ABSTRACT

Astiti Gusti Ayu Ketut (2012), *Classroom Interaction of English as an Additional Language (EAL) in Primary Level at Canggu Community School: A Study Based on a Conversation Analysis Theory*. Thesis. Language Education Departement, Postgraduate Program, Ganesha University of Education.

This thesis has been approved by advisor I : Prof Dr Ni Nyoman Padmadewi, M.A and Advisor II: Prof. Dr. I Ketut Seken, M.A.

Key words: classroom interaction, conversation analysis, turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization

This study analyzed the classroom interaction of English as an Additional Language (EAL) in Primary level at Canggu Community School. This study followed a qualitative description of case study which uses Conversation Analysis to analyze the talk-in interaction in terms of turn-taking organization, sequence organization and the repair organization. The subjects of the study were an EAL teacher and EAL students who come from different classrooms in Primary level. The methods of data collection in this study were audio and video recording of classroom interaction, observation and interview with the teacher. The data of this study were obtained from the five lessons of five different groups. The main data were in the form of classroom interaction transcriptions. This study revealed that in terms of turn-taking organization, the personal solicit was the dominant solicit that occurred and the general solicit was the least dominant. The study also revealed that students made self-selections to take a turn. In terms of the sequence organization, the most common classroom interaction that occurred was Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF)–sequence where the talk was initiated by the teacher and also by the students. In terms of the repair organization, other-initiated other-repair (OIOR) was the dominant type of repair that occurred in these EAL groups, in which most of the repairs were made by the teacher without giving much chance to the students to uptake the repair after the teacher. Based on the result of this study, it was concluded that in classroom interaction, how the turn-taking, sequence and repair were organized were vital components to enhance the learning of EAL students to improve their English proficiency and could increase their confidence in the classroom by having more chance to take a turn in discussion and also initiated the topic and conversation. Besides that the students need to have more opportunities to uptake the correct language after the repairs from the teacher.

ABSTRAK

Astiti Gusti Ayu Ketut (2012). *Interaksi Kelas pada Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris sebagai Bahasa Tambahan Tingkat Dasar di Canggu Community School: Studi dengan Menggunakan Analisis Percakapan.* Tesis. Departement Pendidikan Bahasa, Pasca Sarjana, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.

Tesis ini sudah disetujui dan diperiksa oleh: Pembimbing : Prof. Dr. Ni Nyoman Padmadewi, M.A. dan Pembimbing II: Prof. Dr. I Ketut Seken, M.A.

Kata-kata kunci: interaksi kelas, percakapan analisis, organisasi mengambil giliran, organisasi rangkaian, organisasi perbaikan

Studi ini fokus pada interaksi kelas pada pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa tambahan pada tingkat dasar (English as an Additional Language)-EAL di Canggu Community School. Ini merupakan studi kasus dengan pemaparan kualitatif. Subjek dari penelitian ini adalah seorang guru EAL dan para siswa EAL yang berasal dari lima grup. Penelitian ini menggunakan Analisis Percakapan (Conversation Analysis) dalam menganalisis data. Data penelitian didapatkan dari rekaman video dan suara interaksi kelas, observasi dan melakukan wawancara dengan guru EAL. Data utama berupa lima transkripsi percakapan dari lima kelas yang berbeda. Analisis data menunjukkan bahwa organisasi bergiliran (turn-taking organization) yang paling banyak muncul adalah guru menunjuk murid untuk mendapat kesempatan berbicara. Data tentang organisasi rangkaian interaksi (sequence organization) didapatkan bahwa guru lebih banyak memulai interaksi dan memperkenalkan topik pada siswa, tetapi topik dan inisiatif juga bisa dimulai dari siswa. Data tentang organisasi perbaikan (repair organization), menunjukkan bahwa kebanyakan perbaikan (repair) datangnya dari guru, di mana kurang kesempatan bagi siswa untuk memperbaiki kesalahan bahasa mereka. Dari analisis data dan pembahasan, dapat disimpulkan bahwa di dalam interaksi kelas guru seharusnya lebih banyak memberikan kesempatan siswa untuk berusaha aktif sendiri yang mana di dalam studi ini guru berusaha memberikan kesempatan yang sama kepada setiap siswa untuk berbicara dengan cara menunjuk siswa. Demikian juga halnya dalam rangkaian interaksi dan pengaturan perbaikan kesalahan, dengan adanya kesempatan bagi siswa memulai berinteraksi lebih banyak dan mendapat kesempatan dalam memperbaiki kesalahan bahasa diharapkan dapat meningkatkan kemampuan penggunaan bahasa Inggris mereka.

INTRODUCTION

This introductory section provides the background and the rationale for this study. It clarifies the problem solution and underlying theories for the study.

Background

Teaching and learning is a complicated and interactive process which involves various aspects. Teachers have responsibilities to deal with teaching objectives, teaching materials, teaching pedagogy and teaching strategies. They also have roles to organize activities to engage classes with different individuals who have various aims, abilities, motivations and behavior in learning. Moreover, teachers have to monitor and assess the learning progress that the learners make. Overall of those aspects, the success of teaching and learning depends, to a large extent, on the interactions that occur between teachers and students in the classroom.

