, 3, 583-604.*

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach and language pedagogy(2nd ed.) .* New York, NY: Longman.

Bruner, D. A., Shimray, Y. P., & Sinwongsuwat, K. (2014). *Thai-Serbian A2 university EFL learners' perspectives on learning and teaching oral English communication skills.* In Pramarn Subphadoongchone (Ed.), The 34th Thailand TESOL International Conference Proceedings 2014, pp. 13-34. (Chiang Mai: TESOL Thailand).

Clifton, J. (2011). Combining conversation analysis and reflective practice in the ESP classroom: Putting transcripts of business simulations under the microscope. *J.Clifton / Scripta Manent, 6*(1-2), 25-34.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Darasawang, P. (2007). English language teaching and education in Thailand. A decade of change in N. D. Prescott (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Varieties, literacies and literatures* (pp. 187-204). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Farhady, H. (1995). *Research methods in applied linguistics.* Tehran: Payam Nour Publications Centre.

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

Goodwin, C. (1986). Between and within: Alternative sequential treatments of continuers and assessments. *Human Studies, 9*, 205-217.

Have, P. ten. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis (2nd ed.).* London, UK: SAGE.

Huth, T., & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research, 10*(1), 53-79.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Khamkhien, A. (2010). Teaching English speaking and English speaking tests in the Thai context: A reflection from Thai perspective. *English Language Teaching, 3*(1), 184-190.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). *Teaching English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: Maintaining linguistic and cultural diversity.* Proceedings of the 2012 International Conference on Cultural and Linguistic Diversity in ASEAN, Suan Dusit Rajabhat University, Bangkok, Thailand, 17-25.

Kongkerd, W. (2013). Teaching English in the era of English used as a lingua franca in Thailand. Retrieved July 12, 2014, from www.bu.ac.th/knowledgecenter/executive_journal/oct_dec.../aw01.pdf

Kustati, M. (2013). The shifting paradigms in the implementation of CLT in Southeast Asia countries. Retrieved July 5, 2014, from http://journal.tarbiyahiainib.ac.id/index.php/attalim/article/download/23/31/pdf

Kwangsawad, T., & Yawongsa, P. (2009). Bridging the gap between CLT and CBI theory and practice. Retrieved July 12, 2014, from https://www.yumpu.com/.../**bridging-the-gap-between-clt-and-cbi-theory**.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lin, Y. (2009). Culturally responsive communicative teaching (CRCLT): A new alternative for EFL teachers in China and other non-English speaking countries. *Canadian and International Education,(38)*2, 88-103.

Litttlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Luoma, S. (2004). *Assessing speaking*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Markee, N. (2009). *Conversation analysis*. London, UK: Taylor & Francis.

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

Methitam, P., & Chamcharatsri, P. B. (2011). Critiquing ELT in Thailand: A reflection from history to practice. *Journal of Humanities, Naresuan University, 8*(2), 57-68.

Nonkukhetkhon, K., Baidauf Jr, R. B. & Moni, K. (2006). Learner-centredness in teaching English as a foreign language, Paper presented at 26 Thai TESOL International Conference, Chiang Mai, Thailand, 19-21 January 2006, 1-9.

Noom-ura, S. (2013). English teaching problems in Thailand and Thai teachers' professional development needs. *English Language Teaching, 6*(11), 139-147. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n11p139

O'Loughlin, K. (2001). *Studies in language testing 13: The equivalence of direct and semi-direct speaking tests*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Punthumasen, P. (2007). International program for teacher education: An approach to tackling problems of English education in Thailand. Retrieved March 12, 2015, from https://www.scribd.com/doc/111130160/**English-Education-in-Thailand**

Quan, L., & Zheng, Y. (2012). A study of self-repair markers in conversation by Chinese English learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3*(6), 1216-1223.

Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Bohlke, D. (2012). *Speak now 3: Communicate with confidence.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Richards, K., & Seedhouse, P. (Eds.) (2005). *Applying conversation analysis*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Robson, C. (2011). *Real world research (3rd ed.)*. Wiley: Padstow.

Saengboon, S. (2002). *Beliefs of Thai teachers about communicative language teaching.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University Bloomington, USA.

Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Seedhouse, P. (2007). Interaction and construction. In Z. Hua, P. Seedhouse, L Wei, & V. Cook (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching as social inter-action* (pp.9-21). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n3p13

Teng, B., & Sinwongsuwat, K. (in press). Improving English conversation skill through explicit CA-informed instruction: A study of Thai university students. *PASAA Paritat Journal*, 30.