Important aspects of classroom interaction are how the teachers and students conduct interaction and the discourse used in real classroom. Classroom discourse is interesting from the educational point of view because education is conducted fundamentally through the medium of language. The discourse during classroom interaction differs in form and function from casual conversation and other institutional varieties of discourse such as in hospital, court room, etc (Ellis, 1986: 149).

Appropriate teacher communication creates harmonious atmosphere and at the same time promotes a more friendly relationship between teachers and students and consequently creates more opportunities for interactions between teachers and students. The interaction is an aspect that makes the classroom becomes a social place. The participants interact with each other, and the interaction in classrooms serves different kinds of purposes in which the big challenge for teachers is how to include all students in the classroom interaction (Behnam and Pouriran, 2008).

This study was conducted in EAL Primary level at Canggu Community School (CCS) because the researcher was interested in the classrooms setting at this school where the students come from various ethnic backgrounds, mainly: Indonesian, Australian, English, American, Japanese, French, Italian, Russian, etc. Canggu Community School (CCS) is an International School which adapts and applies National British Curriculum from Early Year until Key stage 3 (3-16 years old). The classroom teachers are English native speaking teachers and assisted by Indonesian teacher assistants. Each year group has two classes, with maximum 24 students in

each class. This school uses English as the language of classroom instruction for all subjects except in Bahasa Indonesia lesson.

There are some phenomena found at this school. Firstly, the students who have limited and no English proficiency encounter problems to interact and understand the lesson in the mainstream classroom. Secondly, they become reluctant to express their ideas because they are not confident to speak in English that make them tend to be quiet during the classroom interaction. Thirdly, the classroom teachers have a huge responsibility to make the classroom interaction is meaningful to all students, but those students who have limited English find it challenging to contribute during the lesson. The other phenomena is that the students who come at CCS with no and limited English proficiency are often taught by the teacher assistants separately from the whole class discussions, so that they have lacks of interaction with the other students in the classroom. This situation makes the students feel neglected and treated differently.

English as an additional language (EAL) is a program to support the students whose English is not their first language. The main goal of this program is to improve their English proficiency so that the students can work successfully and increasing confidence in mainstream classes. They are withdrawn from the mainstream classroom twice a week (45 minutes) to follow the EAL program. Based on the EAL guidelines in CCS 'Parent and Students Handbook' (2012) that EAL students need to develop a considerably higher level of English proficiency than might normally be required for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) course. EAL lesson is the support program but the language is best learned in a meaningful context that is the mainstream classrooms. EAL classroom is a unique classroom in which the students who come to this program have different L1 and ethnic backgrounds and are of different ages, whereas, the teacher does not have knowledge of students' L1. In this situation, the teacher shall respect the speaking of the mother tongue languages when in the appropriate context and it is a valuable channel to support learning and it does not consider as a hindrance.

Plan for Problem Solution

This study aimed at analyzing the classroom interaction that focused on turn taking organization, sequence organization and repair through detail analysis of the audio and video-recordings using Conversation Analysis approach. Conversation analysis has been chosen for

this study, because it offers tools for detailed interaction analysis, this does not only analyze and investigate how the teachers use the language in the interaction, but it also can give details concerning the structure of talk-in-interaction that can be a valuable source for observing attitudes and roles of the participants in the classroom.

The classroom interactions from the five EAL groups were observed and recorded which each lesson lasted for 45 minutes. There were five observations and lesson transcriptions obtained at the end. After the first recording was made, a rough transcription of the class interaction was done. Every aspect and segment of the classroom interaction was transcribed because every single aspect contained very potential things to be analyzed. After the transcriptions were completed, the sequences were selected to answer the research questions regarding the turn-taking organization, sequence organization and repair organization of the classroom interaction.

Transcription of Underlying Theories

In analyzing classroom interaction using conversation analysis, it is essential to consider the special features of classroom interaction. Seedhouse (2004) has taken a conversation analytic perspective on classroom interaction. Classroom interaction is always led by a goal, and this particular goal directs the structure of interaction in the classroom (Seedhouse, 2004). He presents three interactional properties that are universal in language classroom: a) language is both the vehicle and object of instruction; b) there is a reflective relationship between pedagogy and interaction; c) the linguistic forms and patterns of interaction which the learners produce are potentially subject to evaluation by the teacher.

Conversation analysis tries to identify and analyze the sequential organization of interaction. There is basic structure or sequence organization in classroom interaction. Usually it follows the simple pattern: the pedagogic focus is introduced by the teacher and the learners react to it somehow. The learners analyze the situation and decide how to take action and the teacher reacts to this. The cycle repeats and the interaction goes on. It is also possible that it is a learner who introduces the pedagogical focus and the teacher has to analyze the situation and react to it (Seedhouse, 2004).

There are three levels of conversation analysis in classroom context. Sorjonen (1997:111 cited in Makinen 2008) explains the main ideas of these levels. Turn taking, where the utterances of different participants are being investigated, explains how participants take their turns and

how the turns are constructed, in what ways the turns are given or taken, how they are completed and how a participant can continue the turn. Another level is organization where the participants construct larger units of speaking, for instance, a question and answer pair, called adjacency pair, where the sequence of a question and an answer and their relation to each other is under discussion. In other words, in conversation there are cases when one turn needs another turn for the conversation to be complete. These two levels affect the way how interaction is being carried out and how the conversation goes on. The third level is repair organization to understand and explain all the ways that are used by the speakers when problems occur during talking, listening and understanding.

In an early study using CA methodology in an educational setting, McHoul (1990) investigated turn-taking in formal classrooms, and proposed a set of turn-taking rules derived from Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974), which laid out rules "that only teachers can direct speakership in any creative way". According to Sacks et al. (1974), turn-taking is a 'prominent type of social organization' that is used in a variety of activities, such as in games, in traffic and in customer service. Schegloff (2007) has studied sequences organization and turn taking. He states that turn taking organization is a very fundamental phenomenon of interaction as it makes responsiveness in interaction possible. Participants in interaction inspect and analyze each others' turn and then react and respond to these. The cycle of interaction is based on turn taking and if one considers turn taking as sets of units in terms of action, another talk about sequence of action which then form sequence organization of interaction. Every turn includes a message, an action that the speaker wishes to convey through that turn. It is then possible for the other participants to analyze the turn and predict what the speaker expects next.

The focus of research on turn-taking, sequence and repair in the classroom organization has formed a steady topic. It was started by (McHoul, 1978, cited in Gardner 2004) who focused to investigate turn-taking in formal classroom. Paoletti and Fele (2004) argue that there are rules in classroom but the rules do not always apply. The teachers control the turn-taking, attempting to avoid overlapping turn: for example, they usually do not accept answers that are called out. Turn-taking is essential for teaching and learning. It shows how the teacher organizes classroom activities both to facilitate and constrain turn-taking in different ways (Seedhouse, 2004). Turn taking in conversation is a central issue in classroom interaction and an important constituent of teaching-learning process (Maroni, et al, 2008).

Seedhouse (2004) argues that the sequence organization of second language classroom follows a certain pattern. The teacher introduces the pedagogic focus and the students react to it. The students analyze the situation and how to take action and then the teacher gives feedback or evaluation. Mori (2002) focused a research on the sequential organization in the task and pre-task planning. Every classroom setting in its own culture involves various sorts of organizational mechanisms. Those mechanisms have different roles in governing the flow of behavior among the participants of the classroom setting.

Repair has always been a sequence and action of focus in CA. Repair is the organization of how people deal with problem in speaking, hearing and understanding in conversation (Schegloff et al, 1977 as cited in Yasui, 2010). Yasui (2010) stated that repair sequence shows how interactional participants accomplish mutual understanding. Turn-taking, sequence organization and repair are parts of classroom life dealing with how the mechanisms are practiced in classroom environment (Sert & Seedhouse, 2011).

Method

This part describes the research design, the subjects, instruments, method of data analysis and the validity of the study.

Research Design

This study used conversation analysis to examine the interaction between the teacher and students in the classroom through observation and video recording. Firstly, it analyzed how the turn-taking and sequences were organized and then it analyzed the repairs occurred during the interaction. The main data were in the form of classroom interaction transcriptions. The other types of data were field notes during the observation and follow up interviews with the teacher. Jefferson's transcript convention was used in analyzing the conversation and behavior occur in the EAL classroom interaction.

Subjects of the Study

The subjects of the present study were EAL students who were from different primary classes and a Native English speaking teacher. The teacher is Ms Savage, a female teacher who

is from Australia. She has been teaching in Canggu Community School for four years and had taught in Australia for ten years.

There were five different groups in Primary EAL classroom at Canggu Community School. The students came from year 1 until year 4 classrooms primary school. In this study the groups were named using group A, B, C, D and E. The students in group A, B, C and E were all in level 1 for their English proficiency and the students in group D were in level 4. The students who were involved in the research and any teacher's name mentioned during the interaction were identified by pseudonyms in the lesson transcriptions.

Instruments

The primary means of data collection consisted of classroom observations, audio- and video-recording and teacher interviews. Data consisted of field notes from observations, transcripts from audio- and video-recording the classes and follow up interview notes from the teacher.

The classroom interactions from the five EAL groups were observed and recorded once a week, in which each lesson lasted for 45 minutes. The classes were observed in two month period that were started on February, 29th until April, 27th 2012. During this period, the researcher could not observe and record the EAL classes every week because in the middle of March the school had a break for two weeks and on April the EAL teacher went to Australia for a week. Besides that, the school also held events in which the EAL students had to stay in their mainstream classroom. Due to that situation, there were five effective classroom lessons were obtained from the observation and lesson recording during this period.

There were three devices that were used in this research as the key instrument: observation sheet, interview questions, video and audio recorder. Observation sheet was used to take notes of any event occurred in the classroom interaction. . The recorder was used to gather the spoken discourse and interview teachers. The video and audio recorders were used to record any interactions happened during the lesson. Interview guide was used to gather information from the teacher regarding her reason conducting certain behavior in this case is about turn-taking, sequence and repair organization.