Thai Library Integrated System (ThaiLIS) (2015). *Digital Collection Working Group*. Retrieved March 21, 2015, from www.thailis.or.th/tdc/

Ussama, R. (2013). *Conversation proficiency assessment: A comparative study of two-party peer interaction and interview interaction implemented with Thai EFL learners.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Prince of Songkla University, Thailand.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy*. London, UK: Taylor & Francis.

Wu, Y. (2013). Conversation Analysis: A discourse approach to teaching oral English skills. *International Education studies, 6*(5), 87-91. http://dx.doi.org/105539/ies.v6n5p87

Young, R. (1995). Conversational styles in language proficiency interviews. *Language Learning*, *45*, 3-42.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
CA Based Lesson Plan (Sample)

Lesson one
Duration: 60 minutes
Topic: Stages of conversation.
Goal: To teach the following:
1) adjacency pairs: utterances of the same type and different types
2) techniques to make small talks
3) Pre-closing conversation expressions
Terminal Objective: By the end of the lesson students will be able to:
1) identify adjacency pairs: utterances of the same type and different type
2) use techniques to engage actively in conversation
3) politely indicate when they should stop talking
Enabling Objectives: Students will
 1) learn adjacency pairs and practice utterances of the same types
 2) talk about and change a topic in conversation
 3) practice stages of conversation
 4) listen to a recording consisting of a three-stage conversation

Sequence	Minutes	Activities	Material/ Resource
Warm up	5	- Give students a jumbled conversation and get them to rearrange a conversation. (a three-stage conversation).	Marker Board
Vocabulary Adjacency pairs	10	1- Introduce adjacency pairs (utterance of the same type: Greeting and Leave-taking) - Greeting (A: *Hello* B: *Hello*) - Leave-taking (A: *Goodbye* B: *Goodbye*) 2- Introduce adjacency pairs (utterance of the different type) Questions and answers (A: *How are you?* B: *I'm fine.*) 3. Get students to practice the utterances of the two types in pairs.	Marker Board
Structure of conversation	20	1- Hand out a CA-based handout 2- Explain the handout with demonstrations. 3- Have students practice each stage in pairs. 4- Have students practice the three-stage conversation	Marker Board Handout
Listening	10	1- Have students listen to a full conversation recording and ask them to notice stages of conversation 2- Have students work in pairs to figure out what is said in each stage. 3- Elicit their answers.	CD Marker Board
Exercises	7	1- Direct students' attention to exercises 1 and 2	Book CD

		2- Have students match parts of conversation in exercise 1 in pairs. 3- Have students determine stages of conversation and practice the conversation. 4- Have students complete exercise 3. 5- Check the answers.	Marker Board
Wrap-up	3	- Recap the important points in the lesson.	Marker Board
Homework	5	- Assign students to practice short three-stage conversation.	Marker Board

Appendix B

CA-Based Handouts
<u>Handout (1)</u>
<u>Stages of conversation</u>

❖ Any conversation has a stage with **the opening**, **the centring** and **the closing.** In the opening, participants usually say something like **"hello and sometimes add health inquiry like how are you?**" to each other. In the centring, participants talk about something which is called **the topic.** And in the closing, participants show that they want to finish the conversation, then they usually say something like "**goodbye (leave-taking)**" to each other.

1. **<u>Opening</u>**

Greeting		Inquiry into health	
Speaker 1	**Speaker 2**	**Speaker 1**	**Speaker 2**
Good morning / Hello / Hi	Good morning / Hello / Hi	How are you? How's it going?	I'm fine. I'm good, thanks.

2. **<u>Centring</u>**
Topic:
We can introduce a topic and talk about and change the topic. Read them and add some more ideas on the left part.

Topics		
1	Have you had lunch yet?	
2	What can I do for you?	
3	Did you enjoy the weekend?	
4	How was your English class?	
5	I have some good news.	
6	You know I just…	
7	Did you come to the class on Friday?	

3. **<u>Closing</u>**
   3.1 <u>Pre Closing:</u>

❖ **Pre Closing Signal:**

Before you say goodbye, you should say one of these sentences to show that you want to finish speaking.