Method of Data Analysis

In this study, the video and audio recording data of the teachers-students interaction were transcribed and used as the major source for data analysis. From the transcription, the researcher analyzed the classroom interaction using conversation analysis. The result of the interview was also analyzed to know the teacher's reason of conducting certain behavior during classroom interaction. Firstly, the data reduction was done and then it was continued by data display and last the conclusion was derived from the data. After the data was collected, firstly, it was transcribed in the form of classroom interaction transcription. From all the observation and recording, the researcher chose the lesson observation and recording which had effective lessons. From the reduction it was obtained five lesson observations and recording which were transcribed in detail. From the transcription, the excerpts were chosen to be analyzed based on the need of the research and those that related to the research questions. The last step of data analysis was conclusion drawing and verification. The conclusion was done straight after the first data transcription were analyzed which was subject to change after the verification on the next data collection. Verification of conclusion affected data reduction and display because the new data was obtained and became the new entries of the data collection. This process was a cyclical nature of data analysis along the stage of data collection.

Validity

To minimize subjectivity and bias in the data collection, the researcher in this study used the strategy of triangulation or obtaining multiple data sources: both process triangulation which was conducted through direct classroom observation and recording of the classroom interaction to support the observation. It was continued by follow up interview with the teacher after the analysis of lesson transcriptions to obtain the teacher's view of what was observed; and result triangulation which was in the form of lesson transcripts, field notes during the observation and the result of interview with the teacher. Result triangulation was done through member checks (EAL teacher) to cross check the correctness of the findings. Besides that the follow up interviews with the teacher were used to complement and cross-check the evidence gathered from the observation. The cross-check was done to the teacher as the participant after each lesson transcription was completed. The juxtaposition of perspectives from the researcher and the teacher helped reveal the complexity involved in classroom life and teaching-learning processes.

Result

This part presents the data that was obtained from the observations and the five recording lessons to show the distribution of the turn-taking organization, sequence and repair organization during the classroom interaction.

The table 4.1.1 below shows the distribution of turn-taking allocation that was organized by the teacher and the students in their classroom interaction. There are three turn allocation systems which become the focus in this study. The first one is general solicit where the turn is allocated by the teacher without nominating the students' name. The second turn allocation is personal solicit where the teacher nominates a turn to the students next after her turn. The third turn allocation is self-selection where the students allocate themselves for a turn.

Table 4.1.1 Turn-Taking Distribution of EAL Classroom Interaction

Turn-Taking Organisation in EAL Classroom Interaction							
EAL Groups	General Solicit	Percen-tage	Personal Solicit	Percen-tage	Self selection	Percen-tage	Total
A	21	28%	15	21%	38	51%	74
B	31	26%	43	36%	45	38%	119
C	18	18%	50	49%	34	33%	102
D	16	17%	31	34%	45	49%	92
E	10	7%	79	57%	50	36%	139
Total	96	18%	218	42%	212	40%	526

Table 4.1.1 shows that the distribution of the turn-taking organization was not the same among EAL groups. This was in accordance to the type of the lesson activity and the goal of the lesson.

In group A, it was found that students' self selection was the most preferred one which were out of 74 turns, 38 (51%) turns were students' self selections, 21 (28%) turns were general solicits by the teacher and 15 (21%) turns were personal solicits by the teacher. In group B, it was found that the most frequent turn allocation was also the students' self selection. Out of 119 turns, 45 (38%) turns were the students' self selections, 43 (36%) turns were teacher's personal solicits and 31(26%) turns were teacher's general solicits. In group C, the most preferred turn allocation was the teacher's personal solicit. Out of 102 turns, 50 (49%) turns were teacher's personal solicits, 34(33%) turns were the students' self selections and 18 (18%) turns were teacher's general solicits. In group D, the most preferred turn allocation was the students' self

selections which were 45 (49%) turns out of 92 turns, 31 (34%) turns were teacher's personal solicits and 16 (17%) turns were teacher's general solicits. In group E, out of 139 turns the most preferred turn allocation was teacher's personal solicit. Teacher's personal solicits were 79 (57%) turns, the students' self selects were 50 (36%) turns and 10 (7%) turns were teacher's general solicits.

The table 4.1.2 below shows the distribution of the sequence initiation during the lessons in EAL classroom interaction. In the classroom interaction, it is common that the teacher controls and initiates the sequence and topic, but it can be also initiated by the students based on the students' interest of the topic, Seedhouse (2004).

Table 4.1.2 The Distribution of the Sequence Initiation in EAL Classroom Interaction

The Sequence Initiation in EAL Classroom Interaction					
EAL Groups	Teacher's initiation	Percentage	Students' initiation	Percentage	Total
A	32	89%	4	11%	36
B	80	86%	13	14%	93
C	67	93%	5	7%	72
D	42	74%	15	26%	57
E	76	67%	37	33%	113
Total	297	80%	74	20%	371

Table 4.1.2 shows that the most common sequence initiation from the whole lessons recording was teacher's initiation.

In group A, it was found that the teacher initiated the sequence most of the time. From the 36 sequences, 32 (89%) sequences were initiated by the teacher and only 4 (11%) sequences were initiated by the students. In group B, out of 93 sequences, 80 (86%) sequences were initiated by the teacher and only 13(14%) sequences were initiated by the students. In group C, 67(93%) sequences out of 72 were initiated by the teacher and 5 (7%) sequences were initiated by the students. In group D, the teachers initiated the sequence most of the time which is out of 57 sequences, 42 (74%) sequences were initiated by the teacher and 15 (26%) sequences were initiated by the students. In group E, teacher initiated 76 (67%) sequences out of 113 and the students initiated 37 (33%) sequences.

The table 4.1.3 below shows the distribution of repair types occur from the five lessons in EAL classroom interaction.

Table 4.1.3 The Distribution of Repair Types Occur in EAL Classroom Interaction

The Distribution of Repair types Occur in EAL Classroom Interaction								
EAL Groups	The Types of Repair							
	SISR	Percentage	SIOR	Percentage	OISR	Percen-tage	OIOR	Percen-tage	Total
A	1	8%	0	0	1	8%	10	84%	12
B	1	4%	1	4%	13	48%	12	44%	27
C	1	4%	4	15%	6	23%	15	58%	26
D	1	8%	2	17%	3	25%	6	50%	12
E	2	10%	3	15%	7	35%	8	40%	20
Total	6	6%	10	10%	30	31%	51	53%	97

Table 4.1.3 shows the distribution of the repair types from the five lessons in EAL classroom interaction. From the transcription analysis, it was found that other-initiated other-repair (IOIR) was the most common repair type occurs in this study.

From group A, out of the 12 total repairs, 10 (84%) repairs were the teacher's initiation and also who made the repair for the students' speech trouble (OIOR), 1 (8%) repair was initiated by the teacher and the students made the repair (OISR). The students' self repair and teacher's initiation (SIOR) did not occur and self-initiation self-repair (SISR) only occurred once (8%) during the whole lesson 1. The result from group B is quite different from the group A lesson. It was found that other-initiated self-repair (OISR) was the most common repair types occurred, 13(48%) repairs out of the total 27 repairs. The second preferred type was the teacher-initiated teacher-repair (OIOR), 12 (44%) repairs, meanwhile it was only once (4%) occurred for each SISR and SIOR repair types. The result from group C shows that OIOR was the most frequent repair type occurred which were 15(58%) repairs out of 26. OISR repair type occurred 6 (23%) times, SIOR repair type occurred 4(15%) times and SISR only occurred once (4%). From group D, out of overall 12 repairs, 6 (50%) repairs were OIOR type, 3 (25%) repairs were OISR type, 2 (17%) repairs were SIOR type and only one (8%) repair was SISR type. From the result of group E, it was found that the most common repair type occurred was OIOR, which were 8 (40%) out of 20 repairs. OISR repair type occurred 7(35%) times, 3(15) times were SIOR repair type and SISR occurred twice.

DISCUSSION

Below is the analysis discussion of the sequences for turn-taking, sequence and repair organization.

Issues

There are some problems that are found in the classroom of Canggu Community School, that make it appealing to conduct a study in this school. These problems are identified as follows.

Students with limited English proficiency find it difficult to demonstrate their knowledge because they struggle to understand the lesson and encounter problem to express themselves. They sometimes need time to adapt and socialize in the new environment, especially those students who come without English proficiency. The students who have limited and no English proficiency tend to be reluctant and quiet during the classroom interaction because they are not confident to express themselves in English. They are often taught by the teacher assistants separately from the other students that make them feel neglected from the classroom interaction. From the issues encountered, it is very crucial to know how the EAL teacher employs a meaningful communication and interaction with the EAL students, to improve their English communication skill so that they become confident to interact in the classroom and in the school environment.

Turn-taking, sequence organization and repair organization are essential for teaching and learning. Turn-taking shows how the teacher organizes classroom activities both to facilitate and constrain turn-taking in different ways. Sequence organization involves various sorts of organizational mechanisms. Those mechanisms have different roles in governing the flow of behavior among the participants of the classroom setting. Repair is an essential component in classroom interaction. It shows how interactional participants accomplish mutual understanding. Repair organization in second language classroom relates to who initiates and makes the repair, whether it is initiated and made by the teacher or the students.

Findings

The turn-taking organization in this study was divided into three turn allocations. The first one was the general solicit which was conducted by the teacher to give free turn allocations

for the students to involve in the classroom interaction. The general solicits were conducted in term of asking questions and gaining responses from the students in a daily routine activities, such as in asking the day, the date and when the teacher initiates the topic around the students' feeling, and about what they learned during the day in their classroom.