OK	OK then	Alright		Alright then	Well	So	Anyway
I'm running late.	*Oh, I've got to go now.*			*Well, nice talking to you.*			
Alright, what time is it now?			*OK, I'll talk to you later.*				

❖ **Closing**

Leave-taking: saying goodbye	
Speaker 1	**Speaker 2**
Goodbye/ Bye; Bye-bye	*Goodbye / Bye / bye-bye*
See you later / See you on… / Catch you later. (+ Have a nice day)	*See you soon / See you around / Catch you later. (+ Have a good day)*
Thank you. You too.	*Thank you. You too.*

Exercises

1. Match parts of the conversation and name the stages of conversation below.
2. Identify the stages of conversation and then practice the conversation.

1	Hello	A	Thank you. You too. Bye-bye.
2	My name is Ceta.	B	I'm a student, too.
3	Nice to meet you.	C	Nice talking to you, too.
4	Where are you from?	D	I'm Chou.
5	Songkla.	E	Hello.
6	I'm a student. And how about you?	F	Bangkok. And you?
7	Well, nice talking to you.	G	Nice to meet you, too.
8	Bye. Have a nice day.	H	What do you do?

Read the conversation above and fill in the missing sentences. Practice the conversation with your partner.

A	Hello.
B	
A	My name is Ceta.
B	
A	Nice to meet you.
B	
A	Where are you from?
B	
A	Songkla.
B	
A	I'm a student. And how about you?
B	
A	Well, nice talking to you.
B	
A	Bye.
B	

Appendix C

Scoring criteria and descriptors adapted from O'Loughlin (2001), Luoma (2004) and Barraja-Rohan (2011)

Fluency	Students can speak fluently with only occasional hesitation and manage to keep the conversation going without making long pauses or causing communication breakdown even though they perform their speech rather slowly than a native speaker.
Vocabulary	Students has a large command of vocabulary and can use a wide range of vocabulary precisely, appropriately and effectively to express most ideas impressively.
Appropriacy	Students can use English appropriately and effectively according to sociocultural norms and usually can appropriately construct their turns in response to the interlocutor's first- and second-pair-part turn or even to unpredictable questions in conversation.
Comprehensibility	Students can produce speech which can be understood effortlessly by the interlocutor or the interlocutor may occasionally seek clarification.
Grammar	Students can interact effectively by employing a wide range of structures or expressions with only minor mistakes.

Appendix D

Evaluation form for pretest and posttest

Name: _____   Score: _____

Score \ Aspect	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Very poor/ unacceptable
	5	4	3	2	1
Fluency					
Vocabulary					
Appropriacy					
Comprehensibility					
Intelligibility					
Grammar					

Appendix E

Transcription convention employed by Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), Seedhouse

(2004) and Schegloff (2007)

Symbols	Description
[	Point of overlap onset
[[	Starting a simultaneous turn
]	Point of overlap termination
=	a) Turn continues below, at the next identical symbol b) If inserted at the end of one speaker's adjacency turn, indicates that there is no gap at all between the two turns c) Indicates that there is no interval between adjacency utterances.
(0.5)	Numbers in parenthesis indicate silence, represented in tenth of a second; what is given here indicates 0.5 second of silence.
(.)	A dot in parentheses indicates a "micropause", hearable but not readily measurable; ordinary less than 0.2 second
hh ; .hh	hh for exhalation whereas .hh for inhalation
Word	Speaker emphasis
——	Abrupt cutoff
.	Falling (final) intonation
,	Low-rising intonation, suggesting continuation
?	Rising intonation, not necessarily a question
!	Animated or emphatic tone
(guess)	Indicates the transcriber's doubt about a word
[gibe]	In the case of inaccurate pronunciation of an English word, an approximation of the sound is given in square brackets
Ja ((tr.: es))	Non-English words are italicized and are followed by an English translation in double parentheses
——→	Mark features of special interest

Appendix F

Prince of Songkhla University

Faculty of Liberal Arts

Department of Languages and Linguistics

Master of Arts program in Teaching English as an International Language

<u>Consent Form</u>

<u>Title of Project:</u> Improving conversation performance through CA-informed instruction: A study of Thai university students' English conversation in non-scripted role-play activities

<u>Researcher</u>: Bunthan Teng under the supervision of Asst. Prof. Dr. Kemtong Sinwongsuwat

1. I have read and understood the training course.
2. I agreed to be involved in the training course and understood my role in it.
3. I understand that the data collected in the training course might form some bases of either a report or other form of presentations or publications.
4. I understand that my name will be not disclosed in any report or other form of presentations or publication, and my confidentiality will be fully protected.

Participant's signature: ………………………………   Date: …. / ….. / 2014

Participant's name (in CAPITALS): …………………..

Researcher's name signature: …………………………   Date: …. / ….. / 2014