In the main activity, the general solicits from the teacher also occurred when she required the students to provide words that begin with the phonics or when she required them to provide the general comment. In this study, the teacher's general solicit was the least allocation occurred in accordance to there were some students in this EAL group who tended to dominate the turns and these students always actively had something to share. Meanwhile, there were some students who were rather reluctant to respond, they tended to ignore the teacher's questions. Sometimes, they only responded after the prompts from the teacher. In this case, the teacher expected everyone to involve in the interaction, which was why she conducted the personal solicits. Here, the teacher wanted to have every student to involve in the conversation. It confirms what Paoletti and Fele (2004) point out that the teacher always engaged to find balance between the control of the classroom activity and the students' participation. There were some situations where the teacher had to switch from general solicits to the personal solicits. These happened when the teacher conducted general solicit no one gave a response so she nominated someone to respond. This situation confirms what Tsui (1995 cited in Santiago, 2008) describes that a common pattern found in classroom where there is no student volunteers to take a turn, the teacher moves to a personal solicit to sustain the interaction.

The second allocation was the teacher's personal solicits which occurred in some situations as follow: Firstly, they occurred when the teacher had to respond the students' ideas and personal meanings which the students chose to share. In this case, the teacher gave responses and feedback to the students' topic and she asked the follow up questions, in result the teacher allocated and allowed the student who brought up the topic some interactional space. Secondly, the teacher's personal solicits occurred when the teacher recognized a student became reluctant to share her/his ideas and involve in discussion. In this case, the teacher prompted and encouraged the student to take an active part in discussion by giving questions so the students had turn allocations. It is in accordance to Hall (1997, cited in Xie, 2008) who argued that the teacher played an important role in distributing learning opportunities by means of constructing

different social participation structures with different individual students. This data confirms what Seedhouse (2004) points out if the current speaker has not selected a next speaker and if no other participant self-selects, then the current speaker may continue. In this study, the teacher continued the turn when no student took a floor after the teacher's general solicits by conducting personal solicits. Thirdly, the teacher applied the personal solicits when she required the students to provide words of certain topic, so each student had a chance to say the word which was also essential to let the students to brainstorm their words.

The third allocation is the students' self selection. The students made self- selections to respond the teacher's general solicits. It is interesting to note that there were self-selections when the students made initiation topic to share their interest or personal experiences. In this case, the students allocated themselves a turn and at the same time nominated the topics which were interesting for them to share. The students sometimes made a self selection when they interrupted the conversation to be included in the interaction or inserted the sequence to shift the main-topic into the sub-topic.

The sequence organization was analyzed from the beginning activity, where the teacher usually conducted the daily classroom routines before they did the main lesson activity. In this beginning session, the teacher asked questions to the students about the day, date, and the students' feeling of that day. Even though the sequence was initiated by the teacher, the students sometimes inserted their sequence to develop the sub-topic or introduce the new topic that was totally different from the topic which was initiated by the teacher. The teacher allowed this happened because she did not want to stop the students to express themselves, which she believed that the students could develop their vocabulary and expand their communication skills within the topic that related to them and interest them. The topics a lot of times were also initiated by the students which were developed by the teacher asking follow up questions and the sequence organization in this case moved to the series of questions/answers adjacency pairs. In the main activity, the topic was controlled by the teacher based on the goal of the lesson and the sequence organizations were developed based on the activity. During the main-activity, insertion sequences sometimes occurred when the students wanted to develop the sub-topic from the main topic. If the topic-shift was initiated by the students, the teacher allowed that for some points and then it was the teacher's responsibility to bring them back to the main focus. The insertion

sequences also occurred when the students did their writing work to develop the topic within the students' interest. The teacher responded the students' utterance with feedbacks or follow up questions.

When they had reading activity, the sequence organization followed the IRF-sequence which the teacher's initiation was directive moves. In the directive moves, the teacher asked the students to read the passage or read the questions from the passage. The students read the passage which was sometimes interrupted by the teacher to give correction or feedback. After the students read the passage, the teacher gave feedback by praising the students' reading. In the game activities, the sequence organization followed the initiation, response and feedback or evaluation. The initiation could come from the students when they picked the card which was followed up by the teacher giving questions and also feedback.

The students' initiation moves also occurred in this study, where the students initiated the topic of their interest or their personal meanings, asking questions about something they did not understand. The students' initiation could occur in the beginning session, when the students share their experience or anything which was interesting for them to share, it could occur in the main-activity and in the game activity. The students' initiations were followed by the teacher's responses, follow up questions, confirmation and feedback. This relates to what Tainio (2007, cited in Makinen, 2008) describes that a specific structure in a classroom is IRF or IRE-sequence, where the initiation of the sequence is made by the teacher and also can be made by the students.

This study revealed that there were four types of repair occurred in this study. The first type of repair was the self-initiated self-repair (SISR) which the students recognized their speech trouble and they initiated the repair using the delays and pauses for example the utterance "u:m", " uh", "no,no". The students' self-repairs were followed by the teacher's feedback and the confirmation. This type of repair was not very common in EAL classroom interaction of this study. Most of the speech troubles in this type were when they failed to provide the utterance they wanted to say and as what the teacher expected. This confirms the study that was conducted by Kasper (1986) that in a language centered phase the self-initiated and self-repairs by the students were rare.

The second type of repair was the self-initiated other-repair (SIOR) which the students recognized their speech trouble but they could not repair the trouble. In this case, they used self-initiation by using clarification questions or they left the utterance incomplete. The repairs were then done by the teacher by providing the clarification and suggested answer straight after the students initiated a repair.

The third type of repair was the other-initiated self-repair (OISR). In this study, this type of repair occurred when the students produced speech trouble which the propositional content was not clear and when the students failed to produce the certain answers. The teacher initiated the repair by cluing and gesturing for example "the colour, o---", reformulation questions for example: "this clothes, the special clothes?", confirmation questions as "you do?", "pardon?", "something what?" and evaluation "no, it is not bubble gums", "pizza is not a healthy food". Seedhouse (2004) in his study found that other-initiated self-repair (OISR) was more than other-initiated other-repair repair which is in contrast to the present study which revealed that other-initiated other-repair was the common repair occurred.

The fourth type of repair is other-initiated other-repair (OIOR). This type of repair occurred when the students produced the utterances which were linguistically incorrect such as: the incorrect verb agreement, pronunciations and the incorrect used of tenses. In this case, the teacher made the repair of the students' speech trouble using the explicit correction where the teacher repair the students' errors without giving the chance to the students to make their self-repair. In this study, the teacher also conducted recast, where the teacher repeated the students' utterances and then replaced them with the correct utterance. The teacher made the repair also in term of improper manner utterances such as: "hu?", "hu:um", "what?", "pass it". In this case, the teacher prompted the students by giving them the correct form and the students up took the repair by repeating the correct form. This type of repair was the most common repair occurred and most of the repairs were taken by the teacher and only a few was taken by other students. This confirms what Makinen (2008) revealed that the OIOR type of repair was the most common repair occurred. Kasper (1986) discovered that usually the teacher is the one who initiates the repair because usually the teacher is the one who pays attention to the forms used by the students. In this study, the teacher did not make repair to all of the students' speech trouble, specifically in grammatical trouble or errors because the teacher did not want to make the

students feel uncomfortable. The teacher aimed at letting the students had a chance to speak not focused on the accuracy of what is being said. This is relevant to what Seedhouse (2004) describes if the focus is in meaning and fluency context that the teacher does not focus on the linguistic form but rather on the understanding. By giving more chance for the students to speak can expand their vocabulary and improve their fluency. Showing the errors their make very often can decrease their confidence and they can be reluctant to participate during the lesson.

Implications

Based on the discussion presented above, that the success of the students to improve their communication skills in English largely depends on the interaction happened between the teacher and the students during the lesson activity. There are some implications that are derived from this study.

1. Application of Conversation Analysis to English language teaching classrooms may provide examples for teachers to improve their teaching practices by investigating actual language use in the classroom. Investigating and analyzing the classroom interaction may shed light to the teachers to maximize opportunities for students' participation that can promote interaction and provide opportunities for students to participate talk in the classrooms.

2. In terms of turn-taking organization, the teacher should provide equal opportunities for different individuals to have a chance to participate during the interaction.

3. In terms of sequence organization, the students were given rights to initiate a topic and sequence so that they can establish power in the interaction, they did not only accept what the teacher said.

4. In terms of repair organization, it is a vital part of the teacher's role to point out the students' errors and speech trouble and provide repairs. In giving repair, some specific information is provided on aspects of the learners' performance, through explanation, or through elicitation that can help students to clarify their understanding of meaning and construction of the language. So teachers have to be careful when giving repairs, so that the students can accept the repair and they do not lose their confidence speaking in English.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This section shows the conclusion and suggestions that were derived from the study.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion stated above the study arrived at the conclusion of how classroom interaction of EAL Primary level at Canggu Community School were organized. There were some points of conclusion that were derived as follows.

1. From the Conversation Analysis view point, the teacher in this study has a pedagogical focus to those students who don't have much English, to teach them word, so they can function in normal classroom also around the school, so they feel comfortable and easier for them to make friend and they feel safe in their classroom environment. The teacher was able to provide differential treatment to the students' contribution that played an important role distributing learning opportunities for every student. In regards to the sequence organization, the EAL teacher gave a freedom to the students to express their ideas and experiences in which they could initiate the topic of their interest even though they had limited vocabulary to express themselves. Regarding the repair organization, the teacher tried to focus on the meaning and fluency which means that she expected the students to understand and they were able to produce speech confidently.

2. In terms of the turn-taking organization, it revealed that the teacher conducted personal solicits more than general solicits, to share equal opportunities to each individual to engage actively during the interaction   and the teacher is actively encourage the students to improve their communication skills by giving them more talking space. The students' self-selection showed that the students felt free to express their ideas so that they can improve their confidence to speak in English. The teacher controlled the turn-taking but still give opportunities for the students to enhance their own learning.

3. In terms of sequence organization, the teacher initiated the sequence and topic which gave as much as possible to construct their interaction through the IRF-sequence. From the questions given by the teacher, the students can develop and expand their vocabulary within the topic. The students' responses and the teacher's feedback can be the language input for the students to develop their English proficiency. The initiation by the students

showed that the teacher gave a chance to the students to be their agent of learning. It was not the IRF sequence itself that restricted learning opportunities as many classroom-based researchers have claimed, rather it was both the quantity and quality of the opportunities for participation in the exchange that the teacher made available to students. In addition to students' own attitudes and motivation in language learning, the teacher's motivation and interest in giving them right to engage in classroom interaction also had an important role in promoting development of learning opportunities.

4. In terms of repair, the teacher in this study most of the time initiated and made the repair on the students' language trouble especially when they made errors on linguistic form. One of the most difficult achievements in EAL teaching was to maintain a simultaneous dual focus on both form and fluency. There was a focus on form in that the teacher upgraded and expanded the students' utterances on a linguistic level, which meant that the learners had a linguistically correct utterance which could function as both model and input. In this study, the teacher did not tell obviously the students' errors; instead she repeated the students' answers and elicited them with the correct form. The teacher in this EAL groups avoided to point at the students' errors so that they did not feel that they always made mistakes, in which it could lose their confidence.

Suggestions

On the basis of the conclusion of the study, the following suggestions are forwarded.

1. It is expected that the EAL teacher together with the class teacher and relevant administrators should continually gain information about the current research on EAL teaching to provide the best support for the students' progress in language learning.

2. It is expected that the EAL teachers can conduct a study to investigate the classroom interaction in terms of turn-taking organization, sequence organization and repair organization, so that it might be helpful resources for them to know and see the real situation of their classroom interaction and then they can improve their teaching practice.

REFERENCES

Behnam, B. & Pouriran, Y. 2008. Classroom Discourse: Analyzing Teacher/learner Interaction in Iranian EFL Task-Based Classrooms. An article in *Porta Linguarum* (12). 117-132. www.ugr.es/~**porta**lin/articulos/PL.../8%20Biook%20**Behnam**.pdf. *Retrieved on December 2nd.*

Ellis, R. 1986. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Gardner, R. 2004. Conversation Analysis. In Alan Davies and Catherine Elde (eds.). *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blakwell, 262-284. http://202.117.148.226/yy/uploadfiles/201006/20100606095728854.pdf. *Retrieved on December, 25th.*

Kasper, G. 1986. Repair in Foreign Language Teaching. In G. Kasper (ed.), *Learning, Teaching and Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom,* Aarhus: University Press, 12-29 *Journals.cambridge.org/production/action/cjoGetFulltext?fulltextid. Retrieved on January, 21st.*

Makinen, E. 2008. *Correction of Non-Native Students Errors in an EFL Classroom*. A Post Graduate Thesis in English. Department of Languages. https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/.../URN_NBN_fi_jyu-200806095432.pdf *Retrieved March, 19th.*.

Maroni, B. Gnisci, A. & Pontecorvo, C. 2008. Turn-taking in Classroom Interaction: Overlapping, Interruptions and Pauses in primary School. An Article in *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, Vol. XXIII (1), 54-76

McHoul, A.W. 1990. The Organisation of Repair in Classroom Talk. *Language in Society*19:394-377. *journals.cambridge.org/production/action/cjoGetFulltext?fulltextid.*

Mori, J. 2002. Task Design, Plan and Development of Talk-in-Interaction: An Analysis of a Small Group Activity in Japanese Language Classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 23 (3), 323-347. Oxford University Press. https://segue.atlas.uiuc.edu/uploads/nppm/Mori2002.pdf. *Retrieved on November, 18th.*

Paoletti, I. & Fele, G. 2004. Order and Disorder in the Classroom. International Pragmatis Association. *Pragmatics* 14 : 1. 69-85. http://unitn.academia.edu/GioloFele/Papers/1020826/Order_and_Disorder_in_the_Classroom. *Retrieved on November, 18th.*

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. and Jefferson, G.1974. 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation'. *Language* 50 (4), 696-735. http://www.liso.ucsb.edu/Jefferson/Systematics.pdf

Santiago I. R. M. 2010. *The Effect of Teacher Talk on Students' Oral Productions*. Publusihed. Final Master Dissertation. *ddd.uab.cat/pub/.../hdl.../MFP+Santiago.pdf.* .

Schegloff, E. A.2007. *Sequence organization in interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. *books.google.com › ... › Linguistics › General. Retrieved on November, 18th.*

Seedhouse, P. 2004. *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom. A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Maiden, MA: Blackwell. http://books.google.co.id/books/about/The_Interactional_Architecture_Of_The_La.html. *Retrieved on February, 23rd.*

Sert, O. & Seedhouse, P. 2011. Introduction: Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics. Novitas-Royal. *Research on Youth and Language*, 5 (1), 1-14. www.novitasroyal.org/...5.../sert_seedhouse.p. *Retrieved on December, 12th.*

Xie, X. 2008. *Interaction During Teacher-fronted Class Time of English Classes in A Chinese University*. A thesis in Fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor. Published. Victoria University of Wellington. *researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10063/829/thesis.pdf? Retrieved on March, 19th.*

Yasui, E. 2010. Repair and Language Proficiency: Differences of Advanced and beginning Language Learners in an English-Japanese Conversation Group. *An article in TPFLE Journal*, Vol. 14 (1). University of Texas. 41-57 *studentorgs.utexas.edu/flesa/TPFLE_New/.../5_Eiko%20Yasui.pdf.*